



1 Reporting of Gridded (0.1°X0.1°) Methane Emission Data for India to

- 2 Redefine Global Climate Studies
- 3 Ashirbad Mishra¹, Poonam Mangaraj², Pallavi Sahoo¹, Gufran Beig³, Rajesh Janardanan⁴,
- 4 Saroj Kumar Sahu^{1*}
- 5 ¹Dept. of Environmental Science, Berhampur University, India
- 6 ²Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, Kyoto, Japan
- 7 ³National Institute of Advanced Studies, Indian Institute of Science-Campus, Bangalore,
- 8 India
- 9 ⁴Satellite Observation Center, National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Japan

10 Corresponding Authors

11 Saroj Kumar Sahu (<u>sks.evs@buodisha.edu.in</u>)





12 Abstract

13	Methane (CH ₄) is a predominant climate-forcing agent and has become a focal point of
14	global climate discussions, owing to its significant contribution to atmospheric warming.
15	The ambiguity surrounding the relative contributions of various natural and anthropogenic
16	sources, coupled with associated uncertainties, poses significant challenges to assessing
17	methane emissions in developing nations like India. To address these challenges and better
18	understand the methane-emitting sources, this study presents a comprehensive high-
19	resolution gridded (0.1°×0.1°) inventory of CH_4 emission by including 25 distinct
20	anthropogenic and natural sources in India for 2023 by adopting the IPCC bottom-up
21	approach. The estimated CH_4 over India is 37.79 Tg/yr, which will redefine the contribution
22	of various sources. The agriculture sector contributed ${\sim}50\%$ followed by wetlands (8.6%),
23	fossil fuel and waste management. This study reports the first-ever comprehensive
24	emissions from natural sources like wetlands and termites. The Indo-Gangetic Plain (IGP)
25	and coastal states show elevated emissions with Uttar Pradesh contributing the highest
26	(10.8%) followed by Gujarat (9.4%), and Maharashtra (8.6%). However, surprisingly cities
27	exhibit lower CH_4 as compared to other semi-urban/rural regions. This developed dataset
28	can be a valuable input to optimize the climate study by filling the data gap, enabling
29	policymakers to formulate various mitigation measures. The emission dataset can be
30	accessed through the Zenodo repository $\underline{https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14089138}$ (Sahu S.
31	К., 2024).

Keywords: Methane, Greenhouse Gases, Emissions, Anthropogenic and Natural Activities,Climate change



34 **1. Introduction**

35 Methane (CH₄) is the second most abundant and potent greenhouse gas (GHG) in the atmosphere, after Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) (European Commission, 2023). Its ability to trap 36 heat by absorbing outgoing thermal infrared radiation is 28 times more than CO2 resulting in 37 38 16-25% of atmospheric warming to date (Rosentreter et al., 2021). The surface dry-air mole fraction of atmospheric CH, has escalated to 1931 ppb, nearly 2.6 times the level recorded 39 40 in the preindustrial era of 1750 (NOAA, 2024). The significant rise in CH_4 concentrations necessitates urgent mitigation of methane emissions, given its potential to induce near-41 42 term climatic changes and its involvement in the formation of tropospheric ozone.

43 The global CH₄ emissions in 2017 were estimated through the bottom-up approach amounted to be ~747 (602-896) Tg/yr, primarily contributed by anthropogenic sources 44 (Saunois et al., 2020). China is responsible for the highest emissions with more than 20% of 45 the global anthropogenic CH_4 , followed by South Asia (13%), Southeast Asia (8%), and the 46 United States of America (USA) (7%) (Saunois et al., 2020). The anthropogenic emissions are 47 48 attributed to various sources like livestock, agriculture, solid waste, wastewater 49 management, fossil fuel production, biomass burning, etc. Given the extensive domestic and agricultural practices such as livestock and vegetative culture, South Asian regions are 50 a global hotspot of CH₄ emissions (Saunois et al., 2020). Keeping the diversity of methane 51 sources across the world, the real challenge lies in identifying the country-specific prevailing 52 and predominant sources that may have a disproportionate contribution to the national 53 54 total emissions. Understanding regional sources in developing nations like India is paramount, where the spatial diversity of sources is much more complex, to identify and 55 56 quantify methane emissions comprehensively. As per India's third Biennial Update Report 57 to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Indian agriculture sectors contributed nearly 75% of national total methane emissions in 2016 58 59 (excluding Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry) (MoEFCC, 2021). Owing to this report, the Government of India (GoI) has implemented numerous policies like the National 60 Livestock Mission, Gobar-Dhan Scheme, National Biogas and Organic Manure Programme, 61





62 National Mission for Sustainable Agriculture, National Innovations in Climate Resilient Agriculture, and Swachh Bharat Mission under Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) 63 to curtail CH₄ like GHGs. However, India has not signed the 'Global Methane Pledge' 64 65 proposed by the European Union and the United States of America to target a 30% reduction in global methane emissions from 2020 levels by 2030. Since, India is one of the largest 66 producers and exporters of agricultural products, particularly from paddy cultivation and 67 livestock farming, addressing food security both domestically and globally is crucial. 68 69 Consequently, the CH₄ from these sources are viewed as survival emissions rather than luxury emissions (MoEFCC, 2023). 70

71 National multi-sectoral CH₄ emissions were last reported by Garg et al. (2011) for the base year 2008 at the district level (Garg et al., 2011). Although some global inventories have 72 73 reported CH₄ emissions from India in recent years, they primarily relied on Tier I top-down 74 approach, resulting in erratic estimations for several sectors (EDGAR, 2023, Saunois et al., 2016). Given the lack of systematic reporting of sector-specific high-resolution activity data, 75 76 there is a huge challenge in filling the data gaps that estimate comprehensive sectoral CH4 77 emissions in India. Parasher et al. (1996) reported 4 Tg/yr of CH4 from paddy fields for the first time in 1991. Since then, various studies focusing on specific sectors have been 78 conducted, with livestock, solid waste management, and biomass burning being the most 79 80 extensively examined sectors concerning CH_4 emission. The CH_4 from the livestock sector have ranged between 7.26 Tg/yr and 15.5 Tg/yr from 1990 to 2022 (EDGAR, 2023, Garg et al., 81 2001). Notably, there have been only four national multi-sectoral emission inventories 82 during this period, all of which were conducted by Garg et al. (2001, 2006, 2011), where the 83 84 estimated methane ranges from 17.05 Tg/yr to 20.57 Tg/yr for 1990 and 2008. Apart from 85 livestock and paddy, the waste management sector, encompassing solid waste burning and 86 landfilling, and both domestic and industrial wastewater sectors, is also responsible for a 87 significant share of CH₄. Similarly, activities based on biomass and fossil fuels contribute substantially to national CH_4 emissions. However, the lack of updated sector-specific 88 89 activity data and the coarse spatial distribution of emissions render these estimates 90 incompatible, and huge data gaps lead to large uncertainties in climate studies.





91 Furthermore, it has been observed that many natural and unmonitored sources were excluded from earlier estimates, adding to the uncertainty in identifying regional hotspots. 92 The temporal and spatial diversity of sources outlines the necessity of an updated emission 93 94 inventory (Sahu et al., 2023, Mangaraj et al., 2022a, 2022b, 2024a, 2024b, Janardan et al., 2024). 95 This study provides a comprehensive development and spatial analysis of sectoral methane (CH_{A}) hotspots across India at a fine resolution of 0.1° × 0.1° by incorporating 25 natural and 96 97 anthropogenic sources for the year 2023. This study also offers strategic targets for further climate research. The newly developed methane emission database will be invaluable, not 98 only for advancing regional climate research by filling the data gap in the country but also as 99 an essential tool for policymakers in formulating mitigation strategies. 100

101 2. Methodology

102 The present attempt is intended to quantify the recent methane emission budget for India in 2023. The study targets 25 natural and anthropogenic sources, including livestock, rice crop 103 fields, wetlands, oil & gas, solid waste, wastewater, and biomass burning, termite, 104 105 transportation etc., which are the significant emission sectors in the country. The sourcespecific emissions are estimated in accordance with the IPCC tier II/III country-specific 106 107 technological emission factors-based bottom-up approach methodology presented in the supplementary file (Sahu et al., 2023a, 2023b, 2021, 2024, Mangaraj et al., 2022a, 2022b, 108 2024a, 2024b, Sahoo et al., 2024, Samal et al., 2024). The importance of the bottom-up 109 approach lies in the compilation of high-resolution activity data (AD) and regional emission 110 111 factors (EF). The AD entails gathering comprehensive information at each source level, such 112 as species-wise population data of livestock, water regime-wise crop area and cropping 113 pattern for rice and sugarcane cropping, high-resolution spatial information of each source for thermal power plants (TPP), wastewater treatment facilities, type of wetland area for 114 wetlands, vehicular type, volume of traffic and driving pattern, technology used, age of 115 116 vehicles, fuel use for transportation, waste and wastewater generation waste management, 117 temperature data for wetland, etc. Similarly, country-specific EF is a pivotal component of developing emission inventory as the sensitivity of the EF decides the uncertainty in the 118





estimation and leads to inappropriate spatial patterns of gridded emission. This study ratified the country-specific proxy-level technological EFs for estimation. The details of AD and EF are presented in supplementary Tables S1, S2, S3, and S4 respectively. The methodology, uncertainty estimation, and spatial allocation of emission are presented in the supplementary file.

124 3. Results and discussion

125 **3.1 Sectoral contribution to total CH₄ emission**

The total methane emissions, estimated from 25 types of sources (natural and 126 anthropogenic) in India, is ~37.79 Tg/yr in 2023. The agricultural sector, encompassing both 127 128 livestock and crop fields, emerged as the predominant contributor, accounting for nearly half (~49%) of the nation's methane emissions. Specifically, livestock enteric fermentation 129 130 alone is responsible for approximately one-third of agricultural sector emissions, while rice crop fields contributed about 13%. Wetlands constituted the next significant source, 131 contributing more than one-fifth (8.6 Tg/yr) of the national total. This is followed by 132 133 emissions from fossil fuel-based activities, which accounted for approximately 9% (3.35 Tg/yr), waste management (~8%), biomass burning (~5%), cooking activities (~4%), and 134 other miscellaneous sources comprising about ~2% of the total emissions, as illustrated in 135 136 Figure 1 (a).

In the case of livestock, cattle are the major contributors, emitting 6.03 Tg/yr (~51%) 137 138 of methane due to enteric fermentation. Notably, indigenous cattle are identified as the largest contributors within this category, responsible for ~37% of the emissions, followed by 139 crossbred cattle (~14%). It is observed that non-dairy cattle contributed more significantly 140 to methane (~33%) than dairy cattle (~18%). Buffaloes also contributed a substantial ~40% 141 to the emissions, with non-dairy buffaloes being the primary emitters (~24%), followed by 142 143 goats (~5%), sheep (~3%), and other livestock species as shown in Figure 1 (b). Moreover, a 144 similar trend is observed in manure management, where cattle are the leading contributors, responsible for ~45% of methane emissions, followed by buffaloes (~39%), poultry (~8%), 145 pigs (~2.5%), goats (~2%), and other species. 146







147





Fig 1: (a) Sectoral Contribution of CH4 emission (%), (b) Livestock (%) in 2023





150 Wetlands have emerged as the second largest source of natural source of CH₄ 151 emissions in India, where the inland wetlands contribute the highest (~17%) followed by rice fields (~13%). The present attempt examines the comprehensive coastal CH_4 budget, 152 revealing that the marine wetlands in coastal areas emit roughly 1.85 Tg/yr. Additionally, the 153 154 sensitive mangrove ecosystems release 0.84 Tg/yr into the atmosphere. The emission analysis also included data on rice and sugarcane cropping areas, as well as irrigation 155 156 statistics, retrieved from the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare. The findings indicate that flooded agricultural lands contribute more significantly to methane emissions 157 compared to single-irrigation or drought-prone regions, with rice fields alone responsible for 158 5.65 Tg/yr of CH₄. In addition to wetlands and agricultural lands, MSW landfills are identified 159 as a major source of methane emissions, releasing approximately 2 Tg/yr. This is followed 160 by cooking activities (~1.4 Tg/yr) where residential cooking in both rural and urban localities, 161 slum areas, as well as commercial cooking activities do contribute a good fraction. 162

Further, methane emissions from coal mining and oil and gas extraction processes collectively amount to 1.74 Tg/yr. Additionally, crude oil refining processes contribute another 1 Tg of CH₄. The transport and TPP sector, which rely on these fossil fuels, emit an extra 0.62 Tg/yr. Smaller, but noteworthy, contributions come from fugitive sources like brick kilns and crematories, emitting 0.23 Tg/yr. Lastly, natural methane emissions from termites were also accounted for, contributing approximately 1.5% to the total CH₄ in 2023.

169 3.2 Spatial variability in CH₄

The spatially resolved estimated CH₄ emissions are crucial in identifying precise dominating 170 sources over particular regions. The resolution of the inventory is a significant parameter, as 171 it allows for the precise identification of hotspots and associated dominating sectors 172 contributing to high emissions. As illustrated in Figure 2(a), CH_4 from livestock are 173 174 particularly predominant in Western India, the Indo-Gangetic Plain, and the Deccan 175 Plateau. Specifically, the province of Uttar Pradesh contributed the most (~16%) to CH_4 176 emissions from the livestock sector as it outnumbered the other states in cattle and buffalo 177 population. It is then followed by Rajasthan (~10%), Madhya Pradesh (~9%), Bihar (~7%) and





Gujarat (~7%). It is very interesting to note that the top 160 districts (out of 785 districts) are responsible for nearly half of the livestock CH_4 emissions with Banas Kantha district in Gujarat being the largest emitter with ~99 Gg/yr.

181 Natural sources like wetlands, especially inland water bodies that constitute rivers, lakes, and ponds are the second largest sources of CH4 emissions and are well scattered 182 across the country. Figure 2(b) reveals that Eastern India is more susceptible to such 183 184 emissions induced by inland water bodies compared to Western India, largely due to the eastward flow of most major river systems towards the Bay of Bengal. The Ganges, 185 Brahmaputra, Mahanadi, and Godavari river basins, which span the Eastern, Northeastern, 186 187 Deccan, and Southern peninsular regions, are identified as significant sources of wetlandbased CH₄ emissions. As some of the notable rivers originated from the Western Ghats and 188 flowed east, the Southern peninsula and the Deccan plateau region became a web of CH_4 189 emission, as presented in Figure 2(b). However, Gujarat comes out as the highest with 1205 190 Gg/yr (~18%) emitting state from inland water bodies for the Rann of Kachchh and the 191 192 presence of significant water bodies like Narmada, Tapti and Sabarmati rivers and several lakes and ponds. In addition to it, this study also encompasses emissions from coastal and 193 mangrove forest emissions. Although the Andaman and Nicobar Islands have the largest 194 coastline in India, Gujarat leads in CH₄ emissions from coastal water bodies, contributing 195 approximately 506 Gg/yr (27%), primarily due to the presence of numerous coastal creeks. 196 Further, West Bengal is the highest emitter of CH₄ from the mangrove ecosystem with 65.1 197 Gg/yr (52%) due to the Sundarbans delta region. Hence, overall, Gujarat emerges as the 198 199 highest emitting state from wetlands, accounting for approximately 20%, followed by the 200 Andaman and Nicobar Islands (12%), Andhra Pradesh (12%), Maharashtra (12%), and 201 Odisha (10%), It is noteworthy that the top 25 districts contribute to more than half of the total CH₄ from wetlands, with the Kachchh district of Gujarat being the largest emitter from 202 203 the wetland sector. This is followed by North and Middle Andaman (Andaman and Nicobar 204 Islands), South 24 Parganas (West Bengal), South Andaman (Andaman and Nicobar 205 Islands), and Nellore (Andhra Pradesh).





206 The spatial distribution of CH_4 from cropland exhibits a pattern closely aligned with 207 that of inland wetlands, particularly in regions where intensive cropping practices are 208 observed near freshwater bodies and experiencing monsoons. Indo-Gangetic basin, Brahmaputra basin, East Coastal, and the Deccan plateau states are the major rice and 209 210 sugarcane-producing states, as shown in Figure 2(c). Telangana, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal are the largest rice-producing states while Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, and 211 212 Karnataka lead in sugarcane production (MoA & FW, 2024). Consequently, Uttar Pradesh emerges as the highest contributor to CH₄ from crop fields, accounting for approximately 213 1022 Gg/yr (18%) of the total, followed by West Bengal 663 Gg/yr (12%), Chhattisgarh 435 214 Gg/yr (8%), Bihar 418 Gg/yr (7%) and Telangana 409 Gg/yr (7%). Notably, over 50% of total 215 emissions from crop fields originate from the top 90 districts out of which Nalgonda 216 (Telangana), Paschim Medinipur (West Bengal) and Karimnagar (Telangana) are the leading 217 emitters. 218

219 Waste management poses a significant challenge in developing India, where the 220 burden of waste and its associated pollution has adversely affected urban living conditions. It is evident from Figure 2(d) that the Indo-Gangetic Basin states are more susceptible to high 221 222 emissions than rest India. In solid waste management like burning and landfilling, Uttar Pradesh contributes ~ 303 Gg/yr (13%), followed by Maharashtra ~ 229 Gg/yr (10%) and Bihar 223 ~ 200 Gg/yr (9%). Similarly, in the wastewater management sector, Maharashtra is the 224 225 largest contributor, responsible for approximately 202 Gg/yr (23%), with Gujarat, Uttar 226 Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu contributing 97 Gg/yr (11%), 79 Gg/yr (9%), and 76 Gg/yr (8%), 227 respectively. Collectively, Maharashtra accounts for the highest proportion of methane 228 emissions from the waste management sector, with 14%, followed by Uttar Pradesh and 229 Gujarat, with 12% and 7%, respectively. Further analysis indicates that more than half of the CH₄ emissions from the combined waste management sector originate from the top 100 230 231 districts across the country.

232 Methane is also primarily attributed to traditional fossil fuel consumption for energy, 233 which includes coal mining, TPP, oil & gas extraction, refineries, and transportation activity.





234 The states in the Central and Eastern India region, like Chhattisgarh, Odisha, Jharkhand, and 235 Madhya Pradesh collectively emit two-thirds of CH₄ emissions due to intense coal mining 236 activities and substantial coal reserves within these regions. Further, the presence of highcapacity oil refineries in states like Gujarat, Maharashtra, and Assam over Western, and 237 238 North-Eastern regions is jointly responsible for half of the emissions from the Oil & Gas sector. Though a very small amount is emitted from TPP, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, 239 240 Chhattisgarh, Uttar Pradesh and Odisha contribute nearly 50% of emissions due to the presence of supercritical and ultra-supercritical power units. Similarly, significant 241 transport-related emissions dominated over industrialized and populated states like 242 243 Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and Tamil Nadu, resulting in more than onethird contribution. The inclusive emission from all the sectors shows that Gujarat, 244 Maharashtra, and Assam emit one-third of total from fossil fuel-based activity, as shown in 245 Figure 2(e). The Jamnagar in Gujarat emerges as the largest emitter in India, primarily due to 246 247 the presence of the country's largest oil refinery.













Fig 2: Sectoral methane emission from India in 2023 (a) Livestock, (b) Wetland, (c) Rice and
 Sugarcane Crop Field, (d) Waste Management, (e) Fossil Fuel based Activities, (f)
 Remaining sector.

251 In addition to the above sources, there are several sectors contributing to methane emission, including organized and unorganized sectors like cooking activities, forest fires, 252 crop residue burning, brick kilns, crematories, and termites. Given the high rural population 253 254 density in the Indo-Gangetic region compared to the rest of India, emissions from solid fuel 255 and biomass-based cooking activities are notably higher, with Uttar Pradesh and Bihar alone 256 responsible for more than one-fourth of these emissions (MoHA, 2011). In accordance with 257 the shifting cultivation practices in Northeastern India, emissions from forest fires are predominant in that region. Nearly two-thirds of CH₄ come from those Northeastern states, 258 with Mizoram and Assam contributing ~ 139 Gg/yr (16%) and 112 Gg/yr (14%), respectively. 259 Methane from crop residue burning is predominant in Punjab, responsible for nearly one-260 fourth of emissions from this sector. Three major agricultural states, Punjab, Madhya 261 262 Pradesh, and Maharashtra, collectively emit approximately half of CH₄ emissions. The unorganized brick kilns sector is particularly found in Indo-Gangetic regions and Central 263 264 India, where rural population density is high (MoHA, 2011). Though fly ash and concrete bricks are replacing mud bricks in urban and semi-urban areas, Northern states like Uttar 265 Pradesh, Bihar, and Rajasthan still contribute nearly one-third of emissions from this sector. 266 267 Cremation, a practice predominantly associated with the Hindu religion, is another 268 unorganized source of methane emissions, with the number of Hindu adherents in a state 269 serving as a key regulatory factor. Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra emit 15 Gg/yr of CH₄ out 270 of 30 Gg/yr from the cremation of the deceased. Natural sources of CH₄, such as those from 271 termites, have also been accounted for in this study. Emissions were estimated using forest area as a proxy, with dense forests in Jammu and Kashmir contributing to higher termite 272 273 biomass and, consequently, greater CH4 emissions. Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, 274 and Odisha jointly contribute one-third of emissions from the termites. The state-wise top 275 three dominating sectors and districts listed in Table S5 can be used for mitigation.





- The grid-wise analysis depicts in Figure 3 that 11,740 (~40%) out of 30,185 grids
- account for more than 1 Gg/yr of methane. The methane footprint of Indians is found to be
- 278 27 kg and the per square km area is attributed to 11.6 tonnes.



279

280

Figure 3: Spatial distribution of methane emission for India in 2023

281 **3.3 Intercomparison with previous studies**

The intercomparison of CH₄ emissions amongst the current study and previously published papers gives insight into sector-specific contributions and reveals the concurrence and discrepancies in findings over time. Notably, the national-scale comprehensive CH₄ emissions from various types of wetland systems and termites are reported for the first time





286 in this study. The latest estimate of methane emissions from India, as reported by EDGAR, 287 2023, amounts to 32.3 Tg/yr in 2022. The current study observes a consistent trend of contribution to total emission across most sectors; however, the estimated emissions from 288 289 wastewater are remarkably high, exceeding the current estimate by more than sevenfold. 290 Unlike the current estimation, EDGAR's lack of regional emission factors has led to some erratic estimates across various sectors. The current study identifies livestock as the largest 291 292 contributor, with methane emissions amounting to 13 Tg/yr. This figure is relatively consistent with the EDGAR (2023), which reports a slightly higher value of 15.5 Tg/yr. 293 Previous studies, including those by Samal et al. (2024), Garg et al. (2011) and Garg et al. 294 (2006), reported emissions of 12.74 Tg/yr, 10.11 Tg/yr, and 10.62 Tg/yr, respectively, for base 295 296 years 2019, 2008, and 2005, indicating that livestock has consistently been recognized as a 297 major source of methane. The variation in estimates is attributable to adopted emission factors, followed by differences in livestock population, feeding practices, and upgraded 298 299 manure management strategies employed in these studies. It is also important to note that, 300 the current estimate reveals that the agriculture sector comprising livestock and paddy fields accounts for nearly half of the total CH4 emission, which debunks the earlier reporting 301 302 of the agriculture sector attributed to two-thirds of total emissions from India (Garg et al., 303 2001, 2006, 2011, EDGAR, 2023). Agricultural activities, particularly rice and sugarcane 304 cultivation, contribute 5.65 Tg/yr of methane according to the present study, aligning with 305 the understanding that India's status as a major rice producer significantly influences global 306 methane from this sector. However, the EDGAR (2023) inventory reports a lower emission 307 figure of 4.1 Tg/yr from agriculture, which may have resulted from emission factors associated with irrigated versus rain-fed rice paddies. Garg et al. (2011) and Garg et al. 308 309 (2006) reported lower emissions from agriculture, at 3.88 Tg/yr and 4.02 Tg/yr, respectively. 310 These discrepancies may reflect changes in agricultural practices, water management practices, or even climatic conditions that affect methane emissions from paddy fields. 311

In the current study, methane emissions from waste management are found to be substantial, with 2.27 Tg/yr attributed to moderate solid waste management, including both open waste burning and landfilling, and 0.9 Tg/yr from the treatment of residential and





315 industrial wastewater. By contrast, the EDGAR (2023) reports significantly higher emissions 316 from wastewater at 6.7 Tg/yr, yet lower rate from solid waste at 0.73 Tg/yr. This discrepancy may stem from differences in the scope and methodologies employed in estimating 317 emissions from urban versus rural waste management practices. Garg et al. (2011, 2006) 318 319 reported methane of 1.71 Tg/yr and 0.96 Tg/yr from solid waste, and 0.17 Tg/yr and 0.67 Tg/yr from wastewater for the years 2008 and 2005, respectively. Although these figures are lower 320 321 than those reported in the current study, they suggest a consistent trend in the contribution of waste management to methane emissions over time. In the fossil fuel sector, including 322 323 emissions from coal mining, the current study estimates methane at 1.95 Tg/yr, with 0.78 324 Tg/yr specifically attributed to coal-mines. In comparison, EDGAR (2023) reports a lower total of 0.7 Tg/yr from fossil fuel activities, suggesting potential underestimation or 325 differences in methodologies used to account for fugitive emissions. Garg et al. (2011, 2006) 326 reported 1.07 Tg/yr and 0.79 Tg/yr of methane emissions from fossil fuels, in the respective 327 studies, which are lower figures but still indicate a recognized contribution from this sector 328 329 over time. The current study estimates methane from biomass burning at 1.8 Tg while 330 emissions from cooking activities contribute 1.42 Tg/yr. These figures align somewhat with 331 previous estimates, such as the 1.6 Tg/yr for biomass burning reported in EDGAR (2023). 332 However, estimates for cooking activities vary significantly across studies. For instance, Garg et al. (2011) reported 2.23 Tg/yr, and Pandey et al. (2014) estimated 2.31 Tg/yr, both of 333 334 which are higher than the current study's figure. These variations could reflect differences 335 in the types of fuels considered, the efficiency of stoves, or regional cooking practices. The 336 intercomparison between the current and previous studies is illustrated in Figure 4.







337 338

Figure 4: Inter-comparison between current and previous studies.

339 In the current study, natural sources such as wetlands contribute 8.6 Tg/yr of 340 methane (the second most dominant contributor), a notable figure that has not been 341 explicitly detailed in many previous studies. The inclusion of wetlands as a significant 342 source in this study underscores a growing recognition of their importance in methane inventories, likely due to advancements in methodologies for measuring emissions from 343 344 these ecosystems. While there is a consensus that India is a sink to substantial natural 345 sources of methane, the exact magnitude varies considerably across studies due to differences in methodologies, emission factors used, and the scope of sectors considered. 346 Traditionally, livestock, agriculture, and solid waste have been acknowledged as major 347 contributors. However, the current study emphasizes the higher contributions from natural 348



365

366



sources like wetlands and man-made solid waste, reflecting an evolving understanding of
 methane emissions in India.

351 **3.4 Uncertainty Estimation**

Although the current study on methane emissions in India is extensive, it 352 353 acknowledges inherent limitations in its estimations. The reliance on secondary activity 354 data and emission factors and the lack of sufficient details introduces a degree of 355 uncertainty. Despite these limitations, the study addresses crucial aspects of filling the data gap and providing support to climate modeling and will be instrumental in identifying 356 357 methane hotspots across the country. It will also enhance the quantification of the roles 358 played by various natural and anthropogenic sources in the country, thereby assisting policymakers in implementing advanced technological mitigation strategies to reduce 359 360 methane emissions. The uncertainty of all the individual sectors lies in the range of ± 32-161% where the natural sources like wetlands and termites have higher uncertainty levels 361 of ± 137% and ±161% respectively. The uncertainty estimated from waste management is 362 363 restricted to ± 33%. The overall uncertainty of the current CH4 emission inventory is found to be ± 59%. The sector-specific uncertainty level is illustrated in Figure 5. 364









367 4. Conclusion

368	The present study not only addresses the reporting of the most recent gridded
369	methane dataset over India by synthesizing country-specific 25 distinct major and minor
370	natural and anthropogenic sources but also fills the gap in the country's methane budget.
371	The total methane emissions for the most recent base year, i.e., 2023, are found to be 37.79
372	Tg/yr, with approximately 75% attributed to anthropogenic activities. Methane data will be
373	a crucial input not only for climate modeling but also for understanding India's contribution
374	to the global methane budget. The study reports many sub-sectors of wetlands and
375	termites, which are the first-of-its-kind to strengthen the understanding of methane
376	emissions in India. his newly developed state-of-the-art, high-resolution gridded methane
377	dataset would be valuable input for climate models to optimize simulation.

378 Funding:

This full research work did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

381 Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

384 Data availability statements

- 385 The data supporting this article has been included as part of the Supplementary Information.
- 386 The emission dataset can be accessed through the open-access data repository Zenodo.
- Methane Emission Data [Dataset]. <u>https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14089138</u>. (Sahu, S. K.,
 2024).
- 389 Author contributions:





- 390 AM wrote the whole paper and analyzed and plotted the scientific data for necessary
- 391 discussion. PM and PS helped in the analysis and provided useful insight. GB and RJ
- 392 reviewed the article and suggested a justified conclusion, and SKS conceived the present
- idea, analyzed the data and reviewed the manuscript.



394 References

- 395 EDGAR The Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research:
 396 https://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/report_2023.
- European Commission: Methane emissions, https://energy.ec.europa.eu/topics/carbon management-and-fossil-fuels/methane-emissions_en.
- Garg, A., Bhattacharya, S., Shukla, P. R., and Dadhwal, V. K.: Regional and sectoral
 assessment of greenhouse gas emissions in India, Atmospheric Environment, 35,
 2679–2695, https://doi.org/10.1016/s1352-2310(00)00414-3, 2001.
- Garg, A., Shukla, P. R., and Kapshe, M.: The sectoral trends of multigas emissions inventory
 of India, Atmospheric Environment, 40, 4608–4620,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.03.045, 2006.
- Garg, A., Kankal, B., and Shukla, P. R.: Methane emissions in India: Sub-regional and
 sectoral trends, Atmospheric Environment, 45, 4922–4929,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.06.004, 2011.
- Janardanan, R., Maksyutov, S., Wang, F., Nayagam, L., Sahu, S. K., Mangaraj, P., Saunois,
 M., Lan, X., and Matsunaga, T.: Country-level methane emissions and their sectoral
 trends during 2009–2020 estimated by high-resolution inversion of GOSAT and surface
 observations, Environmental Research Letters, 19, 034007–034007,
 https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad2436, 2024.
- Mangaraj, P., Sahu, S. K., Beig, G., and Yadav, R.: A comprehensive high-resolution gridded
 emission inventory of anthropogenic sources of air pollutants in Indian megacity
 Kolkata, SN Applied Sciences, 4, https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-022-05001-3,
 2022a.
- Mangaraj, P., Sahu, S. K., Beig, G., and Samal, B.: Development and assessment of inventory
 of air pollutants that deteriorate the air quality in Indian megacity Bengaluru, Journal
 of Cleaner Production, 360, 132209, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.132209,
 2022b.





- Mangaraj, P., Sahu, S. K., and Beig, G.: Development of emission inventory for air quality
 assessment and mitigation strategies over most populous Indian megacity, Mumbai,
 Urban Climate, 55, 101928–101928, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2024.101928,
 2024a.
- Mangaraj, P., Sahu, S. K., Beig, G., Mishra, A., and Sharma, S.: What Makes the Indian
 Megacity Chennai's Air Unhealthy? A Bottom-up Approach to Understand the
 Sources of Air Pollutants, Aerosol and Air Quality Research, 24, 240089–240089,
 https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.240089, 2024b.
- MoA & FW: Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare: Production Of Important Crops in
 Three Largest Producing States in 2023-24* (Production in Million Tonnes) ,
 Government of India, 2024.
- MoEFCC: India Third Biennial Update Report to The United Nations Framework Convention
 on Climate Change, 2021.
- 434 MoEFCC: Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Measures to Reduce
 435 Methane Emissions:
- https://pib.gov.in/PressReleaselframePage.aspx?PRID=1942106#:~:text=Governmen
 t%20of%20India%20promotes%20green, 2023. last access: 7 September 2024.
- Census of India 2011, National Population Register & Socio Economic and Caste Census India: https://censusindia.gov.in/nada/index.php/catalog/42619.
- 440 NOAA, Global Monitoring Laboratory Carbon Cycle Greenhouse Gases:
 441 https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/trends_ch4.
- Pandey, A., Sadavarte, P., Rao, A. B., and Venkataraman, C.: Trends in multi-pollutant
 emissions from a technology-linked inventory for India: II. Residential, agricultural and
 informal industry sectors, Atmospheric Environment, 99, 341–352,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.09.080, 2014.
- Parashar, D. C., Mitra, A. P., Gupta, P. K., Rai, J., Sharma, R. C., Singh, N., Koul, S., Ray, H.
 S., Das, S. N., Parida, K. M., Rao, S. B., Kanungo, S. P., Ramasami, T., Nair, B. U.,





Swamy, M., Singh, G., Gupta, S. K., Singh, A. R., Saikia, B. K., and Batua, A. K. S.:
Methane budget from paddy fields in India, Chemosphere, 33, 737–757,
https://doi.org/10.1016/0045-6535(96)00223-8, 1996.

- Rosentreter, J. A., Borges, A. V., Deemer, B. R., Holgerson, M. A., Liu, S., Song, C., Melack,
 J., Raymond, P. A., Duarte, C. M., Allen, G. H., Olefeldt, D., Poulter, B., Battin, T. I., and
 Eyre, B. D.: Half of global methane emissions come from highly variable aquatic
 ecosystem sources, Nature Geoscience, 14, 225–230,
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-021-00715-2, 2021.
- Sahoo, P., Sahu, S. K., Mangaraj, P., Mishra, A., Beig, G., and Gunthe, S. S.: Reporting of
 Gridded Ammonia Emission and Assessment of Hotspots across India: A
 comprehensive study of 24 anthropogenic sources, Journal of Hazardous Materials,
 479, 135557–135557, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2024.135557, 2024.
- Sahu, S. K., Mangaraj, P., Beig, G., Samal, A., Pradhan, C., Dash, S., and Tyagi, B.:
 Quantifying the high resolution seasonal emission of air pollutants from crop residue
 burning in India, Environmental Pollution, 286, 117165,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.117165, 2021.
- Sahu, S. K., Mangaraj, P., and Beig, G.: Decadal growth in emission load of major air
 pollutants in Delhi, Earth System Science Data, 15, 3183–3202,
 https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-3183-2023, 2023a.
- Sahu, S. K., Mangaraj, P., Beig, G., Lund, M. T., Samset, B. H., Sahoo, P., and Mishra, A.:
 Development and comprehensive analysis of spatially resolved technological high
 resolution (0.1°×0.1°) Emission Inventory of Particulate Matter for India: A step
 Towards Air Quality Mitigation, Earth System Science Data Discussion,
 https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2023-310, 2023b.
- 472 Sahu, S. K.: Methane Emission Data [Data set]. Zenodo.
 473 <u>https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14089138</u>, 2024.





474	Sahu, S. K., Mishra, M., Mishra, A., Mangaraj, P., and Beig, G.: Quantification and
475	assessment of hazardous mercury emission from industrial process and other
476	unattended sectors in India: A step towards mitigation, Journal of Hazardous
477	Materials, 470, 134103–134103, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2024.134103,
478	2024.
479	Samal, A., Sahu, S. K., Mishra, A., Mangaraj, P., Pani, S. K., and Beig, G.: Assessment and
480	Quantification of Methane Emission from Indian Livestock and Manure Management,
481	Aerosol and air quality research, 24, 230204–230204,
482	https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.230204, 2024.
483	Saunois, M., Bousquet, P., Poulter, B., Peregon, A., Ciais, P., Canadell, J. G., Dlugokencky,
484	E. J., Etiope, G., Bastviken, D., Houweling, S., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Tubiello, F. N.,
485	Castaldi, S., Jackson, R. B., Alexe, M., Arora, V. K., Beerling, D. J., Bergamaschi, P.,
486	Blake, D. R., and Brailsford, G.: The global methane budget 2000–2012, Earth System
487	Science Data, 8, 697–751, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-8-697-2016, 2016.
488	Saunois, M., Stavert, A. R., Poulter, B., Bousquet, P., Canadell, J. G., Jackson, R. B.,
489	Raymond, P. A., Dlugokencky, E. J., Houweling, S., Patra, P. K., Ciais, P., Arora, V. K.,
490	Bastviken, D., Bergamaschi, P., Blake, D. R., Brailsford, G., Bruhwiler, L., Carlson, K.
491	M., Carrol, M., and Castaldi, S.: The Global Methane Budget 2000–2017, Earth System
492	Science Data, 12, 1561–1623, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-1561-2020, 2020.