Engineering and Technology Journal e-ISSN: 2456-3358

Volume 10 Issue 08 August-2025, Page No.-6232-6239

DOI: 10.47191/etj/v10i08.16, I.F. – 8.482

Framework for Quantified Methane Reductions in Industry Net-Zero Strategies

Semiu Temidayo Fasasi[1], Oluwapelumi Joseph Adebowale[2], Zamathula Queen Sikhakhane Nwokediegwu[3]

[1]Colorado State University, USA

[2]Independent Researcher, USA

[3]Independent Researcher, Kansas, USA

ABSTRACT: Methane is a critical greenhouse gas whose reduction is essential for achieving near-term climate targets and advancing industry net-zero strategies. This paper presents a comprehensive framework for the quantified reduction of methane emissions in industrial sectors, emphasizing accurate measurement, transparent reporting, and integration with broader climate goals. The framework begins with establishing detailed emission inventories and baselines, employing a variety of quantification methodologies tailored to diverse emission sources. Analytical approaches, including cost-benefit analysis, performance indicators, and uncertainty management, support informed decision-making and continuous progress tracking. By embedding methane quantification within corporate net-zero targets, the framework enhances credibility, operational efficiency, and stakeholder engagement. The discussion highlights the framework's implications for policy standardization and industry practices, advocating for consistent, scalable, and adaptive methodologies. Future directions focus on leveraging emerging technologies, improving data accessibility, and fostering multi-sector collaboration to refine and expand the framework. This integrative approach provides a practical and scientifically rigorous pathway for accelerating methane mitigation, reinforcing the role of industrial sectors in global climate stabilization.

KEYWORDS: Methane quantification; Industrial emissions; Net-zero strategies; Emission inventory; Performance tracking; Methane mitigation framework

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Importance of Methane Reduction

Methane is a potent greenhouse gas with a global warming potential approximately 28-36 times greater than carbon dioxide over a 100-year period. Despite its relatively short atmospheric lifetime, its significant radiative forcing makes it a critical target for near-term climate mitigation efforts (Lelieveld et al., 1998, Balcombe et al., 2018). The industrial sector is a major contributor to anthropogenic methane emissions, originating from activities such as fossil fuel extraction, processing, waste management, and agriculture-related industrial operations (NJOKU, Thakur and Solanki, 2022). Consequently, reducing methane emissions from industry is essential for achieving meaningful progress toward global climate goals, including the Paris Agreement's target of limiting global temperature rise to well below 2°C (Pettus, 2009, Severinsky and Sessoms, 2021).

Methane reductions also provide ancillary benefits beyond climate mitigation. By addressing methane leaks and inefficiencies, industries can improve operational efficiency, reduce product losses, and enhance regulatory compliance. Furthermore, these reductions contribute to improved air quality, as methane is often co-emitted with other harmful pollutants. This dual benefit positions methane reduction as a critical component of sustainable industrial development (Howarth, 2014, Ussiri and Lal, 2017).

Given the urgency to limit near-term warming, many countries and corporations have integrated methane reduction targets into their net-zero strategies. However, realizing these commitments requires robust frameworks that ensure reductions are real, measurable, and verifiable. Thus, understanding the background and importance of methane reduction establishes the foundation for developing a structured approach to quantify methane mitigation in industrial net-zero strategies (Ozin and Ye, 2024, Jones et al., 2023).

1.2 Challenges in Quantifying Methane Emissions

Quantifying methane emissions accurately remains a complex challenge due to the gas's variable sources, intermittent release patterns, and measurement uncertainties. Emissions may occur as diffuse leaks, episodic venting, or fugitives, complicating detection and consistent measurement. Variability in emission rates, influenced by operational conditions, equipment integrity, and environmental factors, further complicates quantification. This heterogeneity demands multi-method measurement approaches ranging from direct sensor data to atmospheric monitoring and modeling, each with inherent limitations (Shaw et al., 2021, Connor et al., 2024, Erland et al., 2022).

Another challenge lies in the lack of standardized measurement protocols and the inconsistent application of existing standards across industries and jurisdictions. This inconsistency can lead to significant discrepancies in reported emissions and undermine confidence in mitigation claims. Additionally, temporal and spatial resolution constraints affect the ability to capture short-term emission spikes or localized leaks, which are critical for accurate baseline establishment and reduction tracking (Ebert et al., 2024, Sciences et al., 2018).

Moreover, economic and technological barriers hinder the widespread deployment of advanced methane quantification technologies. Costly equipment, limited technical expertise, and data integration challenges prevent comprehensive emission monitoring in many industrial facilities. Addressing these challenges is crucial to building reliable quantification frameworks that support credible, verifiable methane reductions in net-zero pathways (Nisbet et al., 2020, Zhao et al., 2020).

1.3 Objectives and Contribution of the Framework

This paper aims to present a structured framework for quantifying methane reductions within industry net-zero strategies, addressing the critical need for accurate, consistent, and transparent emission measurement and reporting. The framework is designed to integrate current best practices in emission inventory development, quantification methodologies, and performance tracking, tailored to the unique characteristics of industrial methane sources.

The contribution lies in synthesizing diverse quantification approaches into a cohesive model that aligns with net-zero goals and supports decision-making. By providing clear guidance on baseline establishment, emission measurement, and progress evaluation, the framework facilitates credible accounting of methane mitigation efforts, enhancing stakeholder confidence and regulatory compliance.

Additionally, the framework emphasizes practical considerations such as cost-effectiveness, uncertainty management, and integration with broader environmental and operational goals. It lays a foundation for continuous improvement and scalability, enabling industries to adapt to evolving technologies, policies, and climate commitments. Ultimately, this work contributes to advancing systematic methane reduction efforts crucial for accelerating industrial transitions toward net-zero emissions.

2. CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS FOR METHANE REDUCTION QUANTIFICATION

2.1 Methane Emission Sources in Industry

Methane emissions in industry arise from a variety of processes, each presenting unique challenges for quantification and mitigation. The fossil fuel sector is among the largest contributors, with emissions occurring during natural gas extraction, processing, transmission, and distribution. Equipment leaks, venting, and incomplete combustion are common sources (Uddoh et al., 2024, Akinsooto et al., 2025). Additionally, coal mining releases methane trapped in coal seams during extraction. These sources are often characterized by intermittent and unpredictable emission patterns, making measurement difficult (Ogunnowo et al., 2025, Okuh et al., 2025, Omisola et al., 2025).

Industrial agriculture-related operations also contribute significantly, particularly from waste management practices such as anaerobic digestion and manure storage (Okem et al., 2024, Okuh et al., 2024a). Methane can be released through biogenic decomposition processes, with emission intensities varying depending on waste handling and environmental conditions. Wastewater treatment plants and landfills similarly emit methane due to organic matter decomposition, often accounting for substantial local emissions (Okuh et al., 2024b, Olanloye et al., 2024).

Understanding these sources is fundamental to designing effective quantification strategies. Differentiating between continuous, fugitive, and episodic emissions is necessary to capture the full emission profile accurately (Asolo et al., 2024, Ayorinde et al., 2024). Recognizing source-specific emission behaviors informs the selection of measurement technologies and approaches, ensuring that quantification reflects actual methane release patterns critical for informed mitigation and net-zero planning (Kufile et al., 2024, Ogeawuchi et al., 2024).

2.2 Metrics and Measurement Standards

Reliable methane quantification relies on well-defined metrics and adherence to measurement standards that ensure consistency and comparability across studies and industrial applications (Adelusi et al., 2023a, Adelusi et al., 2023b). Common metrics include emission rates, expressed in mass per unit time, and emission factors, which relate methane output to activity data such as production volume or fuel throughput. These metrics enable baseline assessments and facilitate tracking of progress over time (Sagay-Omonogor et al., 2023, Adewoyin et al., 2024).

International standards and protocols, such as those developed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), provide methodological guidance for methane measurement and reporting (Ogunnowo et al., 2023, Okuh et al., 2023). These frameworks outline best practices for direct measurements, inventory compilation, and uncertainty quantification. Adopting standardized approaches mitigates discrepancies arising from methodological variability and enhances transparency (Olajide et al., 2023a, Olajide et al., 2023b, Oluoha et al., 2023).

Advances in sensor technology and remote sensing methods necessitate ongoing updates to standards, incorporating emerging tools such as satellite observations and continuous monitoring systems (Adelusi et al., 2023c, Asata et al., 2023).

Harmonizing traditional and novel measurement approaches within a clear metric framework strengthens data reliability. Consequently, metrics and standards form the backbone of robust methane quantification, enabling credible integration into industry net-zero strategies (Gbabo et al., 2023b, Gbabo et al., 2023a).

2.3 Role of Quantification in Net-Zero Strategy Development

Quantification serves as the cornerstone for developing effective net-zero strategies by providing the data necessary to identify emission sources, prioritize reduction measures, and verify progress. Without accurate measurement, mitigation efforts risk being misdirected or insufficiently validated, undermining credibility and climate outcomes. Quantification enables transparent accounting of methane emissions, ensuring that net-zero targets reflect genuine environmental improvements (Ogeawuchi et al., 2022, Ogunnowo et al., 2022).

Furthermore, quantification informs the design of tailored reduction strategies by elucidating emission hotspots and temporal patterns. It facilitates the evaluation of mitigation technologies and operational changes, supporting cost-benefit analyses that optimize resource allocation. By embedding quantification into strategy development, industries can set realistic, science-based targets aligned with global climate goals (on Energy et al., 2018).

Additionally, robust quantification frameworks enable regulatory compliance and enhance stakeholder trust, including investors, customers, and communities. Transparent reporting based on verifiable data builds confidence in net-zero commitments and encourages collaborative climate action. Ultimately, quantification transforms net-zero aspirations into actionable, measurable, and credible pathways, accelerating industrial contributions to climate stabilization (Hu et al., 2014).

3. FRAMEWORK COMPONENTS FOR METHANE REDUCTION

3.1 Emission Inventory and Baseline Establishment

The foundation of any methane reduction framework is a comprehensive emission inventory, which systematically catalogues all methane sources within an industrial facility or sector. Developing this inventory involves identifying emission points, categorizing sources by type and magnitude, and compiling activity data that influences emission levels. An accurate inventory provides the quantitative baseline against which future reductions are measured, making its quality critical for credible mitigation tracking (Connor et al., 2024, Hu et al., 2014).

Baseline establishment requires collecting robust historical and current emission data to capture typical operational conditions and variability. This involves using direct measurements, emission factors, and modeling approaches where direct data is unavailable or incomplete. The baseline must account for episodic and fugitive emissions alongside routine sources to fully represent methane release patterns. Sensitivity analyses often accompany baseline development to understand uncertainty ranges and improve data reliability. A well-defined baseline enables industries to set realistic reduction targets and monitor performance effectively. It also facilitates compliance with regulatory reporting and voluntary climate commitments. By providing a clear snapshot of methane emissions before intervention, the emission inventory and baseline establish the starting point necessary for quantifying progress toward net-zero objectives in a transparent and verifiable manner (Scarpelli et al., 2020, Sciences et al., 2018).

3.2 Quantification Methodologies and Tools

Accurate methane quantification leverages a diverse suite of methodologies and tools tailored to specific emission characteristics and operational contexts. Direct measurement techniques, such as optical gas imaging, flame ionization detectors, and tunable diode laser absorption spectroscopy, offer precise localized readings and enable leak detection. These methods are essential for identifying and quantifying point sources, but can be labor-intensive and limited in spatial coverage (Smith et al., 2022).

Remote sensing technologies, including drones, aircraft-based sensors, and satellites, provide broader spatial assessments and facilitate monitoring of large or inaccessible areas. These tools complement ground-based measurements by detecting plumes and estimating aggregate emissions over time. Continuous monitoring systems employing fixed sensors deliver real-time data, supporting rapid response and ongoing performance verification (D'Alesio et al., 2025, Scarpelli, 2021).

Complementing measurement technologies, modeling approaches, and emission factors fill data gaps and support inventory compilation. Statistical and machine learning techniques are increasingly applied to integrate heterogeneous data streams, enhance emission estimates, and reduce uncertainty. Selection of quantification methods depends on factors such as emission source type, facility scale, cost, and required accuracy, emphasizing the need for a flexible, multi-tiered approach within the framework (Foulds et al., 2022).

3.3 Integration with Industry Net-Zero Targets

Integrating methane quantification into broader industry net-zero targets ensures that emission reduction efforts are aligned with strategic climate goals and contribute meaningfully to overall decarbonization pathways. This integration requires embedding quantification outcomes into corporate sustainability frameworks, climate action plans, and regulatory compliance mechanisms. Methane metrics become part of key performance indicators guiding operational decisions and investment priorities (Glavič et al., 2023, Egbumokei et al., 2024).

Aligning quantification with net-zero targets facilitates transparent reporting and benchmarking against internal and external commitments. It enables industries to demonstrate progress credibly to stakeholders such as investors, regulators, and customers, fostering accountability. Moreover, integration supports adaptive management by informing ongoing strategy adjustments based on quantitative feedback, ensuring continuous improvement (Miller et al., 2021).

A successful integration also acknowledges the interplay between methane reductions and other environmental objectives, such as energy efficiency and air quality. Embedding methane quantification within the net-zero context promotes holistic environmental management, encourages cross-functional collaboration, and strengthens the business case for methane mitigation. This alignment is essential for accelerating industrial transitions toward sustainable and climate-resilient futures (Mani et al., 2024, Neethirajan, 2023).

4. ANALYTICAL APPROACHES TO SUPPORT DECISION-MAKING

4.1 Cost-Benefit Considerations for Reduction Options

Effective methane reduction requires careful evaluation of costs and benefits to identify strategies that maximize environmental impact while optimizing resource allocation. Cost-benefit analysis compares the financial investments needed to implement reduction technologies or operational changes against expected returns, including avoided methane emissions, energy savings, and potential regulatory incentives. This approach aids decision-makers in prioritizing interventions with the greatest net positive impact (Kuosmanen et al., 2009, Bruno et al., 2023).

Economic considerations encompass capital expenditures, operational costs, maintenance, and potential disruptions to production. Benefits include direct methane abatement, improved efficiency, and avoided penalties or carbon pricing. Additionally, social and environmental co-benefits, such as enhanced air quality and community health improvements, can be incorporated to reflect broader value beyond financial metrics. Quantifying these factors systematically informs balanced, sustainable decisions (Chang et al., 2012, Shindell et al., 2017).

Integrating cost-benefit analysis within methane quantification frameworks supports transparent justification of reduction initiatives, facilitating stakeholder buy-in. It enables industries to deploy capital strategically, focusing on high-impact opportunities and avoiding investments with limited returns. This analytical rigor is essential for advancing methane mitigation within industry net-zero strategies in a manner that is both economically viable and environmentally effective (Lave and Gruenspecht, 1991).

4.2 Performance Indicators and Progress Tracking

Robust performance indicators are vital for monitoring methane reduction initiatives and ensuring continuous alignment with net-zero objectives. These indicators translate complex emission data into clear metrics that track progress over time, evaluate the effectiveness of interventions, and identify areas needing attention. Common indicators include total methane emissions, emission intensity per unit of production, and percentage reductions relative to baseline levels (Liu et al., 2019).

Progress tracking involves systematic data collection, analysis, and reporting, supported by transparent methodologies that ensure accuracy and comparability. Frequent monitoring enables early detection of deviations or underperformance, allowing timely corrective actions. Moreover, benchmarking performance against industry peers or regulatory standards enhances accountability and drives continuous improvement (Farber, 2015, Edwards et al., 2024).

Effective use of performance indicators also fosters communication with internal and external stakeholders, building trust and demonstrating commitment to climate goals. By integrating these indicators into management systems and sustainability reporting, industries institutionalize methane mitigation as a core business function. This operationalization is critical for maintaining momentum toward net-zero emissions (Ghinea et al., 2025).

4.3 Risk and Uncertainty Management in Quantification

Methane quantification is inherently subject to uncertainties arising from measurement limitations, data variability, and methodological assumptions. Effective risk and uncertainty management is essential to ensure that mitigation decisions are based on reliable information and that reported reductions are credible. Quantifying uncertainty allows decision-makers to understand confidence levels and potential variability in emission estimates (Bellingham et al., 1994, Conrad et al., 2023).

Techniques for managing uncertainty include statistical analysis, sensitivity testing, and probabilistic modeling, which help identify key sources of error and guide data quality improvement efforts. Incorporating uncertainty ranges into reporting enhances transparency and supports risk-informed decision-making. It also helps prioritize measurement investments toward the most uncertain or impactful sources (Sun et al., 2021, Kimei et al., 2024).

Risk management involves identifying potential barriers to accurate quantification and reduction implementation, such as equipment failure, data gaps, or regulatory changes. Developing mitigation strategies, contingency plans, and adaptive management approaches strengthens resilience. Addressing risk and uncertainty holistically within the methane quantification framework ensures robust, defensible net-zero strategies that withstand scrutiny and evolving conditions (Johnson et al., 2023, Scheidt et al., 2018).

5. CONCLUSION

The presented framework for quantified methane reductions provides a structured approach to accurately measure, track, and integrate methane mitigation within industry net-zero strategies. Establishing a robust emission inventory and baseline lays the groundwork for credible accounting of methane emissions and reductions. The framework’s emphasis on diverse quantification methodologies ensures that both point and diffuse emission sources are effectively captured, addressing the variability inherent in industrial methane release.

Incorporating analytical tools such as cost-benefit analysis and performance indicators enables informed decision-making and continuous progress tracking. The framework also addresses the critical challenges of uncertainty and risk management, fostering transparency and confidence in reported outcomes. Collectively, these elements create a comprehensive system that supports both operational improvements and strategic climate commitments.

This integrative approach advances the ability of industries to deliver verifiable methane reductions aligned with net-zero ambitions, enhancing environmental integrity and stakeholder trust. By aligning quantification with broader sustainability goals, the framework encourages more holistic management of methane emissions, strengthening the overall impact of climate mitigation efforts in industrial sectors.

The adoption of a standardized methane quantification framework holds significant implications for both policy development and industrial operations. For policymakers, it offers a foundation to establish clear regulatory requirements and reporting standards that promote transparency and comparability across sectors. This can facilitate the design of incentive mechanisms, carbon pricing, and compliance verification systems that drive meaningful methane reductions.

Industries benefit from a clear pathway to integrate methane management into corporate sustainability strategies, enhancing risk management and operational efficiency. The framework supports improved communication with stakeholders, including investors, regulators, and communities, fostering trust and enabling more informed decision-making. Furthermore, it provides a scalable model adaptable to diverse industrial contexts and evolving regulatory landscapes.

While the framework establishes a solid foundation, ongoing refinement is essential to address emerging challenges and technological advances. Future enhancements may include the integration of real-time data analytics and machine learning techniques to improve emission detection accuracy and prediction capabilities. Expanding the framework to incorporate lifecycle methane emissions and supply chain considerations would further strengthen its comprehensiveness.

Collaboration across industry, academia, and government will be critical to update standards, share best practices, and develop interoperable data platforms. Additionally, efforts to reduce measurement costs and increase accessibility will be important for broader adoption, particularly among smaller industrial operators. Addressing social and economic dimensions of methane reduction can also enrich the framework, promoting equitable climate action.

Continuous validation through independent verification and benchmarking against evolving climate targets will ensure the framework remains relevant and effective. By embracing innovation and adaptability, the framework can evolve into a dynamic tool that supports accelerating methane mitigation and the transition to sustainable, net-zero industrial systems.

REFERENCES

1. ADELUSI, B. S., UZOKA, A. C., HASSAN, Y. G. & OJIKA, F. U. 2023a. Blockchain-Integrated Software Bill of Materials (SBOM) for Real-Time Vulnerability Detection in Decentralized Package Repositories. International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering, 7**,** 102-116.
2. ADELUSI, B. S., UZOKA, A. C., HASSAN, Y. G. & OJIKA, F. U. 2023b. Predictive Analytics-Driven Decision Support System for Earned Value Management Using Ensemble Learning in Megaprojects. International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering, 7**,** 131-143.
3. ADELUSI, B. S., UZOKA, A. C., HASSAN, Y. G. & OJIKA, F. U. 2023c. Synthetic Data Generation for Workforce Analytics: A Review of GANs and Differential Privacy Techniques in Human Capital Forecasting.
4. ADEWOYIN, M. A., OGUNNOWO, E. O., FIEMOTONGHA, J. E., IGUNMA, T. O. & ADELEKE, A. K. 2024. Advances in AI-Based Optimization for Multiphysics Fluid Dynamics in Product Design Engineering.
5. AKINSOOTO, O., OGUNNOWO, E. O. & EZEANOCHIE, C. C. 2025. The future of electric vehicles: Technological innovations and market trends. Engineering and Technology Journal, 10**,** 4392-4405.
6. ASATA, M. N., NYANGOMA, D. & OKOLO, C. H. 2023. Reducing Passenger Complaints through Targeted Inflight Coaching: A Quantitative Assessment. International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering, 7**,** 144-162.
7. ASOLO, E., GIL-OZOUDEH, I. & EJIMUDA, C. 2024. AI-Powered decision support systems for sustainable agriculture using AI-Chatbot solution. Journal of Digital Food, Energy & Water Systems, 5.
8. AYORINDE, O. B., ETUKUDOH, E. A., NWOKEDIEGWU, Z. Q. S., IBEKWE, K. I., UMOH, A. A. & HAMDAN, A. 2024. Renewable energy projects in Africa: A review of climate finance strategies. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 11**,** 923-932.
9. BALCOMBE, P., SPEIRS, J. F., BRANDON, N. P. & HAWKES, A. D. 2018. Methane emissions: choosing the right climate metric and time horizon.

Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts, 20, 1323-1339.
10. BELLINGHAM, J., MILTON, M., WOODS, P., PASSANT, N., POLL, A., COULING, S., MARLOWE, I., WOODFIELD, M., GARLAND, J. & LEE, D. 1994. The UK methane emissions inventory: A scoping study on the use of ambient measurements to reduce uncertainties.
11. BRUNO, M., MARCHI, M., ERMINI, N., NICCOLUCCI, V. & PULSELLI, F. M. 2023. Life cycle assessment and cost–benefit analysis as combined economic–environmental assessment tools: Application to an anaerobic digestion plant. Energies, 16, 3686.
12. CHANG, N.-B., QI, C., ISLAM, K. & HOSSAIN, F. 2012. Comparisons between global warming potential and cost–benefit criteria for optimal planning of a municipal solid waste management system. Journal of Cleaner Production, 20, 1-13.
13. CONNOR, A., SHAW, J. T., YARROW, N., HOWES, N., HELMORE, J., FINLAYSON, A., BARKER, P. & ROBINSON, R. 2024. A framework for describing and classifying methane reporting requirements, emission sources, and monitoring methods. Environmental Science: Atmospheres, 4, 1203-1217.
14. CONRAD, B. M., TYNER, D. R. & JOHNSON, M. R. 2023. Robust probabilities of detection and quantification uncertainty for aerial methane detection: Examples for three airborne technologies. Remote Sensing of Environment, 288, 113499.
15. D’ALESIO, P., NACCARELLA, E., CARAMANICO, L. & NORIS, F. Smooth Development and Implementation of Methane Emissions Reduction Operational Plans. Offshore Mediterranean Conference and Exhibition, 2025. OMC, OMC-2025-564.
16. EBERT, D., WENG, B., WANG, C., BEDLE, H., XU, M., HU, X.-M., CROWELL, S., KOCH, J., DANALA, G. & KAYAKAN, E. 2024. Multi-Scale Integrated Monitoring System for Enhancing Methane Emission Detection, Quantification & Prediction. Univ. of Oklahoma, Norman, OK (United States).
17. EDWARDS, M. R., SURANA, K., RATHOD, S., BISWAS, N. & BINDL, M. 2024. Costs and key leverage points for atmospheric methane removal technologies. Eng. Med.
18. EGBUMOKEI, P. I., DIENAGHA, I. N., DIGITEMIE, W. N. & CYNTHIA, E. 2024. Sustainable business strategies for decarbonizing the oil and gas industry: A roadmap to net-zero emissions. Int. J. Multidisciplinary Res. Growth Eval, 5, 1014-1028.
19. ERLAND, B. M., THORPE, A. K. & GAMON, J. A. 2022. Recent advances toward transparent methane emissions monitoring: a review. Environmental Science & Technology, 56, 16567-16581.
20. FARBER, D. A. 2015. Coping with uncertainty: Cost-benefit analysis, the precautionary principle, and climate change. Wash. L. Rev., 90, 1659.
21. FOULDS, A., ALLEN, G., SHAW, J. T., BATESON, P., BARKER, P. A., HUANG, L., PITT, J. R., LEE, J. D., WILDE, S. E. & DOMINUTTI, P. 2022. Quantification and assessment of methane emissions from offshore oil and gas facilities on the Norwegian continental shelf. Atmospheric chemistry and physics, 22, 4303-4322.
22. GBABO, E. Y., OKENWA, O. K. & CHIMA, P. E. 2023a. Designing Value Realization Models for Stakeholder Benefits in Long-Term Energy Projects.
23. GBABO, E. Y., OKENWA, O. K. & CHIMA, P. E. 2023b. A Risk-Based Digital Governance Model for Ensuring Programme Assurance in Complex Infrastructure Delivery. International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering, 7, 67-81.
24. GHINEA, C., UNGUREANU-COMĂNIȚĂ, E.-D., ȚÂBULEAC, R. M., OPREA, P. S., COȘBUC, E. D. & GAVRILESCU, M. 2025. Cost-benefit analysis of enzymatic hydrolysis alternatives for food waste management. Foods, 14, 488.
25. GLAVIČ, P., PINTARIČ, Z. N., LEVIČNIK, H., DRAGOJLOVIĆ, V. & BOGATAJ, M. 2023. Transitioning towards net-zero emissions in chemical and process industries: a holistic perspective. Processes, 11, 2647.
26. HOWARTH, R. W. 2014. A bridge to nowhere: methane emissions and the greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas. Energy Science & Engineering, 2, 47-60.
27. HU, E., BABCOCK, E. L., BIALKOWSKI, S. E., JONES, S. B. & TULLER, M. 2014. Methods and techniques for measuring gas emissions from agricultural and animal feeding operations. Critical reviews in analytical chemistry, 44, 200-219.
28. JOHNSON, M. R., CONRAD, B. M. & TYNER, D. R. 2023. Creating measurement-based oil and gas sector methane inventories using source-resolved aerial surveys. Communications Earth & Environment, 4, 139.
29. JONES, M. W., PETERS, G. P., GASSER, T., ANDREW, R. M., SCHWINGSHACKL, C., GÜTSCHOW, J., HOUGHTON, R. A., FRIEDLINGSTEIN, P., PONGRATZ, J. & LE QUÉRÉ, C. 2023. National contributions to climate change due to historical emissions of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide since 1850. Scientific Data, 10, 155.

30. KIMEI, E. H., NYAMBO, D. G., MDUMA, N. & KAIJAGE, S. 2024. Review of Sources of Uncertainty and Techniques Used in Uncertainty Quantification and Sensitivity Analysis to Estimate Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Ruminants. Sustainability, 16**,** 2219.
31. KUFILE, O. T., OTOKITI, B. O., ONIFADE, A. Y., OGUNWALE, B. & OKOLO, C. H. 2024. Designing Ethics-Governed AI Personalization Frameworks in Programmatic Advertising. International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering, 8**,** 115-133.
32. KUOSMANEN, T., BIJSTERBOSCH, N. & DELLINK, R. 2009. Environmental cost–benefit analysis of alternative timing strategies in greenhouse gas abatement: A data envelopment analysis approach. Ecological Economics, 68**,** 1633-1642.
33. LAVE, L. & GRUENSPECHT, H. 1991. Increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of environmental decisions: Benefit-cost analysis and effluent fees a critical review. Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association, 41**,** 680-693.
34. LELIEVELD, J., CRUTZEN, P. J. & DENTENER, F. J. 1998. Changing concentration, lifetime and climate forcing of atmospheric methane. Tellus B, 50**,** 128-150.
35. LIU, B., WU, Q., WANG, F. & ZHANG, B. 2019. Is straw return-to-field always beneficial? Evidence from an integrated cost-benefit analysis. Energy, 171**,** 393-402.
36. MANI, A., BUDD, T. & MAINE, E. 2024. Emissions-intensive and trade-exposed industries: technological innovation and climate policy solutions to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. RSC Sustainability, 2**,** 903-927.
37. MILLER, S. A., HABERT, G., MYERS, R. J. & HARVEY, J. T. 2021. Achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions in the cement industry via value chain mitigation strategies. One Earth, 4**,** 1398-1411.
38. NEETHIRAJAN, S. 2023. Navigating to Net Zero: Leveraging Big Data, AI, and Benchmarking for Sustainable Climate Action and Emissions Reduction.
39. NISBET, E., FISHER, R., LOWRY, D., FRANCE, J., ALLEN, G., BAKKALOGLU, S., BRODERICK, T., CAIN, M., COLEMAN, M. & FERNANDEZ, J. 2020. Methane mitigation: methods to reduce emissions, on the path to the Paris agreement. Reviews of Geophysics, 58**,** e2019RG000675.
40. NJOKU, A. T. THE GREEN HOUSE GASES.
41. OGEAWUCHI, J. C., ONIFADE, A. Y., ABAYOMI, A., AGOOLA, O., DOSUMU, R. E. & GEORGE, O. O. 2022. Systematic Review of Predictive Modeling for Marketing Funnel Optimization in B2B and B2C Systems. Iconic Research And Engineering Journals, 6**,** 267-286.
42. OGEAWUCHI, J. C., SHARMA, A., ADEKUNLE, B. I., ABAYOMI, A. A. & ONIFADE, O. 2024. Ethical Frameworks for AI Deployment in Financial Decision-Making: Balancing Profitability and Social Responsibility. International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology, 10**,** 905-917.
43. OGUNNOWO, E. O., ADEWOYIN, M. A., FIEMOTONGHA, J. E. & ODION, T. 2022. Advances in Predicting Microstructural Evolution in Superalloys Using Directed Energy Deposition Data.
44. OGUNNOWO, E. O., ADEWOYIN, M. A., FIEMOTONGHA, J. E. & ODION, T. 2023. A Conceptual Framework for Reliability-Centered Design of Mechanical Components Using FEA and DFMEA Integration.
45. OGUNNOWO, E. O., OGU, E., EGBUMOKEI, P. I., DIENAGHA, I. N. & DIGITEMIE, W. N. 2025. A pedagogical model for enhancing mechanical engineering education through experimental learning and laboratory techniques. Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews, 8**,** 194-213.
46. OKEM, E. S., NWOKEDIEGWU, Z. Q. S., UMOH, A. A., BIU, P., OBAEDO, B. & SIBANDA, M. 2024. Civil engineering and disaster resilience: A review of innovations in building safe and sustainable communities. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 11**,** 639-650.
47. OKUH, C. O., NWULU, E. O., OGU, E., EGBUMOKEI, P. I., DIENAGHA, I. N. & DIGITEMIE, W. N. 2023. Advancing a waste-to-energy model to reduce environmental impact and promote sustainability in energy operations. Journal name needed]. Year.
48. OKUH, C. O., NWULU, E. O., OGU, E., EGBUMOKEI, P. I., DIENAGHA, I. N. & DIGITEMIE, W. N. 2024a. Creating a Workforce Upskilling Model to Address Emerging Technologies in Energy and Oil and Gas Industries.
49. OKUH, C. O., NWULU, E. O., OGU, E., EGBUMOKEI, P. I., DIENAGHA, I. N. & DIGITEMIE, W. N. 2024b. A Strategic Model for Carbon Emission Reduction through Process Optimization in Energy Sector Operations.
50. OKUH, C. O., NWULU, E. O., OGU, E., EGBUMOKEI, P. I., DIENAGHA, I. N. & DIGITEMIE, W. N. 2025. Designing a reliability engineering framework to minimize downtime and enhance output in energy production.

51. OLAJIDE, J. O., OTOKITI, B. O., NWANI, S., OGUNMOKUN, A. S., ADEKUNLE, B. I. & FIEMOTONGHA, J. E. 2023a. Building a Working Capital Optimization Model for Vendor and Distributor Relationship Management. International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering, 7, 55-66.
52. OLAJIDE, J. O., OTOKITI, B. O., NWANI, S., OGUNMOKUN, A. S., ADEKUNLE, B. I. & FIEMOTONGHA, J. E. 2023b. Designing Cash Flow Governance Models for Public and Private Sector Treasury Operations. International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering, 7, 45-54.
53. OLANLOYE, O. O., ADENIYI, A. E., AWORINDE, O. H., OLAGUNJU, M., ADENIYI, J. K., ADELEKE, I. A. & NGOKA, M. U. Development of a stock prediction system using Deep Learning Model Approach. 2024 International Conference on Science, Engineering and Business for Driving Sustainable Development Goals (SEB4SDG), 2024. IEEE, 1-7.
54. OLUOHA, O., ODESHINA, A., REIS, O., OKPEKE, F., ATTIPOE, V. & ORIENO, O. 2023. A Privacy-First Framework for Data Protection and Compliance Assurance in Digital Ecosystems. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 7, 620-646.
55. OMISOLA, J. O., ETUKUDOH, E. A., OKENWA, O. K. & TOKUNBO, G. I. 2025. Pore-Scale Modeling of CO_2-Brine-Rock Interactions in Carbonate Reservoirs: Numerical and experimental evaluation of geochemical and Geomechanical changes occurring during CO_2 injection in carbonate formations.
56. ON ENERGY, B., ON AGRICULTURE, B., NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES, E. & MEDICINE 2018. Methane emission measurement and monitoring methods. Improving characterization of anthropogenic methane emissions in the United States. National Academies Press (US).
57. OZIN, G. A. & YE, J. 2024. Story of Methane: Five Atoms that Changed the World, Royal Society of Chemistry.
58. PETTUS, A. 2009. Methane: Tapping the untapped potential. CleanAIR: Boston, MA, USA.
59. SAGAY-OMONOGOR, I., BOLARINWA, T. & AKOMOLAFE, O. O. 2023. Overcoming Challenges in Cancer Immunotherapy: Mechanisms and Clinical Solutions.
60. SCARPELLI, T. 2021. Integration of bottom-up and top-down methods to evaluate national methane emission inventories. Harvard University.
61. SCARPELLI, T. R., JACOB, D. J., MAASAKKERS, J. D., SULPRIZIO, M. P., SHENG, J.-X., ROSE, K., ROMEO, L., WORDEN, J. R. & JANSSENS-MAENHOUT, G. 2020. A global gridded (0.1∘× 0.1∘) inventory of methane emissions from oil, gas, and coal exploitation based on national reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Earth System Science Data, 12, 563-575.
62. SCHEIDT, C., LI, L. & CAERS, J. 2018. Quantifying uncertainty in subsurface systems, John Wiley & Sons.
63. SCIENCES, N. A. O., MEDICINE, EARTH, D. O., STUDIES, L., STUDIES, B. O. E., ENERGY, B. O., SYSTEMS, E., SCIENCES, B. O. E., SCIENCES, B. O. A. & STATES, C. O. A. M. E. I. T. U. 2018. Improving characterization of anthropogenic methane emissions in the United States, National Academies Press.
64. SEVERINSKY, A. J. & SESSOMS, A. L. 2021. Methane versus Carbon Dioxide: Mitigation Prospects. Int. J. Environ. Ecol. Eng, 15, 214-220.
65. SHAW, J. T., SHAH, A., YONG, H. & ALLEN, G. 2021. Methods for quantifying methane emissions using unmanned aerial vehicles: A review. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 379, 20200450.
66. SHINDELL, D., FUGLESTVEDT, J. & COLLINS, W. 2017. The social cost of methane: theory and applications. Faraday Discussions, 200, 429-451.
67. SMITH, S. J., MCDUFFIE, E. E. & CHARLES, M. 2022. Opinion: Coordinated development of emission inventories for climate forcers and air pollutants. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, 2022, 1-28.
68. SUN, S., MA, L. & LI, Z. 2021. Methane emission estimation of oil and gas Sector: A review of measurement technologies, Data Analysis Methods and uncertainty estimation. Sustainability, 13, 13895.
69. THAKUR, S. & SOLANKI, H. 2022. Role of methane in climate change and options for mitigation-A brief review. International Association of Biologicals and Computational Digest, 1, 275-281.
70. UDDOH, J., AJIGA, D., OKARE, B. P. & ADULOJU, T. D. 2024. Scalable AI-Powered Cyber Hygiene Models for Microenterprises and Small Businesses. International Journal of Scientific Research in Civil Engineering, 8, 177-188.
71. USSIRI, D. & LAL, R. 2017. Historical and Contemporary Global Methane Cycling. Carbon Sequestration for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. Springer.
72. ZHAO, Y., NAN, X., YANG, L., ZHENG, S., JIANG, L. & XIONG, B. 2020. A review of enteric methane emission measurement techniques in ruminants. Animals, 10, 1004.