

Name of submitter: Mark Bonner (please note that my comments are offered on an individual basis and do not necessarily reflect the broader views of the Institute or its membership).

Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any): Global CCS Institute

Contact email of submitter: mark.bonner@globalccsinstitute.com

Date: 23 June 2013

Questionnaire for soliciting public inputs on the ‘concept note on operationalizing carbon dioxide capture and storage as a CDM project activity’

Background: The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (hereinafter referred to as the CMP) adopted at its seventh session decision 10/CMP.7; "Modalities and procedures for carbon dioxide capture and storage in geological formations as clean development mechanism project activities" (hereinafter referred to as the CCS modalities and procedures).

At its seventy-second meeting, the CDM Executive Board (the Board) approved the ‘workplan of the CDM Executive Board for 2013’. In the workplan Board approved to launch a public call for concept note of project 160 ‘Operationalizing carbon capture storage (CCS)’. The input received from this call for input will be considered in seventy fourth meeting of the Board.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I: Overall assessment of the concept note

Please provide general suggestions for improvement and editorial comments on the draft document. For example, is the document:

- (a) Well written; YES
- (b) Simple and accessible; YES
- (c) User-friendly; YES
- (d) Well-organized, with flow of logic that is clear; YES
- (e) Exemplified;
- (f) Complete

Part II: Input on specific and technical issues

The concept note has discussed the main issues in CCS modalities and procedures which may need clarity for implementation. The inputs are sought on the following:

- a. **Coverage of issues:** Are the issues covered in concept note adequate? Is there any other issue which require further clarification? YES
- b. **Options and recommendations:** Do you propose some other option and recommendation other than mentioned in the concept note? NO
- c. **Additional standards/procedures:** Do you require any additional procedures/guidelines/standards which may help fulfilling the requirements for CCS project activity as mentioned in CCS modalities and procedures? If yes, kindly explain. NO

Part III: Other comments/inputs

Please provide comments/inputs on any other general or specific issue that you identify with the draft or any other issue which may help in operationalizing the CCS CDM project activities, using the commenting table below:

0	1	2
Para No.	Issue to be addressed (including need for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text, if applicable)
10.d	Verification after laws repealed	In a situation where a CCS project has been registered but national laws are repealed or rescinded at some unforeseen future time, and a negative verification opinion results against a host Party, this should not negatively impact the CCS project proponent in terms of having to remedy any CDM shortfalls or breaches. This should default to the host Party.
12	Sufficiency of national laws	A risk management approach should be adopted in making such legalistic judgements. Any perceived shortfalls in regulatory provisions should be identified and made known to the host Party for explanation and/or remedy so as to preserve the integrity of CDM operations and objectives. But it is important to recognise that ‘sufficiency’ provisions may be assured with alternate complementary approaches (non-regulatory) and in the absence of explicit regulation/s.
13	host Party validation	A one time independent validation should be sufficient if deemed at that time that the prevailing provisions are sufficient and that there are no subsequent changes given effect. There should be a process triggering an assessment only if material changes are given effect to prevailing provisions.
15.a	Confirmation of compliance	Note that a host Party’s provisions to comply with “Party participation” requirements could be complementary and entirely consistent with, and not necessary identical to, the CDM M&P.
18	Issuance of CERs	The concept of ‘mutatis mutandis’ is important and CCS should be treated equally under the CDM M&Ps as with comparable CDM activities.
21.b	Site selection	Agree that the decision should be left to the host Party based on the assessments required by the M&P. It should be recognised that geological storage sites may lend themselves to multiple resources and uses, and there should be flexibility to manage these resources (i.e. potable water, resource extraction, permanent CO2 storage etc.) in a manner that is consistent with the host Parties national interest and in adherence with the CDM’s M&P’s to ensure for permanent storage. Do not support Recommendation 21.A.

0	1	2
Para No.	Issue to be addressed (including need for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text, if applicable)
25	Monitoring – significant deviation	I note that the application of such a performance metric will be very site specific and locationally relevant, and will rely on the extent to which predictive versus actual data is available at the time of assessment (which is further influenced by the stage of project noting that tolerances will inevitably change over time as actual plume behaviour firms and according to the inherent but manageable risks identified). Adopting a one size fits all CCS projects approach should be avoided.
26	Notification of significant deviation	Agree that there needs to be a triggering process where the project participant immediately notifies the host Party of remarkable deviations as determined by a risk assessment and considered by expert judgements.
29	Administrative expenses and cost of adaptation	The concept of ‘mutatis mutandis’ is important and CCS should be treated equally under the CDM M&Ps as with comparable CDM activities.
37	Requirements for financial provision	Agree that the host Party should determine the adequacy of financial provisions and report this in their letter of approval to the DOE.
40	Notification of liability transfer	Agree that the project participant should notify the EB 3 to 6 months prior.