



Acceptance of CCS

Jason Anderson
Senior policy analyst, IEEP

European NGO priority concerns



- Diversion of effort from efficiency and renewable energy
- Impact on ecosystems (including long-term leakage and acute short-term impacts)
- Whether CCS is bridging or long-term
- Cost of deployment
- Dangerous levels of leakage for humans
- The differential acceptance of different types of CCS (in ocean disposal very unacceptable)
- The impact of CCS on expanding coal use (lifecycle impacts of coal in particular)
- The full cycle impact of continued fossil fuel use (lifecycle more broadly, including EOR)
- Scale of deployment (in the sense of physical infrastructure needed)
- CCS in the CDM: doubts about preparedness for 2008-2012

Conclusions



- Identifying CCS as just one part of the portfolio, and a ‘bridging’ solution, has implications:
 - Incentives will have to be structured in a way that *adds* action, rather than taking from other options (i.e. probably *not* a level playing field, but banded by technology)
 - Companies have to be seen to do their fair share (including paying for, if not actually managing, liability)
 - Action has to start now to avoid missing the boat
- Frameworks which guaranteed good site selection, risk assessment and site management must be developed and implemented
 - Note: demonstration projects should include storage demo’s, not just capture facilities.
- Dialogue is better than ‘managing’ opinion; but actions speak louder than either one