Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum
www.cslforum.org

PROJECTS INTERACTION AND REVIEW TEAM (PIRT)
Engagement of CSLF-recognized Projects
Background and Status

Background

At the London meeting in June 2016, there was consensus by the CSLF that the PIRT should find ways to improve its interactions with CSLF-recognized projects. To that end, a new format was developed for projects to inform the CSLF on their status:

Project Name:
Brief non-technical description:
Is the project still active?
If not, when did it end, and why?
If still active, what have been the important factors in its continued progress, and why?
Please briefly describe the overall project timeline (with emphasis on next six months):
What kinds of sharable information have been produced?
Please describe any interesting outcomes or gains in knowledge.
Who is the project's main point-of-contact for the CSLF?

A survey of projects was conducted prior to the CSLF's 2017 Mid-Year Meeting in Abu Dhabi, and a summary of preliminary results, based on a collection of reports received from 25 of the 35 active CSLF-recognized projects as well as one recently-completed project, was presented at that meeting.

Findings

Findings of general interest to other CSLF activities, including the Technology RoadMap (TRM):

1. The 'active' CSLF-recognized projects included many operative or soon-to-be-operative large-scale integrated CCS projects (LSIPs).

2. Success factors: Factors influencing success are, not surprisingly,
   a. Secure funding
   b. Encouragement from owners,
   c. Collaboration between stakeholders like industry, academia, authorities and research organisations
   d. Good communications with locals and other stakeholders

3. Factors leading to project stop:
   a. Target reached
   b. Lack of funding

None of the projects reported failure to meet targets as reason for stop.

Specific comments to the returned project forms:

1. Few of the returned project forms address general technology needs (we did not ask), only project specific challenges or next steps.

2. The questions were answered in a variety of ways with respect to completeness and quality of the returned forms.
    a. For example, the question of factors that secured continued progress was answered both in terms of financial support and moral encouragement, as well as in terms of technical achievements but often without indications of what mattered most.
    b. The question on information was answered both in very general terms and with specific references and links

3. Role of CSLF recognition: None of the project engagement forms address the overall CSLF goals, nor is there information on why CSLF recognition was sought, what the benefits, if any, have been, nor what the projected expected from CSLF. The reason is that this was not asked for. It may be up to PIRT to decide how the projects contribute to the CSLF goals, but it might have been useful to challenge the projects on this.

4. Fulfilment of criteria: Most projects satisfy at least one of the three criteria. However, there are a few where it is not obvious how they meet at least one of the criteria. These were probably recognized prior to the establishment of the criteria.

5. CO_2 captured/stored: This question is relevant for some but far from all projects. Some information on amounts of CO_2 captured and/or stored had to be taken from elsewhere and could not always give the accumulated amount to date. A direct question might have been useful.

6. Outcomes and advances: Described outcomes range from the obvious to very specific technical learnings.

7. Information: Access to information ranges from very open to confidential.

Recommended Actions

- Decide what, if anything, CSLF can offer to the projects.
- Decide what CSLF/PIRT wants to achieve by recognising projects.

Follow-Up Activities since the 2017 Meeting

The PIRT has not yet conducted a follow-up survey of the projects. (Note: The time frame for doing such a survey will need to be revised. There had been consensus to conduct surveys in years when there would be a CSLF Ministerial Meeting, but it now seems unlikely that there will be any more CSLF Ministerials.)

There was consensus during the 2017 Meeting that the survey format be revised to include the following information requests:

- Why did you seek CSLF recognition for the project?
- What benefits have there been (or are expected) from CSLF recognition?