

Wrap-up

**Workshop on CDM Methodological Issues in regard to Carbon
Dioxide Capture and Storage (CCS)**

20-21 April, 2006

Le Palais des Congres de Paris, France

Makoto Akai, AIST

Purpose of the Workshop

- To develop and deepen mutual understanding among experts from both sides of CCS and CDM
- To discuss how to implement CCS projects as CDM, focusing on the three key methodological issues:
 - Project boundary, Leakage and Permanence
- **Not to intend to reach a consensus or an agreement**

Program of the CCS-CDM Workshop

- **Presentations:**
 - **Introduction to CCS and CDM**
 - Geological storage technology
 - IPCC SRCCS
 - Case studies (Weyburn, Sleipner)
 - Accounting
 - CDM scheme
 - **Proposed methodologies**
 - **Briefing of IEA-GHG workshop**
- **Panel discussions:**
 - **Project boundary**
 - **Leakage and permanence**

Key Issues - Panel discussion 1

Project Boundary

- Discussion focused on geological storage.
- CCS is not a SINK.
- Boundary should be simplified as a first step.
 - Capture and storage in the same country
 - Inclusion/exclusion of the source plant within the boundary would be an issue.
- Project/fugitive emissions should be accounted properly.
- Concern about permanence issues and effectiveness of CCS as a mitigation option.
 - Viability as a mitigation option was discussed in SRCCS

Key Issues - Panel discussion 2

Leakage and Permanence

- Whether the discount factor is needed?
- Need definition of "negligible" in terms of seepage
- Various monitoring technologies are available
- Monitoring strategy should be established.
- After the crediting period, liability could revert to the host government --- still need decision by COP/MOP.
- Enhanced hydrocarbon production
 - Debate
 - Recovered oil through EOR-CCS is not GHG.
 - Emission from the recovered oil should be accounted for at combustion, separately from EOR-CCS process.
- There are tools available for proper site selection with a high level of assurance for permanence.
 - Site characterization is important. Reservoir modeling follows.
- Need to stay within the current CDM framework
- Should be practical

Needs Better Communication

- Perception Gaps -

- **CCS technologies**
- **Uncertainty**
- **Risk**
 - Sudden release by earthquake?
- **Effectiveness as a mitigation option**
- **Permanence/Physical leakage**
- **Existing practices in related areas**
 - Oil industries, etc.

Where to Go?

Outcome of the workshop will provide useful input for:

- **the workshop on considering CCS project as CDM at the 24th session of SBSTA (May 22).**
- **the discussions at the CDM Executive Board and the COP/MOP at its 2nd session.**

Have a Nice Trip Home!