
KPIs for the Otway Project

Charles Jenkins

CO2CRC

KPIs from Victorian EPA

Phase 1A

1. Establish injection and migration models and uncertainties.

Phase 1B

2. Environmental impacts within SEPP¹ bounds.
3. Injection/Migration within model prediction bounds.

Phase 2

4. Verified stable plume within model prediction.
 - 4a Measurements (logs) show no evidence of injected CO₂ beyond secondary containment in Naylor-1 and CRC-1
 - 4b Air samples collected from existing deep-water wells show no evidence of the injected CO₂. There are four such wells that are monitored by DSE and Southern Water.
 - 4c Air samples collected over a few days in the proximity of the Naylor-1 and CRC-1 wells shows no evidence of the injected CO₂.

KPIs from Victorian EPA

Phase 3

8. No evidence of injected CO₂ over 2 years would lead to end of Phase 3.

8a Air samples collected from existing deep-water wells show no evidence of the injected CO₂.

8b Air samples collected over a few days in the proximity of the Naylor-1 and CRC-1 wells shows no evidence of the injected CO₂.

Phase 4

9. No evidence of injected CO₂ over 2 years would lead to end of Phase 4.

9a Air samples collected from existing deep-water wells show no evidence of the injected CO₂.

Some comments...

- Little is prescribed for the M&V programme and technology.
- Requirements are qualitative, refer to a range of indicators, but do not prescribe how to combine them.
- Focused on outcomes in areas of actual environmental interest – air and water.
- Phrasing (...“few” ...“evidence”...) gives both sides room for negotiation in what is a new area.
- Overall the tone is that containment is presumed very likely but spot checks are made of this assumption in key areas.
- A light regulatory touch, appropriate for a safe project that needs latitude to develop fit-for-purpose metrics.