

NATIONAL CARBON DIVISION COMMITTEE

MEETING

Tuesday 28 April 2026

2.00pm - 3.00pm AEST

Via Zoom

MINUTES

1. Welcome & apologies

Attendees: Gayle Sloan, Phil Carbins, Paul Lightbody, Julian Gastaldi, Tracey Haberkorn, Tiana Nairn, John Varcoe, Taku Ide.

Apologies: Ramona Bachu, Romily Webster, Jeff Maguire, Andrew Race, Joe Pickin.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The meeting minutes of 16 March 2026 were circulated without comment and confirmed as a true and accurate record.

Moved: Gayle Sloan *Seconded:* Julian Gastaldi

3. Issues for discussion

i. [Proposed update to NGER Scheme consultation –](#)

Key amendments for discussion include :

- Emissions of methane released from landfills:
 - Updating Method 2 to provide more specificity for measurement of emissions and removing the collection efficiency limit (CEL),
 - Making consequential changes to Method 1 following the changes to Method 2
 - Updating default waste composition values to reflect modern disposal practices,
- Emissions from wastewater treatment:
 - Subsections 5.23(1) and 5.40(1) - enabling reporting of zero emissions from managed aerobic ponds,
 - Subsection 5.25(5) - updating emission factors for wastewater and sludge
- Renewable fuels:
 - Introducing provisions for the reporting of emissions from consumption of co-processed liquid fuels
 - Making a minor update to the definition of biomethane displacement ACCU in the renewable gas market-based reporting arrangements.

Submissions close on Friday 8 May 2026, with proposed changes commencing on Wednesday 1 July 2026

The group discussion raised the following points:

- Broad support was expressed for the proposed reforms to Method 2, particularly the removal of the CEL, the Increased flexibility to use different technologies and ability for “suitably qualified persons” to undertake measurements rather than only independent experts
- Members agreed the reforms are a positive step toward improving the current high level of inaccuracy in landfill emissions reporting under NGERs. WMRR indicated high-level support for Method 2 reforms and intends to support these changes in its submission.

Participants raised several concerns regarding practical implementation for consideration:

- Some landfills likely to be captured under the Safeguard Mechanism may face a two-year transition period, approximately 12 months required to establish Method 2 systems and continued reliance on Method 1 data during transition. It was noted that no transition or correction mechanism currently exists to address this issue.
 - Suggestions included introducing retrospective correction mechanisms, allowing revised emissions calculations to apply to previous years once improved landfill data becomes available and concerns regarding measurement requirements.

- Some concern was raised around the requirement to measure emissions at each landfill gas well was described as impractical or physically impossible for many sites.
- Quarterly full-landfill surveys and increased survey resolution were viewed as potentially “gold-plated” requirements that may create excessive costs and operational burdens but will provide measure outcomes
 - The proposed reduction in transect spacing from 25m to 4m was questioned - Participants noted this appears based on FluxLab/OTM51 methodologies not fully aligned with Australian practices. Concerns were raised regarding applicability to sites with phytocaps and large landfill footprints.
 - Participants raised the possibility of allowing flexibility where no hotspots are detected
 - Reduction of thresholds from 50 ppm to 25 ppm generated mixed feedback -in particular, although simpler, questions were raised regarding whether 25 ppm should be considered ‘elevated’
- The group noted that current waste composition assumptions do not adequately account for FOGO diversion and reduced organic waste, and the -changes in landfill residuals over time (ie: The ‘Class III’ composition for FOGO is not proposed)
 - The First Order Decay (FOD) model still contains conservative assumptions and it was suggested that waste composition defaults be reviewed further in future consultations.
- The WMRR submission will generally support Method 2 reforms.
 - Participants acknowledged that while the government’s intent is to improve measured outcomes, methods must remain practical and proportionate.
 - There was support for approaches that encourage methane reduction and improved landfill management, enable adoption of new technologies and provide flexibility for operators to choose methods best suited to their sites. It was discussed that the Method 2 provides stronger incentives for technology investment and improved methane management.
 - Questions were raised about whether a future Method 3 could be considered, but it was agreed that this would not be flagged in a WMRR submission, which will remain high level, noting that the removal of the CEL and guidance should help increase uptake of Method 2.

ii. **Safeguard Mechanism** – the 2024–2025 [Safeguard Mechanism data](#) released. No comments made by the group.

iii. **ACCU Methods update:**

- AWT method update – proponent led by ARRC – fortnightly meetings.

iv. **Other matters for discussion**

- Impact of NSW EPA [GHG reporting requirements](#) - no feedback. Noted that this may change with the restructure of EPA.

v. **WMRR Submissions Pipeline (carbon)**

- [Guarantee of Origin - biogas, biomethane and iron ore](#) (27 April 2026)
- [Victorian Energy Upgrade – industrial heat decarbonization](#) (28 April 2026)
- Expected soon – Safeguard Method Review consultation

vi. **Market overview**

- Prices have gone up slightly - ~\$37 / 37.50

6. Next meeting

Monday 1 June 2026