



CCS in the CDM

***George Peridas,
Natural Resources Defense Council***

UNFCCC Technical Workshop

7th September, 2011

Abu Dhabi

Outline



- Background – NRDC and our views on CCS
- December 2009 submission
- Feb 2011 submission
- Considerations and issues for CCS in the CDM

NRDC and our views on CCS



- Environmental NGO
 - >1 million members and activists
 - New York, Washington DC, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, Beijing
- CCS:
 - Not the sole nor the preferred climate mitigation tool (truly sustainable options should be preferred)
 - Nonetheless essential given the scale and rate of effort needed
 - Primary need: coal-fired power
 - Low hanging fruit: high purity CO₂ streams
 - Ready to begin deployment today
 - Primary barrier is economic
 - Must be regulated appropriately

December 2009 submission



- Who:
 - Bellona Foundation, Climate Institute, E3G, Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council
- Acknowledges the need to deploy CCS, especially in certain developing countries
- For a number of reasons, considers the inclusion of CCS in the CDM as problematic and ill-advised
- Calls for an alternative financing mechanism with the mention in the LCA text as a basis

February 2011 submission



- Who:
 - Clean Air Task Force, Environmental Defense Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council, Zero Emission Resource Organisation
- Does not address eligibility
- Aims to assist SBSTA and the parties to achieve:
 - Maximum environmental integrity
 - Minimal unintended consequences

Considerations and issues



- Credit generation
 - Large credit generation potential (millions of tonnes of CO₂ per project)
 - Targets must be adjusted/negotiated accordingly
 - Deployment must not be at the expense of other CDM activities
- Ensuring project integrity
 - Site selection
 - Monitoring, verification
 - Project operation
 - Reporting and accounting
 - Post-injection monitoring and care

Considerations and issues



- Site characterisation and selection
 - Perhaps the most important step
 - Rigorous screening needed
- Monitoring, verification
 - Necessary to establish sequestration of injected CO₂
 - Must be ongoing and inform models in feedback loop
- Project operation
 - Operational limits
 - Plans and procedures

Considerations and issues



- Reporting and accounting
 - Important for crediting
 - Must reliably capture CO₂ leakages, if any
 - Several crediting options (e.g. reserve, obligation to buy back)
- Post-injection monitoring and care
 - Leakage possible after cessation of injection, although risk may typically decrease
 - Must ensure adequate (funds and designated entities) for monitoring and any needed “maintenance”

Closing comments



- Details matter
- Safe and effective CCS projects can be deployed today
- There is a need to address economic barriers and deploy CCS in developing countries
- Such deployment must not be done at the expense of environmental integrity – CCS is not for “everyone”
- Future CCS deployment depends on retaining a clean track record
- Any inclusion in the CDM must not result in cutting corners or two tracks/standards

Contact



George Peridas, Ph.D.

Natural Resources Defense Council

***111 Sutter St. 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104***



415-875-6181



202-390-9453



415-989-0062



gperidas@nrdc.org