International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation
ISSN: 2582-7138
Impact Factor (RSIF): 7.98
Received: 21-03-2021; Accepted: 27-04-2021
www.allmultidisciplinaryjournal.com
Volume 2; Issue 2; March-April 2021; Page No. 538-543

Framework for Integrating Methane Monitoring Data into Carbon Credit Verification Systems

Semiu Temidayo Fasasi [1*], Oluwapelumi Joseph Adebowale [2], Abdulmaliq Abdulsalam [3], Zamathula Queen Sikhakhane Nwokediegwu [4]
[1] Independent Researcher, Nigeria
[2] Independent Researcher, USA
[3] Independent Researcher, Durban, South Africa
[4] Department of Chemical and Petroleum Engineering, University of Lagos, Nigeria

Corresponding Author: **Semiu Temidayo Fasasi**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2021.2.2.538-543

Abstract
Methane is a critical greenhouse gas with a substantial impact on global warming, making its accurate monitoring and verification essential for effective climate mitigation. This paper presents a comprehensive framework designed to integrate methane monitoring data into carbon credit verification systems, addressing key challenges related to data heterogeneity, quality assurance, and regulatory compliance. The framework delineates robust data processing and validation mechanisms that standardize and authenticate diverse measurement inputs from ground-based sensors, aerial platforms, and satellites. It proposes a modular integration architecture that facilitates seamless data flow, scalability, and traceability, ensuring the integrity of emission reduction claims. By emphasizing transparency, accountability, and adherence to international verification standards, the framework enhances the credibility and environmental integrity of carbon credit markets. The implications for policy and market participants are discussed, highlighting the potential for improved market confidence and more effective methane mitigation strategies. Finally, recommendations for implementation and future research are provided to guide the adoption of this framework and foster innovation in methane emission monitoring and verification. This work contributes a vital methodological foundation to support robust, data-driven climate action and sustainable carbon market development.

Keywords: Methane Monitoring, Carbon Credit Verification, Data Integration, Emission Reduction, Environmental Integrity, Climate Mitigation

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and Importance of Methane Monitoring

Methane is a potent greenhouse gas with a global warming potential significantly higher than carbon dioxide over a 20-year horizon. Its emissions stem from various sources including natural gas production, agriculture, waste management, and wetlands (Howarth, 2015). Due to its substantial contribution to climate change, accurate and timely monitoring of methane emissions is critical for effective environmental management. Understanding the spatial and temporal patterns of methane release is essential to target reduction efforts and to evaluate the impact of mitigation strategies (Balcombe *et al*., 2018, Howarth, 2014).

Recent advances in detection technologies, such as satellite sensing, aerial surveys, and ground-based sensors, have improved the ability to monitor methane emissions with increasing precision. However, the variability in emission sources and the complexity of atmospheric transport processes continue to pose challenges (Le Fevre, 2017, Gatland *et al*., 2014). Reliable methane monitoring provides data that not only supports regulatory compliance but also enables stakeholders to quantify emission reductions for reporting and verification purposes (Balcombe *et al*., 2017, Howarth, 2021).

Moreover, methane monitoring is central to global climate initiatives, including the Global Methane Pledge, which seeks to reduce methane emissions by 30% by 2030 (Costa *et al*., 2021). By providing scientifically robust data, monitoring enables policymakers to design targeted interventions and industry operators to identify leaks and inefficiencies. Thus, methane monitoring forms the foundation for any credible emission reduction program and plays a vital role in the broader context of climate change mitigation (Dean *et al*., 2018, He *et al*., 2021).

1.2. Role of Carbon Credit Verification in Climate Mitigation

Carbon credit verification serves as a critical mechanism to ensure the credibility and integrity of emission reduction claims within carbon markets. These markets incentivize reductions by assigning tradable credits to verified decreases in greenhouse gas emissions (Nardelli, 2012). Verification processes establish that claimed reductions are real, measurable, additional, and permanent, thereby maintaining confidence among investors, regulators, and the public (Leonard, 2009, Kreibich and Hermwille, 2021).

In the context of methane emissions, verification requires integrating monitoring data to quantify reductions accurately. This is particularly important because methane's high warming potential means even small reductions can yield significant climate benefits (Yamin, 2012). Verification frameworks must align with established international standards and protocols, such as those developed by the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) or the Gold Standard, which define rigorous methodologies for data collection, analysis, and reporting (von Unger and Emmer, 2018).

Effective verification also enhances transparency and accountability, which are paramount for maintaining the environmental integrity of carbon offset projects. By ensuring data quality and consistency, verification processes prevent double counting and fraudulent claims. In sum, carbon credit verification is indispensable in converting methane emission reductions into reliable carbon credits, thus linking environmental action with financial incentives to drive sustained climate mitigation efforts (Boyd and Salzman, 2011, Arup and Zhang, 2015).

1.3. Objectives

The primary objective of this framework is to provide a structured approach for integrating methane monitoring data into carbon credit verification systems. This integration is essential for bridging the gap between raw environmental data and validated emission reductions that qualify for carbon markets. The framework aims to address key challenges such as data heterogeneity, quality assurance, and alignment with verification standards.

By offering a clear methodology for data processing, validation, and integration, the framework enhances the accuracy and reliability of methane emission reporting. It facilitates the seamless flow of information from monitoring technologies through to verification entities, thereby improving the overall efficiency of the carbon credit issuance process. Additionally, the framework supports transparency and traceability, which are critical for maintaining stakeholder trust and market confidence.

Beyond immediate practical benefits, the framework contributes to the broader goal of advancing climate mitigation. It fosters the adoption of robust data-driven approaches in emission accounting and encourages innovation in monitoring technologies and verification protocols. Ultimately, this work provides a foundation for scalable, standardized integration that can adapt to evolving environmental policies and market demands.

2. Methane Monitoring Technologies and Data Characteristics

2.1. Overview of Methane Detection Methods

Methane detection methods have evolved significantly, offering a range of technologies tailored to different monitoring scales and applications. Ground-based sensors, such as tunable diode laser absorption spectroscopy (TDLAS) and cavity ring-down spectroscopy (CRDS), provide high-sensitivity, real-time measurements ideal for localized monitoring (Arnoldus and Bymolt, 2011). These sensors are frequently deployed near industrial sites, pipelines, or landfill areas to detect leaks and quantify emissions with high temporal resolution (Oluoha *et al*., 2021, Onifade *et al*., 2021).

Satellite remote sensing has emerged as a powerful tool for large-scale methane monitoring. Instruments aboard satellites use spectrometers to detect methane's absorption signatures in the atmosphere, enabling global coverage and repeated observations over time. Although satellite data offer extensive spatial insights, their temporal resolution and sensitivity may be limited by factors such as cloud cover and atmospheric interference, requiring complementary ground verification (Adewoyin *et al*., 2021).

Aerial methods, including aircraft and drone-based sensors, bridge the gap between ground and satellite monitoring. These platforms provide flexible deployment options and can cover mid-scale areas with precise spatial detail. They are particularly useful for mapping emission hotspots and validating satellite observations. Overall, a combination of these detection methods, often integrated within multi-tiered monitoring networks, enhances the robustness of methane emission assessments (Ogunnowo *et al*., 2020, Adeleke *et al*., 2021).

2.2. Data Types and Quality Considerations

Methane monitoring generates diverse data types that vary in format, resolution, and accuracy, necessitating careful consideration in their use for verification. Continuous time-series data from ground sensors provide detailed temporal trends but may be spatially limited. In contrast, remote sensing data often consist of spatially gridded concentration estimates captured at discrete time intervals. Understanding these differences is critical when integrating datasets for comprehensive emission quantification (Eyinade *et al*., 2020, Odedeyi *et al*., 2020).

Data quality factors include accuracy, precision, sensitivity, and detection limits. Calibration of sensors is essential to minimize systematic errors and ensure comparability across different platforms. Additionally, environmental variables such as temperature, humidity, and wind speed can influence measurement reliability, requiring contextual metadata to support data interpretation (Eyinade *et al*., 2020).

Data completeness and coverage also affect quality. Missing data due to instrument downtime or adverse weather can introduce uncertainties in emission estimates. Quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) protocols, including cross-validation with independent measurements and statistical filtering, help maintain data integrity (Ciais *et al*., 2014, Cusworth *et al*., 2020). High-quality data forms the foundation for credible carbon credit verification and supports sound decision-making in climate mitigation (Adewoyin *et al*., 2020b, Adewoyin *et al*., 2020a).

2.3. Challenges in Methane Data Acquisition and Reliability

Despite technological advances, methane data acquisition faces several challenges impacting reliability and usability. One primary challenge is the spatial and temporal variability of methane emissions, which can be episodic and highly localized. Capturing transient leaks or short-term emission events requires monitoring systems with sufficient sensitivity and sampling frequency, which can be costly to maintain (Okuh *et al*.).

Environmental conditions such as atmospheric turbulence, temperature fluctuations, and precipitation can degrade sensor performance and introduce noise. Remote sensing platforms are particularly susceptible to interference from clouds, aerosols, and surface reflectance, complicating data retrieval and interpretation. These factors necessitate robust data correction and validation methods (Gbabo *et al*.).

Furthermore, data integration from multiple sources presents interoperability challenges. Differences in sensor calibration, data formats, and measurement protocols can lead to inconsistencies. Establishing standardized data processing workflows and harmonized protocols is essential to overcome these barriers. Addressing these challenges is critical to ensuring methane data are reliable and fit for purpose in carbon credit verification frameworks (Ogunnowo, Okuh *et al*.).

3. Carbon Credit Verification Systems: Principles and Requirements

3.1. Verification Criteria and Standards

Verification of carbon credits is governed by stringent criteria designed to ensure that emission reductions are authentic, quantifiable, and additional to any baseline scenario. These criteria typically include accuracy, completeness, consistency, and transparency (Kuemper *et al*., 2018). Accuracy ensures that emission reductions are measured correctly, while completeness requires that all relevant emissions and reductions are accounted for. Consistency demands that methodologies be applied uniformly over time and across projects, enabling comparability. Transparency involves openly documenting procedures, assumptions, and data sources to allow independent review (Gbabo *et al*.).

International standards, such as the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), Gold Standard, and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), establish frameworks that define eligibility, monitoring requirements, and verification procedures (Mustapää *et al*., 2020). These standards require project developers to submit monitoring reports and undergo third-party audits to confirm the validity of emission reductions. The process involves rigorous validation of data collection methods, calculation models, and adherence to predefined baselines (Yang *et al*., 2020).

Such verification frameworks also emphasize the concept of additionality, demonstrating that reductions would not have occurred without the project intervention. They require permanence assurances, especially for methane projects where leaks may recur or be temporary. By enforcing these criteria, carbon credit systems uphold environmental integrity, ensuring that traded credits represent real and meaningful climate benefits.

3.2. Data Integration Needs for Verification

Effective verification depends heavily on the seamless integration of methane monitoring data into the verification workflow. This integration is essential for transforming raw measurement outputs into verified emission reduction claims. Data must be aggregated, processed, and validated in a manner consistent with verification protocols. This includes harmonizing data from diverse monitoring technologies and formats, managing metadata, and ensuring temporal and spatial alignment.

Verification bodies require robust data management systems capable of handling large volumes of heterogeneous data while preserving data quality. Integration processes should include automated checks for completeness, consistency, and anomaly detection to identify potential errors or outliers. Additionally, metadata documentation, including sensor calibration details and environmental conditions during measurement, is necessary to contextualize the data and support audit trails (Bhaskaran, 2020, Bin Mahfoodh *et al*., 2017).

A well-designed integration framework facilitates efficient reporting by standardizing data workflows and enabling traceability. It also allows verification entities to reproduce analyses and verify emission reductions independently. Without such integration, inconsistencies and data gaps can undermine confidence in the verification process, potentially invalidating carbon credits and jeopardizing market credibility (Raptis *et al*., 2019).

3.3. Transparency, Accountability, and Compliance

Transparency is fundamental to building trust in carbon credit systems, ensuring that all stakeholders can access and understand how emission reductions are quantified and verified. This requires comprehensive documentation of methodologies, data sources, and verification results. Publicly accessible registries often support this by providing detailed project information and credit issuance records.

Accountability mechanisms ensure that project developers, verifiers, and regulatory bodies adhere to established standards and ethical practices. This includes clear roles and responsibilities, conflict-of-interest policies for auditors, and enforcement of corrective actions if discrepancies arise. Independent third-party verification is a key pillar of accountability, offering an objective assessment that mitigates biases (Sohail and Cavill, 2008).

Compliance with regulatory requirements and market rules is also critical. Verified projects must align with legal frameworks governing emissions and credits, including regional or international agreements. Regular audits and ongoing monitoring ensure sustained adherence over the credit lifecycle. Failure to comply can result in credit invalidation, financial penalties, or reputational damage. Together, transparency, accountability, and compliance form the backbone of credible carbon credit verification, safeguarding environmental integrity and market confidence (McAllister, 2012).

4. Proposed Framework for Data Integration

4.1. Data Processing and Validation Mechanisms

Effective integration of methane monitoring data into carbon credit verification requires robust data processing and validation mechanisms. The first step involves standardizing data inputs from various sensors and platforms to ensure consistency. Raw data must be cleaned to remove noise, correct for sensor drift, and address missing values. Automated algorithms can support anomaly detection, flagging data points that deviate significantly from expected patterns for further review.

Validation is critical to confirm the accuracy and reliability of the processed data. This includes cross-referencing measurements against independent datasets or established benchmarks, where available. Calibration records and environmental metadata should be incorporated to adjust data for contextual influences such as temperature and wind conditions, which may affect methane concentration readings. Statistical validation methods, including uncertainty quantification, help characterize data confidence levels.

By implementing rigorous processing and validation protocols, the framework ensures that only high-quality, verified data advances to the verification phase. This reduces errors and enhances confidence in emission reduction calculations, supporting the issuance of credible carbon credits. Importantly, these mechanisms should be adaptable to accommodate emerging monitoring technologies and evolving data standards.

4.2. Integration Architecture and Workflow

The integration architecture for methane monitoring data is designed to facilitate seamless data flow from acquisition through to verification reporting. It typically consists of modular components including data ingestion, storage, processing, and output layers. Data ingestion handles diverse inputs from ground sensors, aerial surveys, and satellite sources, converting them into standardized formats. Centralized storage systems, often cloud-based, provide scalable capacity and secure access.

The workflow orchestrates data transformation steps, cleaning, validation, aggregation, and analysis, automatically or with minimal human intervention. APIs and interoperable data exchange protocols enable real-time or near-real-time updates, enhancing responsiveness. This architecture supports traceability by maintaining comprehensive logs of data provenance, processing steps, and versioning.

The output stage produces verified emission reports aligned with carbon credit verification standards. By employing a modular, flexible design, the architecture can integrate new data sources or analytical tools without major disruptions. This facilitates scalability and long-term adaptability, essential for keeping pace with technological advancements and regulatory changes.

4.3. Ensuring Data Integrity and Traceability

Data integrity and traceability are foundational to trustworthy carbon credit verification. Integrity ensures that data remain accurate, complete, and unaltered from the point of collection to final reporting. This is achieved through secure data handling practices, including encryption, access controls, and audit trails. Traceability involves documenting every step of data processing and management, enabling independent verification and reproducibility of results.

The framework incorporates digital signatures and blockchain technology as emerging solutions to enhance data security and immutability. These tools provide transparent, tamper-evident records that increase stakeholder confidence. Regular audits and validation checkpoints embedded within the workflow further safeguard data quality.

Maintaining comprehensive metadata, including sensor calibration, environmental conditions, and operator logs, supports traceability by contextualizing data and explaining processing decisions. By ensuring data integrity and traceability, the framework protects against errors, fraud, and misrepresentation, reinforcing the credibility of methane emission reductions and the associated carbon credits.

5. Conclusion

This paper presents a comprehensive framework for integrating methane monitoring data into carbon credit verification systems. It addresses the complex challenges of handling heterogeneous data from multiple detection technologies and ensures that only validated, high-quality information is used to support emission reduction claims. By outlining clear data processing, validation, and integration mechanisms, the framework enhances the accuracy and reliability of methane emission quantification.

A key contribution of the framework is its modular integration architecture, which facilitates seamless data flow and scalability. This design supports real-time data ingestion and processing, enabling timely reporting that aligns with verification standards. Additionally, the framework emphasizes data integrity and traceability, incorporating secure handling protocols and audit trails to maintain trust throughout the verification lifecycle. Overall, the framework advances the linkage between environmental monitoring and market mechanisms, providing a structured pathway for methane emission data to underpin credible carbon credits. This contribution is crucial for strengthening the environmental integrity of carbon markets and promoting effective climate mitigation strategies.

Integrating methane monitoring data into carbon credit systems has significant implications for carbon markets. By improving the transparency and robustness of verification processes, the framework fosters greater market confidence among investors, regulators, and project developers. Enhanced data quality reduces the risk of inaccurate or fraudulent credits entering the market, thereby preserving the value and credibility of carbon offsets.

From a policy perspective, the framework supports more informed decision-making by providing reliable emission reduction data. Policymakers can leverage this information to design targeted methane mitigation initiatives and enforce compliance with international climate commitments. Furthermore, standardizing data integration and verification practices may encourage wider adoption of methane reduction projects, accelerating progress toward global greenhouse gas reduction goals.

The framework also highlights the need for continuous collaboration among technology developers, verification bodies, and regulators. Such cooperation will be vital to address evolving challenges, adapt to new monitoring capabilities, and refine verification protocols. Ultimately, this integrative approach strengthens the foundation for sustainable and effective environmental policies.

Successful implementation of the framework requires investment in robust data infrastructure and capacity building. Organizations involved in methane monitoring and verification should prioritize developing interoperable systems that adhere to common data standards and protocols. Training programs for operators and verifiers will be essential to ensure consistent application of data processing and validation procedures.

Future research should focus on advancing methods for uncertainty quantification and integrating emerging technologies such as machine learning for anomaly detection and predictive analytics. Investigations into cost-effective sensor deployment strategies and long-term monitoring

solutions will also enhance the framework's practical applicability. Additionally, exploring blockchain and other digital ledger technologies could further strengthen data integrity and transparency.
Expanding the framework to incorporate multi-gas monitoring and linking with broader environmental reporting systems offers promising avenues for future work. By continuously evolving, the framework can remain responsive to technological innovations and policy developments, thereby maintaining its relevance and impact in climate change mitigation efforts.

6. References

1. Adeleke AK, Igunma TO, Nwokediegwu ZS. Modeling advanced numerical control systems to enhance precision in next-generation coordinate measuring machine. Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval. 2021;2:638-49.
2. Adewoyin MA, Ogunnowo EO, Fiemotongha JE, Igunma TO, Adeleke AK. Advances in thermofluid simulation for heat transfer optimization in compact mechanical devices. [Publication details incomplete]. 2020.
3. Adewoyin MA, Ogunnowo EO, Fiemotongha JE, Igunma TO, Adeleke AK. A conceptual framework for dynamic mechanical analysis in high-performance material selection. [Publication details incomplete]. 2020.
4. Adewoyin MA, Ogunnowo EO, Fiemotongha JE, Igunma TO, Adeleke AK. Advances in CFD-driven design for fluid-particle separation and filtration systems in engineering applications. [Publication details incomplete]. 2021.
5. Arnoldus M, Bymolt R. Demystifying carbon markets: a guide to developing carbon credit projects. Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute (KIT); 2011. p. 135.
6. Arup C, Zhang H. Lessons from regulating carbon offset markets. Transnatl Environ Law. 2015;4(1):69-100.
7. Balcombe P, Anderson K, Speirs J, Brandon N, Hawkes A. The natural gas supply chain: the importance of methane and carbon dioxide emissions. ACS Sustain Chem Eng. 2017;5(1):3-20.
8. Balcombe P, Speirs JF, Brandon NP, Hawkes AD. Methane emissions: choosing the right climate metric and time horizon. Environ Sci Process Impacts. 2018;20(10):1323-39.
9. Bh到来
10. System: Bhaskaran SV. Integrating data quality services (dqs) in big data ecosystems: challenges, best practices, and opportunities for decision-making. J Appl Big Data Anal Decis Mak Predict Model Syst. 2020;4:1-12.
11. Bin Mahfoodh A, Ibrahim M, Hawi M, Hakami K. Introducing a big data system for maintaining well data quality and integrity in a world of heterogeneous environment. In: SPE Kingdom of Saudi Arabia annual technical symposium and exhibition; 2017. SPE, D023S012R002.
12. Boyd W, Salzman J. The curious case of greening in carbon markets. Environ Law. 2011;41:73.
13. Ciais P, Dolman AJ, Bombelli A, Duren R, Peregon A, Rayner PJ, Miller C, Gobron N, Kinderman G, Marland G. Current systematic carbon-cycle observations and the need for implementing a policy-relevant carbon observing system. Biogeosciences. 2014;11(13):3547-602.
14. Costa C, Wironen M, Racette K, Wollenberg EK. Global warming potential* (GWP*): understanding the implications for mitigating methane emissions in không có agriculture. [Publication details incomplete]. 2021.
15. Cusworth DH, Duren RM, Thorpe AK, Tseng E, Thompson D, Guha A, Newman S, Foster KT, Miller CE. Using remote sensing to detect, validate, and quantify methane emissions from California solid waste operations. Environ Res Lett. 2020;15(5):054012.
16. Dean JF, Middelburg JJ, Röckmann T, Aerts R, Blauw LG, Egger M, Jetten MS, de Jong AE, Meisel OH, Rasigraf O. Methane feedbacks to the global climate system in a warmer world. Rev Geophys. 2018;56(1):207-50.
17. Eyinade W, Ezeilo OJ, Ogundeji IA. A treasury management model for predicting liquidity risk in dynamic emerging market energy sectors. [Publication details incomplete]. 2020.
18. Gatland JR, Santos IR, Maher DT, Duncan T, Erler DV. Carbon dioxide and methane emissions from an artificially drained coastal wetland during a flood: implications for wetland global warming potential. J Geophys Res Biogeosci. 2014;119(8):1698-716.
19. Gbabo EY, Okenwa OK, Chima PE. Constructing AI-enabled compliance automation models for real-time regulatory reporting in energy systems. [Publication details incomplete].
20. Gbabo EY, Okenwa OK, Chima PE. Integrating CDM regulations into role-based compliance models for energy infrastructure projects. [Publication details incomplete].
21. He X, Wallington TJ, Anderson JE, Keoleian GA, Shen W, De Kleine R, Kim HC, Winkler S. Life-cycle greenhouse gas emission benefits of natural gas vehicles. ACS Sustain Chem Eng. 2021;9(22):7813-23.
22. Howarth RW. A bridge to nowhere: methane emissions and the greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas. Energy Sci Eng. 2014;2(2):47-60.
23. Howarth RW. Methane emissions and climatic warming risk from hydraulic fracturing and shale gas development: implications for policy. Energy Emiss Control Technol. 2015;3:45-54.
24. Howarth RW. Methane and climate change. In: John F, Stolz W, Griffin M, Bain DJ, editors. Environmental impacts from development of unconventional oil and gas reserves. [Publication details incomplete]. 2021.
25. Kreibich N, Hermwille L. Caught in between: credibility and feasibility of the voluntary carbon market post-2020. Clim Policy. 2021;21(7):939-57.
26. Kuemper D, Iggena T, Toenjes R, Pulvermueller E. Valid. IoT: a framework for sensor data quality analysis and interpolation. In: Proceedings of the 9th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference; 2018. p. 294-303.
27. Le Fevre C. Methane emissions: from blind spot to spotlight. [Publication details incomplete]. 2017.
28. Leonard K. Quality enhancement in voluntary carbon market. diplom.de; 2009.
29. McAllister LK. Regulation by third-party verification. BCL Rev. 2012;53(1):1.
30. Mustapää T, Nikander P, Hutzschenreuter D, Viitala R. Metrological challenges in collaborative sensing: applicability of digital calibration certificates. Sensors. 2020;20(17):4730.

31. Nardelli C. Trust, but verify: ensuring the accuracy of carbon credits registered under the Clean-Development Mechanism. Geo Wash J Energy Environ Law. 2012;3:204.
32. Odedeyi PB, Abou-El-Hossein K, Oyekunle F, Adeleke AK. Effects of machining parameters on tool wear progression in end milling of AISI 316. Prog Can Mech Eng. 2020;3.
33. Ogunnowo EO. A conceptual framework for digital twin deployment in real-time monitoring of mechanical systems. [Publication details incomplete].
34. Ogunnowo EO, Adewoyin MA, Fiemotongha JE, Igunma TO, Adeleke AK. Systematic review of non-destructive testing methods for predictive failure analysis in mechanical systems. [Publication details incomplete]. 2020.
35. Okuh CO, Nwulu EO, Ogu E, Ifechukwude P, Egbumokei IND, Digitemie WN. Creating a sustainability-focused digital transformation model for improved environmental and operational outcomes in energy operations. [Publication details incomplete].
36. Okuh CO, Nwulu EO, Ogu E, Ifechukwude P, Egbumokei IND, Digitemie WN. An integrated lean six sigma model for cost optimization in multinational energy operations. [Publication details incomplete].
37. Oluoha O, Odeshina A, Reis O, Okpeke F, Attipoe V, Orieno O. Development of a compliance-driven identity governance model for enhancing enterprise information security. Iconic Res Eng J. 2021;4:310-24.
38. Onifade AY, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi A, Agboola O, George O. Advances in multi-channel attribution modeling for enhancing marketing ROI in emerging economies. Iconic Res Eng J. 2021;5:360-76.
39. Raptis TP, Passarella A, Conti M. Data management in industry 4.0: state of the art and open challenges. IEEE Access. 2019;7:97052-93.
40. Sohail M, Cavill S. Accountability to prevent corruption in construction projects. J Constr Eng Manag. 2008;134(9):729-38.
41. von Unger M, Emmer I. Carbon market incentives to conserve, restore and enhance soil carbon. Arlington: Silvestrum and The Nature Conservancy; 2018.
42. Yamin F. Climate change and carbon markets: a handbook of emissions reduction mechanisms. London: Routledge; 2012.
43. Yang G, Jan MA, Rehman AU, Babar M, Aimal MM, Verma S. Interoperability and data storage in internet of multimedia things: investigating current trends, research challenges and future directions. IEEE Access. 2020;8:124382-401.