

Global Methane Initiative
3rd Steering Committee Meeting
16-17 October 2014
Montreal, Canada

Summary

The Third Session of the Global Methane Initiative (GMI) Steering Committee met in Montreal, Quebec, Canada on 16-17 October 2014. Seven GMI Partners were represented at the meeting, including: Argentina, Australia, Canada, China, Italy, Poland, and the United States. A complete attendee list is included at the back.

During its deliberations, the Steering Committee heard country updates, background on CCAC and its applicable initiatives (e.g., MSW, Agriculture, Oil and Gas), and plans for a future international methane forum. The Steering Committee also compiled a list of questions for a proposed task force to consider on GMI's future (e.g., streamlining administrative functions, linkages to other programs). The meeting followed an approved agenda that set forth a program addressing meeting goals that were outlined in a pre-distributed discussion paper on the future of GMI.

The following sections provide more details of the meeting discussions.

DAY ONE

Introductions

Mr. Paul Gunning, Climate Change Division Director with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and Steering Committee Chair, welcomed the participants and thanked Environment Canada (EC) for hosting the meeting. He provided an overview of Methane to Markets and its transition to Global Methane Initiative, and how the current climate discussions now allow more opportunity for evolution and change.

Mr. Laurence Blandford, Director of Partnerships, Climate Change International Directorate, Environment Canada, also welcomed participants to Montreal. He explained the Biosphere's history and how preparation for the 1967 Exposition led to excavation and building the island within the St. Lawrence River. The structure was built for the U.S. pavilion by Buckminster Fuller. Originally covered with acrylic panels, a 1970s fire destroyed the exterior. The structure is still considered one of the largest domes in the world. In the 1990s, Environment Canada procured the facility to serve as a water research center for the St. Lawrence River, and in recent years, transitioned the building to serve as an EC regional office as well as an environmental museum focused on sustainability.

Mr. Blandford indicated the next two days would involve very important discussions related to methane, building on the GMI Vancouver Methane Expo 2013 and political tensions surrounding short-lived climate pollutants (SLCPs). He noted that GMI was a pioneer in the methane arena and reiterated how great it was to host another meeting in Canada.

Mr. Gunning thanked Mr. Blandford and acknowledged the international diversity of Partners present, asking each to make an informal introduction. Following introductions, Mr. Gunning provided a second welcome, stating that it was great to see the core group so frequently engaged on behalf of the entire 43-Partner Initiative. He also noted this group has been steadfast in its contributions to GMI.

Mr. Gunning stated the meeting would start off with "why," as well as the goals the Administrative Support Group (ASG) set forth over the next two days, including discussion of the white paper distributed to participants in advance of the meeting. Mr. Gunning drew attention to the slide outlining meeting goals (see details below), which generally comprised: open and informal dialogue, potential changes to the GMI structure, an

evaluation/discussion of the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC), and introduction to the World Bank's new Pilot Auction Facility for Methane and Climate Mitigation. Specific meeting goals included:

- Begin a dialogue among GMI Partners about the role of GMI moving forward.
- Assess interest and achieve consensus on pursuing an extension of the GMI Charter beyond 2015.
- Discuss and identify ways in which GMI should adapt to be as effective as possible.
- Begin a dialogue about how the work of GMI could support and complement broader international approaches to methane mitigation.
- Establish a roadmap for the next 12 months to define the future of GMI post-2015.

Mr. Gunning acknowledged the science has grown stronger and stronger, which has led to steadfast approaches and growing challenges. He referred to the Obama administration's aggressive climate strategy as a catalyst for increased activity. He further explained that in the United States, methane mitigation plays an important part of climate change strategy.

Mr. Gunning explained today's agenda did not call for decisions but rather open dialogue to set forth GMI's future in accordance with a "roadmap" to 2015 (i.e., future discussions on the next steps).

Mr. Gunning indicated attendees would be asked to provide the status of advancement from each of their countries (e.g., updates) and mentioned the meeting would then move into more specific discussion of the white paper during the afternoon portion. He encouraged participants to think in the big[er] picture or outside-the-box and asked if there were other things to do (i.e., had GMI completed its tasks; if not, what remains to be done). He noted the afternoon's discussions would also explore how to advance greater efficiency globally. Mr. Gunning stated they would close out the day with an overview on where each of the countries stands regarding the questions distributed in advance to be noted by the ASG. He indicated Friday would comprise a more focused approach regarding next steps.

He again asked if there were other items for the two-day agenda. Hearing none, he proceeded to outline the anticipated meeting process, including robust discussion and open dialogue among participants. He then opened the floor to the Partner Country updates.

Partner Country Updates

Argentina

Mr. Álvaro Zopatti, Advisor on Climate Change for the Secretariat of Environment and Sustainable Development, provided Argentina's update and expressed his hope that Argentina will engage in more future projects. He noted that Argentina participated in the March 2014 tri-sector subcommittee meeting in Brazil, and provided an overview of the country's ongoing efforts. He mentioned the Global Environment Facility (GEF) embarked on efforts in the agriculture and municipal solid waste (MSW) sectors two months ago in conjunction with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in country, including the creation of new business models.

Mr. Zopatti explained that Argentina's Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) development had previously stalled but was now starting again. He noted the NAMA will examine three ambitious scenarios within the MSW sector. He also indicated Argentina is compiling its third United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) communication that includes a series of mitigation scenarios dependent on the size of municipalities—although 85 percent of Argentina's population lives in the big[est] cities—and the results will be available in November 2015, in the advance of the UNFCCC Conference of Parties (COP). He also provided an overview of the PROBIOMASA program started in 2014, which explores turning biomass into biogas as the process relates to engineers' needs. Despite its activities in the mitigation arena, Argentina has yet to join CCAC.

In response to the questions circulated to the Steering Committee in advance of the meeting, Mr. Zopatti expressed Argentina's support for GMI beyond 2015 and concurred with the goals to enlarge the "box" and

provide increased flexibility. He also commented on the emergence of small initiatives that seem to disappear after a short time and even though they don't last, they might still garner power to move critical issues forward. He also emphasized the specificity of methane and how it differs from other initiatives' missives. Again, Mr. Zopatti expressed Argentina's complete willingness to support GMI, and despite not being very active over the last decade, the country has greatly benefitted from the technical and policy information provided by the partnership.

Mr. Henry Ferland with the GMI ASG inquired about the mitigation options anticipated in Argentina's third communication and whether efforts specifically target methane. Mr. Zopatti responded that ideally, the document would be organized by sector as well as size of municipality. Once the results are available in November, he will share this item with the ASG.

Australia

Mr. Michael Schwager, Minister Counsellor (Science & Technology) with the Embassy of Australia in Washington, DC, provided Australia's update, noting the abundance of recent policy changes. He reiterated Australia's reduction commitment(s) and growing policy arena, including potential activities (e.g., direct action plan) that will replace the previous government's Clean Energy Future Plan. Mr. Schwager continued by stating Australia has established a \$2.55 billion emission reduction fund that provides incentives for businesses, households, and landowners to reduce emissions. Confidential bids for a specified carbon price will be submitted/considered, and the entities will enter contracts. The new emission reduction fund works with closed and/or existing programs to reinvigorate efforts.

Mr. Schwager described Australia's efforts in the agriculture sector, including Carbon Farming Initiative which encourages farmers to undertake methane and carbon reductions that can be sold to businesses to offset their emissions. The initiative focuses primarily on biogas from livestock and landfills. In regards to "Filling the Research Gap" program, the Australian government is providing assistance to farmers to help them adapt to climate change by implementing changes such as higher-efficiency fertilizers. Australia's National Agriculture Manure Management Program (NAMMP), for example, is currently exploring 16 research projects for improving livestock practices. The Ruminant Pangenome Program (RPP) is also compiling high-quality data by genome type.

In the coal arena, Australia's Coal Mine Abatement Technology Support Program (TSP) comprises government regulations and funding totaling nearly \$40 million to identify safe abatement measures by capturing fugitive emissions. This investment is currently matched 1:1 by industry; thereby increasing the available funds to \$80 million for methane pre-drainage, ventilation air methane (VAM), and research into other mitigation options.

Mr. Schwager indicated Australia joined CCAC in October 2012 and is represented by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, with primary focus on initiatives related to hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), black carbon, and oil and gas emissions. He noted Australia's participation in GMI is conducted by the Department of Industry. He continued by stating its participation in GMI is due to its methane-specific focus and engagement of the coal mining sector. He noted that CCAC is providing policy and financial support to its participants, and significant progress has been made in the short time since its start. In closing, he emphasized Australia would support consolidation and/or increased collaboration with CCAC, as well as streamlined administrative function(s), and would be pleased to participate in efforts for the proposed Roadmap 2015 via teleconference or webinar as the government has imposed a "no travel" rule.

Mr. Zbigniew Kamienski, Director with the Polish Ministry of Economy, asked Mr. Schwager about Australia's coal mine methane (CMM) efforts and whether these were actual projects and/or demonstrations. Mr. Schwager responded Australia's activities primarily comprise demonstrations (e.g., structure of vent shafts) typically called "pilots." Mr. Kamienski asked if cost effectiveness was considered during these pilots. Mr. Schwager confirmed and said he would be happy to circulate the findings once available.

Mr. William Niebling, Senior Advisor for Congressional & International Affairs at U.S. EPA, expressed his hope that Australia would elaborate on how the two different departments work on CCAC versus GMI during the afternoon's discussion. Mr. Ferland asked if Australia had an incentive-based program similar to Argentina, to which Mr. Schwager responded affirmatively to some degree but indicated there were no direct incentives to do more (i.e., go above and beyond).

Canada

Mr. Franck Portalupi, Manager, Technology Partnerships in the Climate Change International Directorate at Environment Canada, provided Canada's update and explained that they have been involved with GMI since 2005, including participating in the Steering Committee and four subcommittees as well as funding on-the-ground projects. He continued by reviewing active federal mandates related to Canada's regulatory sectoral plans, particularly as they relate to transportation and energy. Mr. Portalupi continued to describe the country's advocacy science related to SLCPs, and investment in clean energy (example included the Tech Fund at Sustainable Development Technology Canada (SDTC) which invested \$600M for 230 projects over the past three years).

He also described Canada's international efforts to assist Chile, Colombia, and Mexico with NAMA development. He noted Canada co-chairs the GMI Oil and Gas Subcommittee and also serves as the Arctic Council chair. Within the CCAC realm, Canada was one of the original founders and top contributor (\$13 million), and serves on the steering committee. For CCAC's Oil and Gas Initiative, Canada is leading the technology demonstration component. Canada is also focused on financing and urban health issues. He acknowledged more can be done to mitigate methane and encouraged a strengths and weaknesses analysis. By doing more, he said the initiative(s) have the potential to make a bigger impact and with GMI at a crossroads, now is the time to revise the GMI's Terms of Reference (TOR). Specifically, he encouraged looking at ways to emphasize strengths and reduce duplication in order to make maximum impact and/or provide "bigger bang for the buck."

Mr. Portalupi explained that Canada would support a bigger/broader approach that builds on the strengths of both GMI and CCAC, noting GMI has lost buy-in from its Partners and as a newer initiative, CCAC [still] has it. However, he explained the newer initiative has greatly benefitted from the foundation provided by GMI. He anticipated "marketability" might be the way the initiative will be judged. He also noted the funding element is missing from GMI but given its knowledge and ability to serve as a clearinghouse, perhaps CCAC could serve the financing role. Mr. Portalupi re-stated Canada's commitment to work toward the Roadmap 2015 by participating in the proposed task force, helping to engage the entire Partnership as well as Project Network, and identifying best ways to implement eventual changes.

Mr. Ferland asked Mr. Portalupi about Canada's international support to developing countries and whether it is specific to GMI. Mr. Portalupi responded Canada's support was provided as part of either GMI or CCAC, depending on the activity and/or sector.

Mr. David Turk with the U. S. Department of State asked how GMI participation has influenced Canada's sectors. Mr. Portalupi indicated Canada has a strong relationship within its industries and feedback from stakeholders has been positive. Mr. Blandford interjected CCAC has had a larger policy impact, and they are looking for more opportunities to leverage networking among the private sector to bring the message(s) forward.

Mr. Gunning asked if there was greater awareness in Canada of methane and its impact as a result of GMI and Mr. Portalupi confirmed, stating the sector-specific focus has been important to advancing awareness. He continued by saying despite different mandates, there was support from the government familiar with the sector-specific issues.

China

Mr. Zhen Sun, Department of Climate Change Deputy Director-General with the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) provided China's statement on methane emission reduction, stating that China has been mainly focused on carbon dioxide- (CO₂)- and energy-related emissions to date. In order to improve its position on climate change, the *National Plan for Addressing Climate Change (2011-2020)* has been issued by the government that includes an audit of local governments. Various cities have already published local carbon emission reduction management methods and 47 projects have been registered by NDRC. Seven provinces and/or cities have initiated carbon emission trading pilot programs that show the price is steadily rising. China's greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory will also be helpful to help guide businesses in development of mitigation plans.

Mr. Sun indicated that China is active on all five GMI subcommittees, with representatives from various organizations and government agencies (e.g., departments) or companies, as is the case with the oil and gas sector. In the coal sector particularly, he commented there are 11 GMI-funded projects that have reduced emissions by 12 billion cubic meters. He continued to explain these efforts focus on energy utilization and worker safety, regulatory updates, and capacity building. In the agriculture sector, China worked with GMI to prepare feasibility studies for 16 farms and vigorously developed rural household and farm biogas projects. An overview of the remaining sectors can be found in China's presentation.

Mr. Sun indicated he did not address the Steering Committee's advance questions in his presentation, but would be willing to express China's position in later discussions and/or participation in future conference calls. He did explain there has been discussion with NDRC on whether to join CCAC and indicated a main problem is the issue with black carbon, which is not a GHG. He further expressed the political sensitivities that GHGs should be the focus. He did, however, defend the position to use CCAC as a foundation for more policies China could support. He also reinforced GMI's approach to technology transfer and felt efforts had proved successful. Mr. Sun said Chinese industry has appealed to the government for emission reductions incentives and questioned whether the carbon market should include methane. He again emphasized China's current focus on energy-related CO₂ emissions. Industry is looking for permissions to incorporate methane, but it might be a wait of five or more years before government policy catches up.

On the separation between GMI and CCAC, Mr. Sun commented that perhaps duplication is not all bad as long as more conversations are taking place. He did, however, note the need for more political support and funding within GMI and asked how China might be able to advance those issues. Mr. Blandford acknowledged Mr. Sun's comment that not all duplication is bad and overlap and/or completion [between initiatives] might be positive. He noted it would be important to avoid bureaucratic duplication (e.g., same functions).

Mr. Sun commented on the absence of developing country participation in the meeting and whether their involvement would be encouraged in the future discussions. Mr. Gunning confirmed the ASG would seek to engage the entire breadth of the Partnership in Roadmap 2015 discussions.

Mr. Turk asked which Chinese sectors were most posed to benefit from a potential financing mechanism. Mr. Sun responded that in accordance with the National Plan, Chinese industry is considering how to improve its carbon market and which projects generate emissions to advance carbon trade. He said they need would need to carefully examine the sectors given economic reliance by industry. He also commented on the need to provide other incentives such as the World Bank Global Gas Flaring Reduction (GGFR) Partnership and the European Union. He acknowledged Australia's work in China and its impact on the carbon market. Mr. Turk asked when the National Plan would be ready and Mr. Sun responded they were at the very beginning of the process and there was no official time table.

Mr. Gunning asked if methane awareness was increasing in China as in Canada. Mr. Sun again re-iterated China's efforts have been CO₂-focused, particularly from a policy perspective.

Italy

Mr. Filippo Lonardo, Deputy Consul at the Consulate of Italy in Montreal, provided a brief overview of Italy's involvement in climate-related issues. He indicated Italy is currently serving as the European Union (EU) President this term and he will work to share issues raised during the meeting with his colleagues back home. He also noted Italy will host the 2015 Universal Exposition (Expo) in Milan, and hopes to work with others present toward a good result for GMI.

Poland

Mr. Kaminski opened Poland's country update by indicating GMI activity is very important and Poland participates in all five sectors. In particular, coal and its related methane emissions are considered critical energy sources. He explained the sector seeks to capture methane emissions and use the gas productively—in lieu of [coal] excavation, in some cases. Within the agriculture sector, they are working in livestock management but he admitted enteric fermentation is a bigger issue for Poland. Mr. Kaminski continued by explaining Poland is compiling an oil and gas inventory to better guide future activities. For wastewater, 60 percent of the potential emissions are currently captured and he expects that coverage to increase to 80 percent by 2020. He explained MSW is not an area for future consideration given EU regulations (e.g., organics diversion) and they anticipate lower emissions from landfills in the coming years. Mr. Kaminski provided an overview of data on methane usage for energy and the percent captured and reviewed project development in Poland. Within the agriculture sector, for example, digester installations doubled from 2012 to 2014 and there are new ideas emerging. For wastewater, the industry is capable of generating 40 to 70 percent of its energy needs, and their heat requirements are fully covered by methane captured. In the MSW realm, he re-iterated there are no future opportunities for methane generation/capture since the EU no longer allows organics to be disposed in landfills.

Poland is embarking on a *National Programme for Development of a Low-Emission Economy* and therefore, participates in both GMI and CCAC. Mr. Kaminski expressed his view that GMI fills the role of technical consultant providing global solutions and sees CCAC in the role of popularizing, educating, and spreading awareness. He felt there was a good dividing line between the two organizations and has discussed that division with persons deeply involved in both GMI and CCAC. He did note, however, perhaps GMI could serve in an advisory capacity to the UNFCCC, with a focus on proposing global solutions.

Following conclusion of Poland's update, Mr. Blandford commented on the anticipated brainstorming that might take place over the next two days and potential linkage(s) to carbon markets. He also wondered if the Clean Technology Centre should be channeled through the UNFCCC. He emphasized the need to avoid an overly formal link to the UNFCCC but saw the benefit of having an improved relationship.

United States

Mr. William Niebling, Senior Advisor for Congressional & International Affairs in USEPA's office of air and radiation, provided the United States' update, starting with the White House's *Strategy to Reduce Methane Emissions* (i.e., "strategy") released in March 2014, as part of the Obama administration's climate action plan. He noted the strategy includes both domestic and international activities in the MSW, coal, agriculture, and oil and gas sectors, as well as continued support for both GMI and CCAC. He reviewed U.S. support for GMI, indicating that assessments, capacity building, and information sharing have led to project development and ultimately emissions reductions. Mr. Niebling continued to highlight U.S. support, including direct funding that has led to significant leveraged funding. He also provided a brief description of the anticipated international methane forum to be held in 2015 that will follow a similar format to previous Expos and partnership-wide meetings. He explained the United States participates in numerous initiatives, including CCAC and GGRF, as well as GMI.

Mr. Niebling reviewed a potential model to better align GMI with CCAC, including a streamlined administrative component and overarching mechanisms to corral agriculture, MSW, and wastewater issues in a combined biogas sector. He emphasized the United States supports the idea of an autonomous GMI, but with [increased]

coordination among certain sectors (e.g., agriculture, MSW, oil and gas) that have CCAC-specific initiatives while maintaining continued support for non-CCAC sectors (e.g., coal mines). On the topic of potential consolidation of biogas, he envisioned a leaner, more efficient effort as well as opportunity to transform into a more powerful sector within Roadmap 2015 through key policies/practices and high-level engagement.

Mr. Portalupi asked whether the U.S. methane plan included a component to divert organics from landfills for composting. Ms. Pamela Franklin, Non-CO₂ Program Branch (NCPB) Chief with U.S. EPA, responded there was a regulatory proposal on diversion and public comments are currently coming in.

Mr. Sun asked about the U.S.-supported projects in China, some of which he was unaware, and Mr. Niebling said the ASG would provide the corresponding information. Mr. Ferland indicated the ASG had not provided the traditional “status of outreach and communications” paper to the Steering Committee, but the ASG was working on more transparent information via a forthcoming Google map application would show sector-specific projects worldwide. He added that as more information became available, Partners would be encouraged to share and/or update the content. He also envisioned this map would help strengthen GMI’s knowledge hub.

Colombia

Ms. Monica Shimamura provided Colombia’s update on behalf of the country representative who was unable to attend the meeting in person. She opened by explaining Colombia’s Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) for which GMI will provide peer review support. With initial support from Canada, Colombia has started developing a NAMA and is looking for additional financing to complete the process. It would also like to develop a measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) process.

Ms. Shimamura reported that Colombia participates in CCAC, particularly the Oil and Gas Initiative. She explained that Colombia supports a more holistic view of the climate change arena, with GMI as a pioneer and CCAC as an implementation partner. Colombia does envision a broader emphasis on technology transfer and supports the idea of a Roadmap 2015, with greater cooperation from industry.

Germany

Mr. Ferland reviewed Germany’s update, starting with 23 projects totaling \$41.7 million Euros through the International Climate Initiative (Internationale Klimaschutzinitiative or IKI). He also mentioned the forthcoming World Bank pilot auction, noting the U.S. State Department would provide additional details in later discussions. Mr. Ferland indicated Germany’s efforts are focused on domestic efforts under the new EU measures, noting the waste sector became a closed cycle in 2013 and most efforts now target waste prevention activities. He also reported Germany has a National Climate Action Programme and is an active member of CCAC, particularly in MSW bilateral waste management projects. Germany expressed its view the CCAC is more suitable for its efforts and given EU limitations, is a lesser participant in GMI. Germany’s continued participation in both initiatives will depend on avoided parallels and co-joined meetings.

Mexico

Mr. Ferland also provided Mexico’s update, stating that it has been a key GMI Partner from the beginning and has adopted complementary national goals/plan on GHG mitigation. Since 2004, Mexico has participated in all five GMI subcommittees and currently serves as the co-chair for both Oil and Gas and Wastewater.

Current and/or future Mexican sector-specific efforts include:

- Oil and Gas: Complete a NAMA under PEMEX leadership.
- Agriculture: To date, 317 digesters have been installed and the country is compiling a best practices handbook.
- MSW: Focused on electricity generation and biogas control.

- Wastewater: Latin America's largest plant capturing biogas.
- Coal Mines: Looking at mechanisms to capture/use CMM.

Additionally, Mexico will continue to participate in GMI as well as co-chair the subcommittees. Mr. Ferland noted that Mexico is represented by SEMARNAT on GMI and other agencies for CCAC. Mexico would be interested to work on key elements to differentiate between GMI and CCAC, while also looking for synergies to leverage each initiative's work. Mexico is also willing to serve on the task force regarding GMI's future.

Mr. Gunning thanked Mr. Ferland for delivering Mexico's update and asked if there were any additional Partner observations or comments. Mr. Blandford interjected the former CCAC Steering Committee chair from Nigeria expressed a desire to attend the meeting but was unable to make the trip. He encouraged the GMI Steering Committee and subsequent task force to engage her in future discussions going forward.

Mr. Gunning thanked all the participants for their country updates, saying he was pleased to hear the growth in projects and the spectrum of comments on GMI's future.

ASG Update

Mr. Ferland provided the ASG update to give participants a sense of GMI's background before the group proceeded into more in-depth discussions. He reviewed the importance of methane (see bullets below), stating these elements led to creation of the former Methane to Markets later re-launched as GMI:

- SLCP, with atmospheric lifespan of 12 years.
- Most prevalent manmade GHG after CO₂.
- Traps 28 times more heat in the atmosphere than CO₂.
- Accounts for 32 percent of climate forcing.

He also described the global sources of methane, noting more than 60 percent of anthropogenic methane comes from the sectors targeted by GMI. He acknowledged enteric fermentation and rice cultivation are the largest sources and while not covered by GMI, they might be addressed by CCAC. The ASG update included a map showing GMI Partner Countries and Mr. Ferland explained GMI members represent nearly 70 percent of total manmade methane emissions, which equates to approximately 5,000 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMTCO₂E).

Mr. Ferland continued to highlight GMI's project development cycle that helps sum up the various aspects of what GMI does: assessment, information sharing, capacity building, and partnerships. He emphasized the inter-linkage between each "piece" of the puzzle and how activities flow back-and-forth (i.e., multi-directional). He elaborated on each element of the cycle, noting these inter-linkages lead to more projects. He also reviewed the number of activities undertaken (e.g., more than 110 resource assessments; 13,000 people trained). He also reviewed GMI's accomplishments over the last decade, which include nearly 300 MMTCO₂E actual emission reductions since 2004, with another 100 MMTCO₂E potential emission reductions that could be achieved if those projects were implemented given the right resources (i.e., financing).

The ASG update also included GMI major events, comprised of three Expos—Beijing (2007), New Delhi (2010), Vancouver (2013)—that attracted more than 1,500 attendees combined. Mr. Ferland emphasized the Expo is the only forum specifically targeting methane and provides networking opportunities for the experts, developers, and national governments.

Mr. Ferland provided an overview of the core technical development in GMI's sectors that build on synergies without duplicating efforts, and noted some of the key projects or accomplishments in each sector (see slides for complete details). Mr. Ferland also noted the GMI Project Network is now comprised of more than 1,300

entities—ranging from multi-national banks such as World Bank and the Asian Development Bank to small technology providers.

Mr. Ferland continued the ASG update by reiterating the past decade's accomplishments (e.g., 43 Partners; 1,300 Project Network members, wealth of information) and also presented future opportunities such as reductions that can be achieved at \$0/ton CO₂E and \$30/ton CO₂E and sharing NAMA development experiences (e.g., Argentina) with other countries. He also described the forthcoming World Bank pilot auction facility, into which GMI might be able to feed potential projects, and post-2015 funding mechanisms in the absence of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).

Mr. Ferland concluded the presentation by stating this would be a transformative year for GMI, with opportunities to identify yet-to-be-solved problems (e.g., barriers), develop new tools to work on, and link to complementary programs (e.g., CCAC) given the new climate change environment that did not exist in 2004.

Mr. Gunning thanked the ASG for its update, and acknowledged the tremendous work that has been put into the Partnership over the last 10 years. He commented the discussions would now follow a more formal track but he was encouraged to hear from the onset all the positive messages from the meeting participants during their country updates. He explained the GMI charter will expire in 2015 and since he believes international collaboration will continue to be important in the methane mitigation realm, this provides a timely opportunity to help guide what GMI might look like going forward.

Mr. Schwager expressed Australia's willingness to continue GMI and also to participate in the task force. He noted particular concern that the CCAC lacks any approach toward coal, given Australia has made significant investment in technical potential in recent years. He added that GMI serves an important role in information sharing that—through increased international collaboration—could help transform pilot projects into commercial applications. Mr. Niebling provided the U.S. position to continue GMI, while hoping to identify ways to leverage links to other organizations. Mr. Sun acknowledged 2015 as a year of transition and added to Australia's comment that many practices will have commercial importance, and he hoped the Partnership could help find ways to encourage government actions (e.g., policies). In particular, he expressed the need to aggregate information toward policy formulation and emphasized the importance for national governments to assume or embrace ownership with the initiative. Mr. Gunning echoed Mr. Sun's comment on 2015 being a transformative year, as well as the need for governments to take ownership. He asked how GMI might evaluate what it does next.

Mr. Kamienski commented on the possibility to present concrete results (e.g., emission reductions) as a good way to point out GMI's benefits. He indicated GMI should seek closer cooperation with CCAC, but from the point-of-view to concentrate efforts on concrete results without duplication. He acknowledged CCAC as important and that GMI should find an effective way to divide activities. He also emphasized that CCAC does not include a coal component, which is important to Poland. He suggested going forward, GMI seek clear lines of division in the pursuit of perceived duplication efforts.

Mr. Portalupi provided Canada's position, indicating they support a renewed charter and reminded participants of GMI's re-launch and expanded scope revealed in Mexico City to include methane abatement and avoidance. He commented on that impressive session comprised of ministers and the private sector and the eventual outcomes. He also expressed Canada's desire to find ways to link with and/or leverage CCAC activities in order to attain a "bigger bang for the buck."

Mr. Zopatti noted Argentina has been watching the changes in the climate arena and while it supports links to existing initiatives (e.g., CCAC), he encouraged the participants to consider linkages to new and/or other emerging initiatives even if it might be unclear of their intended outcomes. He noted some of these programs might be specific to individual countries (i.e., micro-level). Mr. Zopatti also talked about leveraging existing products (e.g., UNDP tool to assess if NAMAs are ready/sustainable) and how to employ GMI's expertise to mobilize the private sector to action. Mr. Blandford stated that while not from Canada's perspective, he wondered what GMI might want to develop for ministers' response or consideration (e.g., set of decisions, future needs,

results). He commented on GMI's gas-specific focus versus CCAC's more broad approach to air issues, which might be perceived as a lack of focus. He also referred to the transformative process as bottom-up (i.e., "where do we [want to] end up?"). Within CCAC, for example, the initiative maps its goals to activities (e.g., engage 1,000 cities in the MSW initiative). He pushed for GMI to consider a mapping exercise to help tie pieces of the pie to organizations. As part of the "Roadmap to 2015," he encouraged GMI to pencil in development of three to four products—and their intended audiences (e.g., ministers).

Mr. Turk responded how [best] to work with CCAC by emphasizing GMI's 10-year history and this transformative opportunity to recraft its mission. He recognized not all GMI Partners participate in CCAC so it might be complicated but he thought the challenge(s) could be overcome with rigorous and robust thought. He added a strengths-and-weaknesses analysis might be helpful to determine how pieces fit. He commented that some of GMI's strengths over the last 10 years are unparalleled elsewhere (e.g., not even World Bank). GMI encompasses the world's 10 largest methane emitters and Partners account for 70 percent of the total manmade methane emissions. Weaknesses might be lack of political buy-in and/or multi-lateral ownership beyond the Partners in the room. Mr. Turk encouraged the participants to conduct the analysis by mapping against other organizations (not just CCAC) and ask themselves "what's in it for me?" He also noted the broad diversity of Partners across the spectrum of countries (e.g., developing, developed) and further encouraged them to look at potential changes through a country lens. He suggested examining other voluntary partnerships (e.g., cook stove initiative, Arctic Council) to benefit from their lessons learned. He commented that any one program can't do everything; otherwise, they are doing nothing. He also noted there are moments in time to match the country's will to its needs. He explained the White House strategy was a major deal/effort and based on the experience, he foresees how to match political expertise and capture opportunities for countries. He also acknowledged Argentina's comments to get to the heart of models and prompted participants to lay out some framing thoughts.

Mr. Kamienski asked if a similar discussion was happening within CCAC (i.e., do they see the need to be linked with GMI). Mr. Blandford responded CCAC is a relatively new organization—only two years young—so they would need GMI to clarify the pitch (i.e., come up with a sense of self). He anticipates that if the message makes good sense (e.g., reduce perceived duplication), it will likely be easily approved or adopted. Mr. Turk echoed the two-year tenure, despite CCAC's rapid growth. Again, he mentioned mapping the strengths and weaknesses to see who has what and where it [best] fits. He anticipated a desire by CCAC to bring in GMI. He added that he does not see the need for the two organizations to merge and results to date show need/room for both.

Mr. Gunning said it sounded like there was strong agreement for approaching CCAC, and he anticipated robust discussion around GMI's goal/vision. He also said the ASG would ask the task force to consider GMI's role in relationship to UNFCCC. Hearing consensus to continue the discussion toward GMI's transformation over the next year, he specifically asked if participants would support moving forward and there were no objections. He indicated the afternoon agenda would include a review of CCAC efforts to date (e.g., sector-specific initiatives, financing) and how GMI might work in concert with these efforts.

To open the afternoon session, Mr. Gunning previewed the agenda, noting it would serve as a guidepost for discussion. In particular, he stated discussions would focus on developing synergies with CCAC and streamlining the administrative function(s) of GMI. He continued by emphasizing the opportunity to develop bigger, broader, and better approaches regarding framework and financing. He then invited Mr. Turk to provide additional background about CCAC to set the stage for today's and future discussions.

CCAC Presentations

General Overview of CCAC

Mr. Turk opened the General Overview of CCAC by noting Australia, Canada, Italy, and Poland—as well as the United States—are CCAC members. He indicated CCAC was a work in progress, being only two years old so he would take a step back and provide a strategic look. He explained CCAC was launched in 2012 with six partner countries and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), which serves as the secretariat so no one

country staffs the initiative. There are now 90 partner countries to date, as well as numerous international and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), so CCAC has experienced tremendous growth. He continued to explain CCAC's trust fund with a wide group of contributors, with the United States as the third largest donor. CCAC is structured similarly to GMI in that it is a non-binding, voluntary public-private model, but with SLCPs as the primary focus. He noted the group is eclectic and relies on lessons learned from previous efforts. Mr. Turk explained that while CCAC was science-driven, with efforts built on information such as the UNEP report, it is not looking to develop new science but instead ramp up and take action based on existing data. He likened the initiative as comparable to UNFCCC's CO₂ efforts, although it is focused not just on climate issues but also takes into consideration health impacts and agriculture benefits.

Mr. Turk explained there are 11 individual initiatives in varying stages of development or action, and not all are project based. He indicated CCAC approached funding as a catalyst between government and industry. He also noted the identification of which initiatives to pursue were based on analysis such as political will, funding, and interested cities or other stakeholders. He reviewed the sectoral versus cross-cutting initiatives, as well as Supporting National Planning (SNAP) actions for developing countries. He emphasized that when a partner joins CCAC, there is no bar—countries participate to the extent they can/want. He said again that CCAC is science-driven but it is organized around policy; therefore, it has an advisory panel. As far as work in progress, he said that there have been successes to date but many challenges remain.

Mr. Blandford interjected that CCAC is primarily a minister-level organization that relies on political will, which is how Canada has been able to contribute funding (i.e., high-level attention and support). He noted this is an important feature of CCAC (e.g., certain clientele) and these high-level officials are hearing directly from the experts. Mr. Turk acknowledged the collaborative, collegiate process, stating again the initiative is non-binding (i.e., no treaty) and it is in the partners' self-interest to make emission reductions.

Mr. Schwager asked if the funding came strictly from partner countries. Mr. Turk confirmed that no funding has been contributed by the private sector and also noted the funding has come from 10 countries. He did mention, however, that the private sector does come into play as full members engaged in particular sectors (e.g., oil and gas companies) albeit voluntary efforts. He noted funding is the missing ingredient for GMI, so perhaps the goal should be to identify projects. Mr. Blandford commented on how the private sector players might invest in promising solutions, such as financing a group on black carbon in order to tap into expertise.

Mr. Sun asked if the ultimate direction of CCAC might be to establish a structure similar to the UNFCCC (i.e., treaty), similar to the U.S.-China agreement on hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). He further expressed a concern from the perspective of developing countries that this should be a UNFCCC responsibility, but perhaps in close cooperation with CCAC. He also referred to China's work with the United States on cookstoves. Mr. Turk responded the CCAC was established to be a supportive, collaborative effort and was not meant to be a treaty-based exercise. He added the initiative was more so a constructive approach to how countries could do more. He also noted that in the SLCP space, there was a desire that all countries should benefit from cutting-edge science as well as the non-state actors. Regarding comments on the UNFCCC, he emphasized that CCAC is not an alternative model and/or to be absorbed by the framework. It was instead intended to be a forum in which countries can benefit from policy development. Specifically, he explained CCAC focuses on how the various sectors relate and employ comparative analysis to carefully tailor and fill any [missing] niches.

Mr. Ferland asked about the CCAC decision-making process, to which Mr. Turk responded the CCAC framework guides a consensus-driven process over three levels or layers: high-level assembly, a working group, and a Steering Committee co-chaired by Norway and Chile. As previously mentioned, UNEP hosts and staffs the secretariat and provides communications and outreach, science officers, logistics, and support for the initiatives. Mr. Schwager asked when the working group last met. Mr. Turk explained the CCAC working group met in July 2014, and will meet again in Nepal in November 2014.

Mr. Blandford commented on some of the important features of the CCAC initiatives, of which each has its own organization with a core group of lead partners that serve in a decision-making capacity. He also noted that

consensus does not require agreement by everybody but rather a willingness to let an idea go forth. He added not everybody provides input on every issue (i.e., there is no official text that requires approval). Mr. Schwager asked if the 11 initiatives were static. Mr. Turk responded that initiative growth would depend on partners coming up with a new area. If there were an issue that was compelling and able to achieve traction, CCAC might be willing to set aside time and labor to explore further.

Mr. Turk did acknowledge some weaknesses of CCAC, including not all of the big emitters participate and the need to establish relevance in the climate change arena. Mr. Gunning asked how the action plan initiative was progressing. Mr. Turk explained that it was one of the original initiatives and focused on capacity building in developing countries (e.g., NAMAs), adding that funding had been set aside to hire local consultant to be housed within the partner governments. He said the initiative was also exploring how efforts apply to developed countries.

Mr. Gunning asked if there any other general questions regarding CCAC. Hearing none, he invited Ms. Hingman Leung, a Climate Change International Policy analyst with Environment Canada, to provide an overview on the MSW initiative.

CCAC MSW Initiative

Ms. Leung opened the CCAC MSW initiative presentation by explaining that Canada plays a strong role in both the GMI MSW Subcommittee as well as the CCAC MSW Initiative. She then reviewed the various partner countries and global organizations participating in the MSW initiative. She emphasized the initiative works directly with cities, with a goal to engage 1,000 cities by 2020, and explained the initiative operates in a three-prong framework to assess, build, and scale [up projects]. She noted progress to date includes establishing mentors, compiling and launching a knowledge platform, as well as assembling a diverse group of organizations that have provide an important route to new partners and pilot cities. One of the tools developed under the MSW initiative includes an emissions quantification calculator to help identify where the best value might be found. Ms. Leung also reflected on the synergies with GMI after two years. She added the CCAC effort provides the opportunity to hear from countries that have already done the work (e.g., mentors) and she saw how GMI and CCAC could work cooperatively within this sector.

Mr. Gunning asked if the MSW Initiative cities were [required to be] in CCAC partner countries. Ms. Leung responded the criteria for identifying and/or selecting cities requires national government buy-in but CCAC membership is not required, providing Pune as an example whereas India is not a CCAC partner. Mr. Turk interjected on the need to recognize how much of the initial push comes from GMI. Mr. Gunning also asked if GMI MSW Subcommittee delegates are representatives or involved in the CCAC initiative. Mr. Portalupi acknowledged GMI certainly helped the CCAC ramp up. Mr. Blandford likened the CCAC initiative and GMI subcommittee to harvesting (i.e., CCAC) what has been planted (i.e., GMI). He also encouraged participants to find ways to leverage opportunities to access the channels created by CCAC to reach key decision-makers, citing Norway's desire to work on urban health issues through some of the CCAC MSW Initiative cities. Mr. Gunning also commented on how support filters down from the country to city level. Mr. Portalupi noted the MSW Initiative is working outside the cities as well so the effort is not done in isolation and provided the Cali, Colombia example. Ms. Leung added that some of the funding (e.g., Asian Development Bank) has to be funneled through the national government (i.e., cannot go directly to the cities) so again, buy-in and support are critical. Mr. Niebling made the observation that while the municipal wastewater sector is similar to MSW, he did not see wastewater-specific representation within CCAC so he felt the need to maintain GMI's autonomy to serve that sector.

Mr. Sun commented not all waste management occurs at the city level (i.e., might be regional). Ms. Leung acknowledged the initiative started at the city-level initially but they now see how national buy-in is necessary given regulations and/or standards so they are moving beyond mere cities. Mr. Zopatti asked if the initiative worked with other city networks. Ms. Leung stated they are looking for ways to leverage and/or create linkages

with such networks, particularly as it relates to three sectors (i.e., agriculture, MSW, wastewater) that produce biogas. She also indicated the initiative is working with the transportation sector that moves the waste.

Mr. Zopatti also raised the issue about how to deal with a situation when the city is not the same political party as the national government and the difficulty to obtain buy-in. Mr. Niebling said it might be a case of getting tools into the right hands (e.g., technicians) regardless where the interest came from—either city or national government.

CCAC Agriculture Initiative

Mr. Portalupi provided an overview of the CCAC Agriculture Initiative that was launched in 2013, starting with the objective to share and implement best practices to reduce SLCPs in the agriculture sector. He emphasized three components (see bullets below); some focus on methane, while others target black carbon. He then provided an overview of the following components, including financing and expected results:

- Livestock and Manure Management: \$2.193 million to increase awareness, create a network, assess best practices, and develop pilot projects.
- Open Agricultural Burning: \$300K investment to determine nature of open burning, create a network, and develop shovel-ready projects.
- Paddy Rice Production: \$777K to create an information hub (e.g., clearinghouse) as well as a network.

He indicated the initiative has proposed the inclusion of enteric fermentation (still under development). Mr. Portalupi acknowledged the synergies with GMI comprised of communication and information sharing, technology transfer, and capacity building.

Mr. Gunning asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he provided his observations relating to enteric fermentation and rice cultivation, which GMI explored (but declined) in the past, and he thought it was great that someone else picked up those issues. He did express some concern regarding overlap versus synergy in the livestock realm. As CCAC explores other sectors, he hoped the initiative(s) would make an effort to engage other agriculture-related organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and New Zealand's agriculture-related activities. Mr. Portalupi addressed Mr. Gunning's concern on livestock, saying that it was not necessarily perceived as overlap since the effort actually builds on GMI's efforts. He also acknowledged the large role New Zealand is playing in enteric fermentation (e.g., governance structure). He noted that FAO, as lead partner, is also engaged, providing funding as well as in-kind services.

Ms. Franklin commented that perhaps GMI could dust off and re-package some of its tools and documents for the forthcoming agriculture platform. Mr. Portalupi indicated the platform is still in Phase 1 and they are working to identify existing resources, such as those developed by GMI, noting it will be essential to build a comprehensive resource.

CCAC Oil and Gas Initiative

Mr. Turk provided the CCAC Oil and Gas Initiative presentation and stated that this effort comprised of two components, and was one of the first initiatives given that oil and gas accounts for more than 20 percent of total methane. He added the initiative was formulated in conjunction with GMI stakeholders. A new Oil and Gas Methane Partnership (OGMP) was launched in 2014 as a public-private partnership to address upstream leaks. He continued to explain CCAC leveraged GMI's foundational approaches, with companies agreeing to participate via Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) to survey, identify, and quantify leaks that can be cost-effectively mitigated. The OGMP also requires participants to publically report their findings and he noted companies get technical assistance to aid in their efforts.

Mr. Turk reviewed a chart on programmatic components of the various oil and gas-related efforts (e.g., Gas STAR, GMI, GGFR, CCAC) for added value and/or where missing pieces might exist. Mr. Portalupi indicated the initiative's technology demonstrations were based on GMI's Oil and Gas Subcommittee activities, and have been

expanded to prevent black carbon as well as remove hydrocarbons, which are valuable for reuse. He added the initiative provides companies with the opportunity to employ cutting-edge technologies to yield a business case for savings. He reported work started in March 2014, with measurement studies undertaken by PEMEX in Mexico and EcoPetrol in Colombia. Additional outreach has been conducted in Canada and Nigeria. He emphasized the CCAC oil and gas-related efforts would never have happened without the foundation created by GMI (e.g., capacity building, information sharing, policy development tools, demonstrations, partnerships).

Mr. Gunning again asked if there were questions. Since none were voiced, he expressed his perception that CCAC seemed to be focused on oil and gas production and inquired what was being done in the processing, distribution, and transmission sectors. Mr. Turk responded the initiative relied on high-level ministers to engage officials at the corporate level (e.g., Chief Operating Officer) and that scenario was most prevalent in the production sector. Mr. Portalupi added they worked through the NAMA process in Mexico and Colombia to identify which companies might be most driven by cost savings, which also happened to be production companies. He provided an example that one facility identified the opportunity to save \$237 million by mitigating 1 million MTCO₂E.

Mr. Sun inquired about protecting company-specific data. Mr. Turk said it was a critical component, and the initiative employed both discretion and flexibility in regard to reporting. He noted the initiative targeted opportunities (e.g., emission reductions) to show progress versus production volumes. Mr. Ferland commented on the role of GMI as an incubator and how it helped companies get to a level of comfort/willingness to join. Mr. Turk echoed the foundational role of GMI.

White Paper Question Discussions

Mr. Gunning thanked the United States and Canada for setting up the foundational conversation for later discussions and dialogue. He also reminded participants the only goal for this meeting would be to establish a plan, and not to reach consensus. He directed the attendees' attention to the first question posed in the white paper to support closer alignment with CCAC as it relates to the Agriculture, MSW, and Oil and Gas initiatives (and if so, how and when). He encouraged Partner thoughts along those lines, indicating the ASG would seek answers over the coming months via a task force. Therefore, the remainder of this meeting would serve as a backdrop for developing initial guidance and ideas for that group, as well as capturing additional areas for the task force to explore further.

Mr. Schwager commented Australia was keen on GMI and it would be helpful to flag the issue of no coal component within CCAC. He also expressed a perception that coal had been orphaned in the proposed GMI organization. Mr. Niebling responded that was not the intention, but the proposed organization was intended to show which sectors had potential linkage (e.g., agriculture, MSW, oil and gas) with CCAC. Mr. Turk stated it would be good to see what comes out of the task force, looking across all five sectors but with particular emphasis on the overlap in the CCAC-focused sectors and how GMI might tighten its efforts to avoid duplication.

On the issue of co-branding, Mr. Turk wondered if perhaps it might apply more toward non-GMI or non-CCAC partners (i.e., countries that have not joined either effort), stating it might help them feel they do not have to do more (to participate in both). He also emphasized the foundational support GMI has lent to CCAC and by conscientiously linking CCAC initiatives with GMI's subcommittees, some countries might be more inclined to join. He added in regards to CMM, CCAC did consider this source of methane but has not pursued it further. He noted it would be nice to have access to CCAC's trust fund as well as ministerial-level support, but he felt it was okay for GMI to proceed separately to address this source. On co-locating GMI and CCAC meetings to better leverage schedules and tight travel budgets, he said it might help for those participants to see firsthand how the two programs could be linked. Mr. Sun commented on co-branding, expressing some concern since China is not a CCAC member but noting it might be good so non-CCAC countries could attend as observers. He did point out, however, that air pollution and climate change issues are handled by two different ministries so that might be extra or double work for some countries. Mr. Turk explained several countries have a different approach to air versus climate issues, providing Norway as an example of a country more interested in air issues as they relate to health versus climate. Mr. Blandford echoed that some countries are explicit air versus climate and vice versa. He

noted CCAC's structure allowed for such flexibility and participants self-select the initiatives in which they are involved. He added co-location might also lend itself to the organic transformation process of GMI. Mr. Gunning said there are varying degrees of co-branding, indicating there were CCAC meetings held during GMI's Methane Expo 2013 that provided the first hint(s) of potential linkages. He suggested that it might be possible for stakeholders in CCAC sector-specific initiatives to get together when GMI subcommittees meet.

Mr. Kamienski returned to China's comment and explained Poland also has two separate ministries that participate in these efforts—Ministry of Economy for GMI and Ministry of Environment for CCAC—but the ministries have good cooperation and communication so it might not be a problem. He also expressed the different approaches by each ministry, with a view that CCAC is strictly environmental whereas GMI is a combination of environment and economy given the use of methane as clean energy. He also added that methane's end use did not seem as important for CCAC as GMI.

Mr. Kamienski also encouraged the group to find ways to make financial support a bigger component of GMI by formulating a global proposal to reduce emissions and capture methane as a clean energy source. He also wondered if there was a way to offer advice to UNFCCC on how best to address methane and hoped the discussion with CCAC would identify elements that were beneficial to both organizations. Mr. Portalupi commented that co-location of meetings has already been underway, albeit informally. He also thought co-branding meetings made sense, at least for the three sectors with analogous subcommittees and initiatives. Mr. Schwager asked for those non-CCAC partners if the procedure to join was easy. Mr. Turk responded joining CCAC involved a simple letter process, but encouraged those considering joining CCAC to attend a working group meeting as an observer first. He continued to explain participation in the initiatives was even less formal and countries were not required to be CCAC partners. Mr. Sun commented the informal process seemed to accommodate various levels of participants (e.g., policymakers versus technical experts). Mr. Turk acknowledged that was the perfect way to view CCAC, with experts participating in the initiatives while policymakers were more likely to be involved in the working group. Mr. Gunning recapped the discussion, saying he heard strong support for both co-branding and co-locating meetings to reduce the strain on the ASG. While he recognized the foundational work of GMI, he wondered what might be left for the subcommittees to achieve, noting perhaps the next steps might be to advance projects more broadly. He said this moment in time provides an opportunity to GMI to ask if what it has done is enough (i.e., what more do we want to accomplish?), should it continue "business as usual," or pursue something different and new. He opened the floor to brainstorming among meeting participants.

Mr. Zopatti said he would be inclined to try and go toward the concrete, weighing what has been done [successfully] and what has not been done (i.e., remains). A couple of elements that came to his mind included financing and project design in light of the GEF example. He also asked if the ASG foresaw the late 2015 event as an opportunity to relaunch GMI, noting mid-level technical experts seem to be project advocates while the government officials seem more closely tied to program changes. Mr. Kamienski encouraged the group to consider the cost benefits of using captured methane as an important element when evaluating the program, adding that a concentrated effort to promote energy savings could be perceived as an additional benefit without added project costs.

Ms. Franklin commented on Mr. Gunning's question regarding "is the job done?" going into 2015, asking if now was the time for a historic nudge when it seems like things should happen more naturally given GMI's global outreach and pipeline of projects that have been featured at the Expos. She stated her view that perhaps the job is not completely done but the program should aspire to build upon its network and information (e.g., best practices, lesson learned). She pointed to a recently-passed Ukraine law to incentivize projects. Mr. Sun commented it might not be "what" but "who" is done, noting the United States has been taking the leadership role within GMI. Mr. Portalupi acknowledged GMI's achievements, but stated the job is not done yet. He acknowledged GMI's role as an incubator with proven technical knowledge—coupled with its extensive Project Network, noting he did not see how CCAC would be capable of generating a similar number of projects in 10 years. Therefore, he felt the foundation needed to be maintained and continued. Mr. Blandford echoed the comments, seeing GMI as a project originator that served an extremely useful purpose of project pipeline for other institutions (e.g., multinational

development banks). He envisioned keeping the two organizations separate, while focusing on low risk or no regret changes for GMI such as co-locating that do not require political-level decision. He also encouraged participants to create a list of items strategically by defining GMI's core service offerings (e.g., the way we do business). Specifically, he suggested a list of incremental, non-controversial elements in the near term, and then Partners could entertain bigger picture issues. He also asked if others might be willing to step up as the United States has for the last 10 years. Lastly, he wondered about GMI's client base.

Mr. Niebling built on Mr. Blandford's comments by stating that these were ideas that could be used to develop a "charge" or set of directions to a task force. Based on the day's topics, co-locating and co-branding would be on the list, as well as the potential for a relaunch that would require political buy-in and potential greater coordination. He suggested the group forward these ideas to the task force rather than deal with in this meeting, emphasizing the need for specific and strategic direction. He commented GMI has been the body of expertise for more than 10 years, matching policy expertise with countries when the ministry or leadership is ready. He suggested tapping into GMI's resources to identify three to five countries that are ready to do the work, then GMI providing guidance to craft either a holistic strategy or sector-specific plan. He indicated that there should be a process to identify those countries, focusing on those with high-level buy-in to make decisions as well as to provide continuity. He also wondered if it might be possible for government officials to have a stint with GMI.

Mr. Turk provided an overview of the ASG's structure, noting the U.S. leadership and the role of EPA and the State Department, implying that countries could get the benefit of "ownership" if they hold a leadership position. He also likened ministerial engagement to giving them "credit" for GMI's achievements. Mr. Zopatti asked if the exercise could also be extended to the subcommittees (i.e., provide them with a list of questions to address). Mr. Niebling asked if the concrete ideas should be focused on target countries versus project origination. Mr. Blandford commented the two issues were not mutually exclusive but rather the Project Network could help facilitate getting to the right people over the long term.

Mr. Gunning summed up the afternoon discussion as a desire to focus on low- versus high-risk elements, with low-risk elements comprised of a baseline to which adjustments could be applied to improve efficiency and effectiveness. This initial element might also include some discussion on how to organize GMI to improve "ownership." Mr. Gunning stated the higher risk elements would require more serious thought as to project-level versus strategic policy, including country agreement to put up capital resources. He noted the latter issue adds extra dimension and improves the political visibility, indicating a willingness among Partners/players to increase participation.

Mr. Portalupi commented on the need for GMI to work in the policy arena, particularly as it relates to developing countries (e.g., NAMAs or other national strategies). He added some countries are reluctant to pursue NAMAs since they were originally conceived as an UNFCCC idea, but perhaps there would be more willingness for something that could be scaled up to[ward] a nation-wide strategy. Mr. Turk expressed that policy should be a natural evolution based on GMI's 10 years of experience, pointing to co-benefits such as increasing energy security within the realm of a climate objective. GMI could serve the purpose of matching up governments with real political buy-in potential to governments that have completed the process (e.g., peer exchange). If the process works, other countries will see the results (e.g., co-benefits such as cost savings). GMI could also provide the technical assistance to help countries advance the ideas within their plans. Lastly, he noted the mutual benefit to the Project Network as countries develop plans/policies and undertake projects. Mr. Portalupi interjected this process also gets to country "ownership," while using the GMI incubator. Mr. Zopatti reminded participants that not all governments think or behave rationally and that technical assistance is not lacking in some cases but rather it's the willingness of government to pursue activities [further]. He likened agencies to clients, with GMI serving in a consultancy capacity. Mr. Turk acknowledged that was the right way to think about the process, as the need to make it easy and user-friendly. He asked the participants that were more experienced in GMI how best to get the Project Network engaged. Mr. Gunning offered the Expos as examples to engage the Project Network, since they get direct access to decision makers. Ms. Shimamura also highlighted the March 2014 Brazil tri-sector meeting as a forum for the private sector to communicate and network with policy makers.

Mr. Gunning revisited the issue of financing as a key ingredient to project development, noting the CCAC trust fund established by multiple countries. He also acknowledged that in the wake of a diminishing CDM, the World Bank is stepping up to the task. He asked Ms. Franklin to provide more details. She explained that at the 2012 G8 meeting, the delegates tasked the World Bank's methane finance study group with exploring the technical and financial aspects of methane mitigation. In particular, the group revealed findings that the collapse of carbon markets had stranded many projects. The World Bank has worked with donor countries to collect \$55 million (with an ultimate target of \$100 million) to assist those stranded projects. The funds will be disbursed in a pilot auction in 2015. The World Bank will be looking to developers to help identify projects with a proof of concept (e.g., test features, framework, coalesce around biogas). Ms. Franklin said more details would be forthcoming but in the meantime, GMI should begin to think about reaching out to the Project Network, recognizing that they might have projects ready for development.

Mr. Gunning asked if there were additional thoughts. Mr. Turk suggested developing a compelling narrative to engage donors. Mr. Niebling asked what additional resources/financing might be available to provide technical assistance. Mr. Blandford indicated that was two separate issues: funding GMI (including technical assistance) and financing projects (i.e., origination). Mr. Turk reiterated exploring the linkage with CCAC and opportunities to use its trust fund for co-branded activities. Mr. Gunning noted there had been a lot of momentum around the ideas raised and the next day's discussion would focus on developing questions to help the task force take these issues to the next level.

DAY TWO

Ms. Franklin took over as chair on the second day, and opened with her hopes to continue the robust discussion from the previous day with the same energy and enthusiasm. She provided an overview of the morning's schedule with the objective to wrap up early. She proceeded to go over the consensus slides developed by the ASG on the proposed roadmap post-2015, and encouraged the participants to speak up if they thought of anything else as she recapped the previous day's discussions.

Consensus from Day 1

Ms. Franklin reviewed the consensus points, noting they were an attempt to capture the nature of Thursday's discussion. They are summarized as follows:

1. Robust enthusiasm for GMI was expressed broadly in the country updates.
2. Recognition that transformative opportunities do not come along often.
3. Discussion around CCAC's important work, with GMI's foundational role, including the differences between overlap and synergies as well as the need to be more efficient/effective.
4. Strong support for aligning certain sectors regardless of status.
5. Continued GMI emphasis/support for the coal sector, as well as support for convening a task force to explore the low risk/no regrets opportunities in the near term (e.g., co-locate, co-brand) to have a bigger/bolder impact (while not discussed in detail, it provided an intriguing option).

Mr. Ferland reminded participants that GMI has co-located subcommittees involved in biogas (i.e., agriculture, MSW, wastewater) in Venice, Singapore, and Brazil to combine/leverage resources as well as to ease travel for delegates involved in more than one of these sectors. Mr. Niebling thanked the ASG for providing specific examples where the proposed model has already been effective. Mr. Portalupi expressed a desire to include the element of ownership/empowerment in the questions and Ms. Franklin agreed. Mr. Niebling added that while the United States is willing to continue to chair the Steering Committee, they would be happy to share that responsibility with another country.

Next Steps

Ms. Franklin indicated the homework from this meeting for Steering Committee members would be to determine what [still] needs to be done and take advantage of the momentum around this transformative time. She then characterized next steps based on previous discussions:

1. Convene a task force and issue charter questions.
2. Develop a plan for approaching GMI subcommittee.
3. Develop a plan for approaching CCAC.
4. Conduct outreach to general partnership.
5. Solicit feedback on private sector engagement.

She nominated those present to serve on the task force but also indicated the ASG would solicit participation from other GMI Partners (not just Steering Committee members). Mr. Niebling recalled China's comment from the day before about the importance of involving developing countries. Mr. Blandford reminded the group that Nigeria had expressed interest in attending the meeting but was unable due to logistics so he suggested it be included in the task force. He also asked if the task force would be limited to Partner Countries or would it be open to other organizations. Ms. Franklin suggested working with some of the more active Project Network members to learn if they might be interested in participating. In regard to questions involving the TOR, however, Mr. Portalupi said the decision making should be limited to the Partners. Ms. Franklin asked for suggestions on how to select potential Project Network members. Mr. Portalupi responded there should be a limited number of spots (e.g., two) and the Project Network members should meet certain criteria for consideration. Mr. Schwager stated that while Australia initially supported Canada's thoughts, he was not familiar with the Project Network's involvement and wondered if broad solicitation would be necessary. Instead, he agreed with the chair's suggestion to select a few of the more active members. Mr. Niebling agreed with both Canada and Australia but in the interest of the relatively short timeframe to develop the roadmap, it would be hard to have the Project Network self-select. Mr. Sun indicated China would support the inclusion of Project Network members on the task force. Mr. Blandford asked if it might be possible to survey the Partners and solicit feedback on which Project Network members to invite. Mr. Ferland expressed concern that it also might be difficult to have the Project Network members self-select given the diversity and breadth of member (1,300). Ms. Shimamura suggested asking the sectors (e.g., subcommittee chairs) for their input.

Ms. Franklin said the ASG would conduct some initial engagement with a few key actors (e.g., World Bank) and then follow up with a request for nominations from Steering Committee or subcommittee delegates as well as non-Steering Committee Partners. She noted the nominations should be based on prior contact and/or personal relationship with the Project Network members.

Mr. Kamienski agreed with that path forward but stated a need for good balance between the number of Partners and Project Network members. Ms. Franklin acknowledged his comment as well as Mr. Portalupi's comment that Partners would be the primary decision-makers. She also noted that participation on the task force was an opportunity for those Partners/Project Network members to experience "ownership."

Mr. Sun suggested that a representative from each subcommittee (e.g., at least one co-chair) participate in the task force and Mr. Schwager supported that idea. Ms. Franklin noted the need to balance the size of the task force while trying to ensure its diversity, particularly from a geographical perspective. Mr. Niebling stated the task force should be comprised of those who choose to participate and the group should not wait on others. Mr. Schwager asked for confirmation that the task force would meet virtually, which was affirmed.

Ms. Franklin noted there had been robust discussion on CCAC activities to date (e.g., initiatives), and wondered if GMI needed a plan (e.g., timeline, message, ambassador) to approach CCAC about potential alignment. Mr. Blandford thought such formality might be unnecessary and the issue was likely to raise itself at some point, at which time Partners that participate in both organizations could share ideas casually with their colleagues (i.e., let it happen organically). Ms. Franklin asked if the next CCAC meeting in Nepal might be appropriate timing, and

Mr. Blandford indicated it might be a good marketing exercise to promote potential linkages. Mr. Ferland echoed that sentiment, but commented many of the representatives to GMI and CCAC are not the same individual, even if the country participates in both efforts. Ms. Franklin again called for some sort of plan, albeit informal, to ensure the issue is raised to CCAC. She also asked if outreach to the entire Partnership was warranted to capture all the salient topics, to which Mr. Schwager asked if these points could be the topics. He also commented the significant amount of U.S. work as chair and secretariat, noting that whatever transformation takes place it would be important to retain the institutional knowledge and identify how to keep/maximize that asset. Ms. Franklin acknowledged the 10 years of experience and the interest to build upon or capitalize.

Charter Questions for Task Force

Ms. Franklin then turned participants' attention to potential questions for the task force, noting the ASG had developed a preliminary list to stimulate discussion and hopefully capture the meeting's spirit. On the first question regarding the "mission" for GMI post-2105, she indicated interesting ideas were raised the previous day that included increasing high-level policy and staying the course as far as being a project originator and incubator. Mr. Portalupi said "policy" might be too restrictive and suggested changing it to read "national strategies," with guidance and/or best practices as possible examples. Mr. Blandford suggested saying "strengthen" instead of "maintain" to bring greater focus on the latter elements and demonstrate a building opportunity versus status quo.

On the second question regarding "low risks/no regrets" (e.g., co-locating, co-branding), Ms. Franklin asked if the task force should identify any additional opportunities and/or consider a more formal alignment for the biogas-related sectors (to the extent it makes sense). Mr. Portalupi commented UNEP coordinators manage the initiatives' day-to-day activities so it might be a good idea to engage them first before approaching the overall CCAC about alignment. Ms. Franklin acknowledged his comment and said the ASG would explore a mechanism to facilitate such discussions.

Regarding a third question on sector-specific alignment, Ms. Franklin asked what makes the most sense given CCAC activities already planned and whether the task force should explore more closely to come up with other ideas or suggestions. Mr. Portalupi suggested changing the language to read "support the creation of" a third component of the Oil and Gas Initiative since it's a CCAC action and GMI cannot direct it what to do. Ms. Franklin agreed, stating the original text was intended merely to capture the vision and not generalities.

Ms. Franklin commented "align" might be applicable for some sectors but not all; for those to which it is not appropriate (i.e., coal), they would continue on their own. She also noted the tone could be changed to suggest approaching—versus telling—CCAC with new ideas. Mr. Kamienski interjected it might be good to engage CCAC on coal issues, but expressed skepticism. Ms. Franklin agreed. Mr. Blandford commented on the specificity of the sector and engagement would depend on who might be in the room (e.g., India is also actively involved in the coal sector but not present at this meeting, nor a CCAC partner).

Mr. Niebling asked how GMI might become a recipient of CCAC funding. Mr. Blandford stated they would have to rethink the organizational structure to be able to receive funding from donors, although he recognized the difference between direct resources and in-kind services.

On a fourth question regarding a strengths-and-weaknesses analysis as part of the overarching vision, Ms. Franklin asked participants if they thought it was a worthwhile exercise to help determine missing elements. Mr. Schwager asked what the ultimate endpoint might be (e.g., sharing results with the Partnership). Ms. Franklin explained it might help identify differences. Mr. Niebling added it might help identify compatibility and what steps could be combined. Mr. Schwager commented that perhaps the analysis should focus more on gaps. Ms. Franklin noted if the group didn't feel the analysis would be beneficial, it could be dropped from the questions. Mr. Portalupi returned to Australia's comment regarding gaps and how to identify/close them. Mr. Schwager explained some people have indicated CCAC does not lend itself to coal issues, for example, and he wondered if the task force could seek out and clarify that position. Mr. Kamienski stated Poland would support a strengths-and-weaknesses analysis. Mr. Blandford expressed concern that regardless of the outcomes, GMI should continue

and encouraged the group to look at other organizations besides CCAC. Ms. Leung commented some countries have already conducted some kind of analysis and perhaps the task force could collect this insight, to which Mr. Zopatti agreed. Mr. Sun stated one outcome might be that Partners often can't receive direct financing so a consideration might be matching funds.

Mr. Zopatti interjected there should be a clear mandate to the task force; specifically, which questions are strictly related to GMI and which apply to alignment with CCAC? Mr. Niebling stated the strengths-and-weakness analysis would be applied to GMI only to identify where possible gaps exist. Ms. Franklin suggested the analysis could be more holistic with overall reference to other programs so the task force charge would be changed to "and other organizations" so it might be applicable to all sectors. Mr. Zopatti suggested giving space to stakeholders/agencies to identify the other possible organizations.

On the fifth charge regarding robust Project Network engagement, Mr. Niebling said it was appropriate to leave as is, since the group has already suggested some steps. Mr. Blandford noted it might be important to temper expectations and avoid decision making opportunities with the Project Network, indicating "views" would be welcome but they would not likely play a role in governance. Ms. Franklin agreed, but reminded the group that GMI's Project Network is an asset. The group also discussed strictly targeting the private sector, which is only one element of the Project Network that also includes academia, MDBs, and NGOs. Ms. Franklin asked if there was support for targeting the private sector explicitly and there were no objections.

Regarding questions 6a and 6b, Ms. Franklin noted that it followed the strengths-and-weaknesses analysis and based on the results, asked the group what should be a proposed model and/or framework for GMI going forward (e.g., maintain autonomy but leverage CCAC initiatives to include GMI activities from those sectors)? Mr. Niebling explained this charge represented the idea to combine the biogas sectors. Subsequently, 6b would involve TOR amendments to incorporate any newly-identified elements once 6a is approved. Mr. Portalupi commented on a previous TOR addition regarding action plans and expressed if the forthcoming GMI "mission" includes national strategy (under question 1), that language could be removed from the TOR.

Ms. Franklin explained question 7 might not be geared toward the task force but maybe this group instead, and continued to ask if there was enough time prior to the proposed International Methane Forum (planned for late 2015) to roll out a "new" GMI. She also asked if there was an opportunity to leverage a CCAC event. Mr. Portalupi responded the CCAC routinely meets during the summer and in advance of the UNFCCC COP, usually held late November to early December.

Ms. Franklin introduced question 8 on GMI leadership and whether it was appropriate to ask for recommendations from the task force, noting there has been a single chair for the last 10 years and should GMI explore other options such as co- or rotating chairs. Question 9 echoed a previous comment by Mr. Blandford to restructure the ASG to be able to receive funds and whether this, too, was appropriate for task force consideration. Both Mr. Schwager and Mr. Portalupi agreed.

Ms. Franklin asked if there were other questions or comments. Mr. Niebling inquired if the task force could be charged with identifying additional actions that could be undertaken at no cost (e.g., building off China's comment on how to share information about projects without adding burden). Mr. Portalupi stated that when Methane to Markets became GMI, it involved a name change that involved a significant level of work and he wondered if that was under consideration with this potential GMI re-launch. Ms. Franklin indicated the United States have received feedback that the GMI brand is well-recognized so there might be a benefit to keep it. She asked participants if it would be okay to pose the question to the task force for its consideration and if so, suggestions for new names. Mr. Kamienski said if there were to be a name change, he felt it would be important to retain "global" so the name continues to reflect ambitious activities.

International Methane Forum

Ms. Franklin directed attendees' attention to the remaining agenda items: the international methane forum and timeline for the task force (i.e., roadmap). Ms. Shimamura provided a brief overview of the proposed forum, indicating the ASG has been working on "where" and "when." She noted they have tentatively selected Washington, DC since that's where Methane to Markets was initially launched in 2004 and in this transformative year, returning full circle. She also explained the forum would have a format similar to past Expos and partnership-wide meetings that comprises plenary sessions on cross-cutting issues, sector-specific technology and policy sessions for methane experts, site visits, and subcommittee meetings. She did note, however, the ASG is open to suggestions for shaping the format.

She also explained as a result of the Vancouver meeting, the ASG had been tasked with developing ways to share GMI's decade of accomplishments. The ASG is currently preparing a series of videos members can use in their meetings with officials that will also be streamed on the GMI website. Additionally, the ASG is creating a visually-appealing infographic that will display GMI accomplishments in a new and different way.

She closed the presentation by stating the proposed forum would greatly benefit if Partners helped to identify session topics and/or nominated speakers. Mr. Schwager asked how many attendees were anticipated for the forum, to which Ms. Shimamura indicated she hoped attendance would be similar to the Krakow meeting that attracted 250 attendees. Mr. Kamienski asked about the timing for the forum (e.g., before COP) and whether GMI intended to invite representatives from CCAC. Mr. Zopatti interjected his preference for a larger time gap from the COP meeting, and Mr. Kamienski agreed. Ms. Shimamura said the timing would be mostly driven by venue availability. Mr. Zopatti noted the ADB meeting would be held in October and wondered if co-locating might be an option. Mr. Sun asked if the ASG intended the forum to be a minister-level meeting, since that requires advance notice to ensure dates are recorded on calendars and travel plans made. Mr. Schwager wondered if hosting a minister-level meeting might be dependent on the task force outcomes. Mr. Blandford suggested keeping an open mind in case decisions and/or approvals are needed (e.g., TOR changes). He noted the forum could encompass ministers and/or senior government officials with authority to make decisions on behalf of Partner Countries. He also addressed previous comments that the forum be scheduled around CCAC meetings, which have not been identified but the ASG could keep an eye on timing. Mr. Kamienski commented on the limited number of ministers in Mexico City and opined while it's good to involve them, it might not be doable. Mr. Zopatti inquired if it might be possible to host a side event at the COP. Mr. Blandford suggested perhaps a signing of the new GMI missive and Ms. Franklin thought it could be an opportunity to show the new GMI videos. Mr. Kamienski expressed concern that COP delegates might not be the [primary] audience. Given comments about COP timing, Ms. Shimamura stated it might be necessary to move the forum out to early 2016. Mr. Ferland indicated the TOR would expire in October 2015, which was a primary driver for the suggested late 2015 timing, but it could be extended. Ms. Franklin asked if the Steering Committee could agree to an extension during this meeting and/or if it might need to be conducted via proxy with the broader partnership.

Proposed Roadmap for the Future of GMI

Ms. Shimamura reviewed the Roadmap to 2015 timeline, indicating it was adjustable and open to input from participants. She noted the months of October and November were set aside to solicit volunteers for the task force. In early December, the ASG hoped to have a conference call to discuss the questions/tasks developed during this meeting. After reviewing the remainder of the schedule, Mr. Schwager stated two months (i.e., by end of February 2015) was not sufficient time to develop a draft proposal and Mr. Ferland acknowledged that feedback. Ms. Franklin said in order to put together the forum, she thought the ASG needed a notional draft at least six months prior.

Mr. Blandford interjected that while it might be important to get the pitch right (e.g., how to approach CCAC), the task force did not have to have all of the answers. He noted there was value added in being able to point to a task force taking the issue under consideration and thinking about the potential relationships as they relate to how

CCAC works. He also said Canada would be happy to present any ideas on behalf of GMI. Ms. Shimamura asked what might be a more agreeable date for having a working draft (i.e., answers to the questions).

Ms. Franklin asked to revisit the issue of giving the Steering Committee an extension to revise/approve the TOR to accommodate the possible need to move out the forum (i.e., early 2016) and allow more time for task force proposal development. For the sake of argument, she noted additional TOR issues might crystallize in the task force discussions that will need to be ironed out so perhaps it should be more than a three-month extension. She then suggested perhaps the Steering Committee meeting during the international methane forum could be used to work through the remaining issues. Mr. Kamienski agreed with that proposal versus approaching the forum as merely a celebration. Mr. Ferland also commented the next Steering Committee could be used to prepare text for a future activity (e.g., signing) at a high-level side event—either COP or CCAC. In response to Australia's previous comment on in-person meetings, Ms. Franklin assured participants that preliminary discussions would take place over a series of conference calls. In response to feedback, she noted the ASG would update the roadmap and send it out the review/approval.

To wrap up the meeting, Ms. Franklin asked if there were further comments. Mr. Zopatti acknowledged the previous day's brainstorming as a valuable exercise. Mr. Ferland noted the ASG would post the meeting minutes, presentations, and consensus points on the GMI website for the entire partnership. Ms. Franklin asked again if the group should provide itself an extension to update the TOR (beyond October 2015). Mr. Blandford noted the importance to portray this extension only for the purposes of simple changes and not an opportunity to re-open negotiation on the entire TOR. Ms. Franklin indicated the ASG would send a message to the full Steering Committee regarding an extension, seeking concurrence. Ms. Franklin and Mr. Blandford respectively thanked the participants for their valuable contributions and coming to Montreal.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.



Steering Committee Meeting Montreal, Canada 16-17 October 2014

Attendee List

ARGENTINA

Álvaro Zopatti

Advisor on Climate Change
Secretariat of Environment and
Sustainable Development of
Argentina
Reconquista 555 (E.P)
Buenos Aires, 1003 - Argentina
+54-114-34-88292
alvarozopatti@gmail.com

AUSTRALIA

Michael Schwager

Minsiter Counsellor
(Science & Technology)
Embassy of Australia
1601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
+1-202-797-3440
michael.schwager@industry.gov.au

CANADA

Laurence Blandford

Director, Partnerships Division
Climate Change International
Environment Canada
200 Sacre Coeur
Gatineau, QC K1A 0H3 Canada
+1-819-938-3748
laurence.blandford@ec.gc.ca

Hingman Leung

Environment Canada
200 Sacre Coeur
Gatineau, QC K1A 0H3 Canada
+1-819-953-9253
hingman.leung@ec.gc.ca

Franck Portalupi

Manager
Environment Canada
200 Sacre Coeur
Gatineau, QC K1A 0H3 Canada
+1-819-938-3743
franck.portalupi@ec.gc.ca

CHINA

Hou Fang

International Cooperation Division
Department of Climate Change
National Development and Reform
Commission
38 South Yuetan Street
Beijing, 10082-4 China
+8610-68505663
houfang@ndrc.gov.cn
houfang12345@126.com

Sun Zhen

Deputy Counsel
Department of Climate Change
National Development and Reform
Commission
38 South Yuetan Street
Beijing, 10082-4 China
+8610-68501706
sunz@ndrc.gov.cn

ITALY

Filippo Lonardo

Deputy Consul
Consulate of Italy in Montreal
3489 Drummond Avenue
Montreal, QC H3G 1X6 Canada
filippo.lonardo@esteri.it

POLAND

Zbigniew Kamienski*

Director
Ministry of Economy
Pl. Trzech Krzyzy 3/5
Warszawa, 00-507 Poland
+48-22-6934261
tomasz.szczepura@mg.gov.pl

Tomasz Szczepura

Expert
Ministry of Economy
Pl. Trzech Krzyzy 3/5
Warszawa, 00-507 Poland
+48-22-6935165
tomasz.szczepura@mg.gov.pl

UNITED STATES

Henry Ferland

Co-Director, Administrative Support
Group
Global Methane Initiative
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW MC
6207M
Washington, DC 20460- USA
+1-202-343-9330
ferland.henry@epa.gov

Pamela Franklin

Branch Chief, NonCO2 Programs
US Environmental
Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW MC
6207J
Washington, DC 20460 USA
+1-202-343-9476
franklin.pamela@epa.gov

Paul Gunning

Director, ClimateChange Division
US Environmental
Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460 USA
+1-202-343-9736
gunning.paul@epa.gov

William Niebling*

Senior Advisor for Congressional &
International Affairs
US Environmental
Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460 USA
+1-202-564-7400
niebling.william@epa.gov

Monica Shimamura

Co-Director, Administrative Support
Group
Global Methane Initiative
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW MC
6207M
Washington, DC 20460- USA
+1-202-343-9337
shimamura.monica@epa.gov

David Turk

U.S. Department