



TECHNICAL GROUP

Possibilities for Collaboration with CSLF Policy Group

Background

The CSLF Policy Group, at its November 2013 meeting in Washington, initiated development of an Action Plan. A Policy Group Exploratory Committee was formed during that meeting which later held a series of teleconferences (in December and January) that resulted in consensus on five topics that would be a primary focus for near term Policy Group activities. Two of these topics are relevant to the Technical Group.

This paper provides background information that may assist the Technical Group in determining how it can best collaborate with the Policy Group for these and other areas. Included are the following two documents:

- The section of the Policy Group minutes for the Washington meeting that pertain to development of a Policy Group Action Plan; and
- The summary of 2014 Policy Group Topics that resulted from the Exploratory Committee's teleconferences.

Sections of these documents of likely interest to the Technical Group are **highlighted in yellow**.

Action Requested

The Technical Group is requested to review the two documents and develop opinions on how the Technical Group should engage the Policy Group.

From the November 2013 CSLF Policy Group Meeting Minutes:

11. Development of Policy Group Action Plan

Christopher Smith led a discussion about the possible future agenda for the CSLF Policy Group. To preface the discussion, Mr. Smith stated that the Policy Group consists of experienced and senior policy people in more than twenty governments, and that any forward action plan should aim at finding ways to more effectively amplify and communicate key messages that increase the CCS knowledge base, advances the financing environment for large-scale CCS, and, in the end, helps get projects built. Ensuing discussion mainly centered around two broad topics: improved communications and increasing the knowledge base.

Concerning communications and public outreach, Paul van Slobbe stated that there is a great amount of public opposition to on-shore CO₂ sequestration, due in part to ineffective outreach. The majority of people do not yet know much about CCS and that CO₂ can be effectively stored in a safe manner, and are therefore against any CO₂ storage projects near populous areas. Peer Hoth added that public perception seems to be that CCS is not needed if more money is instead spent on renewable energy, and that there is a fear that storing CO₂ underground would result in contamination of underground resources such as fresh water aquifers. Both Mr. van Slobbe and Dr. Hoth endorsed the idea that a future CSLF meeting should host a public perception roundtable, including both proponents and opponents of CCS, as this would allow better understanding on why the public is so reluctant to accept that CCS is both necessary and safe. Louise Barr agreed that there should be a role for the CSLF in increasing the awareness about CCS. **Khalid Abuleif offered that the Policy Group needs to have a good communications strategy, and stated that not enough is being done to promulgate knowledge from the CSLF Technical Group. Mr. Smith agreed, adding that the Policy Group should more effectively get information and recommendations from the Technical Group to decision makers in government.** Juho Lipponen suggested that the IEA's Greenhouse Gas R&D Programme (the IEA GHG) has a social research network about CCS and could collaborate in any CSLF activities involving public outreach and communications.

Concerning increasing the overall CCS knowledge base, Julio Friedmann proposed several new initiatives for consideration by the Policy Group. Two of these, establishment of an international CCS test center network and investigation of offshore geologic storage options, have been mentioned in the "Moving Forward" section of the Ministerial Communiqué. In addition, Dr. Friedmann suggested that the Policy Group could sponsor a coordinated international science program, in order to understand not just the broad-based scientific and technical issues concerning large-scale CCS projects but also important operational issues as well. Up to now, any such activities have been done mostly in an ad hoc fashion. Dr. Friedmann also proposed that the Policy Group

consider a large-scale joint international CCS project, even given that there would be many issues (e.g., governance and funding) that would first need to be solved. Dr. Friedmann stated that even though it would seem to be a hugely ambitious undertaking, projects of this nature always start with a dialogue like the current one. Ensuing discussion resulted in support for the international science program concept. Tone Skogen offered that this could be taken a step further, to coordinate and collaborate on various policy-related issues. Building on that idea, Ms. Barr stated that the Policy Group could perhaps find common threads among all the existing large-scale projects that might assist new projects' efforts to gain financial closure.

2014 CSLF Policy Group Topics Recommended by Exploratory Committee

The planned path forward is for topics recommended by the Exploratory Committee to be approved by CSLF Policy Group delegates via e-mail communications in the February timeframe, providing approval for teams to form around each major topic. Assuming two CSLF Policy Group meetings annually, this would allow several months for each team to develop a work plan and suggested deliverables that could then be discussed at the next Policy Group meeting (late spring / early summer, exact time/place TBD). It is envisioned that discussion and approval of each team's work plan would be a primary focus of the next Policy Group meeting. As of the second Exploratory Committee call on 8 January, the following topics have emerged as likely to move forward:

COMMUNICATIONS: The CSLF is well-positioned to communicate with Ministers being the only ministerial body focused solely on CCS. Messages should include timely topics (e.g. induced seismicity), be harmonized and closely coordinated with other organizations such as the IEA and GCCSI, and be more frequent than the Ministerial meetings held every two years. The CSLF should also evaluate the potential to communicate directly with other key audiences such as the UNFCCC. Key messages include the need for a "level playing field" or "policy parity" for CCS, and that CCS will ultimately be needed in non-power sector applications such as the cement and steel industries.

GLOBAL COLLABORATION ON LARGE-SCALE CCS PROJECT(S): The CSLF is well-positioned to facilitate discussions on global collaboration efforts for large scale CCS projects, whether as new greenfield projects or by adding additional functionality and value to existing or planned commercial projects. Such efforts could include both on-shore and off-shore deep saline projects. The CSLF Policy Group should also analyze and disseminate policy-relevant lessons from other large-scale projects.

FINANCING FOR CCS PROJECTS: The Policy Group, building on past work under Bernard Frois, should host a series of workshops and discussions on the business case for CCS, including discussion of what business-to-business connections and government-to-government actions the CSLF should support. Outcomes and recommendations should be captured and disseminated to maximize value.

SUPPORTING DEVELOPMENT OF 2ND AND 3RD GENERATION CCS TECHNOLOGIES: Efforts should be taken to better understand the role of 2nd and 3rd generation technologies for achieving widespread CCS deployment, and policies and approaches identified among individual CSLF member countries that can stimulate 2nd and 3rd generation CCS project proposals to improve the outlook for successful Large Scale Integrated Project deployment in the 2020 to 2030 timeframe. Development of these technologies will benefit from the CCS Pilot Scale Testing Network, which is in the process of being stood up.

TRANSITIONING FROM CO₂-EOR TO CCS: The Policy Group should look into policy issues based on the findings of the CSLF Technical Group's Task Force on Technical Challenges for Conversion of CO₂-EOR to CCS. This has particular relevance in the US, Chinese and European contexts.