

Carbon Sequestration leadership forum

CSLF-T-2010-13
01 September 2010

www.cslforum.org



TECHNICAL GROUP

Review of Options for CSLF Projects Workshop

Barbara N. McKee
Tel: +1 301 903 3820
Fax: +1 301 903 1591
CSLFSecretariat@hq.doe.gov



REVIEW OF OPTIONS FOR CSLF PROJECTS WORKSHOP

Note by the Secretariat

Background

At its March 2010 Technical Group meeting in Pau, France, there was consensus that in order to properly engage the representatives of CSLF-recognized projects, the Technical Group should first learn what the projects want and expect from CSLF recognition. To that end, Technical Group delegates contacted representatives of projects located in their countries to obtain information that would allow the Technical Group to develop a projects engagement strategy, including a plan for a Projects Workshop. One of the questions asked of project representatives was:

Would you be interested in participating in a conference / workshop on CSLF projects?

- If so, what format is desirable for you?

Responses to this question were received from about half of the 30 CSLF-recognized projects. Australia has used this information to produce a paper, presented below, that outlines issues related to this type of workshop and suggests a pathway on how to proceed.

Action Requested

The Technical Group is requested to review the information summary in this paper and consider the recommendations.

Review of Options for CSLF Projects Workshop

Background

At its March 2010 meeting, the CSLF Technical Group reached consensus that in order to properly engage the representatives of CSLF-recognized projects, the Technical Group should first learn what the projects want and expect from CSLF recognition. To that end, Technical Group delegates contacted representatives of projects located in their countries to obtain answers to the following questions:

1. What do you need to make the project succeed?
2. What advantages do you see from greater CSLF project interaction?
3. What else should the CSLF do?
4. *Would you be interested in participating in a conference / workshop on CSLF projects? And if so, what format is desirable for you?*

Responses were received from 17 projects. This paper focuses on responses to Question 4.

SUMMARY

- The majority of respondents support the concept of focused, topic- specific workshops to share learnings from CSLF-recognized projects.
- The workshops must allow adequate time for in-depth discussion of presentations; outcomes from the workshops, including discussions, should be summarized and available to the CSLF members.
- Attendance of CSLF meetings and workshops has significant cost in terms of time and money, due to the travel involved. Suggestions to make participation in a CSLF workshop more cost effective ranged from holding “virtual meetings” (e.g., via videoconference) to holding the CSLF workshops in conjunction with other carbon capture and storage (CCS) events.
- Actions arising include: agreeing the best model to meet the needs of the membership, including identifying resourcing to support the meetings, and an analysis of existing/proposed CCS project networks, to avoid duplication.

ISSUES

Focus / Sharing of Learnings / Avoidance of Duplication

- There are already many CCS conferences and workshops (e.g., GHGT), which are global and can be seen as an important platform for the *ad hoc* exchange of information.
- There is a need for specific topic-focused meetings to share learnings from CSLF projects. Topics should be determined by members. Options, based on comments from project sponsors, included: lessons learned from storage exploration; saline aquifer projects; monitoring and verification techniques; environmental issues associated with amine emissions. Workshops should address specific issues; models include the Gordon Research Conferences and the American Association of Petroleum Geologists (AAPG) Hedberg Conferences.
- CCS project networks are also being established by other entities and an analysis needs to be undertaken to avoid duplication.
- Participants should have adequate time to have structured discussions following presentations, and outcomes from discussions need to be summarized and published.

Costs

- Attendance of CSLF meetings and workshops has significant cost in terms of time and money, due to the travel involved. The CSLF is not resourced to offset costs of delegates, stakeholders, or project sponsors.
- Options to reduce these costs included:
 - Hold workshops as virtual meetings (e.g., video/webinar/teleconference)
 - Hold workshops in conjunction with CSLF-sponsored meetings or back to back with an existing CCS event (e.g., GHGT Conference, NETL CCS Conference, Regional Carbon Sequestration Partnership, GCCSI meetings, etc.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **That the Technical Group note the report.**
- **That the Technical Group support the establishment of CSLF topic- focused workshops.**

ACTIONS ARISING FROM ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Consensus is needed on how to initiate the targeted workshops.

- Logistics
 - Back-to back or partnerships with existing CCS events? (note: this requires a calendar of planned/existing events)
 - Virtual meetings: How would they be resourced?
 - Other opportunities/ideas?
- Topics and timetabling
 - PIRT to canvass representatives of CSLF-recognized projects.
 - PIRT to undertake an analysis of existing specialist conferences/project networks to avoid duplication.