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IEA Greenhouse Gas R&D Programme

- A collaborative international research programme founded in 1991
- **Aim:** To provide information on the role that technology can play in reducing greenhouse gas emissions from use of fossil fuels.

**Producing information that is:**

- Objective, trustworthy, independent
- Policy relevant but NOT policy prescriptive
- Reviewed by external Expert Reviewers

- **IEAGHG is an IEA Implementing Agreement in which the Participants contribute to a common fund to finance the activities.**
- **Activities:** Studies and reports (>250); International Research Networks: Wells, Risk, Monitoring, Modelling, Oxy, Capture, Social Research, Solid Looping; Communications (GHGT conferences, IJGJC, etc); facilitating and focussing R&D and demonstration activities eg Weyburn, Summer Schools, Peer Reviews.
CCS in CDM Feedback
Work Ahead

CMP7/COP17 Durban:
• Milestone for climate agreements
• Milestone for CCS
• IEAGHG role
UNFCC and CCS

• *Five negotiating bodies relevant to CCS:*

  • **UNFCCC:**
    • COP – Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC (194 Parties)
    • AWG-LCA – Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action

  • **Kyoto Protocol:**
    • CMP – Conference of the Parties serving as a Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (191 Parties, 37 ‘developed‘ countries)
    • AWG-KP – Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (Post 2012)

  • **SBSTA – Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice**
Kyoto Protocol and CCS

Considering CCS in CDM since 2005

- 2005 CDM Executive Board (EB) considers two new CCS methodologies
- 2005 CMP1 Montreal - referred to SBSTA
- 2006 SBSTA Technical workshops in Bonn
- On agenda of each SBSTA meeting
- 2007 and 2008 Submissions from Parties and NGOs – two synthesis reports
- 2008 Decision due at CMP4/COP14 Poznan – failed
- 2009 EB commission ‘Experts Report’
- 2009 Decision due at CMP5/COP15 Copenhagen – failed

IEAGHG contributions

- Two IEAGHG workshops
- Contribution to UNFCCC ‘Experts Report’
- Numerous presentations in Side Events and support to members’ negotiators
Kyoto Protocol and CCS.....

• Considering CCS in CDM since 2005

  • 2010 CMP6/COP16 Cancun - CCS is eligible provided that certain ‘issues’ are addressed.

  • IEAGHG decided to use its storage Research Networks to address Cancun issues (Modelling, Monitoring, Risk Assessment)

• 2011 Technical Workshop in Abu Dhabi
Technical Workshop, Abu Dhabi
7-8 Sep 2011

Science Intersects with Policy

• Brought technical expertise to UNFCCC negotiators
• Technical experts on site selection; modelling; accounting; project boundaries; transboundary; risk assessment; environmental impacts; monitoring; liability (28 talks, several members of IEAGHG Networks (arranged and briefed by IEAGHG), results from IEAGHG Networks).
• Results and experiences from real projects and natural systems, to support modelling and risk assessments
• Good Q&As from CCS negotiators and others

This meeting allows the negotiators to be in touch with experts to clarify questions et. al. that are relevant to CCS and CDM
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History-matching plume migration at Sleipner (3)

observed layer growth

numerical flow simulation of layer growth

Match imperfect but sufficient to prove understanding of process

Scope for divergence in long-term predictions is limited
Brine Impacts: Natural Analog
Chimayo, New Mexico, USA

- Integrated field, lab and modeling.
- Trace elements are strongly associated with brackish water; in-situ mobilization is negligible.
- Mineral precipitation decreases metal concentrations.

CO₂ rising along faults Keating et. al., 2010
Impact of Technical Workshop

Technical Workshop, Abu Dhabi, 7-8 Sep 2011

Outcomes:

• Number of issues of concern shrunk considerably
• Liability remained as genuine concern – part technical, part policy issue
• UNFCCC then produced draft Modalities and Procedures (M&Ps) drawing upon the workshop and synthesis report, 20 pages of detail, the basis for negotiations in Durban
Negotiations on CCS CDM

- Over 32 hours of formal negotiations
  - “Do we have technology to monitor groundwater impacts?”
    - An example of questions from delegate who have not attended the Technical Workshop in Durban
  - “Definition of seepage should include CO₂ dissolved in groundwater migrating to ocean or atmosphere”
    - An example of questions from delegate who have attend the Durban workshop
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Information into UNFCCC

- SBSTA work (including occasional workshops)
- Side events (official, unofficial)
  - One official Side event in Durban on CCS (CCSA with IEAGHG)
- Booths
Modalities & Procedures for CCS in CDM

• Agreed and adopted Modalities and Procedures!

• Decision 10/CMP.7 (final draft was FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/L.4)

• [Link](http://unfccc.int/2860.php)
Modalities & Procedures for CCS in CDM

CDM Modalities and Procedures (M&Ps)

- Apply mutatis mutandis (use existing as much as possible) with the addition of the CCS-specific M&Ps

Definitions:

- Seepage – transfer of CO$_2$ ultimately to atmosphere or ocean
- Net reversal of storage – seepage exceeds emission reductions during operational period, or seepage after project close
M&Ps - Requirements

DOEs – CCS expertise

Participation Requirements

- Host to establish regulations to control and permit CCS. To include site selection and characterisation, storage rights, redress for affected entities, remediation, liability.

Validation by DOEs

- Site characterisation, risk and safety assessment, environmental and socio-economic assessment, liability provisions, financial provision.
- Host country has to agree to financial provision and liability
- Whether host country agrees to responsibility for net reversal of storage
M&Ps - Liability

- **Treatment of local liability** - *health, safety, environmental impacts*
  - Participation requirement; host party establish national laws and regulations that address local liability
- Liable entity identified for each phase of project lifecycle
  - Project participants liable from operation phase until transfer of liability
  - Transfer of liability to host party after monitoring period ends (20 yrs after crediting period)
- **Treatment of climate liability** - *obligations to surrender allowances for “net reversal of storage”*
  - Any CO₂ seepage results in retirement of credits equivalent to seepage emissions
  - Host party has 2 options;
    - Ultimate responsibility resides with the host party
    - Ultimate responsibility resides with developed country using the credits, i.e. a buyer liability.
M&Ps – Provisions

- **Financial provisions**
  - Project participants establish financial provision ahead of project proceeding
  - Host party agrees to the financial provision
    - Appears to provide the flexibility to choose the most appropriate instruments

- **CER Reserve Account**
  - 5% of issued CERs held in reserve account for the purpose of accounting for “net reversal of storage”
  - CERs released once the last certification report has been received, i.e. at least 20 years after crediting period
M&Ps – Project Closure

• CDM project closure when monitoring stops

• Monitoring stops when:
  • Not less than 20 years after last CDM crediting period
  • No seepage observed in previous 10 years
  • All available evidence from observations and modelling indicates CO₂ will be completely isolated from the atmosphere in the long-term
    o History matching of modelling and monitoring
    o Modelling confirms no future seepage expected

• Enables transfer of liability to host party
• Enables final certification report, which triggers release of CERs from Reserve Account to project participants
Significance of CCS M&Ps from Durban

- Allows CCS to be CDM project activity and earn CERs
- Create incentives / signal for CCS in developing countries
  - CDM key international mechanism supporting low-C technology in developing countries
- Legitimises CCS as valid technology for developing countries
- Establishes precedence-setting regulatory framework for CCS funded under international mechanisms
- Assisted and enabled by getting science and technology into the UNFCCC negotiations
Durban Outcomes
CMP7/COP17

Durban Platform for Enhanced Action

• New negotiating process established (AWG on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action);
• Recognises that current emission pledges inadequate <2°C
• Process to develop “protocol, another legal instrument or outcome…with legal force” for all Parties
• Timeline;
  ‣ Process to completed no later than 2015
  ‣ Implemented by 2020
Durban Outcomes
CMP7/COP17

• AWG KP: Parties agreed to have Kyoto Protocol 2nd Commitment period
  • 2nd Commitment period commences 1st January 2013 and ends 31 December 2017 or 2020
  • Continued project-based mechanisms (CDM)

• AWG LCA:
  • New Market Mechanism to be developed
  • Technology Mechanism
  • Green Climate Fund
Work Ahead

- UNFCCC work on CDM documents (Standards, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms) over 2012-13
  - Bonn Workshop 25 March – IEAGHG (T.Dixon) was invited to present on “Implementation of CCS CDM – Use of Best Practice from both Guidelines and Recent Projects”
  - CDM EB – CCS Working Group of experts

- UNFCCC Negotiations:
  - Trans-boundary CCS issues
  - Global reserve of CERs
    - Submissions (by 5 March)
    - Consideration by SBSTA 36 (May 2012, Bonn)
    - Draft decision to CMP8/COP18 (Dec 2012, Qatar)

- IEAGHG will continue to contribute, via UK DECC and EU, and as IEAGHG with IEA, CCSA, GCCSI
Regulatory Developments in other Regions

• Australia
  • Offshore using Petroleum and GHG Storage Act (2008)
  • Onshore in Victoria, Queensland, WA

• USA
  • US EPA have developed Federal level regulations “Rule” for CO$_2$ storage and for Reporting of Emissions from Capture and Storage
  • Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission developed recommendations for regulations for CO$_2$ storage at a State Level
  • Individual state regulation (KS, LA, TX, WY, ND, MT, etc)

• Canada
  • Canada – acid gas injection and CO$_2$-EOR already permitted in states like Alberta
  • Alberta CCS Amendments Act 2010

• Japan
  • Adapted marine laws
Concluding Remarks...

• An important element of implementing CCS under CDM requires a good Monitoring, Verification and Accountability (MVA)

• Picture courtesy of FUTUREGEN2
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