



**Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum (CSLF)
Risk Assessment Task Force Meeting Summary
Al Khobar, Saudi Arabia
27 January 2008**

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Chair	George Guthrie (United States)
Australia:	John Bradshaw
European Commission:	Estathios Peteves
France:	Bruno Gerard, Hubert Fabriol
India:	Malti Goel
Japan:	Makoto Akai, Chiaki Shinohara
Norway:	Odd-Magne Mathiassen
United States:	Joseph Giove

CSLF Secretariat

Richard Lynch
Scott Miles

Welcoming Remarks

The Chair of the Risk Assessment Task Force, George Guthrie, called the meeting to order and stated that the focus of the meeting would be a discussion on the Task Force's Phase I report. A draft of sections 1-3 was distributed to Task Force members prior to the meeting via e-mail to allow the members to review those sections and provide comments.

Opening Discussion

The Chair began the discussion of the Phase I report by soliciting ideas of areas requiring greater coverage. Task Force members provided many ideas which are incorporated into the sections below. Bruno Gerard of France noted that the section on existing literature requires further work and he volunteered to take the lead on this assignment.

Introduction

A reorganization was proposed that would shorten the front section of the report by moving much of the detail to the Appendix. It was decided that the report should begin with an initial risk assessment and then progress into a discussion of the management of risk. The framework for the presentation of risk needs to be explained. The framework would be something like a loop or lifecycle. Norway volunteered to share its experience for this report. It was suggested that the introduction needs a definition of risk and a timescale. The emphasis in the introduction should be on near- and long-term risks.

Next Steps

The composition of the Critical Gaps section of Next Steps needed to be discussed at a later date after task force members had time to consider the issues further. The Critical Gaps section needs to emphasize what is and isn't known. It was decided that Next Steps should include recommendations. The method of future communication was discussed with the consensus being e-mail was the preferred communications vehicle.

The Task Force decided that the path forward should be to circulate portions of the report for review and comment by Task Force members. The Task Force will hold a meeting in Cape Town, South Africa, in April 2008, prior to the beginning to CSLF Technical Group Business Meeting. One of the issues to discuss in this meeting will be the calibration of the magnitude of risk. The Chair will then make a presentation to the Technical Group.

Section 3

The only comment received on this section was the suggestion that the section utilize a template.

Section 4 - Critical Needs and Gaps

While a draft of this section has not been prepared, Task Force members shared their opinions on how this section should be structured. It was decided that this section would be improved with the addition of a discussion of critical needs. This section requires mention of the uncertainties of risk assessment and a comparison of analytical and numerical solutions. The impact of impurities and other substances should be addressed. The section needs a system approach. An explanation of the capabilities of modeling and the delivery speed (three-year, five-year, multi-year) is worthy of coverage in the section. Legal needs are a critical need and require mention.

Conclusions

This section will include a discussion of the technology roadmap and technology gaps. The inclusion of summary tables was suggested.

Other Comments

This section of the summary contains valuable comments which applied to more than one section of the Phase I report or questions for consideration by the Task Force members for future discussion. One such question was how the report should treat aquifers that are too large to accurately describe. Another issue was how to handle the management of petroleum risk versus storage risk. Legally this issue is too complicated to address. The Task Force debated whether or not to acknowledge the existence of the risk. The legal issues cross into the policy arena. The Task Force noted that the management of petroleum risk versus storage risk issue is not being addressed at present time by any group.

The Task Force recognized the need to address the entire set of steps that must be undertaken. Many steps need to be taken in parallel. It was noted that a commonality of approach and utilization of best practices is the best course of action.