

**Daphne Wysham, CEO, Methane Action, moderating:**

So today at this roundtable we will be discussing during the New York Climate Week, halfway through the Global Methane Pledge, methane emissions are accelerating. Can we hit the brakes? What we were thinking when we pulled this event together was how critical it is to connect our colleagues in Europe with those of us working in North America at this moment in time. There is currently a \$750 billion deal on the table between the US and the EU to export LNG, liquefied natural gas, and the Global Methane Pledge is of course at a halfway mark, and agricultural emissions are also continuing to rise. So we felt it was very urgent to bring some speakers from EU, together with speakers from the U.S. to discuss this issue. So some of our speakers are caught in other meetings, and they will be joining us shortly. But I wanted to turn it over to the president and founder -- perfect timing -- of the Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development, Durwood Zaelke. So, Durwood, why now, why are we concerned? And please do take a microphone, because we are live streaming. Why are we so concerned about methane? We say we're in a methane emergency. What does that mean?

**Durwood Zaelke, founder/President, Institute for Governance & Sustainable Development:**

It's very simple. It's too hot. We're at 1.5 degrees. The latest IPCC report says we're on course for 3 degrees. We have too little time before the self-amplifying feedbacks push us past a series of tipping points. There are 5 to 11 irreversible tipping points between 1.5 and 2 degrees. So: 1.5 today, 2 tomorrow, 3 soon after. We are in a climate emergency. So we need the strategies that are the fastest way to turn that warming down.

It should be obvious. But originally, those of us who've worked on this for decades, thought that climate might be a long-term problem. We thought: "100 years GWP, we're going to figure this out in the future." But the moment is now that we need to bend the warming curve.

So you look at the strategies, you look at the decarbonization side, which is absolutely essential. and we need to move to clean energy as fast as we possibly can. But you discover that decarbonization is not the fastest way to turn down the warming. It's a long-term marathon. That's because it's politically difficult, but it's also because when you shut down fossil fuel facilities, especially coal and diesel, you shut down the co-emitted cooling sulfates, and they fall out in days to weeks, and unmask existing warming.

There was an op-ed this week in *The New York Times* by Zeke Hausfather and David Keith pointing out the unmasking problem. Jim Hansen refers to it as the Faustian bargain: as we clean up the air, as we decarbonize, we're exposing existing warming. [...] Now, the op-ed,

unfortunately, came to the wrong conclusion as to the solution. It said we should look to geoengineering as a solution and put cooling aerosols back into the atmosphere. And, you know, that's not the first thing I'd put on the list for fast mitigation.

What I'd put on the list is cutting the non-CO2 short-lived super pollutants. Because when you cut these, you think of it as the sprint, you get four times more avoided warming at 2050. So you get somewhere between 0.4 and 0.6 degrees at 2050 compared to 0.1 degrees from decarbonization. Decarbonization kicks in around 2060, and starts to go up fast, but it's the marathon. So there's the marathon, and the sprint. Within that sprint, methane is the most important piece.

I just came from a meeting with the Climate and Clean Air Coalition that Bloomberg was hosting. And every single minister and head of state there used the facts and figures from the CCAC on methane. (At least their staff wrote the right things for ministers.) And I think some of the ministers really do like it, they see that, they think this is the right approach.

We've been doing promises and pledges, and these have been okay to get us going to socialize the issue. But it's no longer sufficient in a climate emergency to make promises. You have to have mandatory mitigation. So that's the direction. It could be done at the municipal level for waste, but it's got to be mandatory. It can be done at the state level, like California, and it can be done at the national level, and the European regional level, Europe's methane...regulation....is the most important in the world right now. We need to multilateralize it.

**Daphne Wysham:**

We're going to be talking about that at the very end. Okay. So maybe what we could do is segue from this really important overview. We're going to hear more from you. I'm going to keep going to the fossil methane panel: Justin Mikulka with Oilfield Witness and Constantin Zerger, also with Environment Action Germany. Environment Action Germany is a non-governmental environmental and consumer protection organization [founded in] 1975. And we will also be hearing in our second panel on agricultural sources of [methane] emissions once this one is over. So, Justin, starting with you, we hear that "certified low-intensity" methane is a way for U.S. energy fossil gas exporters to meet the terms of the EU methane regulations for imports to the EU. Can you give us a sense of whether or not this is in fact true?

**Justin Mikulka, Communications Director at Oilfield Witness**

So to answer your question, no, I don't believe [natural gas or LNG] certification is a legitimate approach. and I put certification in the category of "clean" coal. We were promised clean coal 10 or 15 years ago. I think right now (other than the people running this country) everybody laughs at the idea of clean coal. And so what now we're being sold is the idea of "clean" methane. And

we know from US-based science that LNG is worse than coal. So now what we're basically doing is mocking the idea of clean coal, but [meanwhile] we're saying we'll take this [other] fossil fuel product and make it slightly better. And that's not going to be possible.

To put this into perspective as a delaying strategy, we were told [the same thing] about carbon capture 10 to 15 years ago. We were promised that we would have natural gas-fired power plants capturing 99% of the carbon, so we'd have "clean" gas. No one is talking about that now, because it's not possible. So what we're getting with methane certification in my opinion is we're headed right down the same path, we're getting sold another delaying strategy and told this is a climate solution. If you heard what Durwood just said, we're talking about increasing the amount of methane we're producing in this country by a huge amount, liquifying it, and [shipping it around] the world to be burned. There is no climate solution that involves combusting fossil fuels. [...] If we want any hope of achieving the goals that you're hoping to get us to, we must admit there is no path to addressing climate change and reducing emissions that involves using more methane.

**Daphne Wysham:**

Okay, so what do you think is the most important thing we can do right now to address the methane crisis?

**Justin Mikulka:**

I really think we need to be honest, start having much more honest conversations about this topic. [...] There is no way to reduce more methane and decrease global methane emissions [by increasing production and use of methane]. And if you need evidence of that, four years ago, the whole world agreed that we definitely need to drastically reduce methane emissions by 2030. In those four years, it's only gone up. We have produced a lot more methane in that time period. Production of methane means higher methane emissions.

So I think we need to stop talking about methane as the climate solution. Five or ten years ago, you could have argued with me that we need some gas in the system because renewables weren't going to be able to do it all, and batteries and grid-scale storage were far too expensive. Well, guess what happened in the last five years? Grid scale storage is cheap. Solar is really cheap. And around the world, no one is building new government buildings; they're building solar plus storage. That is the path to reducing methane emissions. It's why China, the U.S. economy, India, Pakistan, Thailand, they all are using a lot more solar. That is how we reduce methane emissions.

**Daphne Wysham:**

Okay. Constantin, it's your turn. Justin has talked about the reality of methane emissions associated with the production and transport of fossil gas and much of that of course is going to the EU. We are expecting these exports to grow massively over the next few years. How does this sit with Germany's role as a champion of the global methane pledge?

**Constantin Zerger**, Head of the Energy Department at Deutsche Umwelthilfe/ Environmental Action Germany:

Well, first I have to express my frustration with that role of Germany. I always hear that Germany is supposed to be the champion of the global methane regulation, but when you look closer, Germany doesn't have the targets to reduce methane regulations, it doesn't have a reduction plan, and what kind of champion is that? To be fair, there are some positive things when it comes to the implementation of the methane regulation, which is tremendously important. We're going to talk about that later.

But the other thing that is of absolute importance is what you mentioned, that Germany and Europe are importing lots of LNG, which is one of the dirtiest fuels we have on this planet. There are EU plans to expand that to a \$750 billion deal which was signed, which is bizarre because it can never be met. The numbers don't add up. There's not so much energy that can be produced in the United States, and Europe will never be able to use that. But anyway, this points in a direction, and the direction is that more gas shall be used in Europe and the United States want us to buy it. They are completely ignoring the evidence of methane emissions on the ground. And they don't want us to know [about] that.

So I think it's an important job for us to spread the word. So we are a big fan of your work. We use it a lot to show what this is really about. I think it's absolutely imperative that we find strategies to reduce energy exports or imports, and that we find strategies to reduce gas demand. And I would also like to say that there are some promising signs, because the European Union has adopted some ambitious policies. That's particularly significant. The European Union seeks to halve its gas demand by 2030, and it's already on the way. Gas demand has been reduced by 20 percent between '21 and '24.

Now this is about the decisions that need to be made. Are we going to sign [energy] deals and are we going to deliver [on] those deals [on the one hand], or are we going to invest in the energy transition on the other hand? This needs to happen. This is about political decisions we have to make right now in Europe and in the United States. I think that's the important thing that lies ahead: we need to defend the regulation. We need to come up with a strong standard for methane, then we need to adopt a gas phaseout plan. Because otherwise this problem will never be solved.

So we know that the Trump administration's lobbyists are pressuring the EU to weaken the EU methane regulations, which [in] my understanding are the strongest on record in the world right now. Why are these EU methane regulations so critical? Well, they seem to be very critical. Chris Wright, the US Energy Secretary, has just been in Brussels and bullied the European Commission because he still wants the Commission to cancel all those kind of provisions, and methane regulation seems to be first on the list. He said this is a colossal wreck and he doesn't want it. If [although] he says that, I think it can't be knocked down.

I think the EU methane regulation is a huge opportunity. As you said, I think it's probably the best methane regulation we have on this planet. And we need to strongly implement it. What's debated right now is setting up an input standard in particular. Part of the EU regulation is to set up input standards, which would also integrate all methane emissions coming from oil and gas production and transportation to third countries into that system. And of course, we hear many voices at this moment from industry who want to stop that, who are against that. Their argument is that we will lose competitiveness.

But on the other hand there are other voices [in favor of methane regulation], which are not so loud, and there are also countries preparing to comply with those rules, like Nigeria and countries from the Middle East. And I think the task for us right now is to get coordinated, [including having] events like this with important organizations like IGSD, CCAC and others, because this battle will be really important. We can't allow the industry to [derail the regulation].

**Daphne Wysham:**

Okay, we're going to have to switch to the next panel. Justin, do you want to have one last word?

**Justin Mikulka:**

I do. We're told often that there's enough certified gas in the US to meet the EU's demand. I would recommend you research that. If it were true, why does Chris Wright have to go to the EU and say [a massive LNG deal] is going to be the first thing they're going to get. Chris Wright made his money in the fracking industry. He knows how dirty it is. He knows there is no way for the US to ever meet the EU regulations. So you can go to Oilfield Witness to see more videos like that.

**Constantin Zerger:**

Thank you. Let me add one sentence. The important thing here is that US LNG is the most expensive fuel the Europeans can buy. So it's going to be the first thing they're going to take out if they want renewable energy. This goes well in hand with the environmental considerations

here. This is why he [Chris Wright] is looking for this market, he has to *create* this market, because it's not there. It's not there. [Applause]

## **Daphne Wysham**

Thank you so much, gentlemen. Our second panel is focusing on agriculture. I'd like to invite up Nusa Urbancic who directs Changing Markets Foundation and Hürdler who is a senior expert on air quality at Environmental Action Germany. So can you give us a sense of just how important agricultural methane is in the global context?

## **Jens Hürdler, senior expert on air quality at Environmental Action Germany:**

Thanks for this concise and even simple question. [Globally agriculture was the second-largest source of methane emissions, 39%, but it's near to the largest source, energy, which is 41%, and the remaining 20% comes from the waste sector.] More than 90% of global agricultural methane emissions come from livestock. This is something we can reduce, and use measurement to reduce. It's really important; we can no longer ignore the emissions from agriculture. We need to talk about it, we need to raise ambition about agricultural emissions and to reduce it. And yet so far political ambition is not so big, in some places it's even getting scaled back.

So one more point: we have the farmers, I am talking about farmers, not industrial farming. The farmers are the ones who are feeling strongly the impact of climate change and air quality issues already now. So they have smaller harvests, lower incomes and greater risks. And that's why we want to bring them on board. Their work must be valued, and from all of us I mean the consumers. And only if we get them on board can we achieve acceptance and so we can move forward in this direction. But the good news is that there are solutions already on the table. Technical measures in livestock management and manure treatment, combined with demand-side strategies such as climate-friendly consumption, can significantly reduce methane.

We also demand that there be reduced methane. So we have talked about livestock manure [and] manure management and so on. We have [also] compiled a consumer-based strategy so we can significantly reduce methane. We must utilize all the possible approaches that we have, especially in the moment to achieve a critical mass, not only for the climate, but also for air pollution.

We must utilise all the political approaches and solutions available to us to reduce methane, particularly from agriculture. To achieve this, we must also prioritise air pollution control. At the moment the revision of Gothenburg Protocol and the EU based implementation called NEC (National Emissions Reduction Commitment) is time sensitive and we can also address

methane as a precursor for air pollution control problems [e.g. methane is a precursor of ground level ozone.].

What we need to do is now exert political leadership, especially on policy, with a strict focus on methane reduction, and time is already running out. We must take determined action where we combine all of our efforts.

**Daphne Wysham:**

Okay, thank you. Turning to you, Nusa, we know from the Global Methane Assessment that agricultural methane is actually the largest source, yet it's not currently on the table for methane emissions cuts. What did you find in Changing Markets Foundation's research on agriculture?

**Nusa Urbancic, CEO, Changing Markets Foundation:**

When the Global Methane Pledge was adopted, the language on agriculture was actually much weaker than on waste and energy, where we talk about all feasible reductions. But when it comes to agriculture, we just talk about incentives, [and vague] partnerships with farmers for agricultural solutions. This [was seen as] a good thing. When this was passed, there were leaked documents showing that the beef industry actually celebrated this language as a significant win for them. They said, this could have ended much worse for us, and [the GMP] could have been doing something, but this [language] means it will just continue [to be] business as usual [for us].

So the National Cattle and Beef Association was very proud of their efforts at the highest political level where they managed to kind of undermine action at the global level when it comes to agriculture. We exposed them with our work -- I mean not just us, but several investigative journalists, etc.

It comes down to "agricultural exceptionalism" where the sector gets special treatment, which kind of leads to an all-carrots-and-no-sticks approach. There are a lot of sensitivities around how we treat farmers. We tried to shift this narrative, to show that actually this is not down to individual farmers. We have huge meat and dairy companies that have most of their methane within their supply chains and these companies also have huge resources that they should be investing in solutions and supporting farmers, either with technical measures or with transition towards other ways of producing food.

We looked at the five biggest meat and dairy companies, and their methane emissions are actually higher than total methane [emissions] of the Russian Federation, which is, you know, all three sectors, so that's huge. Even in individual companies, if you look at, for example, Dairy Farms of America, their methane is estimated to be close to the UK's entire livestock sector, and

Tyson's methane is estimated to be similar to the livestock sector of Australia. And when you look at the action that these companies are taking in the meat industry, it's close to zero.

We tried to look at their investments. JBS is one of the biggest meat companies in the world. It's based in Brazil, but it also produces in the UK, US, etc. And they basically had a net zero target, which they dropped. And we tried to look at their investment. Something along the lines of 0.03% of their revenue is actually going into climate solutions. And a lot of it is greenwashing, to say how great their net zero target was.

The dairy industry is moving too slowly. We saw Danone was the first one to set a 30% [methane] reduction target into the year 2023. We tried to create a little bit more momentum around that by getting other companies on board. Now we have five dairy companies reporting [emissions] and some developing action plans [to reduce them]. But given that methane is around 50% of the footprint of dairy companies, this is also too little, too late.

And I would just add to what Durwood was saying, that promises are not enough. It's going too slowly. [Promises] are also easy to break. We also need regulation when it comes to Big Meat and Big Dairy companies because, yeah, it's not about farmers. These are huge corporations. They have resources to act, and they're not really investing into these solutions.

**Daphne Wysham:**

So can you speak to what exactly the EU is doing right now on agricultural emissions reductions?

**Nusa Urbancic:**

Yeah, we looked at the EU, and they had agriculture as part of the Green Deal, and agriculture is actually one of the few sectors [in Europe] where emissions are stagnating, especially emissions of methane and nitrous oxide. And [as] part of their long-term climate targets, there was a 30% reduction of non-CO2 emissions, but this got dropped after lobbying by the big [companies.]

But we see this as a major opportunity, because, you know, any way you square it, we need to do something in agriculture, because otherwise we can't meet our targets, we can't become net zero, and we can't meet the Paris Agreement. 54% of total [EU] methane emissions come from agriculture. So, what we really see as a major opportunity is what Jens was talking about, the net national reduction directives, and national emission ceilings, which had 33% methane reduction targets in the previous round of revisions. And we're really hoping to bring this back because the regulation was kind of [...] when the [...] target got taken out of the next directive.



It's due to be revised again this year. And yeah, we're really hoping that we'll be making the case that permits should be brought back into place.

**Daphne Wysham:**

Okay, thank you so much, Jens and Nusa. Up next, I'm going to call the government roundtable, and I wanted to welcome Eamon Ryan, Minister for Environment, Climate, Communications and Transport in the Irish government from 2020 to 2025. In that time, he was also appointed EU Climate Finance Administrator for COP27 and 28 and a Ministerial Pair with responsibility for climate adaptation negotiations in COP21. And he was recently elected to co-chair the International Energy Agency for its 50th anniversary meeting in 2024. And on top of all of that, he was the leader of the Green Party of Ireland from 2011 to 2024. Thank you so much for joining us.

So Minister Ryan, can you tell us about what progress we are making on the Global Methane Pledge? What are some of the successes and challenges that you see now that we're halfway through the time that we set for ourselves to cut methane emissions by 30% below 2020 levels by 2030?

**Eamon Ryan, High Level Advocate, Climate and Clean Air Coalition, former Minister for Climate Action and Minister of Transportation, Ireland:**

Well, good morning everyone. I'm very glad to be here. I was a little bit late. I was coming from that same meeting uptown [Durwood went to] -- I don't know how you made it so quickly. I want to just quote from it to answer your question. [...] was speaking at that earlier meeting and I think he absolutely rightly accurately said we should be very somber and that we're not on track. We're nowhere near the reductions that so many countries have pledged to. So that's a reality. But actually, you could also see there's a possibility in terms of pulling this emergency brake. Are there conditions in place to do that? [...]

The emissions are still rising, particularly in agricultural waste, mainly an increasing number of livestock, [as was] said in the previous few minutes. I absolutely agree with you. We know about that in Ireland, we have our own dairy and beef sector and the challenges in agriculture. In energy there has been progress, but nothing like the scale of progress that's possible. But by those key measures, by setting legal standards that change the market, that's not undoable.

You know, the European Union has the regulations now. They really financed them, they may really [get en]forced. Japan, Korea, UK, and others are doing the same. We can change the market, particularly for the likes of LNG and obviously [...] natural gas. And I think to a certain

extent, in my mind, that's one of the key issues coming up in COP 30 that can be [gotten] over the line. And then, [CCAC] is doing a whole load of different work, different projects, that I think could help. And the World Bank, similarly, they have this new trust that they're able to deploy that would really support national [governments to take action]. So, while we should be somber and realistic and pulling the emergency brake and calling out the alarm, there is another side of this methane story that actually could give people some hope. And we need that this in this time.

**Daphne Wysham:**

So, just give us a sense of what some of the real success stories are in your mind. Can you point to particular countries that have taken bold action on [methane]?

**Eamon Ryan:**

I mean, the first and obvious and easiest [regarding] fossil fuels, is around flaring and the release of methane. [...] You know, we can now see not just when people are necessarily flaring, I was listening to something the other night, you can actually [now] see places where it's not really flared, it's just being released straight out. And the obvious suspects, the likes of the UK or Norway or others, have [companies] that do that. It's important that we look for those stories, particularly [among] national oil companies. It's not just about the public the private multinational oil companies; it is about the national oil companies. [...] So that's the space [e.g., stopping methane releases from oil and gas infrastructure]. That's the easiest, cheapest, money-saving way. But I fear that [while] there are examples that [show] this is absolutely technically doable, it's actually not in the federal system. The truth is it's not happening. What I hear from people looking at satellite data is [methane] is often released without even flaring, which is even more catastrophic.

**Daphne Wysham:**

Well, we're going to turn now to the governmental panel. Why don't you come and join the minister on the stage, Ken Alex? We're expecting one more speaker. [...] So, Ken Alex, you are the leader of the Subnational Methane Action Coalition. Under the Trump regime it's of course very critical for the US and other countries to take action [at the subnational as well as national levels]. Tell us a little bit more about what you see in terms of the potential for subnational methane action.

**Ken Alex, Director of Project Climate at UC Berkeley, representing the Subnational Methane Action Coalition:**

Okay. Well first of all, thanks for being here. I will say having been working on methane issues for decades it's actually great to see the full house of people who want to hear and talk about methane. That has changed the last few years fairly dramatically.

So I go back, I worked for Governor Jerry Brown in California and one of the scientists who discovered the impact of the climate pollutants [CFCs], Dr. Ram Ramanathan at UC San Diego, convinced Governor Brown of the importance of this issue.

So I work primarily at the sub-national level. And one of the initiatives that we have is, as Daphne said, the Subnational Methane Action Coalition -- SMAC -- which is so very memorable. We have about, at this point, about 30 members around the world. Right now, just two in the EU, in Germany and in Spain. We'd like to expand that and work across all sectors, oil, gas, agriculture, waste, coal.

I don't want to be pollyanna, but there are, as the minister said, success stories and reasons for hope at the sub-national level. There is a truism that about 70% of action on climate is at the sub-national level, and that certainly has been my experience.

So quickly, a couple of examples: In South Korea, the sub-national governments are working on waste and making really remarkable progress, something like 97% reduction in organics. For many reasons, for some that's hard to replicate in other places. But there are also efforts around the world, [to deploy] bio-covers at the sub-national level, which are inexpensive responses to methane emissions from landfills. There is a fair amount of work in Catalonia and California, the two areas that we're aware of that have methane reduction requirements for agriculture, and there is a fair amount of progress being made in different ways -- there are efforts around biogas, recovery of agricultural waste. On oil and gas, it's mixed on the national level, and at the state level, but in the U.S., Colorado in particular and California have excellent regulations and requirements.

I could go on and on, but I know this is a short effort here, so I'll stop.

**Daphne Wysham:**

I'll turn you to Durwood. We are expecting another speaker who is on his way from the Brazilian government. But Durwood, we know we need to cut methane emissions by 45% below 2020 levels by 2030 in order to meet the terms of the Paris Agreement. and that doing so, of course, is, as you mentioned, the fastest way to cool the planet. How do we go about striking a mandatory agreement to make such ambitious cuts in the next five years?

**Durwood Zaelke:**

I think about this every question day. I'd like to come up with a perfect answer to it. It is the only way to cool the planet in the near term. And so in a sense, it's inevitable that we'll have a mandatory agreement at some point. It's a question of when. Do we wait until the impacts are so severe that we've already lost half of the opportunity? Or do we do it faster?

I use the model of the Montreal Protocol. This is the treaty we put together in a remarkably short period of time, in less than two years. Because we feared the UV radiation was coming in from a thinning [ozone] layer, causing skin cancer, cataracts, suppressing our immune systems, degrading our [eco]systems. And we decided we needed a treaty. Again, two years to negotiate that, with a small group of countries. There were 24 when we started, there were 42 when we finally ratified it. And it grew and grew.

We think of it as a "start and strengthen" model, it's put the ozone layer on the path to recovery by 2066. At the same time, it has avoided as much warming as CO2 causes today. It's pretty remarkable. It's on course to avoid 2.5 degrees C by the end of the century -- 1.7 degrees C for taking out the gases, and almost another full degree, 0.85 degrees C, for from protecting forests and other carbon sinks that were being degraded by UV radiation. So it's a hell of a model to inspire us and to model a methane agreement.

So to be very specific about what we do right now and what the Climate Clean Air Coalition is doing, they're building the pieces of this right now. The CCAC has put together something that is modeled after the Montreal Protocol called the Methane Technology Economic Assessment, to tell all of the countries exactly what they need to do to cut methane. What does it cost? What's the technology? All the solutions that are out there. They also do all the scientific assessments.

We're building the pieces of a future binding methane agreement by helping develop national methane regulations. We've got Carbon Mapper and methane hunters like Sharon Wilson-- there are great people out there identifying all of the leaks. So you can't hide anymore. We will build the pieces and then we will assemble them when the moment is right.

There is political leadership including from the Prime Minister of Barbados who has made a binding agreement a priority for the Climate Vulnerable Forum, which now numbers more than 70 countries. This is an interesting coalition. The vulnerable countries recognize that a binding agreement is essential. They can't adapt to what's coming if we go past these tipping points. So Europeans, Californians, Catalonians -- there are people who are ready, and then we will soon be able to put this binding agreement together.

[AUDIENCE Q&A]

**Daphne Wysham:**

I want to introduce -- and thank you for making it here -- the National Secretary of Urban, Environmental, Water Resources and Environmental Quality, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, from Brazil, Adelberto Maluf. He's a key leader for COP30, including on the emerging lending strategy. And as I mentioned earlier, COP30 will be held in Belem, Brazil. He's also the co-chair of CCAC, the Climate Clean Air Coalition. So, in the time we have left, I'd love to hear from you on what your thoughts are in terms of methane action at COP30. What do you see playing out in the next few months before the COP?

**Adalberto Maluf, National Secretary of Urban Environment, Water Resources & Environmental Quality, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, Brazil:**

Well, thank you for the invitation. Sorry for the delay. Here in New York sometimes you leave half an hour earlier to arrive half an hour late. [Sometimes] we have goals and we know where we want to be, [but] we're gonna have, you know, construction work on the subway which delays you. Sometimes we [get] the address, but we don't know the real data, the real information, how to get there.

But we are positive that COP 30 will be the COP which will put us in the right position to understand if we are moving right or not. It's all about implementation, right? After 10 years of the Paris Agreement. There's huge expectation [for] when we receive all the NDCs [nationally determined contributions]. I think today President Lula is going to [meet] about China's NDCs. Up to now we have [received] at least 50 -- [some] delivered yesterday. Some countries [we still need, including in the European Union].

Brazil's NDC goes for up to a 67% reduction by 2035. We're on track. So we reduced deforestation in the last few years 50%. That's *500 million tons* [of GHG reduction]. It's larger than a lot of the countries -- larger than the UK -- just with the deforestation [reduction].

But we know there's a huge gap. What are we going to tell society when we all meet at COP30 in Belem. Are we going to say, look, unfortunately, these [goals we adopt] are not as ambitious, that we are not on track for [avoiding] 1.5 [degrees of warming] and actually we're not even on track to [avoid] 2 degrees of warming, so that's life, you know, let's wait for the next round of NDCs?

We can't wait. We don't have any other option. The only option we have is arriving in Belem acknowledging that our NDCs are far away from where we need [to be]. We made hundreds, thousands of plans and announcements and commitments. As you all might know, Brazil has selected 30 specific areas that we all agreed on in Dubai, at COP28. Each of the areas therein has an acceleration action plan for five years that we plan to launch and build it in, going all the way to the really try to get us back on the track of 1.5. So in order to really deliver these agendas, we will have to understand what worked as well, what didn't, what are existing technologies that are proven, that are cost-beneficial, that are cheap.

In the case of methane, oil, and gas, all these [reduction methods] are proven. They're available. It is somehow [sic] easy to implement. If all countries would follow Norway's standard, we would reduce 90% of emissions from oil and gas.

But every single day, the satellites are seeing leakage everywhere. It's not only Mexico; it's actually in the Czech Republic. It looks like a Swiss cheese with all the holes moving around everywhere. So we know that we are far away. We also believe there is huge potential.

At the summit of the leaders, we added in[to] the agenda [methane]. The presidents will talk about [methane and] non-CO2. Of course, we don't control that agenda because it's another level of decision, but it's there. We also have the local leaders forum, supported by [C40] in Rio November 3 - 5.

And in in that forum, which is just for Brazil, we are planning to bring a lot of the mayors who will announce new investments in landfill methane capture on their waste systems that we approved with the climate fund that the Minister of Environment created. [...] We plan to reduce 1 million tons of methane equivalent. [...] [That's] one country with 12 cities delivering 1 million tons. What about countries with 500 cities – China, India, Africa (which has some of the biggest cities in the world)?

We know the solutions, they are there.

Also, CCAC will have a large report and, well, it doesn't look good. We are far away, even on the Global Pledge, [where] we hope to get a 30% reduction. And on the plans we have, the announcements, we could even get up to 40% reduction on the business as usual [trajectory] if we deliver everything. But this 40% of business as usual actually is only a 10% reduction absolutely.

So we've got to change the way we run [things] [...] It's certain that short-lived climate pollutants, especially methane, which represents 30% of the global warming in the short term, is our emergency exit. It's the only way. CO2 is going to take so much longer, you know.

Brazil is pushing a lot for the financial aid, fair transition, gender [equity], also the roadmap for the fossil fuel because we're committed to this]. We haven't seen too much. So President Lula has proposed this goal to be announced with the [UNEP], that would oversee action [on] this.

Also most of the ministers are going to be to our meeting tonight. We're going to do a [...] meeting. Besides the ministerial of the GMP, we're going to do a [methane] meeting. We are thinking about actions and a menu of options to propose to countries. One of them would be to create a task force that would really integrate and coordinate what everybody's going to do. Because the World Bank is already a big [methane project]. CCAC is doing many projects. But we feel there's not enough coordination between all the stakeholders. So if we really get the

numbers, a good monitoring and verification system, we know how much it costs and where we need to go, [methane] will be for us and for the presidency [of COP30] one of the biggest priorities, to try to find a solution [for] the emergency we are in.

**Audience question from Dominic Frongillo, Elected Officials To Protect America:**

I have a question for you. My question would be given this is a global problem, and given what's happening with the political situation in the US, in a way, how can South National Governments and the United States coordinate and work to together and also with National Governments to deliver [methane reduction]?

**Adalberto Maluf:**

Well, let me just jump in for a second before I [have to leave]. Yesterday, the Minister of Department signed an MOU with the Governor of California, for example, you know, about environmental energy transition. Brazil has approved in our NDCs that cities are part of the process, sub-national governments have to be. We created what we call this multi-level governance structure under one of the initiatives called CHAMP. There was an announcement about that in June. So in our climate plan, which is the implementation of our NDC that we just updated, the targets are [for] the mayor and the governor. So the targets are there, the instruments are there, because who delivers the policies to reduce methane? Our mayors and governors. The Presidents don't have [the practical power] to do it. You [i.e. a president] can say, "I'm going to do it, I'm going to do it," but it doesn't happen. The mayors control everything in the cities and the governors have [responsibility for] most of the regulations. So even if one or two big countries on the federal level say "I don't want to be part of this," it doesn't matter. Because at the end of the day they suffer the consequences of climate change, and if they don't solve the problems they won't be reelected. We have a lot of announcements we are trying to develop, announcements of new things. We just want to assess the announcements that we're [making], and we have an acceleration plan for five years until the end of the year. It was adopted five months ago, and there's a need for that. So, after a year, after, let's hope to do it. It was a surprise what you just heard, that Brazilian states are the largest member of members of the subnational action group.

**Daphne Wysham:**

Okay, well thank you all for joining us and hope you can join us afterwards. Lunch is upstairs.