



## Minutes of the Policy Group Meeting

Perth, Australia  
Thursday, October 25, 2012

### LIST OF ATTENDEES

#### Policy Group Delegates

Chair:	Barbara McKee (United States)
Australia:	Ann Boon, Margaret Sewell
Canada:	Eddy Chui
China:	Sizhen Peng, Jiutian Zhang
France:	Bernard Frois
Japan:	Koji Hachiyama, Kei Miyaji
Norway:	Tone Skogen
Saudi Arabia:	Hamoud Al-Otaibi
South Africa:	Faizel Mulla, Gina Downes
United Kingdom:	Jonathan Hood
United States:	James Wood

#### CSLF Secretariat

Jeffrey Price, Adam Wong

#### Observers

Australia:	Maureen Clifford (CarbonNet Project); Asha Titus (University of Newcastle); Zoe Naden (Dept. of Resources, Energy and Tourism); Clement Yoong (Coal Innovation NSW)
India:	Preeti Malhotra (Alstom)
Netherlands:	Bill Spence (Shell)
Chinese Taipei:	Shih-Ming Chuang, Ren-Chen Wang (Industrial Technology Research Institute)
United States:	Victoria Osborne (Striker Communications); Barry Worthington (U.S. Energy Association)
Global CCS Institute:	Barry Jones
International Energy Agency:	Juho Lipponen

## PROCEEDINGS

### 1. Opening Statement

Barbara McKee, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy for the United States, said that Charles McConnell, the Chair of the Policy Group, had asked her to read a message from him to the Policy Group. In that message, Mr. McConnell extended his regrets that he could not attend the meeting in Perth and said that Ms. McKee would serve in his place as Chair of the Policy Group. In the letter Mr. McConnell also raised the concern that the world was not on track to meet the agreed-upon goal at least 20 diverse, fully-integrated, industrial-scale projects by 2020, noted the importance of moving from Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) to Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage (CCUS), and asked the CSLF to address the fundamental question of how international collaboration could be redefined and restructured through the CSLF to meet that goal.

Ms. McKee thanked Australia for its hospitality in hosting this meeting in Perth and noted that this was the second time Australia has hosted a CSLF meeting. She also thanked the delegates and stakeholders participating in this meeting, many of whom had to travel long distances to attend. She reviewed the major decisions of the CSLF Ministerial last year in Beijing. These major decisions were that the term of the CSLF was extended indefinitely from 2013 when it was originally to expire; the mission of the CSLF was expanded to include commercialization; and the scope was broadened from CCS to CCUS.

Ms. McKee said the ultimate goal of the CSLF must be the real-world application of CCUS technologies. Economic barriers have been particularly daunting and simply storing CO<sub>2</sub> in a saline formation – where the main considerations are cost and risk – does not yet provide a compelling incentive for industry to invest in these technologies. CCUS offers an approach that can take us much closer to the finish line because it provides a viable stream of revenue to cover much of those costs. Noting that many countries do not have opportunities for EOR, she said that those countries will benefit because CCUS will accelerate the development at scale of the technologies and procedures needed to capture and store CO<sub>2</sub>.

### 2. Australia Host Country Welcome

Margaret Sewell, Head of Clean Energy and Environment Division, Australia Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism, welcomed the delegates to Perth. She thanked the Australian organizing team and the CSLF Secretariat for their work on the meeting and stated that Australia places a high importance on international collaboration. Ms. Sewell then described the policy drivers for CCS in Australia and explained why CCS was important to Australia. She said that a carbon price of A\$23 per tonne was introduced in July 2012 and will become flexible in 2015. This price will be linked to the European Union's emissions trading scheme. The goal is to encourage investment in CCS and other low-carbon technologies. Australia has a heavy reliance on fossil fuels and is the world's largest net exporter of coal and, for these reasons, Australia has many projects for both CO<sub>2</sub> capture and storage, some of which she described.

Ms. Sewell also conveyed the following message from Hon. Martin Ferguson AM MP, Minister for Resources and Energy and Minister for Tourism: "I wish you a successful meeting, and encourage you to exchange ideas and discuss practical ways to accelerate the development and deployment of CCS."

### **3. Introduction of Delegates**

Chairman McKee asked delegates and observers to introduce themselves, which they all did.

### **4. Adoption of Agenda**

The Agenda was approved without change.

### **5. Review and Approval of Minutes from Beijing Meeting**

The draft of the Minutes of the previous Policy Group Meeting, held in Beijing, China in September 2011 had been circulated for comment to the Policy Group prior to the meeting. The final draft, which incorporated comments received, had been posted on the CSLF website. The Minutes were approved without further change.

### **6. Review of Beijing Meeting Action Items**

Jeffrey Price of the CSLF Secretariat reviewed the status of the Action Items from the Policy Group Meeting in Beijing. Two action items related to raising further money for capacity building, but currently-available funds have not yet been fund committed so fundraising has not been started. Action items for the Communications and Public Outreach and CCUS in the Academic Community Task Forces are underway. The edits to the Strategic Plan have been completed.

## **Task Force Reports**

### **7. Report on Capacity Building**

Tone Skogen, Norway, Chair of the Capacity Building Governing Council, gave a presentation on CSLF capacity building activities. She said that the CSLF Capacity Building Fund was established at the CSLF Ministerial in London in October 2009. Contributions from Australia, Canada, Norway and the United Kingdom to the CSLF Capacity Building Fund total US \$2,965,143.75. The CSLF Capacity Building Governing Council was established to assure that the Fund is spent wisely and appropriately. Although the Fund is open to all CSLF Members, the expectation is that the financial contributions should focus on emerging economy CSLF Members. A total of US \$2,016,950 has been committed to 12 projects in 4 countries. These include 3 projects in Brazil, 5 projects in China, 2 projects in South Africa and 2 projects in Mexico. A total of US \$250,000 has also been ring-fenced for a possible project in India. US \$514,812 remains available for further projects. Submissions for those remaining funds will be invited by the Governing Council. The Governing Council is also keen to make sure that lessons learned from activities are shared with the largest possible group of interested stakeholders.

Sizhen Peng of China thanked the Capacity Building Governing Council for its support of China's CCUS activities, including the Chinese CCUS website ([www.ccus.china.org.cn](http://www.ccus.china.org.cn)), a legal and regulatory workshop and a knowledge-sharing workshop. These have had a very significant impact in China where there is considerable interest. He said that participants from other CSLF countries had been invited to the workshops and he wanted to encourage their participation. Juho Lipponen of the International Energy Agency (IEA) noted that participation by other CSLF Members added moral support that was itself important. The

Chair said that the Secretariat would be pleased to work with China to obtain participation from other CSLF Members in future workshops.

Gina Downes of South Africa also thanked the Governing Council for its generous support. Workshops held in 2011 provided a base upon which the South African Center for Carbon Capture and Storage could build. Subsequent to the workshops, an extensive work program was developed and the workshops enabled industrial representatives to come on board with that program.

Asked whether the Governing Council should try to raise additional funds, Ms. Skogen responded that further fundraising should be put on hold for the time being since substantial funds were still available from the original contributions to the Fund. After seeing the response to the call for submissions next year, the Governing Council would determine whether additional funds are needed. China suggested that industrial firms be invited to contribute to the Fund. The Governing Council will take this under consideration.

## **8. Report from Financing CCS Task Force**

Bernard Frois of France, Chair of the Task Force, gave a presentation on the Task Force's activities. Mr. Frois stated that the Task Force had held two roundtables on financing. The first roundtable was held in Paris in January 2012 on the topic of "What will it take to turn ambition into reality." The second roundtable was held in Washington in September 2012 on the topic of "Lessons from first movers in CCUS." The Paris workshop had about 50 participants including many from banks. The banks indicated that they are ready to finance large-scale projects provided that the projects have solid business plans. Mr. Frois also stated that one conclusion was that polygeneration plants were the most viable approach, but the situation was different in Europe and the U.S. The Washington roundtable consisted of presentations from several first movers. These projects are proceeding based on their economics, not due to climate regulation. Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR) was seen as having value for both the project and the production of significant amounts of oil. This could be valuable in the United States, the Middle East and China. His conclusion was that large-scale CCUS is possible, but today only polygeneration with EOR would create adequate revenues.

Barbara McKee noted that considerable knowledge had been gained through the workshops and asked how the Task Force planned to convey this knowledge to a wider audience. The response was that the Chair of the Task Force wanted feedback from Policy Group about what the Policy Group wanted. Delegates were then invited by the Chair of the Policy Group to provide that feedback. In response, delegates stated that messages on financing could be developed for Ministers, but cautioned that situations vary widely, particularly as it relates to the potential for EOR. Delegates from Australia, Norway, South Africa, and the United Kingdom stated that many countries did not have opportunities for EOR which was central to the successful financing approach described by the Chair of the Task Force. They emphasized that national circumstances differ and "one size does not fit all."

Potential messages on financing that should be given to the Ministers were discussed. Norway emphasized that conditions vary in different parts of the world and, in particular, the ZEP initiative in Europe had concluded that the long-term path to a business case was not present without public funding. Other delegates echoed this message. Australia noted that

the Clean Energy Ministerial (CEM) may be addressing financing in the messages it presents to its Ministers at its April 2013 Ministerial. The Task Force Chair was requested and agreed to have a dialog with CEM about building on the CEM's work and coordinating messages.

## 9. Policy Roundtable: Advancing CCUS in a Time of Challenge

James Wood, United States Delegate, moderated this roundtable discussion, which consisted of his presentation and two other presentations in the morning followed by an open discussion after lunch. He began the Roundtable by describing the extensive work on CCUS of the US Department of Energy, including the National Energy Technology Laboratory. He discussed the Department's major demonstration projects, emphasizing the commercial and financial aspects of the projects. Costs of these projects are being shared by companies that see commercial opportunities in those projects. He also described the global drivers for CCUS including the rapidly increasing needs for energy, rising coal demand and how carbon capture can meet climate goals.

Mr. Wood emphasized how the drivers have changed since 2009 and how this change created a need for CO<sub>2</sub> utilization and, in particular, for EOR, which has a very large potential to increase oil production and to create jobs. He said that EOR is not a business case, but rather an implementation method for moving some projects forward. He noted that several projects in the United States were moving forward without EOR, notably FutureGen and ADM. The focus of work on CCUS should be on reducing the costs of capture and addressing related challenges such as the energy penalty and scale. Work is proceeding in many R&D areas to develop and improve technologies to reduce capture costs.

Juho Lipponen of the IEA described what he saw as the four fundamentals of CCS, what CCS could accomplish, and what should now be the focus of further work. The four fundamentals were: (1) demand for energy and corresponding CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are increasing; (2) fossil fuels are indisputably part of the global energy mix; (3) global energy use will continue to grow; and (4) CO<sub>2</sub> emissions must be cut by 50% by 2050. CCS could play a very significant role in reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, not as a substitute for other low-carbon energy technologies, but in addition to them. One unique advantage of CCS is that it can be applied in industrial sectors where no other solutions are feasible. While the investment required in CCS is large, US \$3.6 trillion, an additional investment of US \$3.1 trillion would be required to meet the same emissions reduction goals in the electricity sector without CCS. Clear, long-term policy objectives are required to deploy CCS. Specifically, governments should assess the role CCS could play in their countries; it is critical that demonstration projects continue; appropriate policy mechanisms beyond capital subsidies should be considered; and the CCS story should be told in a positive way.

Barry Jones of the Global CCS Institute presented the findings of the Institute's new report, "The Global Status of CCS: 2012," which was released on October 10. This report describes progress since 2011. It has several key messages, notably that action is needed now to ensure that CCS can play a vital role in tackling climate change and progress must be accelerated. That acceleration depends on collaboration and knowledge sharing. The report presents an analysis of Large Scale Integrated Projects (LSIPs) and shows that 74 such projects are currently underway throughout the world, but most are at a relatively early stage of development. More policy support is required, both internationally and nationally. While

various barriers must be overcome, analyses by the Institute show that CCS can be competitive with other low- or no-carbon alternatives.

## **10. Policy Roundtable: Advancing CCUS in a Time of Challenge (Continued)**

The discussion moderated by James Wood continued after lunch. At the beginning of the discussion, Mr. Wood reiterated and commented upon a number of points he drew from the prior discussion:

- While one size does not fit all, experience has shown that more rapid progress is made when a business case can be made for a project, as it will attract private equity investment.
- It is important to encourage diverse projects, both large and small, because they all involve regulators, political decision makers and the public and make them more comfortable with the technology.
- EOR is not a business case because the value of CO<sub>2</sub> is insufficient to cover the cost of capture. There are many possible business cases to make products from fossil fuels, including electricity, while capturing and storing or utilizing the CO<sub>2</sub>.
- The capture cost of CO<sub>2</sub> is too high. The focus of the CSLF and its Members should be reducing the cost of capture.

The ensuing discussion focused in several related areas. Points made in this discussion by various speakers are summarized below organized by topic. Many of these have implications to CSLF activities.

### Advancing CCUS Technology and Demonstration Projects

Enough projects must be built globally by 2020 to reduce costs, but challenges are still substantial and adequate progress is not being made. Many projects are in the final stages of development but are awaiting financing. Nearly all proposed projects are receiving or expecting government financial incentives but different methods are being used to provide those incentives. Some, such as tax credits, do not involve direct government expenditures. A level playing field with other low-carbon technologies is needed.

The types of projects and incentives needed depend on project location since circumstances vary regionally. For this reason, a regional approach may be useful. EOR contributes in some regions while other utilization methods or storage may contribute elsewhere.

First-generation projects demonstrate the integration of various project components at scale but are not optimized. A second generation of plants is needed to begin the optimization process. Due to tight government budgets, these second-generation plants are likely to be modifications of the first generation rather than totally new plants.

Different business cases may be made for different uses of fossil fuels that capture CO<sub>2</sub>. Each business case will need to have adequate revenue streams to go forward. CCUS is not a single technology applied in a single industry but rather a range of technologies applied in a wide range of industries with different situations.

### Messages to Ministers and Others

The CSLF should create messages for Ministers and others, including the public and political leaders that re-energize interest in CCS/CCUS. It is important to convey the message to political decision makers and to the public that CCUS is about clean energy. The CSLF should seek ways to re-energize the political process and focus political decision makers on the short term. We cannot delay advancing CCS/CCUS technology; we are far from meeting the goal set in the CSLF/IEA recommendations to the G8 in 2007. We need to show that CCS/CCUS has progressed, the technology is ready to go and it can contribute. If the CSLF wants to be relevant it should give guidance for actions for the short run, that is, by 2020. Importantly, it was felt that the CSLF should be the organization to involve Ministers in the discussion so the Ministers can make commitments.

### Need for a Short-Term Roadmap

The CSLF must develop and advocate for roadmaps that have a time horizon no later than 2020. Short-term actions are required both to commercialize the technology in a timely manner and to gain meaningful political commitments. Roadmaps can be valuable as a guide to action but depend on how much importance governments attached to them.

The long-term vision for CCUS is that it should eventually become part of the global low-carbon portfolio, but care should be taken that the long-term vision does not detract from the practical achievement of short-term goals. The IEA is revisiting its CCS Roadmap and one idea is a strong section on what must be done in this decade. The CSLF should have both a short-term and long-term view. In the short-term it is important to have several projects realized and in the long-term to develop business cases.

### Coordination with CEM and IEA

At least two related Ministerial meetings will be held in 2013 in which messages about CCUS can be delivered to Ministers. These messages can be coordinated for maximum impact. The CCUS Action Group of the CEM will make recommendations to the CEM Ministerial in April 2013. Similarly, the IEA Ministers will meet in 2013 shortly after the CSLF Ministers. These Ministerials provide opportunities to reinforce CSLF messages, but it is important to avoid duplication. As an Action Item, the CSLF should coordinate messages to Ministers with the CEM and IEA and should coordinate with the IEA on roadmaps.

## **11. Election of Policy Group Chair**

The Chair stated that term of the Policy Group Chair is three years and it was now time for a new election. Vice Chairs will be elected next year. She asked the Vice Chair from China, Sizhen Peng, to chair the election procedure. He reviewed the rules for elections of the Chairs and Vice Chairs and stated that the Secretariat has received nominations from Australia, China, Japan, Mexico, and Norway of the United States to be Chair and that the Members have been notified of this nomination. The United States was elected by consensus. After the election, Barbara McKee thanked the delegates for re-electing the United States.

## 12. Review of 2013 CSLF Ministerial Concept Paper

The Chair stated that the Draft Concept Paper for the Ministerial, which will be held next year in Houston, Texas, USA, was a first draft and would evolve over time in response to comments. Jeffrey Price of the Secretariat presented a brief overview of the Draft Concept Paper covering one section at a time. Delegates were then asked for comments and suggestions on each section of the draft.

### General Theme

The general theme of the Ministerial was proposed as “The Business Case for CCUS – Carbon Utilization to Meet Energy Sustainability for Economic Development and to Fight Poverty.”

Norway expressed a concern about how poverty fit into the theme when the objective of CCS/CCUS is to combat climate change and was not convinced that this topic should be in the theme.

Australia thanked the Secretariat for the first draft of the Concept Paper as a starting point for discussion and said that this was one of the best Policy Group discussions. Australia also noted that the Policy Group had earlier concluded that an agenda was needed to re-energize the political process and a short-term roadmap would help to make CCS/CCUS a priority again for Ministers. Discussions of these issues could be incorporated into the Ministerial agenda. Australia also said that a high-level theme should indicate that utilization is possible in some, but not all, countries and that financial issues remain to be resolved.

The Chair summarized the prior discussion by saying that we had heard that “one size does not fit all;” we must re-energize the political process; and a short-term roadmap is required. She said that the Technical Group would be directed to develop a roadmap that would lead to accomplishments by 2020.

### Key Issues

A number of issues for discussion at the Ministerial were proposed in the Draft Concept Paper. Many of these relate to the political will to make commitments to CCS/CCUS. A number of comments were made on these suggested issues.

Australia expressed concern that the issues as written blurred the distinction between CCS and CCUS and it is important to make the distinction.

The United Kingdom stated that the need for a level playing field for CCUS as a low-carbon technology could be explored further.

France expressed the opinion that what was needed was not a list of issues but rather to focus on a few concrete things that we want to happen.

China stated that the purpose of utilization is to help remove the obstacles of cost and safety in the short term so that we could have CCS in the long term.

South Africa suggested that rather than phrasing the key issues as “willingness to” which implies dragging people along, the issues should be phrased more positively as “showing leadership in.” South Africa also mentioned bottlenecks in the CCS value chain identified in a study by the Global CCS Institute as an area where not enough was being done.

Norway stated that we should be careful not to make EOR the only focus.

South Africa asked how countries that did not have the option of EOR could attract investment to CCS. Responding to South Africa, Barry Jones of the Global CCS Institute reiterated that “one size does not fit all” in terms of attracting investment because there are very different national circumstances. A discussion of what is needed to attract investment should account for those varying national circumstances. Juho Lipponen of the IEA added that, where utilization is not an option, government incentives may be necessary to create the final part of the incentive. He added that the challenges are particularly great for a developing country such as South Africa.

The United States commented that EOR would not attract investment by itself because the cost of capture is so much higher than the potential revenues from EOR, but governments, whether EOR is possible or not, can provide incentives such as tax benefits on a time-limited basis. The benefits that accrue to governments are jobs, the beneficial use (if any) of the CO<sub>2</sub>, and the involvement of political policy makers, regulators and the public who will be able to see that projects are safe and produce benefits.

### Expected Outcomes

Expected outcomes included reaffirmations of prior Ministerial statements and potential new agreements.

Norway stated that it was not happy with the statement that CCUS is needed to make fossil fuels sustainable and preferred to remove this statement as an outcome. The United Kingdom concurred and suggested not including the word “sustainable.” Norway and several other delegated agreed. Juho Lipponen of the IEA commented that sustainability was a large concept that combined aspects of economics, supply security and the environment and it can be taken to mean different things. As an alternative, Norway suggested using terminology such as CCS being needed to “move to a low carbon future.”

Norway suggested that the expected outcome of “reducing poverty” be changed instead to “access to energy.”

Australia voiced concern over statements of “commitments” for governments, stating that Ministers would find it difficult to make such commitments in current budgetary situations.

Japan stated that outreach was important and should be included as one of the actions in the expected outcomes.

South Africa stated that CO<sub>2</sub>-EOR should not be promoted as “the key component” of a CCUS strategy, but rather as “one of the components.”

The United States stated that rather than saying “governments should create the business case,” it should be recognized that what governments actually can do is promote an atmosphere in which business cases can develop. There are regions where there is no utilization possible with EOR and we should keep the door open and not be restrictive.

### Role of Stakeholders

Barry Worthington, as Acting Chair of the Stakeholders Group, reported on the Stakeholders Meeting held the previous day. He said that the participation of stakeholders in the

Ministerial and proposed topics were discussed. The stakeholders would like to have representation on the Ministerial Steering Committee. Stakeholders also discussed reinvigorating and renewing stakeholder participation, particularly by regional officials, NGOs and academics. Stakeholders, particularly corporations, would also like to have the option of sponsoring activities and welcomed the opportunity of participating in the Technology Showcase. A full-day stakeholders' session was seen as desirable with a report on the session being given to the Ministers. Stakeholders also expressed gratitude that they were welcomed as observers and asked to be included in the entire Ministerial, recognizing that government-to-government and government-only meetings would be closed.

#### Site and Date for the Ministerial

Barry Worthington, as Executive Director of the United States Energy Association, which is responsible for the logistical arrangements for the 2013 Ministerial, discussed the possible sites and dates for the Ministerial, which is to be held in Houston, Texas, USA. He noted that virtually every major energy company in the world has a Houston office and this creates opportunities for Ministers. The three best hotels in Houston have been identified and these hotels have been asked to provide availability information from mid-September through the third week in November, 2013. Appropriate venues for social functions are also being explored.

Mr. Worthington asked delegates for dates within the time frame under consideration that they would not want to have a Ministerial, such as conflicts with other Ministerial meetings. In response, Juho Lipponen said that the IEA Ministerial will be held on November 19 and 20, 2013.

#### Procedure for Redrafting the Concept Paper

The procedure for redrafting the Concept Paper was discussed. It was agreed that:

1. Delegates would provide further comments in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible. These comments may be in track changes or other formats. The comments may also include ideas for new concepts, themes or additions.
2. The Secretariat will take these comments and revise the draft Concept Paper by the second week of January 2013.
3. Delegates will have an opportunity to comment on this revised draft.
4. The Steering Committee would then take up planning for the Ministerial using the Revised Draft Concept Paper.

Juho Lipponen of the IEA also stated that he found the draft difficult to navigate and would provide a suggested format for the redraft. Australia also called attention to the terminology in the definition of CCUS and how it related to CCS, stating that the distinction between the two needs to be clearer.

The Chair also noted that Canada had offered to host a Policy Group meeting if it is needed to prepare for the Ministerial.

### 13. Selection of 2013 Ministerial Steering Committee

The Chair stated that a Steering Committee is needed to plan the 2013 Ministerial and asked delegates for volunteers for the Ministerial Steering Committee. The United States will chair the Committee. Canada and France agreed to serve, as did the Global CCS Institute and the International Energy Agency. Australia said that it could participate if it could participate in meetings by videoconference. The Chair said that she wanted Members that had hosted prior Ministerial to participate in the planning so that the CSLF could benefit from their experience. China, Norway Saudi Arabia, South Africa, and the United Kingdom will consult with their capitals on whether to serve on the Steering Committee.

### 14. New Business

The Chair asked delegates if there was any new business. There was none.

### 15. Closing Remarks/Adjourn

The Chair thanked the delegates and the Policy Group Task Forces for their hard work. She said that we need to re-energize and re-invigorate the CSLF and said that the discussion had brought out much that had to be considered and she looked forward to making the upcoming Ministerial the best we have had.

The meeting was then adjourned.

#### ACTION ITEMS FROM THE POLICY GROUP MEETING

Item	Lead	Action
1	Secretariat, China	Work together to inform participants from other countries that they can participate in future workshops in China
2	Capacity Building Governing Council	Consider how to invite business enterprises to contribute to CSLF capacity-building activities
3	Capacity Building Governing Council	Issue a request for submissions for capacity building projects to be undertaken by the CSLF
4	Capacity Building Governing Council	Consider whether to raise additional contributions to the CSLF Capacity Building Fund after receiving the response to the request for submissions
5	Capacity Building Governing Council and Task Force	Consider ways to more widely share knowledge and information developed for CSLF capacity-building activities
6	International Energy Agency, Secretariat	Work together to have CSLF Members participate in the IEA's CCS Legal-Regulatory activities
7	CSLF Secretariat	Conduct a dialog with CEM and IEA to coordinate messages to Ministers in respective Ministerial meetings
8	France	Have a dialog with CEM to see how we can coordinate with their activities
9	Technical Group	Develop a CCS/CCUS Roadmap with short-term (by 2020) results

<b>Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Action</b>
10	Ministerial Steering Committee	Develop ways to re-energize the political process for CCS/CCUS
11	Policy Group Delegates	Send comments on the current draft of the Ministerial Concept Paper to the Secretariat as soon as possible
12	International Energy Agency	Provide the Secretariat with a formatting idea for the revised Ministerial Concept Paper
13	Secretariat	Revise Ministerial Concept Paper by second week of 2013
14	China, Norway, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Kingdom	Consider whether to take part in the Ministerial Steering Committee and inform the Secretariat
15	Ministerial Steering Committee	Plan the Ministerial Concept based on input from the Concept Paper and Member comments
16	Policy Group Delegates	Inform the Secretariat of possible dates between mid-September and November 2013 that may conflict with a Ministerial
17	U.S. Energy Association	Identify possible dates for the Ministerial