

JOINT NGO PRESS RELEASE

Postponing methane rules will not solve Europe's energy security challenges: over 50 organisations oppose delaying the EU Methane Regulation

Brussels, 13 October 2026 - Following the European Commission's announcement of a [proposed delay](#) to the EU Methane Regulation for imported fossil fuels, a coalition of over 50 organisations warns that postponing methane rules will not address Europe's energy security and affordability challenges. **The Regulation [did not cause](#) the current energy price crisis or supply disruptions, and delaying its implementation will not solve them.**

As EU leaders meet in Brussels for the European Council to discuss, among other issues, the proposed delay to the EU Methane Regulation, the [European Civil Society Observatory on Methane \(CSO-M\)](#) urges them to prioritise implementation and deliver the energy security, climate and transparency benefits the law was designed to achieve.

Methane is a short-lived super pollutant responsible for around one-third of current global warming. As public mobilisation for ambitious climate action grows, with [60,000](#) citizens taking to the streets of Brussels last Sunday, the urgency to act is clear, and the EU cannot afford to delay one of the fastest and most cost-effective ways to tackle the climate crisis and strengthen energy security.

The fossil fuel sector offers some of the greatest opportunities for cuts: more than [200 billion cubic metres of gas](#) are wasted globally each year through methane leaks, venting and flaring - equivalent to around two-thirds of the EU's annual gas consumption. **Europe cannot improve energy security by delaying measures designed to reduce energy waste.**

Global supply shocks and Europe's dependence on fossil fuels are driving current market pressures. There is no evidence that delaying the Regulation will increase gas supplies, lower prices or improve market stability, as the Commission itself [has acknowledged](#). Reopening legislation agreed just two years ago risks undermining regulatory certainty and penalising companies and producing countries that have already invested in methane monitoring and reporting systems.

Delaying and weakening the EU Methane Regulation would also carry a heavy human and economic cost. According to [new analysis by DIW Econ](#), **full and timely implementation could deliver around €704 billion in climate, health and economic benefits**, compared with €49 billion in regulatory costs. The Regulation could also prevent an estimated 155,000 premature deaths worldwide by 2030. By contrast, a three-year delay coupled with weaker methane requirements would forfeit about a quarter of these benefits, resulting in an additional €185 billion in damages and around 40,000 more premature deaths.

JOINT NGO PRESS RELEASE

Strong support from the [public, investors](#) and [transatlantic civil society organizations](#) reinforces the need to safeguard EU methane rules. The CSO-M coalition calls on the European Commission and Member States to:

Protect the Regulation's ambition. The Commission's proposal already goes beyond a one-year delay for MRV equivalence reporting and extends the postponement to methane intensity requirements. Significant flexibility has already been provided, including a three-year suspension of penalties. The priority must now be implementation, not further concessions.

Prevent further weakening during negotiations. The Commission's proposal already introduces substantial changes to the implementation timeline. Member States and the European Parliament must ensure a controlled and expedited legislative process, avoiding broader renegotiation of the Regulation, additional delays or weakening of its substantive requirements.

Accelerate implementation. Member States and the Commission must take responsibility for this proposed delay and create the needed incentives for a continuous implementation of the obligations that are already in force. In parallel, they must take responsibility for resolving technical challenges, including verification, accreditation and certification, and ensuring their competent authorities are fully operational. The Commission should support consistent implementation by adopting the missing delegated acts and through guidance and coordination, while industry must use the additional time to prepare for compliance.

Quotes:

Esther Bollendorff, Fossil Free Programme Manager at Climate Action Network (CAN) Europe, said:

"Delaying the EU Methane Regulation makes no economic or strategic sense. At a time of yet another energy price crisis and tensions on the gas market, methane mitigation could unlock over 40 bcm of gas from the EU's main fossil fuel suppliers - more than half the volume of US LNG imported by the EU in 2025.

The US war on Iran has already added billions to the EU's fossil fuel import bill, making it clear that the answer to high prices is to end fossil fuel dependence, not to weaken methane rules. Postponing methane obligations for importers is yet another concession to industry pressure and to the US energy dominance agenda. The EU should implement the agreed regulation and make methane mitigation integral to the inevitable need to phase out fossil fuels, and gas in particular."

Dr Léa Pilsner, Director Energy Policy, at Environmental Defense Fund Europe, said:

"Europe cannot afford to lose another year in the fight against methane. Every delay means more wasted gas, higher costs, and more climate damage. The responsibility now lies with Member States and the

JOINT NGO PRESS RELEASE

European Parliament to ensure any additional time is used to accelerate implementation and keep the EU Methane Regulation on track to deliver emissions reductions as quickly as possible."

Jack Corscadden, Senior Campaigner at Environmental Investigation Agency, said:

"There is no demonstrable link between the implementation of the EU methane rules and the current energy supply challenges. After a summer of record-breaking heatwaves and wildfires, the Commission is failing European citizens by delaying this vital piece of climate legislation to appease fossil fuel producers and exporters.

This delay will do nothing to overcome the implementation challenges that exist and risks opening a Pandora's box of industry lobbying. As we work towards the phase out of fossil fuels, a stable regulatory framework is needed to drive down methane emissions and safeguard EU energy security."

Stefano Ciafani, President at Legambiente, Italy, said:

"The Regulation should be implemented immediately, without any delay. The climate crisis and its consequences across regions due to extreme weather events - with Mediterranean countries increasingly emerging as a hotspot - urges us to act now. Postponing the Regulation is an unforgivable mistake by European policymakers and by Member States, like Italy, that support such a delay. Providing answers to our local communities, citizens and businesses should be our only real priority."

Eva Corral, Political Campaigner, Greenpeace European Unit, said:

"Europe's energy crisis comes from depending on fossil fuels, not from EU rules to cut pollution. Leaky oil and gas infrastructure wastes energy and accelerates climate chaos with powerful emissions – this is exactly what the methane rules are supposed to stop. Ordinary people are being squeezed time and again by energy crises, but the fossil fuel industry responsible lobbies for weaker and weaker rules to boost their profits. Europe should say no to Trump's energy agenda and put struggling people first."

Pablo Lopez Legarreta, Europe Policy Manager at Clean Air Task Force, said:

"There is no compelling case for postponement, as the financial, legal and reputational risks that have been expressed by industry don't stand up to scrutiny. If implementation deadlines are reopened fuel prices won't be impacted, but there is a real risk that further concessions, additional delays, or broader revisions will be sought. A targeted amendment and delay must not leave us in the same situation one year from today, it must be tied to a measurable and predictable path towards implementation and should be strictly conditional on resolving technical bottlenecks."

JOINT NGO PRESS RELEASE

Notes for editors:

- Rystad analysis “[EU energy security considerations in light of EU MER & the Middle East conflict](#)” commissioned by Environmental Defense Fund Europe
- CAN Europe [policy brief](#) and [factsheet](#) on supplier risks and methane abatement potential
- Climate Crisis Advisory Group (CCAG) analysis on understanding the [Wood Mackenzie 43% claim](#) and the impact of the [EU Methane Regulation on energy prices](#)
- Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC) Statement “[56 investors representing over €9 trillion renew call for EU to uphold Methane Emissions Regulation](#)”
- [99 US Organizations Urge European States to Resist Fossil Fuel Lobbying and Implement a Robust Methane Regulation](#)
- Global Methane Hub (GMH) - Ipsos poll: [citizens in six European countries want the EU's methane rules kept on schedule, and the more they learn about them, the more they back them](#)

About the CSO-M

The [European Civil Society Observatory on Methane](#) (CSO-M) is an independent platform bringing together over 50 civil society organisations across 18 countries working to reduce methane emissions from fossil fuels and support the effective implementation of the EU Methane Regulation.

By connecting science, policy and economics, the Observatory strengthens civil society's capacity to hold governments and industry accountable, share knowledge and coordinate advocacy at both European and national levels.

The CSO-M Secretariat is jointly hosted by [Environmental Defense Fund Europe](#) and [CAN Europe](#).

List of organisations in the CSO-M platform:

1. 2Celsius
2. A Sud
3. Agora Energiewende
4. AirClim
5. Amici della Terra
6. Bond Beter Leefmilieu (BBL)
7. BUND
8. Carraway Strategies
9. CEE Bankwatch Network

JOINT NGO PRESS RELEASE

10. Center for Climate Crime Analysis (CCCA)
11. Centre for Transport and Energy (CDE)
12. Clean Air Action Group (Levegő Munkacsoport)
13. Clean Air Task Force (CATF)
14. Climate Action Group (CCAG)
15. Climate Action Network (CAN) Europe
16. Climate Bonds Initiative
17. Climate Reality Initiative (CRI)
18. Climate Rights International
19. Deutsche Umwelthilfe (DUH)
20. E3G
21. Earthworks
22. ECCO
23. ECODES
24. Ecologic Institute
25. ECOS
26. Ember
27. Environmental Defense Fund Europe
28. Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA)
29. Food & Water Action Europe
30. Fossielvrij
31. Friends of the Earth Europe (FoEE)
32. Friends of the Earth Hungary (MTVSZ)
33. Fundación Renovables
34. Global Strategic Communications Council (GSCC)
35. Global Witness
36. Green Alliance
37. Greenpeace
38. InfluenceMap
39. Institute for Governance & Sustainable Development (IGSD)
40. Instrat
41. Klimatická koalícia
42. Legambiente
43. Les Amis de la Terre France
44. Oil Change International
45. Polish Green Network (Zielona Sieć)
46. Priatel'ia Zeme

JOINT NGO PRESS RELEASE

- 47. Razom We Stand
- 48. Rådet for Grøn Omstilling (RGO)
- 49. Réseau Action Climat (RAC France)
- 50. The Good Forces
- 51. WWF Greece
- 52. WWF Italy
- 53. Za Zemiata