Global Methane Hub

Rice Methane Innovation Accelerator

STATE OF SCIENCE

Measurement Tools

Prepared by Agnes Padre, September 2026

Rice cultivation is a major agricultural methane source because flooded rice soils create anaerobic conditions that produce methane (CH_4). Rigorous greenhouse gas (GHG) measurement protocols are necessary to evaluate interventions related to water, crop, fertilizer, soil management and new varieties for mitigating CH_4 emissions. Accurate assessment and quantification of methane emissions from rice fields are also essential for national greenhouse gas inventories and climate mitigation policies, particularly in major rice-producing regions[1]. Methane measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) in rice cultivation is moving from small-plot gas sampling toward integrated systems that combine direct field measurements, digital farm records, remote sensing, models, and external verification to ensure credibility and transparency under frameworks such as the Gold Standard, the Joint Crediting Mechanism and Verra's Verified Carbon Standard methodology (VM0051)[2,3,4].

DIRECT MEASUREMENT APPROACHES

Manual Chambers and Gas Chromatography. The closed chamber method, combined with gas chromatography, remains the most widely used technique for measuring methane emissions in rice fields. Chambers are placed over fixed bases enclosing rice hills or defined soil areas in the field. Air samples inside the chambers are collected weekly within a growing season in glass vials, usually 3 times within 1–30 minutes, for analysis in a laboratory by gas chromatography. Cumulative methane fluxes are calculated from the rate of concentration changes over the season. With well-designed and standardized sampling and gas analysis protocols, this method can produce accurate treatment-level methane flux estimates. However, this method is limited by high labor demand, small spatial coverage, sensitivity to chamber deployment protocols, potential microclimate disturbance, and the risk of missing short-lived peaks or diurnal variation[5,6].

Automatic Chambers and Trace Gas Analyzers. An improvement to the chamber method involves on-site methane measurement using portable laser, infrared, or photo-acoustic trace gas analyzers, which are expensive but provide continuous, real-time methane measurements. The analyzer's built-in pump circulates air from the chamber to the analyzer for a set period. Recent rice studies have used portable laser-based trace gas analyzers with upgraded closed chambers[7], portable gas analyzers with automatic opening-and-closing chambers[8], and laser-based atmospheric monitoring above rice fields[9]. These systems can increase sampling frequency, provide immediate gas concentration time series in the field, support rapid flux calculation, and reduce laboratory bottlenecks. Data corrections for water vapor, temperature, or instrument interference may still be required[10]. Fully automated systems can sample multiple chambers several times per day using multiplexed valves, improving detection of diurnal patterns, ebullition events, and management-induced responses, but they remain costly, technically demanding, power dependent, and vulnerable to field conditions such as flooding, high humidity, and connectivity failures.

Eddy Covariance System (Flux Towers). The eddy covariance (EC) system is a micrometeorological tool for directly measuring CO_2, CH_4, water vapor, and heat fluxes over field to landscape scales. Eddy covariance provides continuous, non-intrusive methane flux measurements, with spatial integration depending on tower height, wind direction, and landscape homogeneity. It is powerful for seasonal budgets, diel cycles, and ecosystem-scale exchange, but it requires expensive instrumentation, trained operators, rigorous data processing, and careful footprint interpretation. In smallholder rice landscapes, variation in field size, crop stage, irrigation status, and surrounding land use can make attribution difficult. For this reason, eddy covariance and chamber methods are often complementary: chambers provide treatment-level detail, while towers provide continuous landscape-scale context[6,11].

DIGITAL TOOLS AND LOW-COST SENSORS

Digital platforms such as farm record apps, greenhouse gas calculators, carbon-footprint tools, and water-management dashboards can connect agronomic management data with methane emissions algorithms. Examples include rice-specific tools such as CF-Rice and SECTOR, and broader agricultural tools such as the Cool Farm Tool and FAO's EX-ACT[12,13,14,15]. These tools estimate emissions using crop management, yield, post-harvest, fertilizer, energy, and land-use data. In rice systems, useful inputs include variety, crop calendar, irrigation regime, drainage frequency, fertilizer type and rate, residue handling, organic amendments, yield, and field location. Their scientific value depends on transparent and verified emission factors, locally validated scaling factors, documented assumptions, and clear uncertainty ranges[1,16].

Water Level and Environmental Sensors. For mitigation practices such as Alternate Wetting and Drying (AWD), water status is one of the most important measurable proxies because methane emissions are strongly influenced by the duration and timing of flooded or drained soil conditions. Low-cost water-level sensors, observation wells, farmer logbooks, mobile applications, and cloud dashboards can document whether fields are continuously flooded, intermittently flooded, or drained during key crop stages. FieldSnap, a mobile data-capture application linked to the LynxAWD rice methane monitoring platform, provides geo-tagged and time-stamped photos and field data for monitoring and verifying AWD implementation[17]. Environmental sensor networks can also measure soil temperature, rainfall, soil moisture, and redox proxies, helping explain why similar practices produce different methane outcomes across sites[18,19]. Soil redox (Eh) status indicates whether flooded rice soils are favorable for methane production. Direct Eh measurements are the clearest proxy, while water-table depth, flood duration, drainage timing, soil moisture, pH, dissolved organic carbon, nitrogen forms, and Fe/Mn status can provide practical indirect indicators. Methane production is favored under strongly reduced conditions, and rice studies link lower Eh and higher carbon availability with greater CH_4 emissions[20,21].

Low-cost IoT (Internet of things)-enabled Sensors. Affordable IoT methane sensors combine a sensing element, microcontroller, and communication module to detect methane, process signals, and transmit data wirelessly for remote monitoring. Many use heated metal-oxide semiconductors, often tin oxide (SnO_2), whose conductivity changes when methane reacts with adsorbed oxygen on the sensor surface. Calibration converts raw electrical signals into reliable methane concentration values by comparison with known standards or reference instruments. When sensors are used in a defined chamber or flow-through system, methane flux can be estimated from concentration change over time together with chamber geometry and environmental correction factors[22,23].

IoT-enabled methane and environmental sensors offer opportunities for more frequent field observations, especially when combined with automatic chambers, edge electronics, wireless connectivity, and cloud-based analytics. Low-cost methane sensors can help increase spatial coverage and support near-real-time measurements, but their reliability depends on calibration against reference instruments, correction for temperature and humidity, management of sensor drift, and protection from harsh paddy-field conditions. Machine-learning approaches can improve calibration models for low-cost methane sensors, although reference validation remains essential[24].

Biosensors are an emerging option for methane detection because they use biological recognition elements, such as methanotrophic bacteria or methane monooxygenase activity, to respond specifically to CH_4. Methanotroph-based systems typically estimate methane indirectly by measuring oxygen consumption or related biochemical signals during microbial methane oxidation. Their potential advantages include selectivity, low operating temperature, portability, and possible use in low-cost field screening. But they are still less sensitive and less mature than optical, infrared, or metal-oxide methane sensors and require further validation for field deployment[25].

DIGITAL IMAGING AND REMOTE SENSING

Digital imaging and remote sensing technologies, including satellites, UAVs/drones, ground cameras, and IoT-enabled sensors, extend methane monitoring from plot to landscape scales. Although these tools do not usually measure methane flux directly at the paddy surface, they provide important information on rice area, crop calendars, flooding duration, canopy growth, biomass, water stress, and other drivers of CH_4 emissions. Optical, radar, multispectral, hyperspectral, thermal, and LiDAR imagery can support inventories, models, and MRV systems when calibrated with chamber, eddy covariance, or ground-sensor measurements. Their main value is in improving spatial coverage, identifying emission-related patterns, and strengthening upscaling for regional and national reporting[26,27].

RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Integrating Direct Gas Measurements with Remote Sensing. The main challenge in methane MRV for rice cultivation is balancing accurate emissions measurement with practical field-scale implementation. Direct gas measurements remain credible but are costly, labor-intensive, and spatially limited, while remote sensing, farmer records, digital tools, and low-cost sensors are more scalable but require ground validation. Future work should therefore focus on hybrid measurement networks that use a small number of high-quality reference sites, equipped with automated chambers, eddy covariance systems, gas chromatographs or laser analyzers, to validate larger networks of low-cost sensors, environmental stations, farmer records, UAV imagery, and satellite products. Standardized protocols are also needed for chamber deployment, analyzer calibration, water-vapor and environmental corrections, sensor drift, data archiving, and quality assurance so results remain comparable across sites, seasons, technologies, and studies.

Improving data integration, modeling, and adoption. Process-based rice models, empirical emission-factor approaches, machine-learning tools, and remote-sensing products need shared benchmark datasets, transparent uncertainty reporting, and clear methods for separating management effects from site effects. Future systems should combine sensor data, chamber or analyzer outputs, imagery, and farmer records to produce auditable estimates for inventories and mitigation projects. To support adoption, monitoring tools must be affordable, durable, locally calibrated, and useful to farmers, extension services, inventory teams, and project developers. Farmers, researchers, and local teams can use simple tools like phone dashboards, text alerts, and sensors to turn field measurements into clear advice for reducing rice methane emissions.

High throughput screening systems for low methane varieties. Breeding low-methane rice varieties requires screening systems that are faster and cheaper than plot-by-plot chamber sampling, yet accurate enough to separate genetic effects from site and management influences. Breeding populations can be screened for low methane emissions using low-cost chambers, sensors, or other rapid flux-measurement methods. Then root, rhizosphere, and plant traits associated with consistently low-emitting lines can be identified. Finally elite candidate varieties can be validated using gas chromatography, laser analyzers, automated chambers, or eddy covariance. Because genotype, root exudates, and root anatomy can strongly affect methane emissions, affordable platforms would ideally combine simplified root phenotyping, low-cost methane and environmental sensors, semi-automated chambers, standardized calibration, and shared breeding datasets. This would allow early screening of many genotypes, reduce costly field flux measurements, and identify varieties with low methane emissions and acceptable yield[28,29,30].

High-throughput gene-expression. There has been a movement from low-frequency single-gene assays to integrated platforms for identifying active methane-cycling pathways in rice soils. Current systems combine RNA preservation, microplate extraction, automated liquid handling, RT-qPCR or digital PCR, targeted functional-gene panels, and metatranscriptomics to measure genes such as mcrA for methanogenesis and pmoA for methane oxidation. Metatranscriptomics can reveal related carbon, nitrogen, iron, and sulfur processes, but remains costlier and more computationally demanding than targeted assays. The most practical approach is tiered: targeted assays for large sample sets, metatranscriptomics for benchmark samples and discovery, and machine-learning models that link gene expression with CH_4 fluxes, soil conditions, root traits, and management records. Key gaps include standardized sampling, field RNA preservation, cross-site calibration, shared datasets, and validation against measured methane fluxes[31,32,33].

REFERENCES

[1] IPCC. *2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* Vol. 1, Ch. 3; Vol. 4, Ch. 5 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2019).

[2] Gold Standard. *Methodology for Methane Emission Reduction by Adjusted Water Management Practice in Rice Cultivation* Version 1.0 (Gold Standard for the Global Goals, 2023).

[3] Joint Crediting Mechanism. *Approved Methodology PH_AM004: Methane Emission Reduction by Water Management in Rice Paddy Fields* Version 01.0 (Joint Crediting Mechanism, Philippines–Japan, 2025).

[4] Verra. *VM0051 Improved Management in Rice Production Systems* Version 1.0 (Verified Carbon Standard, Verra, 2025).

[5] Minamikawa, K., Tokida, T., Sudo, S., Padre, A. & Yagi, K. *Guidelines for Measuring CH_4 and N_2O Emissions from Rice Paddies by a Manually Operated Closed Chamber Method* (National Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences, 2015).

[6] Vo, T. B. T., Wassmann, R., Sander, B. O. & Radanielson, A. M. Measurement approaches for greenhouse gas emissions from rice I: technical evolution and scientific results obtained with different methods. *Front. Agron.* **8**, 1693619 (2026).

[7] Vo, T. B. T. et al. Measurement approaches for greenhouse gas emissions from rice II: advanced technology for accelerating throughput. *Front. Agron.* **7**, 1693620 (2026).

[8] Choi, S. W. et al. Observation of methane flux in rice paddies using a portable gas analyzer and an automatic opening/closing chamber. *Korean J. Agric. For. Meteorol.* **25**, 436–445 (2023).

[9] Li, J. et al. Real-time measurement of atmospheric CO_2, CH_4 and N_2O above rice fields based on laser heterodyne radiometers. *Agronomy* **13**, 373 (2023).

[10] Tokida, T. Increasing measurement throughput of methane emission from rice paddies with a modified closed-chamber method. *Agric. Meteorol.* (2021).

[11] Reba, M. L. et al. Methane flux measurements in rice by static flux chamber and eddy covariance. *Agrosyst. Geosci. Environ.* **3**, e20119 (2020).

[12] Wassmann, R. et al. Carbon footprint calculator customized for rice products: concept and characterization of rice value chains in Southeast Asia. *Sustainability* **14**, 315 (2022).

[13] Wassmann, R., Pasco, R., Zerrudo, J. & Vo, T. B. T. *SECTOR: Source-Selective and Emission-Adjusted GHG Calculator for Cropland* (International Rice Research Institute, 2019).

[14] Cool Farm Alliance. *Cool Farm Tool: Carbon Footprint Calculator* (Cool Farm Alliance).

[15] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. *Ex-Ante Carbon-Balance Tool: Methodological Guidelines for EX-ACT Version 9* (FAO, 2022).

[16] Global Research Alliance. Data automation/software for the calculation of greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural crops. *Global Research Alliance* https://globalresearchalliance.org/library/data-automation-software-for-the-calculation-of-greenhouse-gas-emissions-from-agricultural-crops/ (accessed 8 October 2025).

[17] Creattura. Creattura launches 14,000-hectare AWD project in the Philippines using AI-powered digital MRV platform LynxAWD. *Press release* (26 February 2026).

[18] Cruz, K. M. S. D., Ella, V. B., Suministrado, D. C., Pereira, G. S. & Agulto, E. S. A low-cost wireless sensor for real-time monitoring of water level in lowland rice field under alternate wetting and drying irrigation. *Water* **14**, 4128 (2022).

[19] IRRI. AutoMonPH: automated water-level monitoring for AWD adoption. https://freaklabs.org/in-the-field/monitoring-water-levels-in-rice-paddy-fields-philippines/ (2023).

[20] Wang, Z. P., DeLaune, R. D., Patrick, W. H. Jr & Masscheleyn, P. H. Soil redox and pH effects on methane production in a flooded rice soil. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* **57**, 382–385 (1993).

[21] Xiao, D. et al. Precision aerobic irrigation reduces methane emissions in paddy fields by regulating soil redox potential and root-secreted organic acids. *J. Environ. Manage.* **387**, 125837 (2025).

[22] Furuta, D. et al. Characterization of inexpensive metal oxide sensor performance for trace methane detection. *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* **15**, 5117–5128 (2022).

[23] Lin, J. J. Y. et al. Laboratory and field evaluation of a low-cost methane sensor and key environmental factors for sensor calibration. *Environ. Sci. Atmos.* **3**, 683–694 (2023).

[24] Kiplimo, E. et al. Addressing low-cost methane sensor calibration shortcomings with machine learning. *Atmosphere* **15**, 1313 (2024).

[25] Poma, N. et al. Biosensing systems for the detection and quantification of methane gas. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **107**, 5627–5634 (2023).

[26] Ouyang, Z. et al. Paddy rice methane emissions across Monsoon Asia. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 113335 (2022).

[27] Velez, A. F. et al. Assessing methane emissions from paddy fields through environmental and UAV remote sensing variables. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* **196**, 574 (2024).

[28] Qi, Z. et al. Effect and mechanism of root characteristics of different rice varieties on methane emissions. *Agronomy* **14**, 595 (2024).

[29] Roy, R. K. et al. Genetic dissection of root traits in a rice 'global MAGIC' population for candidate traits to breed for reduced methane emission. *Front. Plant Sci.* **16**, 1616424 (2025).

[30] Roy, R. K. et al. A robust model based on root morphological and anatomical features to distinguish high and low methane emission rice varieties through machine learning approaches. *in silico Plants* **7**, diaf017 (2025).

[31] Masuda, Y., Itoh, H., Shiratori, Y. & Senoo, K. Metatranscriptomic insights into microbial consortia driving methane metabolism in paddy soils. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* **64**, 455–464 (2018).

[32] Shakya, M., Lo, C.-C. & Chain, P. S. G. Advances and challenges in metatranscriptomic analysis. *Front. Genet.* **10**, 904 (2019).

[33] Zhou, X. et al. Time-series metatranscriptomics reveals differential salinity effects on the methanogenic food web in paddy soil. *mSystems* **10**, e0001725 (2025).