



CSLF-T-2005-7

**Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum
Minutes of the Technical Group Meeting
Oviedo, Spain
30 April, 2005**

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Official Delegates

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Australia: | John Bradshaw, Peter Cook |
| Brazil: | Paolo Cunha, Paolo Rocha |
| Canada: | Bill Reynen (Vice Chair), Stefan Bachu |
| European Commission: | Denis O'Brien |
| France: | Christian Fouillac, Pierre Le Thiez |
| Germany: | Jürgen Hake , Hubert Höwener |
| India: | Malti Goel, R. R. Sonde |
| Japan: | Makato Akai |
| Mexico: | Maria Elena Sierra-Galindo, Miguel Angel Gomez Galindo |
| Norway: | Tore Andreas Torp (Vice Chair), Odd-Magne Mathiassen |
| South Africa: | Stan Pillay |
| United Kingdom: | Philip Sharman |
| United States: | Peter Rozelle (Chair), Howard Herzog |

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Note: At this meeting of the Technical Group, significant changes were made to the Draft Agenda supplied by the Secretariat. The outline of these Minutes follows the Agenda that was adopted by the Group. The Agenda adopted for this meeting is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 1.

1. Opening Remarks and Chairman's Statement

The Chair of the meeting, Dr. Peter Rozelle, called the meeting to order, briefly highlighted some of the items to be covered, and thanked the Spanish hosts and the European Commission for their hospitality and providing the CSLF Technical Group with an excellent venue for the meeting.

In the interest of maximizing the time available for the business to be transacted, the Chair combined his opening remarks with his Chairman's Statement. As part of his Chairman's Statement, Dr. Rozelle acknowledged the work of the Technical Group Task Forces, which have resulted in Discussion papers analyzing key technology gaps from the CSLF Technology Roadmap. The Chair also suggested that the review and adoption of these discussion papers be kept brief, and that the group develop next steps based on their results.

2. Welcome

The Hosts' welcoming remarks were delivered by Professor Rosa Menéndez, Director of the Instituto Nacional del Carbón, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. Professor Menéndez welcomed the group to Oviedo. The CSIC is the largest research institute in Spain, with more than 100 institutes. Professor Menéndez expressed that the CSIC is receptive to international collaboration. Professor Menéndez also highlighted work being done in Spain on high temperature carbon capture with regenerable sorbents, and the strong commitment of the INCAR to carbon sequestration work.

3. Introductions

The Technical Group Delegates, Spanish Hosts, and Observers introduced themselves.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

Appendix 1 is the Agenda that was decided on by the Technical Group.

In order to accommodate some delegates' needs, the Technical Group suggested the following modifications to the Agenda:

1. The United States asked that the items on Discussion and Review of the Project Initiation and Review Panel and Discussion on How to Advance New Projects be combined, and that the combined discussion be moved to late morning (directly after the morning coffee break).

2. Canada asked that discussion of a request from the International Energy Agency (IEA) be added, on coordinating efforts in the legal and regulatory area (while recognizing that this area is under the purview of the CSLF Policy Group).
3. Australia asked for discussion of plans for the upcoming CSLF meeting in Berlin, September, 2005.
4. India and France asked to present updates on their country programs relevant to carbon sequestration.

The Chair motioned that:

1. Discussions of the Project Initiation and Review Panel and How to Advance New Projects and moved to the time slot between the morning coffee break and lunch;
2. Keep the rest of the agenda in order, beginning with the review of the discussion papers beginning after lunch;
3. Add discussion on the IEA collaboration request and Technical Group plans for Berlin to the discussion of new business;
4. India and France would be asked to present their updates during the discussion of new projects.

Australia, Canada, and the European Commission seconded the motion, and the motion passed. As mentioned, the Agenda used henceforth for this meeting appears in Appendix 1.

4. Review and Approval of Minutes from Melbourne Meeting

During discussion of this item, the point was raised (by India) that India had proposed a change to the introductory section of the CSLF Technology Roadmap at the Melbourne Meeting (along with the European Commission). However, the draft Minutes only cited the European Commission as recommending this change. India asked that the Minutes (Paragraph 8, second bullet) be changed to reflect the fact that India had also recommended the change.

The United Kingdom asked for clarification as to whether one of the South African delegates, Mr. Roger Wicks, was present at the Melbourne Meeting. The Chair responded that he was present.

The delegate from Japan, Dr. Akai, asked that his name be spelled correctly in the Minutes.

The European Commission motioned that the minutes be adopted with the changes suggested by India and Japan. The United Kingdom seconded, and the motion carried.

5. Presentations by the Spanish Hosts

The first presentation by the Spanish hosts was delivered by Dr. Carlos Alejaldre Losilla, General Director of Technological Policy, Science and Education Ministry. The subject was the Spanish National Energy RTD Program. Dr. Losilla discussed past trends in

Spanish energy research and development, as well as future plans. Much of his discussion covered collaborative activities, and he mentioned that Spain may ask to join the CSLF in the near future.

Professor Herminio Sastre, Responsible for Science and Technology of the

Asturias Regional Government. Professor Sastre's presentation was on the subject of local industry (in Asturias) and environmental policy. He discussed the current situation in Asturias and activities in carbon management.

Ms. Yolanda Fernández Montes, Director of Environment, Hidrocantábrico then delivered a presentation on Hidrocantábrico's carbon management activities.

Hidrocantábrico is a regional electric utility with over 1,000 MWe of installed coal-fired capacity. Ms. Montes discussed options for her company in meeting upcoming limits on CO₂ emissions, especially as the company grows.

The final presentation from the hosts was delivered by Mr. Santiago Sabugal, Director of Engineering, ENDESA. Mr. Sabugal discussed ENDESA's activities with respect to management of CO₂ emissions. Included in the discussion were future demonstration projects in Andorra (lime as a sorbent for CO₂ capture) and associated with the Elcogas Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) Project.

6. Discussion of the Proposal for a Project Initiation and Review Panel

At the Melbourne Meeting in 2004, the European Commission had suggested in both the Policy and Technical Groups that a panel be formed within the CSLF, and that this panel would have functions related to review of CSLF Projects, as well as assisting potential projects through the CSLF recognition process. It was further suggested in the Technical Group in Melbourne that this panel would act on information gained from the projects to refine the CSLF Technology Roadmap. The outcome of the Proceedings in Melbourne was that the concept would be reintroduced at the Oviedo Meeting of the Technical Group, and that the European Commission would write a paper for the Policy Group explaining the proposal.

Toward this end, the European Commission developed a set of draft Terms of Reference for a Project Initiation and Review Panel (PIRP). This draft document was submitted to the CSLF Secretariat, and was offered for discussion at the Oviedo Meeting. As seen previously, the Agenda Adopted by the Group merged this item with the discussion of how to advance new projects.

There were differing opinions within the Technical Group as to whether the PIRP concept would ultimately result in a panel or a task force, and whether its composition would be limited to Technical Group members or open to Stakeholders. While it is recognized that these issues were not resolved in Oviedo, henceforth in these minutes the concept will be referred to as the "PIRP".

Dr. Denis O'Brien of the European Commission began the discussion with a review of the rationale behind the PIRP proposal, and its evolution. He emphasized that two significant purposes of the PIRP would be to facilitate global collaboration, and to make communication among projects more effective.

Following his opening of the topic, Dr. O'Brien asked for comments from the group. Responses were as follows:

Australia responded that it is extremely important that a structure in place for project identification be consistent with the CSLF Charter. Further, any activities undertaken by this PIRP should not duplicate work currently undertaken by the Policy and Technical Groups and should not usurp the responsibilities of those groups.

Brazil had no comments.

France expressed support for the proposal.

Germany stated that this proposed PIRP would be a suitable way to add value to the CSLF by involving projects, but that the concept should not impose too much additional administration on the projects.

Norway highlighted the potential value in going beyond typical scientist to scientist networking and communication and that this PIRP could facilitate a higher level of communication. So there is a need for this but it is still not clear how best to organize this higher level of collaboration.

The United States recalled experiences where there can be significant value in these kinds of networking groups, and at the same time expressed the need to ensure that this PIRP would not duplicate the work of the Policy and Technical Groups.

Canada discussed some potential operational difficulties with the PIRP as proposed, including reporting requirements, that potentially too much power would be accorded to it, and that the concept could be simplified.

India agreed with the need for the concepts outlined in the PIRP proposal, but pointed out that the proposed activity should not duplicate work going on within and without the CSLF, and suggested that how IP issues could be addressed through this PIRP. Additionally, this PIRP could identify cutting edge research going around the world.

Japan had no comments on the proposal, but suggested that the PIRP should not impose excessive administrative burdens on CSLF projects.

Mexico had no comments but reaffirmed the need to minimize the administrative burden on the projects.

The United Kingdom recognized the importance of having a structure that reviews and approves projects for the CSLF, and that the structure should tie in with the Technology Roadmap and the Gaps analyses being conducted by the Technical Group. However, this mechanism would need to be fully consistent with the CSLF Charter. The United Kingdom expressed concerns with respect to the proposal and the existent Project Recommendation Guidelines, which were approved by the CSLF in January, 2004. Also of concern were the practicalities of engaging a potentially large base of stakeholders involved in CSLF projects, and that there may be other mechanisms for generating feedback from projects to the Technical Group, including Workshops. Lastly, the United Kingdom suggested that the CSLF should not presume to act as some form of review panel for generally industrially-led projects to which the CSLF is not a financial contributor.

The United States stated that the PIRP would need to be consistent with a set of critical CSLF guidelines:

- The CSLF Charter
- The CSLF Terms of Reference
- The CSLF Project Recommendation Guidelines

Further, the United States would be opposed to reopening discussion on revising any of the above to accommodate the PIRP. The United States position was that the PIRP should be a working group under the Technical Group, should act in an advisory capacity only with the Technical Group making the final decisions, and should not have the power to reject a project. Membership of the group should be similar to other Technical Group task forces, it should be composed exclusively of Technical Group members or their designated representatives, and that the membership should be limited to five members.

Lastly, the United States suggested that the PIRP should start with a limited scope:

- Assess projects proposed for recognition by the CSLF
- Review the CSLF project portfolio and identify synergies, complementarities, and gaps, providing feedback to the Technical Group and input for further revisions to the CSLF Technology Roadmap.
- Promote awareness of new developments in CO₂ capture and storage and of progress within the CSLF recognized projects and beyond by establishing and implementing a framework for periodically reporting to the Technical Group on the progress of CSLF projects.

The United States volunteered to be part of the group.

South Africa did not have specific comments, but suggested that reviews would be the value-added component of the concept and that this would need to be accomplished without excessive bureaucracy.

Dr. O'Brien then summarized the comments and more comments from the group followed. This item was given a fixed time on the Agenda for discussion. Near the end of the allotted time, the Chair suggested that further discussion on this matter be delegated to a Task Force to work out the differences and develop a refined proposal to be considered by the Technical Group at its next meeting (scheduled for Berlin in September, 2005). The following members volunteered to serve on the task force:

- Canada
- European Commission
- France
- Germany
- India
- Mexico
- United Kingdom

- United States

The European Commission suggested that this task force might also review the slate of new projects to be submitted to the Forum at the September meeting in Berlin. The United Kingdom delegate (Mr. Philip Sharman) stated that in volunteering to serve on the new PRIP task force, he did not volunteer to also review projects for recognition.

At the Rome meeting of the CSLF in January, 2004, the CSLF adopted project recommendation guidelines. At that meeting thirteen projects were nominated for review. An interim task force was formed from the Technical Group to review these projects against the newly adopted recommendation guidelines. At the Oviedo Meeting, Australia motioned retaining the original panel (Chair, Vice Chairs, Australia, India, Japan, and the Secretariat). The U.S. seconded, and the motion carried.

7. Discussion Paper on CO₂ Storage Capacity Measurement

At the CSLF Technical Group Meeting in Melbourne, the Technical Group formed task forces to provide in-depth technology gaps analyses in the form of discussion papers. These were in the areas of Estimation of Geologic CO₂ Storage, Measurement, Monitoring, and Verification, and Capacity CO₂ Capture and Transport.

Consideration of the discussion papers was preceded by a brief exchange regarding the possibility of publishing these papers, along with invited papers on the CSLF projects, as a special edition of a technical journal. This idea was offered by the Chair.

Canada noted that the International Energy Agency Greenhouse Gas Programme (IEA-GHG) is in preliminary negotiations to launch a journal dedicated to carbon capture and storage.

Norway pointed out that the papers should not be submitted until they have been formally accepted by the Policy Group at the September, 2005 meeting in Berlin.

The U.S. suggested that an email dialogue within the group be initiated, to further pursue the concept. The Chair will have the lead on this item.

Dr. John Bradshaw (Australia) then began the consideration of the CO₂ storage discussion paper with a presentation of results. He noted that the paper being considered at the meeting was to be considered to be an interim document, and that the paper be accepted in its current form by the Technical Group. The document would be further refined and sent to the Policy Group for consideration at the Berlin meeting. At that meeting, the task force would seek approval to develop a Phase II document, which would be a more detailed version of the report, and could ultimately lead to the completion of a CSLF Best Practices Manual on the subject.

The United Kingdom suggested that the report be accepted and that the development of Phase II of the document be approved.

Canada suggested that CSLF members should consider applying additional resources toward the development of the Phase II document.

Norway motioned for acceptance of the paper, seconded by the United Kingdom and the United States. Consensus was reached, and the paper was accepted by the Technical Group.

On April 29, 2005, the day prior to the meeting recorded in this document, the Task Force met to discuss the results of this activity. At that time, it was suggested that activity undertaken by this task force might in itself qualify as a CSLF project. This was briefly discussed at the April 30 Technical Group meeting, but there was no motion raised to nominate the project.

8. Discussion Paper on Measurement, Monitoring, and Verification

Consideration of the discussion paper on Measurement, Monitoring, and Verification (MMV) began with a presentation by Dr. Malcolm Wilson (Canada) on the paper.

Norway stated that it is an excellent paper, and further that the CSLF should consider means to communicate this paper to regulators, to improve understanding of how carbon capture and storage technologies should be monitored in practice.

Canada also stated that the document was an excellent report, and that some refinements be made to the document for submission at the September meeting in Berlin, such as:

- Making a clear distinction between monitoring for carbon accounting purposes and monitoring for safety purposes.
- Placing an emphasis on the need baseline measurements in order to provide a basis for comparison of monitoring results.
- Some elements of the text are more relevant to site selection screening than they are to monitoring, and that it should be reconsidered as to whether they should be included in subsequent versions of the document.

The United Kingdom commented that the document was a fine report. However, specific comments for improvement and additional fact finding will be passed on to authors of the paper. Also, the United Kingdom suggested discussion as to whether a second phase of this paper should be initiated.

France also stated that document is a good report, and that minor comments would be passed on to the document's authors.

The United States suggested the possibility of having individual members provide brief, and possibly separate, discussions on the scientific bases behind existing MMV regulatory requirements associated with geologic disposal. Canada suggested doing this as a separate activity, possibly as a next step.

Japan commented that the IPCC is currently drafting inventory guidelines for geologic storage, and that this paper should take these into account.

Norway motioned that the paper be accepted, taking into account the comments of the group. The U.S. seconded. Consensus was reached, and the next step would be an improved draft of the paper to be submitted to the CSLF in September in Berlin.

9. Discussion Paper on CO₂ Capture and Transport

Due to unforeseen circumstances, Prof. Lars Stromberg (the leader of the CO₂ Capture and Transport Task Force) could not attend the meeting, and the German Delegation stepped in to initiate the discussion and outlined the content of the Discussion Paper.

The United Kingdom expressed concerns with the paper, due to technical considerations as well as possible inconsistencies with the CSLF Technology Roadmap.

India stated that there were technical issues with this paper, for example, post combustion technologies and how are they treated in the report, as well as the need to adapt amine-based CO₂ capture technologies to power plant flue gases, which may have impurities that will affect the technology.

The United States expressed concerns with the report in its current form, for example, inconsistencies with the literature or the forthcoming IPCC report. Additionally, the United States standpoint was that some of the comments in the conclusions are not supportable.

Canada stated that it would submit specific comments on the paper to the authors.

Norway suggested asking the authors to go through the document to eliminate judgments and focus on technology gaps, and asked the United States to give some guidance on costs to be included. Germany also offered to share recent study results on costs. The United Kingdom suggested adding some cost perspectives from the CO₂ Capture Project. Dr. Arthur Lee, an observer, agreed to do this.

The Chair asked the United Kingdom and the United States to collect the group's comments and send them to the authors.

Canada motioned that the paper be revised subject to the Group's comments, to be compiled by the US and UK. The new document would then be resubmitted to the Technical Group in September in Berlin. The United Kingdom seconded. Consensus was reached on the motion.

10. Discussion of New Projects and Member Updates

CSLF Technical Group delegates proposed a total of seven projects to be nominated for endorsement by the CSLF:

- Canada
 - Alberta Research Council/China United Coal Bed Methane Company Enhanced Coal Bed Methane Project
- European Commission
 - ENCAP
 - CO₂ Geonet

- India
 - Demonstration of capture, injection and geological sequestration of CO₂ in sediments in Basalt formations of India
 - Anoxic Microbial Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide Present in Flue Gases to Methane/ Methanol/ Other Biomass
- United Kingdom
 - In Salah CO₂ Storage Assurance Project
- United States
 - Assessing CO₂ Capture and Storage Opportunities in China

Of these projects, two addressed the subject of CO₂ capture, while five addressed the subject of geological storage. The projects included demonstrations, commercial scale activities, and multinational collaboration projects for technology development.

As seen in above in Section 6, Discussion of the PIRP, the Technical Group decided to follow the same procedure for reviewing projects that was followed after the 2004 meeting in Rome. For the purpose of project selection, the Technical Group would reconvene the Task Force for review purposes. The following were delegated to this task force:

- Chair
- Vice Chairs
- Australia
- India
- Japan
- Secretariat

This Task Force is requested to screen the proposed projects using the Project Recommendation Guidelines approved by the Policy Group.

The Secretariat was tasked with initiating the process of gathering information on the projects, from the project proponents, after the meeting. The Interim Task Force would then recommend a final list for endorsement to the Technical Group.

At the September meeting of the CSLF in Berlin, the Technical Group in turn will pass on its recommendations for final approval of projects to the Policy Group.

Country updates were provided by India and France. Mexico stated that they may be proposing projects to the CSLF in the near future.

11. New Business

In this session of the meeting, several items were discussed, including actions that had been passed from the Policy Group at the Melbourne meeting in September, 2004.

The first of these items was a task to develop a document explaining the relationships among the CSLF Charter, the CSLF Technology Roadmap, and the CSLF-recognized projects. Canada motioned that this item be tasked to the PIRP when that group is convened. The U.S. seconded the motion, and consensus was reached.

The second item related to a task “to conduct economic modeling as necessary”.

Norway reminded the group that the IEA-GHG has recently completed a comprehensive economic modeling study, and suggested that where this is required, the group should refer to the recent IEA-GHG document.

The United States suggested also referring to similar data in the upcoming IPCC report.

The U.S. motioned that the group refer to the IEA and IPCC reports should economic data be required, and that this be reported to the Policy Group in September. Canada seconded and the motion carried.

The group then discussed updates to the CSLF Technology Roadmap.

Norway motioned that the Technical Group undertake a task to update the technology Roadmap between the September 2005 meeting in Berlin and the following meeting of the Policy Group. The United States Seconded and the motion carried.

The next item discussed was intellectual property issues. No issues were reported by the group.

The next item discussed was the development of a check list for countries new to sequestration.

Canada suggested that this activity is similar to an APEC capacity building activity, and that this check list may be redundant. The group will ask Canada and France to prepare information for the Policy Group on similar APEC and IEA activities.

The group then considered possible Agenda items to suggest for the September, 2005 meeting in Berlin.

Norway suggested that the task forces to provide updates on their discussion papers. The Technical Group will need to meet one more time on these documents prior to their presentation to the Policy Group.

The U.S. suggested invited presentations on results by CSLF projects.

Australia suggested the possibility of a poster exhibition associated with the Berlin meeting. Germany stated that they are working with the Secretariat on the matter.

Regarding the request from the IEA on collaboration in the area of regulatory development, Canada pointed out that this is an area under the purview of the Policy Group, but that elements of this could fit within the activities of the MMV task force.

The United States suggested that the development of papers by members, on the scientific basis behind regulatory MMV requirement, may be of use. Canada stated that this could provide a technical basis for Policy discussions.

Norway suggested that a stock-taking of what exists around the world, including technical bases, may be useful to the Policy Group as well as countries that are developing regulations.

Then European Commission suggested that if the group focuses on scientific bases behind regulatory issues, that the activity should not clash with Policy Group duties.

The U.S. suggested that Canada to provide a document outlining the possible activity. France motioned this, Norway seconded, and the motioned.

The Chair thanked the delegates, hosts, and observers, and asked for a motion to adjourn. Canada motioned, Norway seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.

Summary

The CSLF Technical Group Meeting of April 30, 2005 was held in Oviedo, Spain.

Broadly, the primary items covered in the meeting were as follows:

- Consideration of discussion papers, prepared by Technical Group Task Forces, which were to provide the CSLF with technology gaps analyses and an improved analysis of the evaluation of geologic CO₂ storage capacity. Two of the papers were approved, on the subjects of Measurement, Monitoring, and Verification, and CO₂ Storage Capacity Estimation. The third paper, on the subject of CO₂ Capture and Transport, was not approved but was referred back to the authors for further refinement.
- Consideration of a proposal by the European Commission to develop a Project Initiation and Review Panel. This proposal was not approved. A task force was developed to attempt to reconcile the differences on this concept among Technical Group members. When formed, the group currently referred to as the PIRP will be tasked with developing a document explaining the relationships among the CSLF Charter, the CSLF-recognized projects, and the CSLF Technology Roadmap.
- Seven new projects were proposed for CSLF recognition. The Technical Group will follow the procedure developed in Rome for evaluating the projects against the CSLF Project Recommendation Guidelines, using the previously convened task force for this purpose.
- The CSLF Technical Group will investigate the possibility of publishing the three discussion papers, along with invited publications by the CSLF-recognized projects, as a special edition of a journal. The Chair has the lead on this item.

A summary of actions arising from this meeting appears in Appendix 2.

APPENDIX 1

Agenda for the Oviedo CSLF Technical Group Meeting

- 1. Opening Remarks and Chairman's Statement**
Peter Rozelle, Chair
- 2. Welcome**
Rosa Menéndez, Director, INCAR
- 3. Introductions**
Delegates
- 4. Adoption of the Agenda**
Peter Rozelle, Chair
- 5. Review and Approval of Minutes from Melbourne Meeting**
Peter Rozelle, Chair
- 6. Energy and Environmental Policies and Programs in Spain**
 - Spanish National Energy RTD Programme**
Carlos Alejaldre Losilla, General Director of Technological Policy, Science and Education Ministry
 - Local Industry and Environmental Policy**
Herminio Sastre, Responsible for Science and Technology of the Asturias Regional Government
 - Hidrocantábrico Carbon Management**
Yolanda Fernández Montes, Director of Environment, Hidrocantábrico
 - ENDESA CO2 Reduction Programme**
Santiago Sabugal, Director of Engineering, ENDESA

Coffee/Tea

- 7. Discussion of the Proposal for a Project Initiation and Review Panel**
Denis O'Brien, European Commission

Lunch

- 8. Discussion Paper on CO₂ Storage Capacity Measurement**
John Bradshaw, Australia
- 9. Discussion Paper on Measurement, Monitoring, and Verification**
Malcolm Wilson, Canada
- 10. Discussion Paper on CO₂ Capture and Transport**
Hubert Höwener, Germany
- 11. Discussion of New Projects and Member Updates**
Peter Rozelle, Chair
- 12. New Business**
Peter Rozelle, Chair

APPENDIX 2

Technical Group Action Items Addressed at CSLF Meeting

| Item | Action | Lead | Due Date |
|------|--|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | Update the Melbourne Minutes to include India and Japan suggestions | Secretariat | August 24, 2005 |
| 2 | New PIRP Task Force to Develop New Proposal | European Commission | August 15, 2005 |
| 3 | Reconvene Task Force to assess proposed projects against Project Recommendation Guidelines | Chair Vice Chairs Australia India Japan Secretariat | June 1, 2005 |
| 4 | Project Proposers to submit project information to Secretariat | Canada European Commission India United Kingdom United States | June 1, 2005 |
| 5 | Submit Approved Draft of CO ₂ Storage Capacity Discussion Paper to the Secretariat | Australia | August 15, 2005 |
| 6 | Submit Approved Draft of MMV Discussion Paper to Secretariat | Canada | August 15, 2005 |
| 7 | Collect comments on CO ₂ Capture and Transport Discussion Paper and submit to Lead Author | U.K. and U.S. | May 31, 2005 |
| 8 | Resubmit Discussion Paper on CO ₂ Capture and Transport to Secretariat | Taskforce on CO ₂ Capture & Trans. | August 15, 2005 |
| 9 | Update Technology Roadmap | Technical Group | After September Meeting |
| 10 | Consider suggestions for Agenda Items for the September Meeting | Secretariat | August 15, 2005 |
| 11 | Seek an appropriate venue for publication of Discussion Papers and Invited Papers on CSLF Projects | Chair | July 31, 2005 |

| | | | |
|----|---|--------|---------------|
| 12 | Provide Document outlining possible collaboration with the IEA on scientific matters associated with Geologic Storage Regulations | Canada | July 31, 2005 |
|----|---|--------|---------------|