



CO₂ Capture Project

NGO Focus Group Meeting

Tuesday September 6th 2005
Hotel Amigo, Rue De l' Amigo, 1,000 Brussels, Belgium

Meeting Objectives

Communicate the programme, objectives and expected results of the CO₂ Capture Project Phase 2.

Provide opportunities for ongoing engagement and participation to help shape and steer the program in 2005-8.

Participants

Kirsten Macey	Climate Action Network Europe
Jason Anderson	Institute for European Environmental Policy
Jasper Vis	Stichting Natuur en Milieu
Manfred Treber	GermanWatch
Gabriela von Goerne	Greenpeace International
Catherine Pearce	Friends of the Earth International
Paal Frisvold	Bellona
Beate Christiansen	Bellona
Claire Chevalier	Bellona
Gardiner Hill	CO ₂ Capture Project & BP
Iain Wright	CO ₂ Capture Project & BP
Tony Espie	CO ₂ Capture Project & BP
Livio Ruvo	CO ₂ Capture Project & Eni
Antonio Pellegrino	CO ₂ Capture Project & Eni
Ivano Miracca	CO ₂ Capture Project & Eni
Arthur Lee	CO ₂ Capture Project & Chevron
Camilla Priselac	CO ₂ Capture Project & Chevron
Geir Vollsater	CO ₂ Capture Project & Shell



CO₂ Capture Project

Meeting Structure and Content

Presentations were given by CCP participants (see agenda below), outlining technologies being developed by CCP:

Agenda

Time	Agenda items	Action	Leader
8.30hrs	Welcome, Introductions, Safety, Review Agenda	Information	Iain Wright & Gardiner Hill
9.00hrs	Summary of CCP1	Information	Iain Wright
9.30hrs	Introduction to CCP2	Information	Iain Wright
9.45hrs	CCP2 Capture Programme	Information	Ivano Miracca
10.15hrs	Break		Amigo
10.30hrs	CCP2 Storage Programme (SMV)	Information	Livio Ruvo
11.00hrs	CCP2 Policies Programme	Information	Arthur Lee
11.15hrs	CCP2 Communications Programme	Information	Iain Wright
11.30hrs	CCP2 Programme: Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none">• NGO Feedback	Feedback	Gardiner Hill
12.30hrs	Lunch		Amigo
13.30hrs	Close		



CO₂ Capture Project

Questions and Feedback

Q1. Is the project working to develop regulatory frameworks to support CCS ?

A1. No – The project is focused on technology development. However, we plan to review legislation as it develops and will provide comment if requested.

Q2. Has the project engaged/welcomed utilities and coal companies to participate ?

A2. Yes, but there has not been much interest, so we have put together a package for associate participation, that will allow utilities and others to join the project at a lower cost.

Q3. How does CCP2 relate to other collaborations ?

A3. CCP2 is aware of a number of related initiatives in Europe (CASTOR, ENCAP etc) and around the world (US DoE RCSPs, CO₂CRC) and endeavours to compliment those without duplicating them.

Q4. The capture part of the program contains quite a bit of membrane development – what is the track-record of membrane scale-up to commercialization ?

A4. The project is aware of this key issue.

Q5. To what scale will your storage projects be?

A5. In addition to lab-type R&D, the project envisages industrial-scale pilots and demonstration projects.

Q6. Will remote sensing of geological storage leakage work – won't it be overwhelmed by background variations ?

A6. Technologies have been demonstrated to be effective in detecting CO₂ flux in and out of forests, but their performance in built-up areas has yet to be proven.

Q7. Are you considering tracer studies/demonstrations.

A7. CCP1 studied tracers and recommended molecules that are similar in size to CO₂. CCP2 intends to demonstrate practical application of those recommended in CCP1.

Q8. Have you considered the impact of impurities in a leakage scenario?

A8. Geochemical reactions in the subsurface are more likely to increase storage security than to decrease it. The presence of impurities will undoubtedly influence the permitting process, but there are many years experience in Canada with acid gas (CO₂ and H₂S) injection.

Q9. Have you carried out a risk assessment process that allows apples to apples comparison between the risks of CO₂ geological storage and those associated with more established engineered systems (large dams, public buildings etc)?

A9. We tried to get Harvard University to carry out such a study w/o success – we will try again.

Q10. Are Oil and Gas companies relying on CCS to be the “silver bullet” to solve the climate change issue?



CO₂ Capture Project

A10. No. Most oil & gas companies have a portfolio of climate change initiatives, such as energy efficiency, renewables (solar & wind), only part of which is CCS. In order to tackle climate change, the world will have to deploy all the technologies available.

Q11. What is the project interest in following the EU Water Framework Directive?

A11. This is one of a number of regulatory options. CCP just wants to follow developments and update our understanding.

Q12. Have you considered the issue of long-term liability issues?

A12. Yes, the Policies Team is developing a position paper.

Q13. Are you considering projects paying into a “sinking fund” as insurance against long-term liabilities?

A13. That is one of the options being considered by the Policies Team.

Q14. Are you contributing to the ongoing work to include CCS in the EU ETS.

A14. Yes. Some CCP Participants are contributing the EU ad-hoc work-group, being led by the UK DTI.

Q15. The EU ETS does not give sufficient long-term commercial signal to encourage investment in such a long-term GHG option as CCS. Will CCP recommend an alternative Policy Framework?

A15. Yes. The Policies Team is analyzing options.

Q16. When you communicate CCS, will you compete for funding with renewable energy options?

A16. No. CCS is a GHG mitigation option that could make a significant contribution **in addition to** renewables.

Q17. Will CCP be carrying out a Risk assessment that compares CCS to other similar industrial practices? This must be well communicated before widespread deployment.

A17. CCP will consider including that work within the SMV/Policies work program.