

ZEP Advisory Council Meeting #20

Minutes of meeting

Date and time: 16 September 2009, 10.30 – 17.00 hrs.

Venue: Sofitel, Place Jourdan 1, Brussels

Status: draft

The list of attendees of AC#20 is attached as annex 1.

1 Opening

Chairman opened the meeting and highlighted the upcoming events, listed in the agenda. Jeff Chapman added that a CSLF meeting will be held on 12-14 October and that members who would like to attend the stakeholder meeting on 12 October will have to register through the CSLF website.

Chairman announced that Rudolph Blum and Juergen Eikhoff have stepped back as AC members.

The minutes of AC#19 and the agenda for AC#20 were adopted.

2 Outlook demonstration programme

Regarding EERP (the recovery package) Simon Bennett of DG TREN gave a short summary:

- 11 proposals have been received
- The proposals are now being assessed
- An internal decision by the EC on the project funding is expected at the end of September
- The signing of the contracts is expected before the end of the year

Regarding NER300 David Gye gave a summary of the present draft legislation that was made available to ZEP on 15 September (the day before AC#20), an assessment of this draft legislation against ZEP's principles and a proposed procedure for developing a timely ZEP response to the decision makers (the CCC) before their meeting on Monday 21 September. In the discussion that followed the following remarks were made:

- Many AC members appreciated the very quick and to-the-point follow-up on the latest draft legislation as presented by Gye;
- Many AC members emphasize that the draft legislation as proposed will not deliver the de-risking that is required, and will likely not give a sufficiently broad mix of CCS technologies. Proceeding as described will not achieve the objective. It will deliver a poor demonstration programme. Consequently it is not a viable proposal;

- An ineffective demonstration programme would increase the importance of collaboration with other global initiatives such as Australia, USA and Canada;
- Some debate was on whether to stick to the originally proposed portfolio of 12 demonstration projects it was concluded that 10 projects are the absolute minimum;
- Important issues for improvement of the draft legislation are upfront payment and storage technologies. Upfront payment to the demonstration projects could significantly leverage the funding. Storage technologies should be recognized as key elements of the portfolio. ZEP should concentrate on such issues that are important and also have a good chance of being adopted;
- Regarding ZEP's reply:
 - o The tone of the reply should remain constructive, although some AC members argued for strong wording
 - o The reply should not only be submitted to the CCC on 21 September but also, before that, to the national delegations of the member states
- The AC decided that:
 - o The executive Committee is mandated to comment on the draft legislation on ZEP's behalf;
 - o A two-page letter will be sent to all CCC members;
 - o To follow agreed principles as described in Gye's presentation;
 - o The ZEP response will be prepared, agreed and submitted by hand by Friday
 - o AC members will be copied on submission.

The current progress of the project network was presented by Simon Bennett of DG TREN. He used a presentation derived from a stakeholder meeting of the day before in which also ZEP (Heinz Bergmann) participated and presented the ZEP response to the draft qualification criteria. Simon Bennett considered ZEP's comments in his conclusions. The network should carry out the knowledge sharing for EEPR and NER300 funded projects and start its work after the selection of EEPR projects. The knowledge sharing should be on a reciprocal basis and include international interaction where possible.

Remarks made in the ensuing discussion:

- The project network will communicate with all relevant organizations
- The project network will not replace ZEP. At the next AC meeting the cooperation between ZEP and the project network should be further discussed.

Charles Soothill presented the current status of ZEP's knowledge sharing report and the agreement that was obtained on a final text (version 10). Much appreciation was expressed for the chairman who managed to close a gap that at the previous AC meeting seemed unbridgeable. The AC accepts version 10 of ZEP's knowledge sharing report and that it will be made available for public use.

3 ZEP future organization

Olivier Appert presented the ZEP bylaws document and asks for endorsement. Remarks made in the ensuing discussion:

- It should be ensured that the proposed blind vote for AC members is indeed totally blind. A vote by email, as suggested on slide 7 of the presentation does not satisfy that demand. The voting will therefore be done at the AC meeting itself;
- Regarding the renewal of taskforce chairs as described on the last slide of Olivier's presentation Bulletpoints 2 (co chairs appointed for 3 years) and 3 (replacement of 1 co chair every 2 years) need to be aligned;
- In the bylaws the financing of the ZEP activities should also be described;

The AC decided to adjust the bylaws on the above mentioned points and accept them.

4 Progress taskforces

Only taskforces D&I, Technology and Policy&Regulation presented the progress of their activities.

4.1 Taskforce Demo&Implementation (TDI)

Philippe Paelinck presented its progress and outlined the process for developing the taskforce's main message at the GA. In reply David White proposed university rep's as member of TDI, in particular of the University of London that avails of a good legal research group.

4.2 Taskforce Technology (TT)

Dirk Goldschmidt presented its progress and the proposed key messages for the GA. The taskforce is asked to take the following remarks of the AC into consideration:

- Key is to get the development of 2nd and 3rd generation technologies started soon.
- Many AC members recognize the importance of the proposed work on cost estimates but warn strongly on debating this at the GA because it could be misinterpreted.
 - o it is recommended to use a recent cost study of Harvard University and McKinsey;
 - o cost of integration of technology blocks should not be overlooked;
 - o for the cost of transport the Newcastle University should be contacted. They are doing relevant research on compression, phase changes and leakage;
- Focus should not only be put on money but also on human resources;
- Too much emphasis is given to capture. More attention should be given to safety and on storage;
- In general there is a concern about the GA presentations. A clear process should be defined for finalizing and agreeing on the taskforce presentations at the GA.

4.3 Taskforce Policy & Regulation (TPR)

Paal Frisvold explained that TPR will provide input to the next CSLF meeting and presented the proposed letter on the London Protocol. It was proposed to highlight the importance of cross border transportation in this letter by explaining its necessity in case of public resistance in member states.

5 General Assembly and COP 15

Klaus Willnow and Eric Drosin presented the progress made with the organization of the General Assembly. The taskforce is asked to take the following remarks of the AC into consideration:

- Many AC members are generally concerned that the programme does not have enough "sting";
- The GA should be a step towards COP15 and CDM and is therefore appropriately timed: it will be difficult to influence the COP15 text after October;
- Among the suggestions:
 - o Invite prof. Stern;
 - o The GA might be used to announce the MoU signed by China and the EU. This might be a very good signal towards public at large.

Eric Drosin presented ZEP's proposed activities at COP15. A summary of the following discussion:

- On 13 December ZEP will organize its event.
 - o In Graeme Sweeney's presentation he will stay away from the CDM issue;
 - o It is suggested to involve some "high impact players", "movers and shakers" in the panel;
- Some expect that the chance on an agreement in COP15 in general, and CCS specifically, is low.
- ZEP's knowledge sharing paper will contribute to ZEP's credibility towards developing countries

6 Abu Dhabi project

John Haynes presented the outlines of the Abu Dhabi hydrogen power project. Key facts:

- 400 MW net
- Precombustion capture technology for NG
- Formerly NG was used for EOR, to be replaced by CO₂
- 50% dilution of H₂ in GE-F9 gas turbine
- about 2 bn \$ investment
- Expected CO₂ capture 1,7 Mton/year, to be used for EOR
- Target for commissioning: 2013.
- Current estimate for price per tonne stored: \$90 - \$120

The presentation of John Haynes is not available for publication.

7 Miscellaneous

The proposed dates for AC meetings and CG meetings were adopted. In addition an extra AC meeting shall be held in January, the date shall be set by the secretariat.

meeting name	place	date
CG37	Brussels	18-11-2010
AC24	Brussels	2-12-2010
CG38	Brussels	2-9-2010
AC23	Brussels	16-9-2010
AC22	Brussels	10-6-2010
CG36	Brussels	27-5-2010
AC21	Brussels	10-3-2010
CG35	Brussels	25-2-2010
CG34	Brussels	18-11-2009

Annex 1, DECISION REGISTER AC#20, 16th September 2009

D20.1:

- The executive Committee is mandated to comment on the draft legislation on ZEP's behalf;
- A two-page letter will be sent to all CCC members;
- To follow agreed principles as described in Gye's presentation;
- The ZEP response will be prepared, agreed and submitted by hand by Friday
- AC members will be copied on submission.

D20.2: The AC accepts version 10 of ZEP's knowledge sharing report and agrees to its use in the public domain.

D20.3: The AC accepts the bylaws with the following comments:.

- The blind voting for AC membership will be done at the AC meeting itself;
- The duration of co chairmanship of task forces shall be aligned with the pace of replacement
- In the bylaws the financing of the ZEP activities shall also be described;

Annex 2, list of attendees

AC#20 attendance			
Meeting name	Surname	present	mandate
AC20	Appert	Y	AC
AC20	Barbucci	Y	AC
AC20	Christensen	Y	AC
AC20	Constantin	Y	AC
AC20	Diercks	Y	observer
AC20	Farley	Y	AC
AC20	Fischer	Y	AC
AC20	Garosi	Y	AC
AC20	Giger	Y	AC
AC20	Gye	Y	AC
AC20	Hauge	Y	AC
AC20	Heitzmann	Y	AC
AC20	Hill	Y	AC

AC#20 attendance			
Meeting name	Surname	present	mandate
AC20	Kather	Y	AC
AC20	Kumar	Y	AC
AC20	Lambertz	Y	AC
AC20	Lubbers	Y	AC
AC20	Ludden	Y	AC
AC20	Martinez Jubitero	Y	AC
AC20	Soothill	Y	AC
AC20	Sweeney	Y	AC
AC20	Szynol	Y	AC
AC20	Valero Capilla	Y	AC
AC20	White	Y	AC
AC20	Chamberlain	Y	AC, replaces Alvarez
AC20	Pyka	Y	AC, replaces Dubinski
AC20	Scott	Y	AC, replaces Mabey
AC20	Bysveen	Y	AC, replaces Rokke
AC20	Goldschmidt	Y	AC, replaces Suess
AC20	Hetland	Y	AC, replaces Sundset
AC20	Skogen	Y	CG
AC20	Drosin	Y	CG
AC20	Bergmann	Y	CG
AC20	Frisvold	Y	CG
AC20	Willnow	Y	CG
AC20	Paelinck	Y	CG
AC20	Kougionas	Y	EC
AC20	RALDOW	Y	EC
AC20	Lombardini	Y	EC
AC20	Bennett	Y	EC
AC20	De Lannoy	Y	observer
AC20	de Wolff	Y	observer

AC#20 attendance			
Meeting name	Surname	present	mandate
AC20	Haynes	Y	observer
AC20	Kato	Y	observer
AC20	Zelinger	Y	observer
AC20	Chapman	Y	observer
AC20	Cussagnet	Y	observer
AC20	Gelot	Y	observer
AC20	DUARTE	Y	observer
AC20	Burns	Y	observer
AC20	TAYLOR	Y	observer
AC20	Ahluwalia	Y	observer
AC20	van Breda Vriesman	Y	observer
AC20	Thomson	Y	observer, candidate AC Dong
AC20	van der Lande	Y	support
AC20	st. Leger	Y	support
AC20	Kakaras	N?	AC
AC20	De Marliave	N?	AC
AC20	Mabey	N	replaced by Jesse Scott
AC20	Sundset	N	replaced by Hetland
AC20	Suess	N	replaced by Goldschmidt
AC20	Røkke	N	replaced by Bysveen
AC20	Ximénez Bruidegom	N	
AC20	Alvarez	N	replaced by Chamberlain
AC20	Liberali	N	
AC20	Cordoba	N	
AC20	Becker	N	
AC20	Gasteiger	N	
AC20	Hassa	N	
AC20	Heithoff	N	
AC20	Strömberg	N	

AC#20 attendance			
Meeting name	Surname	present	mandate
AC20	Dubinski	N	replaced by Pyka