



**Methane to Markets
Steering Committee Meeting
2 – 4 March 2010
New Delhi, India**

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Summary of Key Discussion Points and Conclusions

The Seventh Session of the Methane to Markets Steering Committee met in New Delhi, India on 2 – 4 March 2010 to review past accomplishments, develop a working draft of a revised Terms of Reference (TOR), and set forth action items for the coming year. Thirteen Methane to Markets Partners were represented at the meeting, including: Argentina, Australia, Canada, China, Colombia, Finland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, United Kingdom, and the United States. A representative from Kazakhstan also attended as an observer. A complete list of participants is presented in Attachment 1.

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

- Communications and Outreach Efforts
- Update on Wastewater Sector
- Committee Membership Procedures
- TOR Revisions
- UNFCCC Observer Status
- 2nd Ministerial Meeting
- Charge to Subcommittees/Partners and Next Steps

During its deliberations, the Steering Committee approved requests from Ethiopia and Ghana to join the Partnership as well as become members of the Steering Committee.

The following sections provide more details of the meeting discussions.

TUESDAY, 2 MARCH 2010 – DAY ONE

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

Ms. Kruger called the meeting to order at 10:14 a.m. and introduced herself as the Director of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA's) Climate Change Division. She also explained that U.S. EPA Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation, Gina McCarthy, sent regrets that she could not attend the Expo given pressing domestic issues surrounding the final greenhouse gas (GHG) rule and wished the attendees a successful Expo.

Introductions (Agenda Item #2)

Ms. Kruger thanked the Indian hosts for arranging outstanding accommodations and commented on the delightful weather and hospitality. She also noted she looked forward to the outstanding technical and policy content of the sector-specific sessions. She then invited the Steering Committee attendees to introduce themselves (see Appendix 1 for a complete list).

Statement of Meeting Goals (Agenda Item #3)

Ms. Kruger reviewed the [goals of the meeting](#) and explained a primary activity would be to build on previous discussions on the TOR, noting a revised version would be the major objective of this meeting. She also noted that Steering Committee would be discussing plans for a 2nd Ministerial meeting in Mexico as well as next steps for obtaining United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC) observer status and the charge to subcommittees.

Regarding timing, she indicated the Steering Committee would meet for the entire day and continue the next day following the morning's opening plenary session. She noted the Steering Committee also had the option to continue discussions on Thursday, if necessary. She explained there would be a closing plenary session on Friday morning, followed by subcommittee meetings in the afternoon.

Adoption of the Agenda (Agenda Item #4)

Ms. Kruger asked if there were any modifications and/or additions to the Steering Committee agenda (see Attachment 2) circulated prior to the meeting. She also noted flexibility if issues arose during the meeting. Hearing no objections, she asked for consensus on agenda adoption.

Brief Country Statements and Updates (Agenda Item #5)

Ms. Kruger then asked the country participants to provide updates on their activities since the last Steering Committee meeting.

Argentina

Mr. Gabriel Blanco with the Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires (UNCPBA) explained Argentina has embarked on a major methane mitigation effort through its Nation Programme for Urban Solid Waste, which is supported by the World Bank. Elements include a Waste Management Plan for provinces and municipalities to rid them of open dumps, which is already up and running. Subsequent phases will consist of facilitating sanitary landfill construction and methane capture and use. He noted that the program has been successful for Argentina and much progress had been made over the last 4 years, indicating he would provide more detail during the Landfill technical sessions. He also noted that Argentina is undertaking efforts in agricultural biogas that involve creating greater capacity for developing biogas under a new national program that will enter force shortly, although the funding is still unclear. He explained that Mr. Jorge Hilbert, co-chair of the Agriculture Subcommittee, would provide more detail in the sector-specific technical sessions.

Australia

Ms. Margaret Sewell with the Department of Resources, Energy & Tourism noted that [Australia](#) is the 10th largest emitter of anthropogenic methane, and further explained that 60 percent of Australia's methane emission come from agriculture (primarily livestock), which are slowly increasing despite a significant downturn in grazing due to drought. Emissions from coal mining and natural gas systems contribute 25 percent of the methane emissions, with forecasted growth in coal production and new developments in liquefied natural gas (LNG). Within the landfill sector, approximately 30 percent of the methane generated is captured and equates to a 50 percent increase in the last 5 years.

Australia's parliament is currently considering a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) that will establish a cap-and-trade emission trading scheme for fugitive emissions from landfills and the food processing industry, which will be eligible for Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). The CPRS will not

cover fugitive emissions from the oil and gas sector, although the industry will receive other assistance, and the coal sector will receive assistance in the form of subsidies as well as inclusion of electricity generated from coal mine gas as Renewable Energy Targets. Until the legislation is passed, however, Australian industry continues to reduce methane via voluntary measures. Australia has committed to an emissions reduction target of 60 percent by 2050 with primary focus on carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from coal combustion but will also focus on methane reductions within the coal sector.

Ms. Kruger commented on the interesting presentation regarding Australia's domestic policies and recognized the attention on CO₂, while moving toward methane.

Canada

Mr. Darren Goetze with Environment Canada stated he was pleased to be part of the meeting and noted how Canada's Methane to Markets-related efforts helped bridge its activities under the Asian-Pacific Partnership (APP) Clean Development and Climate program. He noted that Canada was looking for global project development opportunities and continued to talk about Canada's international efforts by highlighting their projects and usefulness toward implementing components of the Copenhagen accord. He noted the approach as part in parcel with project outcomes (i.e., tangible results) in light of what he referred to as "Kyoto refugees."

Mr. Goetze emphasized Canada's clean technology and security work in collaboration with APP by incorporating market-oriented activities. In particular, he commented on the relationship with China and the United States following the 2007 Expo, including methane emissions studies and development systems for energy efficient applications. Benefits include reducing GHGs and air pollution, improving energy efficiency, and conserving resources. He also described existing technology transfer activities with the China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) and forthcoming efforts with SINOPEC and CNOOC. Ultimately, Canada will share lessons learned with other Partners. In Mexico, Canada is working on capacity building within the agriculture, landfill, and oil and gas sectors. In particular, Canada is working with the United States and Mexico's national gas company, PEMEX, to identify energy management opportunities and develop case studies. Mr. Goetze also described a SEMARNAT proposal for large-scale landfill biogas projects that will be implemented in three phases: design (e.g., landfill gas flow), collection, and operation.

Canada seeks to share information on its use of biodigesters, including deployment of slurry tanks for collection and electricity generation from manure waste. These activities complement Canada's domestic program to manage commodities across various operations. With APP, this important component is integral to support GHG reductions with overlap and joint work in lessons learned. Mr. Goetze noted it is important to build on Canada's efforts and find ways to support global activities in support of the Copenhagen Accord (e.g., 17 percent below 2005 levels), which is imperative in North America's energy market. Mr. Goetze explained his active role in the UN process and involvement in the Partnership while focusing on achievements. In closing, he thanked India for hosting the Expo and extending its hospitality, as well as the Administrative Support Group (ASG) for putting it together.

Ms. Kruger remarked on Canada's efforts, particularly within the oil and gas sector, and noted that greater detail would be provided in the technical sessions as they relate to identify and mitigating leaks in China and Mexico, as well as India, Russia, and Ukraine.

Ms. Sewell picked up on Mr. Goetze's comments regarding Canada's Methane to Markets participation in combination with APP, in which Australia also participates. In terms of the TOR, she also noted sector-specific efforts working with other forums. Ms. Kruger recognized that not all Partners were involved in the APP, but acknowledged there were similar challenges with other partnerships.

China

Mr. Wu Jianmin with the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) Climate Change office provided comments on behalf of Mr. Gao Guangsheng, also with NDRC. He thanked the Indian hosts and then explained China's emerging policy to mitigate emissions and promote energy conservation. He noted that in 2009, China announced 40 – 45 percent reductions by 2020 given a 2005 baseline. To create this target, China evaluated its present employment target as well as national economic growth under a 5-year plan that included favorable recommendations and policies as well as development and implementation.

China has been an active participant and promoter of Methane to Markets, hosting the 2007 Expo as well as several subcommittee meetings and sector-specific workshops. Within the agriculture sector, China had implemented approximately 40,000 biogas projects by the end of 2008 that equate to 4.5 million cubic meters (m³) of gas and supply nearly 30 million households. China's coal sector produces approximately two billion tons per year. In 2008, 30 landfill gas (LFG) utilization projects were undertaken and there are pilot projects underway in the oil and gas sector.

Mr. Wu indicated that the China Coal Information Institute (CCII) has been identified as a centralized office to coordinate efforts among all the Methane to Markets sectors. In the future, CCII hopes to establish closer links with the ASG to coordinate its programs. He encouraged participants to contact CCII directly to reach individual sector representatives.

Ms. Kruger thanked Mr. Wu for his update, noting that China was a charter Methane to Markets Partner and thanking them for their support of the 2007 Expo. She also commented that she began her career working on China coal mines and she was impressed to see what China has accomplished.

Colombia

Ms. Sandra Lopez of the Ministry of Environment, Housing & Territorial Planning expressed Colombia's gratitude for the efforts put forth to organize the Expo and thanked the Indian hosts. She described Colombia's methane mitigation efforts, indicating they are most active in the landfill sector but are becoming moreso in the other sectors. For example, Colombia has identified new delegates for the Agriculture and Oil and Gas Subcommittees. She also explained the Ministry's Climate Change Mitigation Group (CCMG) has designated personnel to identify coal mines to better engage the Ministry of Coal and Energy. In the agriculture sector, Colombia is embarking on several biomass energy generation projects. They are also developing a landfill biogas model and implementing a sanitation policy for municipalities.

Ms. Lopez stated it was important to Colombia for Methane to Markets to grow the Partnership, as well as expand the sectors (e.g., wastewater). Colombia also supports the Partnership's linkage to the UNFCCC, inclusion of monitoring and reporting, and remains committed to Methane to Markets and its collaborative efforts.

Ms. Kruger thanked Ms. Lopez for foreshadowing several of the topics for conversation in the coming days, and Colombia's concrete and effective involvement in the Partnership.

European Commission

A representative from the European Commission (EC) was unable to attend the meeting, but the EC provided a written statement that was read by Ms. Ashley King with the ASG. Ms. King indicated the EC currently has a Call for Proposals for research and development for coal mine methane (CMM) extraction

open through 4 March 2010. She also noted the EC is co-funding a CMM-related project, Co-Meth, that started in November 2008 with objectives to: develop comprehensive guidelines for optimum CMM use; analysis and comparison of legal and administrative issues in key coal-producing countries; development, construction, and testing of trial units for new CMM technologies; and emission reductions from CMM utilization. Ms. King indicated the EC provided comments on the revised TOR, stating that two years to have a methane study undertaken and an Action Plan drafted and implemented might be too ambitious. The EC also provided support for holding the 2nd Ministerial meeting in conjunction with the 16th meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP16). The EC encouraged the ASG to provide more time for ministers to consider the idea of a declaration and merely seek endorsement rather than actual signatures.

Ms. Kruger encouraged attendees to take a look at the RFP to determine if they might want to respond.

Finland

Mr. Erik Ulfstedt from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs opened his comments by thanking the Indian hosts for their hospitality and expressing appreciation to the U.S. EPA and ASG for their work during the first years of Methane to Markets and in organizing the Expo. He explained that Finland currently has 15 biogas reactor plants at municipal wastewater treatment plants. Industrial wastewaters were treated anaerobically at three different plants primarily treating food processing waste, so he is encouraged the Partnership is considering the wastewater sector. Farmscale biogas plants were operating 10 places. Biogas produced by the reactor installations was 30 million m³ and 140 gigawatt hours of power is produced.

He also indicated they are undertaking biogas recovery at 33 landfills with the following results: 112 million m³ biogas is recovered, of this 76 million m³ is utilized for electricity and heating energy production with 321 gigawatt hours of power produced. He also remarked that Finland is home to Europe's largest landfill, Ammassuo, which has been recovering biogas since 1996. He continued by saying that Finland was about to introduce a heat and energy feed-in tariff for renewables that will apply to a variety of sources (e.g., windmills, new biogas projects) and the anticipated benefits (for biogas installations above 200 kilowatt hours) co-generating heat and energy would be in receiving a guaranteed price of 133,50 Euros (€)/megawatt hour during 12 years. The total amount of aid through the feed-in tariff for new installations is estimated to gradually increase to approximately 200 million €/year through state financing.

Mr. Ulfstedt described the energy and environmental partnership projects Finland was undertaking in Central America. The partnership includes nearly 200 projects, many of which are methane recovery projects. Similar partnerships are developed with the Andean countries in South America, the Mecong region countries, Southern and Eastern Africa, and with Indonesia. Finland also participates in landfill methane capture projects in Jordania and in Durban, South Africa. He added that Finland participated in similar projects in other regions, such as a large wastewater project in China. As part of their efforts, Finland is involved in several Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and Joint Implementation (JI) projects, including one biogas digester programme in Hunan Province, China, that provides biogas to 210,000 households, equivalent to 1.43 million tons of CO₂. The total value of these projects outside Finland he estimated to be around 63 million €

In the context of the World Trade Organization (WTO), Mr. Ulfstedt explained Finland is working together with several Methane to Markets Partners to eliminate non-tariff barriers to improve access to environmental goods and services as well as climate change-friendly technologies specific to methane. These efforts should help to reduce prices and facilitate their deployment. It could provide incentives to expand their production and export. He noted that there is not one single global approach to this negotiation point. He added that Methane to Markets has no mandate to negotiate on trade policy issues,

but Methane to Markets should work to identify any barriers for elimination to ensure methane technologies are well represented in these negotiations.

Ms. Kruger thanked Mr. Ulfstedt for Finland's summary, plus his final talking points encouraging Partners to think about the wide range of barriers that countries face.

India

Mr. Alok Perti with the Ministry of Coal welcomed the participants to India, commenting this was the right time to visit the historic city of Delhi given the good weather. He indicated that India has been involved with the Partnership since its inception, as they recognized the early importance of climate change issues. He also acknowledged Finland's recognition that India has a different stance than many of the other countries involved in Methane to Markets given its focus on a growing population and increasing energy demands. In particular, he stated that thermal energy will be a future major player.

Mr. Perti noted differences within the coal mining sector over the last 30 years and how India has been moving from underground to open cast mines. As such, the issue of CMM/coal bed methane (CBM) development has become more significant. He outlined efforts initiated in November 2006 to establish a coal information clearing house, which was launched in 2008 in Ranchi. The clearinghouse serves as a public face to the coal mining industry and also a centralized point of contact for potential CMM/CBM project investors. To this effect, India has organized CMM/CBM workshops with global experts to help develop blocks of CMM/CBM projects. He indicated that three rounds of projects have been allotted, with a fourth coming shortly, equating to more than 30 blocks total. As far as commercial development, India has been using CBM for power generation on a small-scale and Mr. Perti cited the Moonidih project as a prime example, where two wells are yielding 11.2 units of electricity. He provided a review of other projects that involve foreign collaboration, including the use of slimhole drilling in the open cast mines of in India's northern coalfields. He also indicated India's interest in exploring opportunities to use ventilation air methane (VAM) and that offers are expected in mid-March. Lastly, he noted that Coal India was an Expo sponsor.

Mr. Kruger thanked Mr. Perti for his remarks as well as India's hospitality hosting the Expo, and noted that site visits in the Agriculture and Landfill sectors were taking place concurrent to the Steering Committee meeting.

Italy

Mr. Francesco Presicce with the Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea echoed gratitude to the Indian hosts and U.S. EPA for its efforts. He noted the importance of having a Steering Committee meeting in conjunction with the Expo to help emphasize the role of the Project Network. Mr. Presicce indicated that nearly seven percent of Italy's emissions stem from methane (excluding the land use and forestry sector), mainly from waste (accounting for more than 40 percent of total emissions). Italy's emissions are steadily decreasing due to investment in mitigation technologies, reductions from gas distribution systems, and policy measures to further upgrade its distribution network. He also described some of Italy's renewable energy generation incentives for landfills and manure management. Italy is also pursuing various export policies and measures through international efforts especially in China and The Balkans; in particular, facilitating development and implementation of projects by co-financing feasibility studies. Mr. Presicce also described efforts for bundling small project that otherwise might not be feasible. He indicated this was an emerging trend in project applications for increasing the regional distribution of CDM.

Mr. Presicce noted that Italy supports broadening the Partnership's scope to reach all areas of methane mitigation and sees huge amount of potential. Participation in Methane to Markets is only part of Italy's efforts, and they see the need to build on and explore other opportunities to promote methane capture and use.

Ms. Kruger thanked Mr. Presicce for his comments and drawing attention to the Partnership's potential expansion into other sectors to capitalize opportunities.

Japan

Mr. Kunihiro Shimada with the Ministry of the Environment firstly extended thanks to the Expo hosts and organizers. He continued by stating the Prime Minister mentioned Methane to Markets explicitly in recent remarks and that Japan continues efforts toward its goal to reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below a 1990 baseline by 2020. Mr. Shimada noted that Japan's new government is more supportive of the Partnership's efforts than the previous administration in the absence of significant methane emissions in Japan and continued declining methane trends (e.g., down from 2.5 percent of GHGs in 1990 to 1.6 percent in 2007), despite an overall increase in GHGs by 8.6 percent over the same time period. He noted that the oil and gas sector accounts for the largest increases, primarily stemming from production and processing of natural gas. Within the agriculture sector, Japan's emissions come from enteric fermentation, rice cultivation, and residue burning, and these sources are also declining (i.e., down by nearly 20 percent since 1990). Methane emission reductions from landfills equate to 44 percent, mostly due to incineration, and is quickly approaching zero while emission reductions from coal mines is more than 99 percent.

Mr. Shimada described his efforts to get Japan's Project Network more involved, including holding seven meetings with nearly 90 companies totaling more than 300 participants. He noted these companies, that routinely provide technology transfer opportunities, are primarily interested in CDM/JI projects abroad and hoped these projects would ultimately be recognized by Methane to Markets as well.

As promised at the Washington, DC meeting, Mr. Shimada provided an update on the Greenhouse Gas Observation Satellite or GOSAT (also referred to as "Ibuki"). The satellite was launched in January 2009 and has been relaying information from 56,000 observation points every three days since May 2009. Since October 2009, public access to the images has been available and analytical work started in February 2010 to validate the CO₂ and methane emission results. The Japanese agencies involved continue to improve the data quality. Mr. Shimada explained the current user interface is only available in Japanese, but they are working to translate the pages. He noted the satellite will enable precise observations of land and space data and eliminate "empty areas" that have plagued scientists in the absence of ground-based or regional observation points. He also described how various gas emissions would be color-coded for ease of interpretation. If countries allow GOSAT with airspace access, the data will be provided free.

Ms. Kruger thanked Mr. Shimada for his illuminating presentation and commented on the potential value of integrated land-to-space data. She also acknowledged his efforts to promote Methane to Markets through the Prime Minister's speech and Project Network meetings, and encouraged all Partners to keep in mind ways to raise awareness of the Partnership through communication and outreach mechanisms.

Mexico

Mr. Edgar Del Villar Alvelas with Secretaria de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (SEMARNAT) opened by thanking the Indian hosts before turning his comments to Mexico's efforts in 2009 to establish a National Policy on Climate Change that outlines a national program for waste management and includes

specific mention of Methane to Markets. In light of Ms. Kruger's comment, he also noted Mexico's president recently issued a statement on methane capture and use. Mr. Del Villar indicated that at the Washington, DC meeting, Mexico volunteered to co-chair the proposed wastewater task force and the country continues to identify mitigation opportunities within this sector as it is important to Mexico's national plan.

Mr. Del Villar described Mexico's collaborations with Canada in the areas of agriculture, landfills, and oil and gas. For example, the countries are pursuing small-scale technologies for heating at swine operations. Mexico is also exploring monitoring and verification systems to report methane emissions and mitigation potential from coal mining and oil and gas systems, and is looking to ramp up and/or replicate efforts in the Yucatan Peninsula. Mexico is also promoting the efforts of its Project Network, which is becoming the primary driver of new projects. Lastly, he stated that Mexico looks forward to hosting the COP16 meetings at the end of the year.

Ms. Kruger acknowledged the busy year ahead for Mexico as host to COP16 and the potential 2nd Ministerial meeting.

Mr. Jeremy Eppel with the United Kingdom's Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) asked about trends in Mexico's methane emissions. Mr. Del Villar indicated that Mexico's emissions are down by 129 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (MMTCO₂E) from 800 MMTCO₂E, and its Methane to Markets work focuses on initiatives aimed at further reducing emissions by 60 percent.

Poland

Mr. Zbigniew Kamienski with the Ministry of Economy also thanked U.S. EPA organizers and Indian hosts for the Expo. He stated that [Poland](#) is currently preparing its GHG inventory and that primary Polish activities and progress stems from the coal mining sector. From 2005 to 2008, Polish CMM utilization has increased from 145 to 166 million m³ and of 33 mines, 21 employ degasification and 14 have utilization in place. Recent review of one of the largest mines owned by JSW revealed that zero methane emissions will be released to the atmosphere by 2010. Mr. Kamienski described the Zory abandoned mine project to convert CMM to LNG and also outlined a VAM pilot project, which is expected to identify potential technologies for full-scale operations. Poland hopes to collaborate with other Partners and/or Project Network members on this project.

Mr. Kamienski explained that new support mechanisms relating to methane cogeneration will enter into force in early March 2010. Within the landfill sector, Poland is seeing results from projects funded by two Methane to Markets grants and from oil and gas, a 20 percent reduction equating to seven million m³ is expected from existing projects. He also noted huge potential within the agriculture sector from focused efforts on manure management and ambitious growth of biogas recovery (e.g., 2,500 installations by 2020). Mr. Kamienski also reviewed the challenges Poland faces, including: utilization of all CMM obtained via degasification, providing commercial condition for VAM, rapid development of landfill gas utilization, and maximum utilization of manure and other wastes.

United Kingdom

Mr. Eppel opened by saying his comments would emphasize agriculture as he was the Subcommittee co-chair, but assured participants that the [United Kingdom](#) was involved in other sectors as well. He explained that U.K.'s coal mine emissions were primarily captured under mechanisms in place prior to Methane to Markets and were much less significant than in previous decades. He also noted the LFG sector was quite mature but recognized there might be opportunities to improve and identify more

potential from this source. The oil and gas sector is also mature and the U.K. would be interested to discuss opportunities with the ASG to better share information and lessons learned.

Within the agriculture sector, production levels are high, particularly as it relates to animal manure management. The U.K. is hoping to expand anaerobic digestion (AD) within the agriculture sector and enhance its potential for biogas generation. He noted there was greater use of AD in the wastewater treatment sector, and these systems range in size and volume. Key drivers for mitigation efforts in the U.K. include the Climate Change Act that creates legal objectives to reduce emissions by 34 percent below 1990 levels and by 80 percent by 2050. Additional incentives are provided by European Union's Renewable Energy and Landfill Directives. These initiatives are also driving Project Network interest in renewables. Mr. Eppel provided an overview of various government-supported financial incentives and infrastructure, noting specifically 90£/kWh for AD.

Mr. Eppel outlined the U.K.'s demonstration program for innovative technologies, one of which includes direct injection to the natural gas grid. One barrier to progress is access to available information and the U.K. has established a gateway or centralized location for biogas data (i.e., AD Advice Portal). He described the AD implementation plan across various sectors, which includes creating economic and regulatory frameworks, building capacity, improving knowledge, sharing experiences, and assessing progress.

Mr. Eppel stated the U.K. is committed to continuing its Methane to Markets work in collaboration with China, as well as the potential to expand efforts into Africa. Lastly, he noted involvement in the Global Research Alliance on agricultural GHGs, started by New Zealand, in which both the U.K. and the United States participate.

Ms. Kruger thanked Mr. Eppel for his summary, commenting on the variety of mechanisms for technology deployment and also recognizing the creation of the AD Advice Portal.

United States

Mr. Paul Gunning with the U.S. EPA thanked the Indian hosts and organizers, particularly the Ministry of Coal, which served as the nodal ministry for India's efforts, and the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI), which served as U.S. EPA's in-country partner in Expo coordination and marketing efforts.

Mr. Gunning stated the [United States](#) is primarily focused on capacity building from its domestic methane reduction programs and how these activities can translate into international efforts. He noted that eight percent of U.S. emissions come from methane and many of the larger sources are the targeted sectors of Methane to Markets. Since the 1990s, U.S. domestic programs have been aggressively targeting and reducing methane emissions. With the oil and gas sector, there is robust involvement from the private companies with 60 – 65 percent of the industry involved in U.S. EPA's Natural Gas STAR Program. In the coal sector, approximately 90 percent of the methane emissions are currently captured and utilized. VAM projects, in particular, are increasing with one of the largest projects taking place at Consol Energy's Enlow Fork Mine. For the landfill sector, there exist regulatory requirements for combustion of collected methane as well as other initiatives and significant opportunities to use of LFG onsite or by direct end-users (e.g., greenhouses). From an agriculture perspective, U.S. EPA is taking a hard, close look at accelerating project potential at nearly 5,000 – 6,000 farms.

Mr. Gunning reviewed the various policies at play in the United States, particularly Congressional activity on climate change legislation. He also noted the forthcoming GHG mandatory reporting rule that will be facility-specific and impact approximately 10,000 facilities, both up and downstream. An oil and gas rule

will be proposed in the coming weeks. He commented that the current Administration has linked the importance of GHG reductions to health impacts (e.g., ground-level ozone and asthma) and how these findings might impact vehicle emissions under the Clean Air Act. He also explained a proposed cap-and-trade system is currently before the Senate and expected to be introduced this Spring, despite being a less popular approach.

Mr. Gunning outlined U.S. EPA's commitment to Methane to Markets, including coordination across multiple U.S. agencies, dedication of nearly \$60 million, and continued efforts to build capacity and advance projects through its domestic programs and international activities. He emphasized the availability of \$5 million in annual grants and noted the extended deadline of late July 2010 for submittals. He explained U.S. government activities through 2008 have been highlighted in a series of annual reports. He also described recent ASG efforts to develop and release the *Partnership Accomplishments Report*, which highlights the collaborative efforts of all the Partners. He remarked the report will be critical to promoting the Partnership's climate change activities in Partner governments.

In terms of proposed Steering Committee discussion topics, Mr. Gunning commented the United States is supportive of national action plans, leveraging involvement with other Partnerships, inclusion of methane destruction, improving monitoring/reporting, developing a Ministerial declaration, and encouraging financial and other commitments from Partners.

Ms. Kruger thanked Mr. Gunning for his update, particularly as it related to the flavor of domestic policy issues Gina McCarthy is currently facing.

Consideration of Ethiopia and Ghana's Requests to Join the Partnership (Agenda Item #6)

Ms. Kruger asked to move the consideration of Ethiopia and Ghana's requests to join the Partnership up in the agenda. Ms. Kruger noted that given sparse African participation, she was encouraged by Ethiopia and Ghana's requests to join the Partnership. Mr. Henry Ferland with the ASG explained that Ethiopia sent its letter of intent on January 6 and indicated interest in the Agriculture and Landfill Subcommittees. Ghana's letter of intent was received on February 8, and indicated interest in the Landfill and Oil and Gas Subcommittees. Mr. Ferland outlined the current process for evaluating requests to join the Partnership, comprised of a 60-day review period by the existing Steering Committee, after which the requests are approved if no objections are received.

Mr. Blanco asked which agency made the request for Ethiopia and Ghana. Mr. Ferland indicated it was the Environmental Protection Agency equivalent within each country. Mr. Shimada commented on the poor coverage within the African continent so he felt it would be good for the Partnership; hence, Japan would welcome them as Partners. Mr. Eppel noted that while Africa was poorly represented and it would be beneficial to have more African Partners, he wondered about the likelihood they would provide delegates that actively participated. Mr. Goetze echoed U.K.'s comments to have new active Partners and also wondered about their motivation to participate (i.e., bringing energy and ideas toward achieving a national objective).

Ms. Kruger noted the Partnership does not typically recruit, but yet new Partners continue to seek out Methane to Markets. She hoped with the inclusion of these new Partners, there would be additional opportunities to find and/or form collaborations. She asked for any objections to adding Ethiopia and Ghana and hearing none, Ms. Kruger welcomed them as the 32nd and 33rd Partners.

Outreach and Communication Update (Agenda Item #7)

Mr. Ferland provided an update on the ASG's [outreach and communications efforts](#), as well as activities undertaken by Partners and subcommittees. He indicated that a redesigned Web site was launched in September 2009 with greater emphasis on accessibility and country-specific accomplishments. He pointed to U.K.'s agriculture portal as a prime example of a Web site that would be ideal to link to/from the Methane to Markets Web site and build synergies.

Mr. Ferland also described how the *Methane International* newsletter has been revamped as a Web-based document. He encouraged the Partners to utilize the newsletter to publicize successes and make announcements (e.g., upcoming RFPs), noting the ASG was open to highlighting Partner contributions in the newsletter. From a press and media perspective, he pointed to the recent remarks by the Japanese Prime Minister as a perfect example of how to engage the press and encouraged Partners to think about other mechanisms to promote Methane to Markets.

Regarding the Project Tracking System, Mr. Ferland noted that Finland and Italy's work in other countries was the type of information that should be captured. He described how the tracking system serves as a centralized location for all Methane to Markets-related projects, including the nearly 90 projects highlighted at the 2007 Expo as well as the more than 130 projects to be featured at this Expo.

Similar to the Partnership, the ASG is not actively recruiting for the Project Network yet the group continues to grow. These members continue to participate in the various Partnerships meetings and workshops, and lend their expertise to Methane to Markets activities. Mr. Ferland also noted the various opportunities to better engage the Project Network including highlights on the Web site and in the newsletter, providing speaking opportunities at meetings, and co-locating meetings with other trade and energy-related venues.

Mr. Ferland announced the availability of the [Partnership Accomplishments Report](#), which is the culmination of three years' work. The report is intended to serve as a marketing tool to help educate or inform government officials about the Partnership as well as highlight Partner accomplishments. He expressed his gratitude to the Partners that provided contributions and served as reviewers during the report's development.

The ASG also engaged in extensive outreach for the Expo. Mr. Ferland thanked and acknowledged India Ministry of Coal for serving as the nodal agency to convene the various sectors. Messages emphasized opportunities for methane's potential to mitigate climate change, particularly the more than 130 projects that if implemented, would reduce annual GHG emissions by 17 MMTCO₂E.

To recap the outreach and communications efforts, Mr. Ferland reminded Partners to consider adding portals/links to Web sites, utilize the newsletter, find ways to reach out to press/media, and enter projects into the tracking system. He emphasized the latter is the easiest way for users to identify potential project opportunities. He also encouraged continued Project Network engagement, PAR circulation, and promotion of their Expo participation.

Ms. Kruger thanked Mr. Ferland for the overview and acknowledged the enormous amount of work the ASG has undertaken in the last year. She, too, emphasized the need for Partners to consider creating portals and/or adding links to/from the Methane to Markets Web site. She then encouraged comments or questions from participants.

Mr. Blanco made a general comment on outreach and communication efforts and wondered from Argentina's perspective, how the Partnership communicated with Partners. For example, he indicated that

several workshops had occurred in Argentina about which he was unaware. Ms. Kruger said her understanding was that the ASG had primary contact with the Administrative Liaisons in each country, who was responsible for coordinating contact with the individual delegates. Mr. Ferland acknowledged the point and also commented on China's new approach having CCII as a centralized point of contact. He noted that communication goes both ways and emphasized the need for countries to provide up-to-date contacts, so he asked the partners to review the contact information currently listed on the Web site to ensure the ASG has the right person. Mr. Eppel explained there was no one place or person within the U.K. that dealt explicitly with methane issues. He suggested to help governments be more involved, the ASG should communicate more broadly to all contacts. Ms. Sewell indicated she felt the ASG had good delivery mechanisms and re-emphasized Mr. Ferland's charge to Partners to review and update contact information. She also commented on Mr. Goetze previous comment regarding Ethiopia and Ghana's potential engagement and indicated that face-to-face contact might not be necessary as long as they recognize the wealth of information available to them and make other contributions to the Partnership (e.g., project opportunity identification). Ms. Kruger reinforced the need for up-to-date contact information and recommended copying the Steering Committee members in the interim.

Ms. Lopez wondered if it might be possible to assign tasks to the Administrative Liaisons to be more proactive. She also commented on Australia's point that Ethiopia and Ghana's involvement might not be face-to-face initially but perhaps they will become more involved as time goes by and they realize the benefits of active participation. Ms. Kruger said from the ASG perspective, it was difficult to know where Administrative Liaisons sit relative to other delegates (i.e., across broad agencies) so again, it is imperative for Partners to review their contacts.

Progress Reports from Subcommittees (Agenda Item #8)

Agriculture

Mr. Jorge Hilbert with Argentina's Instituto Nacional de Tecnologia Agropecuaria (INTA) and co-chair of the Agriculture Subcommittee focused his portion of the Subcommittee progress report on livestock manure management and the Partnership's consideration of enteric fermentation and rice cultivation. He also noted that agriculture residue burning is another source of emissions. He indicated the Subcommittee held a meeting in Guangzhou, China in September 2009 in conjunction with the International Conference on Water Pollution and Climate Change, given the sector's strong relationship to water pollution. Topics of discussion included updated action plans and possible inclusion of enteric fermentation, rice cultivation, and wastewater within the sector's purview. Mr. Eppel continued by describing the Subcommittee's other activities, including an international AD protocol that was developed in consultation with U.S. EPA and industry experts. He indicated the Subcommittee would be interested to receive input from Chinese and Spanish users to ensure its global applicability. For time purposes, Mr. Eppel skipped the individual country updates (details are available in the [Agriculture presentation](#)) but announced the Subcommittee would be meeting on Friday as well as later in the year. Mr. Hilbert again stressed the growth of agriculture residue burning and noted the development of the international AD protocol as a good collaboration.

Ms. Sewell asked if the Subcommittee was taking stock of what might be happening within other organizations that address agriculture issues and wondered about opportunities for this group to outline what role Methane to Markets might play. Ms. King explained the ASG identified various groups while developing the wastewater scoping paper, which will be discussed in greater detail later in the meeting.

Ms. Kruger asked Mr. Eppel if, in discussion on various barriers within the Agriculture sector, the issue of trade barriers had come up. Mr. Eppel responded no, and also extended that sentiment to intellectual property as he understood the issues often went hand-in-hand. He noted that technologies within the

Agriculture sector were relatively simple and primarily seen as ways to reduce costs which might attribute to the lack of trade barriers.

Coal Mines

Dr. Jayne Somers with U.S. EPA's Coalbed Methane Outreach Program (CMOP) provided the update as acting Coal Subcommittee co-chair. Dr. Somers reviewed the mission for the Subcommittee and described the October meeting held in conjunction with the United Nations European Commission on Economics (UNECE) Ad-Hoc Working Group on Coal Mines, with a primary focus on the Expo. She emphasized the number of coal project opportunities featured at the Expo, as well as two success stories from China. She also noted the Subcommittee had been involved in the forthcoming *Best Practices Guidance* and worked with Australia on the APP series related to coal mines.

Dr. Somers summarized numerous VAM activities and also reviewed the activities by Partner country (details are available in the [Coal Mines presentation](#)). Dr. Somers outlined collaboration with the APP Coal Mining Task Force, in which many Methane to Markets Partners are involved and commented on an upcoming China study tour. She also described a stranded gas project undertaken in Mexico.

Following the Coal presentation, Ms. Kruger asked Dr. Somers about trade barriers within the coal sector. Dr. Somers explained that some taxation and intellectual property issues have been raised.

Landfill

Mr. Blanco provided an overview of the topics discussed at the September 2009 Landfill Subcommittee meeting in Long Beach, California and drew attention to activities specific to the Expo, including consideration of Call for Presentation abstracts, development of a biogas template for projects, and identifying facilities for site tour(s). Mr. Blanco then provided a review of the landfill projects to be featured at the Expo, which includes more than 30 landfills that premiered at the 2007 Expo. He also noted the Subcommittee has spent substantial time over the last year making improvements to the landfill database (e.g., increased number of landfills from 302 to 668).

Mr. Blanco briefly described various activities by country, with particular focus on how many pilot projects have emerged from feasibility studies (details are available in the [Landfill presentation](#)). He also noted additional non-financial activities such as workshops and model(s) development. Mr. Blanco described the Subcommittee's fruitful discussions regarding the potential inclusion of wastewater under its purview, and indicated the Subcommittee would be looking for more direction from the Steering Committee.

Nest steps for the Landfill Subcommittee include developing an international best practice manual for landfill biogas projects, identifying target sites for near-term methane recovery, use improved databases, and continue to post results and communicate lessons learned. He indicated that some countries, including Argentina, have already begun some work on identifying targets. He then summarized the remaining Subcommittee activities in concluding remarks.

Mr. Franck Portalupi with Environment Canada noted his country's involvement in the Pueblo Landfill project in Mexico was inadvertently left out of the summary. Mr. Presicce announced that Italy's co-chair, Mario Lazzeri, has been re-assigned and will no longer serve on the Subcommittee. Ms. Kruger asked her question regarding trade barriers within the Landfill Subcommittee and Mr. Blanco responded they had not directly encountered such issues.

Oil and Gas

Mr. Mike Layer with Natural Resources Canada and Subcommittee vice-chair opened his presentation by explaining that co-chair Javier Bocanegra has been replaced by Cruz Ernesto Hernandez. He continued by providing an overview of the Subcommittee's activities, which include sharing information with Partners and potential partners such as national energy companies. He noted the Oil and Gas sector relies on critical commitment from its Project Network that set forth emerging ideas (e.g., champions). He was encouraged by the words delivered in Mexico for creating a policy-based objective for Methane to Markets.

Mr. Layer noted some key obstacles for the Subcommittee, including jurisdiction and/or marginalized results, and pointed to the APP as an example (e.g., reluctance to take early action, additionality). Within the oil and gas industry, obstacles include compliance issues and methodology. Items for consideration include membership in a plethora of Partnership does not imply action. In the interest of time, Mr. Layer skipped the country updates (details are available in the [Oil and Gas presentation](#)).

Ms. Kruger indicated that she, too, grapples with the linkage between multiple Partnerships and effectiveness. Mr. Shimada noted that CDM/JI methodologies are severely limited in this sector, and encouraged the Subcommittee to focus more on available reduction technologies since the oil and gas sector is the largest contributor to climate change. Ms. Sewell commented on the relevance to the Steering Committee and other subcommittees, and the lack of recognition of methodologies in climate change strategies and encouraged Partners to spread the message across their portfolios.

Mr. Eppel asked where the question of methane reduction occurs. He noted that CO₂ from combustion of oil and natural gas is so much different from the agriculture sector since it generates little CO₂. Having a better understanding of these issues would provide more traction for the Partnership. Mr. Layer commented on the linkage to UNFCCC and the degree to which Methane to Markets can integrate to ensure a captive and effective audience. He indicated that crumbs from the funding table for no- to low-cost technologies could be used for methane reduction, and includes co-benefits (e.g., economic).

Mr. Goetze commented on the role of methane under UNFCCC, and the tendency to go too far into details "as is" without being specific to each gas. Mr. Eppel noted an agriculture example, that if methane is unique, there is a need to share (i.e., policy synthesis). Mr. Shimada explained there is no explicit coverage for methane under UNFCCC and it is typically addressed as an "other" issue. He added that science and adaptability play a role, again with consideration of co-benefits (e.g., health impacts, energy security). He also admitted that Copenhagen was a "mess." Mr. Layer noted his comments were not necessarily an endorsement of the UNFCCC linkage, but more a reflection on the "currency" or monetary value of having GHG reductions recognized, particularly as it relates to energy supply and security. Ms. Kruger interjected on this interesting discussion regarding how best to build on the Partnership's accomplishments to date. Specifically, it will be important to focus on projects with near-term results and political buy-in from Partner governments (i.e., trade-off for on-the-ground development). She encouraged the Partners to think about Methane to Markets as the place to make projects happen (i.e., "methane hub").

Update on Wastewater Sector (Agenda Item #9)

Ms. Kruger stated the participants might recall that in Washington, DC, the Steering Committee discussed establishment of a Wastewater Task Force, which Mexico and the U.K. agreed to co-chair. Ms. King provided a [wastewater sector overview](#), indicating that developing countries and expanding populations are creating significant opportunities to capture and use methane from wastewater treatment. She indicated the issue was initially raised by Chile in January 2009, and the ASG was tasked with developing a scoping paper that was presented in September 2009. In addition to sector background, the paper also

suggested mechanisms regarding how Methane to Markets might fit into existing international activities. She reiterated the establishment of the Wastewater Task Force and invited other Partners to participate. She continued to outline possible options for incorporating Wastewater into the Partnership, including feedback from the Agriculture and Landfill Subcommittees. While the Landfill Subcommittee felt wastewater might be a logical fit within its purview given similarity in infrastructure (i.e., municipal service), the Agriculture Subcommittee felt the wastewater sector was a departure from its scope and that different players would be involved.

Ms. King also noted the paper identified several international organizations that are currently looking into water resources and encouraged the Wastewater Task Force to give these organizations further consideration during its deliberations. Items for the Steering Committee's consideration include the Task Force members (e.g., additional Partners), consultation with other organizations, and inclusion of the sector within the new TOR.

Ms. Kruger asked if there were other countries interested in Wastewater Task Force participation. Mr. Blanco indicated that Argentina would be interested in participating, but they would also like more direction from the Steering Committee since, as the Agriculture Subcommittee noted, there are different players despite similar technologies (i.e., AD). Ms. Kruger clarified where the individual subcommittees had come down on the issue, stating that while a potential linkage exists, the Agriculture Subcommittee felt it already had too much on its plate to take on the issue. She felt the Landfill Subcommittee approached the idea more warmly. Mr. Blanco said he was not sure that another year was necessary to take the issue under consideration since the Steering Committee had all of the possible elements available to make a decision. He did question what/who might prevail from continued research: technologies or potential stakeholders. Mr. Hilbert interjected that indeed the stakeholders from the agriculture and wastewater sectors were different, despite similar—but not the same—technologies. He agreed that it was more important to have the right people together, regardless of technology used.

Mr. Shimada indicated that Japan would participate in the Wastewater Task Force and agreed that it was not appropriate for the Agriculture Subcommittee, seeing the Landfill Subcommittee as more suitable. He also suggested a possible name change to “Waste Management” to better reflect the breadth of scope. Therefore, Japan would support the development of a new subcommittee and/or incorporation within the Landfill Subcommittee, pending name change.

Mr. Kamienski said Poland agreed the Landfill Subcommittee, rather than Agriculture, would be the best location for the sector. He also indicated that from a cost and resources perspective, Poland would support incorporation within the Landfill Subcommittee in lieu of establishing a new subcommittee given likelihood that it would be the same stakeholders.

Mr. Goetze indicated Canada's perspective that the Steering Committee is close to consensus, and echoed the low transaction costs associated with including wastewater within the Landfill Subcommittee, with the option to separate into a stand-alone subcommittee at a later date if activities outpace the existing subcommittee's capabilities. Canada would support a name change but nothing as broad as “Urban Infrastructure” as suggested in Washington, DC. Mr. Eppel said he was not sure who from the U.K. would participate in the task force but had some ideas. He also noted that if the Landfill Subcommittee was amenable to having wastewater under its purview, he did not see the need for a separate task force but agreed with Canada's suggestion for the option to split the sectors in the future.

Mr. Gunning commented on the similarities to September's discussion and added the United States preferred not to impose limitations with a name including “urban” because there were also rural applications. He also noted the Project Network would be a key element for the sector, and wondered if the private sector focused on wastewater treatment might be different from those that dealt with landfills.

Regardless, he encouraged whatever group formed to co-host meetings with other international organizations that address similar topics. Mr. Gunning explained the creation of a task force would provide opportunities to answer some of the remaining questions, especially those related to what is already occurring in the wastewater sector. To conclude, he indicated that the United States would support either a separate Wastewater Task Force or a working group within the Landfill Subcommittee. As co-chair of the Landfill Subcommittee, Mr. Blanco felt it would be okay to proceed with the Task Force concept, but in a shorter time frame so that final decisions could be made in advance of the next Landfill Subcommittee meeting in late 2010. He also suggested a combined subcommittee should be called “Landfill and Wastewater Treatment.” Mr. Del Villar, who suggested the name “Urban Infrastructure” in Washington, DC, said it would be fine. Mr. Goetze emphasized a central point made by the United States in regards to getting the mandate right; that is, the Task force might be necessary in the near-term to figure out the role that Methane to Markets might play within the wastewater sector but ultimately, the sector might be incorporated into the existing Landfill Subcommittee pending additional consideration. Mr. Layer commented the Landfill Subcommittee was a logical fit given that much of the biomass from wastewater treatment plants was disposed, although Mr. Eppel rejected that comment as organic materials is banned from landfills in many countries.

Ms. Kruger summarized the comments, stating that it appeared incorporation under the Agriculture Subcommittee was off the table while the Landfill Subcommittee was open to undertaking the issue. She indicated that if the Landfill Subcommittee is willing to take on wastewater, perhaps it was no longer necessary to convene a task force. However, the question becomes what is the mandate to the Subcommittee (e.g., barriers, opportunities, tools, integration with other organizations). Mr. Ferland also noted that currently there is only one Landfill chair and that neither Mexico nor the U.K., who volunteered to chair the Wastewater Task Force, has active members on the Landfill Subcommittee. Mr. Eppel stated the practical way forward might be to convene a teleconference among the Partners that have indicated interest in the Wastewater Task Force to gauge sustainable interest and available delegates. Ms. Lopez noted that Colombia is interested in wastewater and she had already expressed willingness to provide inputs to the Task Force in the previous meeting as she currently serves as the Landfill delegate.

Once again, Ms. Kruger sought to summarize the various propositions and proposed to have the Landfill Subcommittee evaluate ways to integrate wastewater into its scope or whether to form a separate subcommittee at a later date. She also encouraged Partners to invite other experts within their countries to participate in the conversation. Mr. Blanco echoed the need to ramp up activity and invite wastewater stakeholders to participate in a forthcoming call or meeting. Mr. Eppel agreed, but emphasized there should be a call first to assess engagement. Ms. Kruger reiterated the need for interested Partners to provide points of contact (POCs), convene a conference call among those governments, then reach out to the Project Network for a second call or possibly co-located meeting with another industry-related meeting. She tasked the ASG to collect POCs and set-up the conference call in coming months.

Committee Membership Procedures (Agenda Item #10)

Steering Committee Membership

Ms. King opened the discussion by stating that while this issue did not come up in Washington, DC, it had been raised at previous Steering Committee meetings and now was the time to address in light of TOR renewal. She provided a background on the history of the [Steering Committee and its membership](#) as well as the current process for joining the Steering Committee. She also noted that all Partners receive Steering Committee e-mail via Administrative Liaisons and are welcome to attend meetings as observers. As part of the TOR renewal discussion, she indicated now might be the time to consider issues related to size of the Steering Committee (e.g., number of members), criteria for Steering Committee members (e.g.,

broad participation in Partnership activities, providing tangible support), and dealing with inactive members (i.e., system to check in and learn if still interested in serving on the Steering Committee).

Regarding the size of the Steering Committee, Mr. Shimada asked for clarification on the current numbers and indicated that he has always been vocal and/or supportive of caps on the number of members to keep the group manageable. He also noted that he would be supportive of establishing an “inactive” category for Partners that miss two consecutive meetings. Mr. Eppel expressed his desire to keep things more flexible since the Partnership is still relatively small (i.e., only 33 Partners). He continued by saying the reality is that not every country participates in every Steering Committee meeting but as long as there is a quorum, there should not be need to limit the size. He added that caps might also create the perception that non-Steering Committee members are second-class. Instead, he encouraged the delegates to focus on the quality of participation rather than quantity of participants. Mr. Shimada agreed with the level of activity as a minimum criterion with an allowance if they contribute in ways other than strict attendance. Mr. Presicce also encouraged the delegates to keep the procedures more relaxed. He recalled the initial discussions on potential caps emerged in the year that several new Partners joined and concerns arose about manageability, which has not materialized. He said Italy would support a lag time to join the Steering Committee, but no other criteria should be necessary.

Mr. Gunning echoed the U.K.’s comment about creating an “exclusive club,” and that it was still too premature to establish membership caps. He did hope, however, that the Steering Committee could set the bar for honest and robust engagement. Mr. Eppel also voiced concern over telling a Partner they might lose Steering Committee seat without taking into consideration the individual in that post and their inactivity versus the Partner country’s contributions as a whole. He emphasized that any procedures should not discourage participation. Mr. Del Villar expressed Mexico’s position as “the larger, the better.” He agreed with no membership cap, but felt countries that desired to be on the Steering Committee should participate in the subcommittees as part of their commitment. Mr. Ulfstedt indicated that Finland supports the U.K. argument as well as Mexico’s comments, and also asked for clarification as to why Finland was admitted in the same year that other Partners joined but they were not Steering Committee members. Ms. King explained that Partners can opt not to participate in the Steering Committee. Mr. Goetze agreed with the U.K. as to no cap but echoed the need to have strong interest in Partnership activities. He noted that some countries might not have the resources to attend meetings, but that should not preclude their ability to contribute in other ways (e.g., project identification/development). Mr. Kamienski indicated Poland would also decline to support a size limit and sees lack of cap as a way to maintain motivation and momentum. In regard to Canada’s comments, Mr. Karas expressed the need to be careful about Partners’ contributions but should also focus on what they can take away from participation (e.g., tools, lessons learned). He encouraged the Steering Committee not to lose the possibility of sharing experiences as a value-added benefit. Mr. Del Villars agreed and clarified that “commitment” should not be limited to “giving” but should include “getting” as well.

In summary, Ms. Kruger noted the Steering Committee seemed to agree there should be no cap but that qualified criteria might include two-way contributions and/or demonstrated engagement. She also noted that delegates did not seem to favor the concept of “inactive” members, but there might be a need for mechanisms to learn why that Partner is not actively participating (e.g., person in that post, lack of travel resources). She added that the ASG could provide information on what the Partnership might be looking for (e.g., participation in subcommittees, project identification) and that after a period of time (e.g., six months or anytime thereafter), a new Partner could request to join the Steering Committee.

Mr. Shimada stated that in light of the loose Partnership structure (e.g., voluntary, non-binding), there might not be a need to ask the Steering Committee to approve new Partners or members and encouraged the ASG instead to merely seek objections. He added that Japan would support some criteria for Partners requesting to join the Steering Committee. Ms. Kruger reiterated the suggestion for flexible or qualified

criteria (e.g., two-way contributions and/or benefits). In light of Japan's comments, she asked the delegates if they wanted to evaluate the requests or defer to the ASG. Mr. Goetze asked that the discussion be reworded to keep membership open to active Partners rather than using terms like "cap" or "criteria." He also noted the need to couch "active" in terms of participation versus contribution or needs.

Since nearing the end of Day One, Ms. Kruger asked if delegates agreed with the lag time between joining the Partnership and requesting to join the Steering Committee. Mr. Gunning said yes, but if so, the Partner should be invited to attend the Steering Committee meeting (if held during that time) as an Observer. Mr. Blanco supported the U.K.'s suggestion that participation (or lack thereof) serves as a natural filter. Mr. Del Villar echoed Japan's suggestion that Partners express any objection in lieu of the ASG seeking approval. Mr. Gunning asked if the ASG could be tasked to create outreach on the types of activities the Steering Committee would be looking for when considering Partners' request to join the Steering Committee. Mr. Eppel encouraged the ASG not to be too prescriptive, but that it would be helpful to have a page or two about why the Partner wants to participate in the Steering Committee and what they hope to get out of participation. He agreed with the U.S. recommendation that Partners have observer status until the six month time frame passes and they become eligible to apply.

To close Day One, Ms. Kruger tasked the ASG to summarize the suggestions and to take a look at the TOR and propose possible "criteria" language for incorporation.

WEDNESDAY, 3 MARCH 2010 - DAY TWO

Welcome and Opening of the Meeting (Agenda Item #11)

Ms. Kruger called the meeting to order at 14:36 and asked the ASG to summarize the Points of Consensus from the previous day. Ms. King provided an overview of Steering Committee membership, which included:

- No cap or limitation on the size of the Steering Committee.
- Partners could participate as observers for the first year in the Partnership, after which the Partner could apply for Steering Committee membership.
- The ASG will develop non-prescriptive guidelines for engagement.
- No "inactive" procedures.
- Seek objections instead of approval for new Partners and/or Steering Committee members.

Ms. Kruger asked if there were any questions or comments regarding Steering Committee membership points of consensus. Mr. Goetze asked how to capture the engagement guidelines if they were not included in TOR language. Ms. Kruger explained the opportunity to convey decisions in the closing plenary as well as the meeting minutes, and that the ASG could add the language to the "How to Join" portion of the Web site. Ms. King also noted the ASG could modify and/or add language to the letter template that Partners submit requesting participation. Once the new template is available, the ASG would send a message to the entire Partnership. Ms. Sewell asked about the two pending requests for Steering Committee membership from Ethiopia and Ghana. Ms. Kruger suggested they grandfather the pending requests and then use the flexible mechanism as proposed for future requests. Ms. King clarified that Kazakhstan has also requested participation on the Steering Committee and they have already been a Partner for more than a year. Ms. Aiyngul Ismagulova with Kazakhstan's Ministry of Environmental Protection indicated that she would consult with her Ministry to determine their continued interest and once confirmed, they would submit a letter in accordance with the newly proposed process.

Subcommittee Leadership

Ms. King explained the current process for identifying subcommittee co-chairs (e.g., one from developing country or country with economy in transition and one from a developed country) but noted there is nothing in the TOR about changing leadership for those countries that want or need to step down as chair. She indicated that the TOR renewal provided delegates with an opportunity to formalize the inclusion of vice-chairs as well as new procedures for changing chairs. As such, the ASG proposes a cycle (e.g., every 3-4 years) to allow other Partners to express interest in serving as chair. She noted that the incumbent would also be eligible to express interest. Mr. Goetze suggested the timeframe be shortened to every 2-3 years and said the ASG captured the situation correctly when a country might want out of the leadership position, but he wondered what would happen if no one wants to leave and given the voluntary nature of the Partnership (i.e., inability to remove a chair). He did, however, see the need for transition in leadership to provide opportunities for other Partners. Mr. Eppel indicated that being chair should not be viewed as a job for life and given his 4 years as the Agriculture co-chair, he sees how longevity adds value as long as the person is still interested. Therefore, he suggested evaluating leadership every 3 years as 2 years might not provide enough continuity, but 4 years should be the maximum.

Mr. Presicce expressed Italy's support for the ASG recommendations and proposed a bottom-up approach; that is, coming from the subcommittees themselves versus the Steering Committee. Ms. Kruger noted the request and said this could be a charge to the subcommittees. She also noted the process would be structured to help facilitate change within a flexible—not forced—mechanism. Mr. Gunning added on a related matter, the position of “vice-chair” is not currently mentioned in the TOR but was instituted in 2004 for Coal Mines and 2006 for Oil and Gas to allow additional countries to play an active leadership role. Mr. Eppel noted the Agriculture Subcommittee would welcome the addition of a vice-chair, stating it would be helpful to have another Partner that might be interested to move up should one of the current co-chairs wish to step down. Mr. Ferland pointed out there was no difference between “co-chair” and “vice-chair,” and suggested referring to all leadership positions as “co-chair” while allowing up to three per subcommittee. Mr. Blanco echoed the U.K.'s position, particularly in light of having only one Landfill chair at this time. He also agreed with Italy's comment that the decision to review leadership should come from the subcommittee(s) and not the Steering Committee.

Mr. Eppel asked what might be the process for reviewing leadership. Ms. Kruger indicated that subcommittees could submit a slate of proposed co- and vice-chairs and that selection would be consensus-driven. Ms. Kruger also addressed Mr. Blanco's comment regarding the single Landfill chair and encouraged the Subcommittee to identify a new co-chair during its upcoming meeting.

UNFCCC Observer Status (Agenda Item #12)

Ms. Kruger explained this issue of obtaining [UNFCCC observer status](#) initially emerged in Mexico (i.e., need to raise awareness of Methane to Markets in a broader, global context), after which the ASG submitted an application for observer status. After the application was denied in April, the Steering Committee discussed the issue further in Washington, DC. At this time, she invited Ms. King to give a more thorough overview of the current status and possible next steps. Ms. King provided the reasoning behind the UNFCCC Secretariat's denial of the Partnership's application, stating lack of judicial personality since it is not a non-profit organization. The Secretariat did, however, note the Partnership is well-versed in issues of relevance to UN matters. Ms. King stated that at the Steering Committee meeting in Washington, DC, there was consensus to continue seeking observer status. As such, the ASG consulted with several stakeholders knowledgeable of the UN procedures and determined the guidelines used by the Secretariat raised some questions about issuing rulings based merely on past decisions (e.g., guidelines) versus a case-by-case basis. Therefore, the ASG proposes to seek new direction for all organizations like

Methane to Markets to become observers, despite not being able to obtain non-profit status from any one Partner government.

Ms. King reviewed the ASG's proposal, which would require a Partner country to submit text to allow organizations like Methane to Markets to become observers. This issue would need to be raised under "Other Matters" during the upcoming June 2010 meeting of the Subsidiary Body of Implementation (SBI). Specifically, a Partner country would need to come forward to make the suggestion with support from other Partners. These Partners would also need to ensure their delegates that attend the negotiations are well-versed on the topic to argue the Partnership's position. Mr. Eppel asked who else was denied observer status in this latest round, if there could be any hidden meaning behind denial, and what is the definition of non-profit status. Ms. King explained that the ASG is not a legally, separate entity from the U.S. EPA and therefore, cannot apply for non-profit status from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. While unsure who else might have been denied observer status, she indicated that the Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum as well as the APP would fall into the same classification as the Partnership. She did not think there was any hidden meaning in the denial as the Secretariat acknowledged the Partnership was well-qualified on the climate change subject. It appears that denial was strictly based on lack of legal separation or non-profit status.

Mr. Blanco asked if it was possible for the ASG to obtain non-profit status. Ms. Kruger explained the need to provide funding within another organization that either has non-profit status or create and build a new non-profit organization, which is not easy. Mr. Goetze indicated that he had seen the legal opinion and understood that indeed the decision was based on the Partnership's lack of judicial personality. He said the ASG had the SBI process correct, but he wondered whether this should be a priority for the Partnership, particularly given the lack of attention it might receive. He agreed that the Partners needed to "pick up the stick" and help provide exposure for the Partnership, noting that UNFCCC Parties get higher priority than observers. Mr. Shimada expressed that he was initially supportive of obtaining observer status but now had missed feelings after consulting with his colleagues, thinking that it might open a Pandora's box if even more organizations were eligible to be emitted as observers. He noted that given the existing 33 Partners, the Partnership should always be able to get a side event and he also encouraged all Partners to display Methane to Markets materials at their booths. He lastly stated that if the Partnership wishes to seek new direction for organizations like the Partnership, the delegates need to reach a decision at this meeting in order to make the appeal in June.

Mr. Ulfstedt acknowledged that he consulted with Finland's chief negotiator, who discouraged further pursuit given potentially long-lasting perspectives of the Partnership. He also acknowledged his negotiator felt there were already too many observers. Ms. Barbara DeRosa-Joynt with the U.S. State Department countered Japan's claim that it should be easy to get side events, stating that it has been difficult to get side events and/or booth space from the United States as well as other Partners. She said it sounded like working through the SBI process was not advisable based in input from Partners' negotiators, but emphasized that if the ASG discontinued its pursuit of observer status, Partners would need to commit to providing space for Methane to Markets. Ms. King echoed the comments on using Partners to sponsor side events but indicated difficulties go beyond cooperation, although having this conversation might help facilitate the process in the future. Having observer status would free Methane to Markets to do things themselves rather than being dependent on a Partner. Ms. Kruger noted that it would be difficult getting new issues in front of the UNFCCC given Partners' multiple priorities. From the ASG perspective, having observer status would be an investment and provide the Partnership with the ability to advance its priorities. Ms. Kruger asked the delegates if there might be consensus to advance the observer application exclusive of seeking change to the guidelines.

Mr. Shimada asked if the Partnership applied as an intergovernmental organization (IGO) or nongovernmental organization (NGO). Ms. King replied IGO, to which Mr. Shimada said if the Steering

Committee elected to go forward with its application, Japan would raise the issue at the SBI meeting. Mr. Eppel interjected that as a non-negotiator he might not be qualified to enter an opinion and while the U.K. would not break consensus, he was concerned by Finland's remark that it would be a significant effort to get the UNFCCC to change its ruling and if continued pursuit of observer status might be counter productive or back-lash on the Partnership. He also noted that with the opportunity to hold the 2nd Ministerial meeting in conjunction with a COP event would raise the profile of the Partnership. He also inquired about the possibility to spin off the ASG separate from the U.S. government in the future. Mr. Goetze noted that as a frequent negotiator, he knows that one needs to give something up or take advantage of someone else in order to get ahead (i.e., can't get something for nothing). He said Canada would be prepared to advocate Methane to Markets presence in Mexico.

Ms. Kruger remarked she heard a lack of appetite toward continuing to pursue observer status and/or getting the guidelines changed but did note a willingness to find other ways to leverage Partners' support. She suggested tabling approaching the SBI for now and waiting to see how things go in Mexico before determining how or when to go forward.

Terms of Reference (TOR) Revision (Agenda Item #13)

Ms. Kruger indicated [TOR revisions](#) were introduced in Washington, DC, at which time the Steering Committee agreed to extend the TOR for one year to provide the delegates time to consider and discuss changes. Ms. King reviewed three types of proposed changes: points of consensus following the September 2009 meeting, updates on other topics discussed, and additional items for consideration. She also noted these items were conceptual and not listed chronologically.

Regarding points of consensus, Ms. King explained that delegates decided during the last meeting to expand the scope of the Partnership to include abatement and destruction of methane. She also noted agreement to add language creating a linkage to the UNFCCC. At the previous meeting, the delegates had also agreed to have Partners develop action plans with assistance for developing countries as well as monitor and report annual progress, as long as the process was not burdensome to Partners. Regarding new sources of methane, the delegates agreed to add wastewater as a new focal area with continued flexibility to add more focal areas at the 2nd Ministerial meeting or anytime in the future. During this round, the ASG recommended adding the position of vice-chair to the TOR language, as well as creating a periodic review of subcommittee leadership. Ms. King noted that changes were suggested regarding hosting the ASG and revising the list of approved Steering Committee members to reflect the current status, plus add Ethiopia and Ghana. Additional changes included removing reference to scientific understanding and establishing the length of the TOR (e.g., another 5 years).

Before discussions ensued, Ms. Kruger stated that the Steering Committee had the authority to adopt any changes without Ministerial approval. She recommended they start at the beginning of the [strike-out version of the TOR](#) circulated in advance of the meeting and work through the suggested changes in chronological order.

Mr. Ulfstedt suggested moving wastewater after landfill given the previous discussions. Mr. Presicce asked to add "emissions" following "methane." Mr. Blanco asked about activities that avoid emissions and how they might be covered. Mr. Goetze sought to address the "Purpose" before revamping the introduction. He also noted the intent of Partners was changed by splitting the sentences as indicated and suggested dropping the new language. Mr. Eppel stated it was possible to drop the reference to GHGs at the end, since it was added up front. Ms. Kruger asked if anyone had objections to the proposed language regarding the linkage to the UNFCCC. Mr. Goetze recommended looking at how the APP references its connection and Ms. DeRosa-Joynt indicated she would provide the exact language.

To continue, Mr. Eppel recommended adding “abatement” to the second reference to “recovery and use.” Ms. Kruger indicated the ASG would ensure universal terms/usage throughout the document. This would also apply to the addition of “wastewater” after “landfills.” Mr. Kamienski asked for the parenthetical clause following agriculture be removed, saying it was too precise for one subcommittee. Ms. Kruger recommended removal of the words “initially” and “subsequently” from 2.1

She continued through the document and asked Partners if it was okay to delete Section 2.9 that relates to scientific understanding. Mr. Eppel indicated that while the Partnership itself does not engage in research, there might arise a need to work with organizations that do. Poland supported U.K.’s comments, particularly as they related to greater development and deployment of VAM. Canada requested to simply keep the phrase in. Ms. Kruger recommended at least dropping “and certainty,” which was acceptable to Partners. In Section 2.10, Canada’s suggestion to remove “country” was taken. The Partners spent ample time discussing 2.11, including adding “achievements” and rather to use “will” versus “shall.” In regards to the legalese, Canada commented that Ministers would likely balk at “will.” Mr. Shimada asked who would be responsible for the evaluation (e.g., third party). Mr. Goetze indicated it would be the Partners themselves. Mr. Del Villar requested to leave it alone since it was open to interpretation and non-prescriptive. China suggested using the word “summarize” while the United States recommended “assess.” Mr. Eppel asked what, specifically, the ASG was asking the Partners to do (i.e., report facts and assess effectiveness).

Mr. Shimada echoed U.K.’s concerns and Canada interjected as well, adding the element of self-reflection in an evaluation report might merely be communication. Ms. Kruger indicated the language was not intended to create a fixed target but merely capture what was happening within Partner countries. She proposed Section 2.12 to capture the essence of evaluation and/or assessment of effectiveness. Mr. Blanco suggested “and assess the effectiveness of activities undertaken by the Partnership.” Canada agreed but preferred to keep the clauses separate and add “periodically.” China expressed ongoing confusion regarding who or what is being evaluated. Ms. Kruger clarified that it does not apply to the progress of specific projects, but rather more broadly how the Partnership as a whole is doing. China also asked about the timing for evaluation (e.g., project completion) and Ms. Kruger reiterated Canada’s suggestion for “periodically” to allow flexibility. Mexico agreed as did the United States, with the caveat that it applies to the Partnership rather than specific activities (i.e., projects). Canada questioned the term “annually” and Mr. Blanco indicated that was more an element of “Function.”

Mr. Eppel interjected regarding the various roles within the Partnership (e.g., Partner governments, Project Network members, ASG secretariat, Steering Committee, subcommittees). Mr. Blanco built on his previous comment regarding the need to rethink the TOR and identify the various organizations before “Function.” Canada agreed with Argentina and the U.K. but stated ambiguity is the lubricant of consensus and suggested keeping the current TOR structure since it has already been approved once before. Ms. Kruger asked the delegates if there was a greater appetite to make broader, sweeping changes and was met with silence. Mr. Eppel did ask the ASG to distinguish the need for communications from the Partners and Ms. Kruger verified they need the Partners to report. Mr. Eppel then suggested incorporating the elements of Sections 4.1/4.2 into 2.11 and Ms. Kruger suggested tabling the section for now and moving on through the rest of the document before coming back to this entry.

A discussion ensued on inserting “wastewater” while maintaining the flexibility to add additional subcommittees and/or working groups in the future. To further reflect future options, Mr. Shimada requested removing the specified number of subcommittees. Ms. Lopez suggested adding the element of Administrative Liaisons to Section 3.1. In Section 3.3, Canada requested changing existing language to “country-specific” and deleting “all.” China inquired about what type of support would be required and Ms. Kruger indicated that it might be financial or technical, depending on each Partner’s resources or capabilities. Mr. Gunning commented on the action plans and indicated there was a robust discussion in

Washington, DC. He explained that when the Partnership first started, the approach was through sector-specific plans undertaken by the subcommittees and those have now been completed. More recently, the Steering Committee tasked the subcommittees with assembling country-specific plans to account for the various barriers and challenges that exist for each Partner. The country-specific plans also help to advance activities and provide more specific information for each country. He noted this was an important reflection of the Partnership's evolution, explaining that it was no longer enough to look at activities by sector. Mr. Goetze backtracked to say remove specificity and Mr. Gunning interjected there needs to be focus on what Partners can do.

Poland requested using the same terminology (e.g., "country-specific," "national") in all areas once decided. Mr. Eppel raised issue with "collaborative." China indicated that action plans might also be undertaken at the regional or local level so it might be restrictive to say "national," to which Mr. Blanco suggested "domestic." Going back to the new Sections 4.1/4.2, Mr. Eppel stated the proposed language was too strong and in the wrong tone when compared to the rest of the document. Mr. Blanco agreed with the U.K. regarding inconsistent tone as well as previous discussions. He foresaw difficulties in passing the proposed language through his government and recommended its removal. Canada said they could support the language as good efforts to undertake but that it could be perceived as a mandate. Again, the issue comes down to "will" versus "shall." Canada also noted that it does not have national action plans given the way the government is organized (i.e., provincial municipalities). Mr. Gunning acknowledged the absence of federal-level coordination for some countries and recognized that while not all Partners would undertake the activity in the same way, they should all be able to develop a document that reflects what they can do (e.g., reduce methane emissions). In an effort to soften the language, Mr. Eppel suggested moving the more prescriptive text to an annex or footnote.

Regarding changes to the subcommittee language, Mr. Goetze restated the "support" element based on China's comment and suggested "assist." China countered with "offer assistance." Mr. Eppel commented on the timing for review of subcommittee leadership, offering either "periodically" or "ideally." He also noted the language should reflect up to three co-chairs. He also recommended leaving it up to each subcommittee whether they want to appoint more than two.

Being the end of Day Two, Ms. Kruger summarized the discussion and key messages as the proposed text was too prescriptive and not facilitative, noting that it might create issues within Partner governments given the level of existing detail. She emphasized, however, that the activity (i.e., development of action plans) is useful to the Partnership but there was a need to balance the spirit and tone of the content. She tasked the ASG with revising the language to better reflect these points for review in the morning.

THURSDAY, 4 MARCH 2010 – DAY THREE

Welcome and Opening of Meeting (Agenda Item #14)

Ms. Kruger called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

Continued Discussion of TOR Revision (Agenda Item #15)

Ms. Kruger opened the session by reviewing the day's discussion topics, including continued TOR renewal, the 2nd Ministerial meeting, and charge to the subcommittees. She also indicated that she looked back at the minutes from the September 2009 meeting in Washington, DC to see where the Steering Committee ended up regarding action plans. She noted at that time, there was explicit support for national methane action plans that might serve as blueprints for Partner activities, while acknowledging that some developing countries might require assistance and/or resources to prepare such plans (i.e., in the absence of national inventories). Ms. Kruger indicated that yesterday's discussion regarding Purpose helped to

capture the elements set forth by the proposed reporting and monitoring language and encouraged the Partners to review the revised, compromise language prepared by the ASG. In particular, she asked them to review sections 2.10, 2.11, and 3.3 to determine if they addressed Partners' concerns; if so, then there would be no need for a separate section on action plans (i.e., 4.1/4.2).

Mr. Shimada indicated that he would support the addition of "and implement," but could not go along with "domestic" since there are no in-country projects in Japan. He would settle for the addition of "where appropriate." Mr. Goetze also reiterated his previous comment that Canada's activities are undertaken at the provincial level so "domestic" was not appropriate. Mr. Presicce asked to drop any government-level reference and keep "action plans." Mr. Gao echoed that recommendation but raised questions with "recognize," wondering if that meant the plans need to be reviewed by all Partners. Ms. Kruger explained the wording's intent was not formal recognition but reflected the discussion in Washington, DC that the Partners agreed it would be helpful to have action plans. China indicated that would be more comfortable with language that states Partners should simply acknowledge they have an action plan. Mr. Goetze expressed appreciation for the previous efforts but felt the next step should be to formulate the content in the right order: get Ministerial approval for the inclusion of action plans, and then add language to the TOR. Ms. King pointed out that development of action plans already existed in the current TOR and that revisions merely added "implementation."

In response to China's comment regarding intent, Ms. Kruger proposed "can be useful tools" as alternative language. Regarding Canada's concern about getting the order right, Ms. Kruger noted the process going forward was to develop a fairly solid draft document to share with the Ministers and to continue to work on sensitivities in advance of the Ministerial meeting, with anticipation there might be time required to sort out final issues the day before. She noted that she was not seeking commitment to final language at this juncture, but merely trying to get close.

Ms. Sewell confirmed the need for action plans, and explained that Australia has a similar situation with state and local governments taking the lead. She further stated the Partnership should not expect developing countries to prepare plans despite seeking to have Partners undertake certain activities; however, she did agree that the Ministers could do their missive in the day before the Ministerial.

Mr. Del Villar commented that while Mexico had a National Climate Change Strategy, it did not have a specific plan for methane. Mr. Shimada echoed these remarks and encouraged participants to simply keep the reference as "action plans." Ms. Kruger noted these concerns to remove "domestic methane," while emphasizing the need to insert "and implement" to reflect the Partnership's evolution (i.e., there was nothing to implement 5 years ago).

With respect to 2.11, delegates discussed nuances and variations before arriving at the proposed language. In particular, Mr. Shimada suggested the word "summaries" and asked what level of detail was expected and why on an annual basis. More important, he wondered if the Partnership had such authority given its voluntary context. Regarding Section 3.7, Mr. Goetze asked if the ASG could be responsible for providing this information. Mr. Gunning explained the ASG first needs to receive information from the Partners in order to communicate results. He said it should be incumbent on the Partners to share information with the ASG.

Ms. Kruger returned to Japan's comment regarding "summaries," noting that she felt the wording was ambiguous and flexible, leaving room for the Partner to do what they can. As far as "annual," she tried to soften the language with "agreed intervals" to ensure a synthesized flow of information. One participant noted the need for some time element and suggested "regular."

An important issue on how to get things done stems from the struggle to get information from Partners. While some countries regularly share updates, there needs to be a more concerted commitment from all Partners to provide information. The ASG simply can not obtain the information without the willingness and responsiveness of the Partnership. Ms. Kruger noted that it was also useful to the Partnership's credibility to have this kind of communication (e.g., concrete, on-the-ground results) and that identified or featured projects (e.g., Web site, newsletter) needs to be backed up by data. Ms. Sandra Herrera with SEMARNAT wondered if this type of communication could take place via the Web site, which would require Partner cooperation versus obligation. Mr. Presicce considered reporting to be a core element so he was comfortable with "reporting" instead of "providing summaries."

Mr. Shimada asked how the APP handles reporting. Ms. DeRosa-Joynt responded that information is reported twice a year on a purposefully simple, one-page template. The collected information is then updated on the APP Web site and shared with its Steering Committee. She encouraged the Partnership to keep its process equally simple. She also noted that of all the voluntary programs, Methane to Markets has been the most effective and has the best story to tell.

Mr. Gunning added that in addition to communicating results to share and promoting success, reporting would allow other Partners to think about future work and how to leverage resources and efforts (i.e., more effective and robust activities). Mr. Goetze agreed with the need for communication, but not how it was stated. He suggested alternative language that was further tweaked by the United States to read "communicate to the ASG their progress and accomplishments in implementing action plans and undertaking activities to support the Partnership." Italy expressed support for this language. Ms. Sewell said the current language captured that sentiment well and she did not feel threatened by it. She felt Partners were already doing as such through the subcommittee reports. Moreover, the language did not say what Partners have to report nor how much (e.g., detail).

Mr. Shimada agreed with the Canada-U.S. language and questioned whether the ASG could be tasked to prepare a template similar to the APP. Mr. Presicce remarked that after looking through the TORs, he noted that the ASG is already responsible for coordinating communication under 3.7.4. Ms. Kruger acknowledged that was a great point from Italy and responded affirmatively to Japan, although she noted that was done to collect information for the PAR and there was very little response. Mr. Blanco asked if the ASG could develop guidelines instead of a template. Argentina also supported the U.S.-suggested language but would add "goals or objectives." Mr. Goetze stated he liked the direction the language was now taking but was unsure of Argentina's proposed guidelines. Mr. Presicce requested that Section 3.7.4 be changed so it paralleled the new language in 2.11 and connected the roles of both Partners and the ASG. Mr. Shimada agreed with Canada's comment and while he felt guidelines might be okay, he would prefer to couple them with a self-explanatory template on the Web site. To summarize, Ms. Kruger said the ASG would add parallel language for both 2.11 and 3.7.4, and the ASG would be tasked with developing guidelines and a template that would be circulated to the Administrative Liaisons for in-country distribution/comment, and then finalized at the next Steering Committee.

Mr. Goetze asked where in the TOR were the goals of the Partnership stated. Ms. Kruger indicated they are currently called out under "Purpose" and suggested adding reference to the second sentence of the introduction. Mr. Gunning recommended modifying language to read "...framework with a goal of achieving..." Participants agreed on the addition of new language at 2.12. Canada commented that it was good to link the assessment of effectiveness with achievement of the Partnership's goal.

Ms. Kruger asked if there were any changes necessary for Section 3.4 to make it consistent with some of the other broad changes. Mr. Blanco requested changing the word "plan" to "program" to better reflect how the countries execute activities. Mr. Gunning initially objected but then conceded, noting that it might be good to keep action plans and other activities (e.g., programs) separate.

To recap the discussions, Ms. Kruger reviewed the proposed changes from the beginning of the document to ensure all of the suggestions had been incorporated correctly.

- *1.0:* Consensus that the proposed UNFCCC language is appropriate, with acknowledgement that some of the issues specific to APP do not apply to Methane to Markets. Mr. Shimada requested to add “and its Kyoto Protocol.” The Australia and the United States supported the inclusion but Argentina and China opposed. Ms. Kruger asked if Japan felt strongly about adding the terminology and Mr. Shimada said it was okay to leave out, but wanted to raise it for consideration.
- *3.1:* Poland recommended deleting “for example” since it was specific to a potential subcommittee. Mr. Blanco suggested not including the names of the subcommittees but instead, keep the listing as focal areas. Mr. Shimada asked if the text should read “landfills and wastewater” to reflect how the sectors might be combined into one subcommittee. He also asked if Ministerial approval was required to create or rename subcommittees. Ms. Kruger responded that the Steering Committee had the authority to make these changes. Mr. Portalupi requested to use the same coal sector terminology (i.e., “coal mining”) in 2.1 and 3.1. Mr. Presicce asked to add “to enlarge the scope of an existing subcommittee” to capture the potential inclusion of wastewater within the Landfill Subcommittee. Participants agreed. Ms. Lopez asked if the correct term was “wastewater” or wastewater treatment plants.” Ms. Kruger recommending keeping the language broad (e.g., removed specificity regarding agriculture) compromised to include “treatment” with the omission of “plants.” The ASG asked if it would be okay to alphabetize the sector listing, which was approved.
- *3.5:* The United States commented on the language that refers to “one from a developing country...and one from a developed country,” given the opportunity for subcommittees to appoint up to three co-chairs. Mr. Goetze commented the existing text established a minimum condition for at least two of the chairs. Mr. Gunning added that it might also be preferred to say “select” instead of “elect.” Mr. Blanco requested a more specific time frame (e.g., three years) and Canada agreed, plus the inclusion of “reviewing leadership.” To clarify the process, Ms. King noted that the Partner country is the chair, not the individual person that might serve in the position. Ms. Kruger questioned whether the text needed to specify the chair stays with the Partner and Japan indicated it would be best to avoid legalese. Ms. Kruger conceded and said if future issues arise, they can be dealt with at that time rather than trying to anticipate them now.
- *3.7.4:* Per the discussion, parallel text from 2.1 would be inserted.
- *3.8:* Participants agreed with the proposed changes to language regarding supporting and hosting the ASG, with Canada’s note that consensus should be on the opportunity to support/host and not the offer.
- *3.9:* To address Colombia’s concern regarding the Administrative Liaisons, a new bullet was split from 3.8 to make their role more prominent and a new sentence added to better define how the Administrative Liaisons should communicate with Partners.

With the changes noted above, Ms. Kruger felt this provided a solid draft going forward. As next steps, the ASG will prepare a revised red-lined/strikeout version to share with the entire Steering Committee and provide 60 days for comment. Following the comment period, the ASG will convene a teleconference to discuss and reconcile any comments. The agreed-upon comments will be incorporated and an interim final version will be circulated in advance of the next Steering Committee, to be held the day before the Ministerial meeting. Ms. Kruger hoped this would provide a good, constructive process to advance the TOR renewal. Lastly, Mr. Del Villar asked that a title be added to the Appendix to indicate the listing referred to Steering Committee members.

Discussion of Next Partnership Ministerial (Agenda Item #16)

Ms. King provided an overview on this issue, noting that it should be straightforward based on the white paper. A [2nd Ministerial meeting](#) will be held to announce the new TOR. At the Washington, DC meeting, participants were provided with the options to hold the Ministerial with the Expo, as a stand-alone event, or in conjunction with another Ministerial-level venue. Mexico offered to host the Ministerial in conjunction with a COP preparatory meeting and participants agreed. Since that time, Mexico had indicated to the ASG they would be interested in hosting the Ministerial just in conjunction with COP16 itself. She noted the Steering Committee would have responsibility to determine the agenda, and there would be no need for a signing ceremony since the Steering Committee had authority to approve the TOR. Ms. King reviewed the process for preparing a Ministerial declaration, which includes designation of POCs and a proposed time frame.

Mr. Shimada expressed his gratitude to Mexico for offering to host the Ministerial in conjunction with the COP but said explicitly no, stating the COP would marginalize Methane to Markets' efforts. He encouraged Mexico to reconsider the timing with one of the preparatory meetings (e.g., November). He also noted that Japan would not be available to participate in any events in October given its own high-profile meeting. Ms. DeRosa-Joynt saw the benefits of pre-COP timing as well, stating the ministers would be present without the potential messiness of the full-fledged COP, during which Ministers might become too wrapped up in negotiation to break away for Methane to Markets. She did note, however, that any meeting held in conjunction with a COP event would be time-defined and that would appeal to ministers. Mr. Goetze also voiced appreciation for Mexico's offer and encouraged the delegates to give Mexico a chance to demonstrate how they could make the meeting work. He noted that the UNFCCC might not want media present at a pre-COP function. Ultimately, he did not have a preference either way and added that the ministers would be defined by what Methane to Markets asked of them (e.g., declaration, photo opportunity). Mr. Eppel also acknowledged it was a great offer that comes with challenges. He didn't have a strong view on timing, but recognized the need to give the ministers something to do in order to get their undivided attention. He also expressed some concern regarding media coverage (or lack thereof, depending when the meeting took place).

Ms. Herrera raised the point that when the concept was initially proposed, it appeared September would be the best time for a COP preparatory meeting but things have changed. Mr. Del Villar acknowledged that it was probably better for the Partnership to go with a pre-COP meeting, but that might no longer be possible. Mexico will go back and assess the logistics further, and then will notify the ASG. Regarding the media, Ms. Kruger indicated the Ministerial meeting would be a good opportunity to highlight all of the great activities happening within the Partnership and while it would be shame to miss out on gaining positive attention, she did wonder about positioning Methane to Markets directly with the COP process itself. She suggested that the timing be left up to Mexico, to which Ms. Herrera responded the decision should be up to the entire Partnership and Mexico would try to make it happen. Ms. Kruger acknowledged the opportunity for the Partnership to contribute, but Mexico's preference does carry weight.

Mr. Eppel asked if any of the pre-COP meeting dates had been set and Mr. Del Villar said not yet. Ms. DeRosa-Joynt indicated they most take place the second half of the year.

While waiting for further direction from Mexico, Ms. Kruger asked if the Steering Committee agreed with the process for developing a Ministerial declaration. Canada advised locking-down the text at least 60 days in advance of the meeting, as well as devising a list of what might be required of the Ministers (e.g., photo opportunity). Mr. Eppel suggested having only 95 percent of the declaration locked down in order to give the Ministers something to contribute during the meeting. He also wondered what the Partnership might lack from a political perspective that the Ministers might be able to fulfill (e.g., how

can they make a difference). Mr. Gunning agreed with the U.K.'s comments and also address Canada's comments based on the outcome from the Washington, DC meeting in that the Partnership would benefit from a global effort in a place/time to show added support from the top-down. He added the Ministerial would also be an opportunity for Partners to bring home the message of near-term GHG reductions at a critical time, if truly committed to climate issues.

Ms. Kruger summarized the key points for reflection. Notably, the ASG will develop a more elaborate schedule for declaration development that will also get to the "meat" of what the Partnership hopes to accomplish (e.g., show success for its activities; emphasize the climate impacts of short-lived gases, particularly in the Arctic; garner additional resources). Moreso than just talking about it, the Ministerial should help illustrate the good story.

Ms. Sewell asked if the United States was going to request funds from other Partners. Mr. Gunning explained that participants in the room have previously indicated that the requests need to be made at a higher level so no action has been taken yet. Ms. Sewell indicated such a request would surely engage the ministers. Canada encouraged the delegates to wait until dates and additional details could be determined before approaching ministers for funding requests. Mr. Eppel noted the fact that Methane to Markets does not require funding in order to participate is part of its appeal and while he appreciates that U.S. EPA has been providing a majority of the financial support, he sees it as politically motivated. When Mr. Eppel asked if Australia had a methane fund, Ms. Sewell indicated they were reliant on leveraging contributions from the private sector, which translate primarily to a commitment of technical support. The United States commented that previous Steering Committee discussions revealed that a centralized fund would be inappropriate, but that other types of support (e.g., grants) might be achievable.

Ms. Kruger asked participants to confirm the preferred elements for a Ministerial meeting, which would include country statements, a press event, and photo opportunity without an official TOR signing ceremony. She also noted that the delegates still needed to discuss a potential agenda (e.g., half-day meeting). Mr. Blanco wondered if an hour might be sufficient, and Ms. DeRosa-Joynt noted that no more than a half-day would be desirable. Ms. Kruger also clarified consensus to defer to Mexico as to timing (i.e., pre-COP or prior to the COP itself). Ms. DeRosa-Joynt explained that pre-COP attendees are identified by the host country and these might include some of the Methane to Markets Partners, but not all. Ms. Kruger acknowledged that additional decisions regarding the declaration schedule and process might be driven by the ultimate timing for the meeting. She also asked if there might be any other issues to discuss during that Steering Committee meeting or if it should be kept tight, with the TOR renewal the only focus. Participants agreed.

Charge to Subcommittees/Partners and Next Steps (Agenda Item #17)

Charge to Subcommittees

Ms. Kruger led participants in a review of the proposed [Charge to Subcommittees](#). As it relates to the Expo, the Steering Committee tasked the subcommittees to continue to promote the project opportunities featured here, publicize their participation in the Expo, complete the survey forthcoming from the ASG, and track/report any progress on project development. The Steering Committee also agreed to ask the subcommittees to review their leadership and/or appoint a third chair, as appropriate. With regards to wastewater, the Landfill Subcommittee will be tasked with inviting interested parties to participate in a teleconference to discuss the issue further.

For outreach and communication, the subcommittees were tasked with providing information for the Web site, and Canada requested that "on an ongoing basis" be added. Regarding the promotion of Methane to Markets and availability of materials, Finland inquired how to obtain hard copies. The ASG responded that materials could be requested via e-mail (asg@methanetomarkets.org) as well as downloaded from the

Web site. Mr. Del Villar asked if mention of the PAR and its translation should be added to the TOR. Mr. Blanco felt that might be too prescriptive, although Ms. Kruger agreed with Mexico about the need for translation and Mexico conceded to leave out the name of the document. Mr. Gunning suggested adding “Work with Partners to coordinate translation of Methane to Markets materials.” This suggestion raised questions about charges to Partners versus subcommittee members. Mr. Gunning indicated that in the past, the Steering Committee developed charges for the subcommittees, Partners, and the ASG. In the case of broad outreach and communication (e.g., Web site, newsletter), those items could be tasked to the Partners as well (see below). Ms. Kruger asked if the element of working with international organizations, particularly as it relates to Agriculture and Wastewater, needed to be added to the charge but there was no clear response. Mr. Del Villar requested to include holding the subcommittee meetings via teleconference or other electronic means, and Mr. Gunning echoed that meeting could be held using alternative means so it was added to the charge. Ms. Sewell asked if there was a need to add consideration of “abatement” to the subcommittee charge. While Ms. Kruger noted that was a good point, Mr. Gunning suggested waiting until the new TOR was adopted before tasking the subcommittees to explore abatement options. Ms. Kruger felt it was okay to add two things to the scope of subcommittee consideration, including the generation of methane (e.g., new sources) and ways to reduce methane without recovery and use (e.g., flaring).

Canada asked if the revised TOR should be reviewed by the subcommittees, to which Ms. Kruger said she would prefer not to muddle the process since only the Steering Committee had responsibility for and authority to change the TOR. Mr. Gunning commented that it might be useful to have the subcommittees provide feedback on incorporation of abatement and destruction in a more casual way, and Ms. Kruger said she would include the concept in her talking points to provide a heads up.

Charge to Partners

Based on the previous discussion, the Steering Committee also developed a [Charge to Partners](#) that included outreach efforts (e.g., Web site, newsletter, translation) as well as providing updated contact information, particularly for their Administrative Liaisons. Mr. Gunning recalled promoting the “take-home message” from the Washington, DC discussion in leading up to the Ministerial and Ms. King said she would add the bullet from the previous charge.

Review of Points of Consensus and Next Steps

Ms. Kruger reviewed the Steering Committee’s [Points of Consensus](#) that would form the foundation for her report during the closing plenary session.

- *New Partners.* Ethiopia and Ghana were welcomed as new Partners as well as new members of the Steering Committee.
- *Wastewater.* The Landfill Subcommittee will take the lead on further exploration of this sector.
- *Linkage to UNFCCC.* No further action necessary toward obtaining observer status.
- *TOR Renewal.* Ms. DeRosa-Joynt indicated this should be couched as a statement and not an opportunity for Partnership review. Ms. Kruger stated the process going forward will include circulation to the Steering Committee for final input within 60 days, and then shared with the Partners for reference (again, not review). Mr. Shimada asked for a distinction regarding Steering Committee members and when the TOR would be final. Mr. Gunning indicated that when the TOR comes back with comments after the 60 day period, there might be a need to sort out some issues via teleconference in advance of the Steering Committee meeting. Finland encouraged the interim final version be completed at least four weeks prior to the meeting and Ms. Kruger agreed, stating that it would not go down to the wire (e.g., day before).

- *Steering Committee Membership.* Ms Kruger sought to keep the report positive and recommended omitting mention of criteria and inactivity since no process was developed. Mr. Gunning also noted the need for POCs.
- *Ministerial Meeting.* Mexico will host the 2nd Ministerial meeting in conjunction with COP meetings. Mr. Del Villar asked if the Ministerial could be made into an Expo. Ms. Kruger said it might be appropriate to bring forward any projects from this Expo that have not been developed. Mr. Gunning added it would be useful to highlight any success stories as well, but that the Ministerial was not envisioned a full Expo-type meeting with separate policy and technical tracks. The ASG has been tasked with developing the schedule and draft content for the declaration, which will be circulated to the Steering Committee members. Once approved, it will be distributed to the Partners for input, then finalized at least one month prior to the Ministerial meeting. Canada questioned the difference between “review” and “input.” Ms. Kruger explained that while Partner input on the TOR was unnecessary, it would be required on the declaration. Other participants agreed input on the declaration was important. Ms. Sewell expressed hope that Steering Committee was merely anticipating potential points of contention with the final TOR so it could have prepared response(s) but that ultimately would not materialize.

Regarding the review periods for the TOR and the declaration, Ms. DeRosa-Joynt recommended not using the same day as deadlines for both because it might be perceived odd that one document was available for review and the other was not. Ms. Kruger agreed that staggering the deadlines would be best. Ms. King asked if the review/comment period for the declaration could be shorter (e.g., 45 days) to help accommodate that request. Participants concurred.

Other Business (Agenda Item #18)

Mr. Shimada provided participants with the dates for Japan’s CBD COP, 11 – 29 October 2010. Ms. Kruger requested if Japan was unavailable, if Mexico could try to avoid scheduling any pre-COP/Ministerial during that time.

Mr. Gunning announced the issue of the next Expo will be on the agenda in Mexico, once the ASG has had an opportunity to take stock of the present Expo. Mr. Del Villar suggested the concept of the next Expo could be an announceable at the Ministerial meeting.

Adjournment (Agenda Item #19)

Hearing no other business, Ms. Kruger adjourned the meeting at 16:45.

**Attachment 1
Steering Committee Participants**

ARGENTINA

Gabriel Blanco

Professor
Universidad Nacional del Centro
de la Provincia de Buenos Aires
Av. del Valle 5737
Olavarria, Buenos Aires B7400JWI
Tel: +54-11-4348-8648
Email: gblanco@ambiente.gov.ar

AUSTRALIA

John Karas

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

Margaret Sewell

General Manager
Dept. of Resources, Energy & Tourism
Low Emissions Coal and CO₂ Storage Branch
GPO Box 9839
Canberra 2601, ACT
Tel: +61 2 6213 7924
Email: Margaret.Sewell@ret.gov.au

CANADA

Darren Goetze

Director of Partnerships Division
Environment Canada
200 Sacre Coeur Boulevard
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0H3
Tel: +1 819-953-9525
Email: darren.goetze@ec.gc.ca

Franck Portalupi

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

CHINA

Gao Guangsheng

Director General
National Development and Reform
Commission (NDRC)
38 S. Yeutan St.
Beijing 100824

Wu Jianmin

Climate Change Office
National Development and Reform
Commission (NDRC)
38 S. Yeutan St.
Beijing 100824
Email: wu.jianmin@ccchina.gov.cn

COLOMBIA

Sandra Lopez Tovar

Advisor - Climate Change Mitigation Group
Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development
Calle 37 # 8-40
Bogota 10010-0
Tel: +57-1-332-3400 x 1179
Email: sandra.lopez.t@gmail.com

FINLAND

Erik Ulfstedt

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

INDIA

Alok Preti

Additional Secretary
Ministry of Coal, Government of India
New Delhi

ITALY

Francesco Presicce

Expert
Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea
Department for Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Energy
via C. Colombo 44
Rome 00147
Tel: +39 06 57228162
Email: presicce.francesco@minambiente.it

JAPAN

Kunihiko Shimada

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

KAZAKHSTAN*

Aiyngul Ismagulova
Ministry of Environmental Protection

MEXICO

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

Sandra Denisse Herrera Flores
Undersecretary of Environmental Regulation
Secretaria de Medio Ambiente y Recursos
Naturales (SEMARNAT)
Blvd. Adolfo Ruiz Cortines 4209
Col. Jardines en la Montana 14210
Tlalpan 5628060

POLAND

Zbigniew Kamienski
Deputy Director
Ministry of Economy
pl. Trzech Krzyzy 3/5
Warsaw 00-507
Tel: +48-22-693-59-19
Email: zbigniew.kamienski@mg.gov.pl

Renata Znamirowska-Orzechowska
Chief Expert
Ministry of Economy
pl. Trzech Krzyzy 3/5
Warsaw 02-503
Tel: +48 22 693 52 98
Email: renata.znamirowska@mg.gov.pl

UNITED KINGDOM

Jeremy Eppel
Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
Area 5C, 9 Millbank
London SW1P 3JR
Tel: +44 20 7238 3117
Email: jeremy.eppel@defra.gsi.gov.uk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Edward Canuel
Foreign Service Officer
U.S. Department of State
OES/EGC, Room 2480
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520
Tel: +1-202-647-6900
Email: canuelet@state.gov

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

**observer Partner*

Henry Ferland

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

Paul Gunning

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

Ashley King

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

Dina Kruger

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

**Attachment 2
Steering Committee Agenda**

METHANE TO MARKETS PARTNERSHIP
7TH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Seventh Session
Taj Palace
New Delhi,
2 – 4 March 2010

M2M7/Doc.1

	<u>Item</u>	<u>Document</u>
	Day 1 – Tuesday, 2 March, at 10:00 Hours	
Agenda 1	Welcome and Opening of the Meeting	
Agenda 2	Introductions	
Agenda 3	Statement of Meeting Goals	
Agenda 4	Adoption of the Agenda	M2M7/Doc.1
Agenda 5	Brief Country Statements and Updates	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argentina • Australia • Canada • China • Colombia • European Commission* • Finland • India • Italy • Japan • Mexico • Poland • United States • United Kingdom 	
	<i>*provided to the ASG via e-mail</i>	
Agenda 6	Consideration of Ethiopia’s and Ghana’s requests to join the Partnership	
Agenda 7	Communications and Outreach Update	M2M7/Doc.2
Agenda 8	Progress Reports from Subcommittees	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture Co-Chairs • Coal Mine Co-Chairs and Vice Chair • Landfill Co-Chairs • Oil and Gas Co-Chairs and Vice Chair 	

Agenda 9 **Update on Wastewater Sector** M2M7/Doc.3

Agenda 10 **Committee Membership Procedures** M2M7/Doc.4

Item

Document

Day Two – Wednesday, 3 March, at 14:30 Hours

Agenda 11 **Welcome and Opening of Meeting**

Agenda 12 **UNFCCC Observer Status** M2M7/Doc.6

Agenda 13 **Terms of Reference (TOR) Revisions** M2M7/Doc.5

Item

Document

Day Three – Thursday, 4 March, at 10:30 Hours

Agenda 14 **Welcome and Opening of Meeting**

Agenda 15 **Continue Discussion of Agenda 13 (TOR Revision)** M2M7/Doc.5

Agenda 16 **Discussion of Next Partnership Ministerial** M2M7/Doc.7

Agenda 17 **Charge to Subcommittees/Partners and Next Steps**

- Charge to Subcommittees/Partners
- Review of Decisions Made and Next Steps

Agenda 18 **Other Business**

Agenda 19 **Adjourn**