

## CCSA Task Subgroup Summary Minutes

<b>Working Group</b>	Technical
<b>Task Subgroup</b>	CCU
<b>Date</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> March 2024
<b>CCSA Lead</b>	Beth Hebditch
<b>Convenor</b>	n/a
<b>Recording</b>	<a href="https://vimeo.com/924691594/fdb5092a82?share=copy">https://vimeo.com/924691594/fdb5092a82?share=copy</a>
<b># Attendees</b>	7
<b>Meeting summary</b>	<p>Review of sections 3, 4 and 5 of the paper (sections 1 and 2 reviewed last meeting). Notable areas of update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draw on existing literature / resources; developments since the last position paper, and we should be pointing to those</li> <li>• Stronger focus on dispersed sites (noting to rename as “stranded assets”)</li> <li>• Highlight timeframes – e.g. before connection to T&amp;SCo</li> <li>• Value proposition of 2 elements; 1) LCA focusing on atmospheric climate impact then 2) co-product &amp; circularity benefits</li> <li>• Merit order of CCUS options (value beyond monetary value)</li> <li>• Real-world examples dropped in throughout</li> </ul>
<b>Summary Minutes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New member: Suzie Ferguson, Wood</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recap of previous subgroup discussion (led by Beth Hebditch, CCSA Secretariat)</b> <p>Identified focus areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permanence and relevant technical definitions</li> <li>• CCU value proposition with a particular consideration of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Life-cycle analysis (LCA)</li> <li>○ Complementary role to CCS</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of CCSA’s CCU Position Paper</li> <li>• Feed into Government’s CCUS Vision work and upcoming EU consultation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Discussion: CCU Position Paper (2022)</b> <p>Recap of CCU Position Paper sections and positions presented within. Further details on the recap of the CCU Position Paper can be found on the meeting slides.</p> <p><u>General comments</u></p> <p><b>Wording suggestion:</b> “barriers to and competition from...”</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> GCI report on CCU from 2023 – find synergies with other papers/literature reviews</p> </li> </ul>

→ Roberta to share this paper with the group

**Comment:** no distinction between biogenic and fossil CO<sub>2</sub> in the paper currently – how can we generate CdRs

**Comment:** positioning on waste is dubious.

**Answer:** mechanical sorting of waste currently – then it will change to C14 analysis to identify biogenic CO<sub>2</sub>. We need to protect waste hierarchy and then reduce, reuse, recover before it goes in the landfill

**Answer:** it depends on the access of the country to sustainable biomass

### Section 3: The current status of CCU in the UK

**Question:** should this section be expanded to look at wider global developments?

**Answer:** the scope of this would be extremely large and might not be able to cover all CCU projects currently planned globally.

We could, however, give examples of type of CCU projects globally (e.g. methanol or SAF production) – this could show Government the value of CCU projects.

**Comment:** dispersed sites – it doesn't necessarily mean that they're smaller. Availability of green hydrogen determines the scale/capacity of the project.

**Comment:** synergies could be brought forward in the introductory section

**Question:** avoided emissions – could this drive forward and incentivise CCU?

**Comment:** UK Government to champion a methodology for LCA

**Question:** should the position paper further steer on what LCA should be including or focusing on?

**Answer:** Yes,

**Question:** what would the purpose of an LCA be for a CCU project?

**Answer:** LCA's purpose is to calculate the carbon intensity and compare that against the base case

**Answer:** Carbon intensity is a good metric. CCSA could form a view on how low an intensity is good enough? And this could be an easier way to look at it rather than an LCA approach.

**Answer:** Wood has an LCA team – Suzie would be happy to ask them to look at this for the group.

**Comment:** suggestion for CCSA to draft a dedicated position paper on LCA

**Comment:** LCA could be done for each application of utilisation so that would be a huge scope of that work

**Comment:** having a pre-emptive position on the CCU position paper could cover further work to be done but it should not take over the ask to the Government

**Comment:** Government is our target audience for this paper so that should come across

	<p><b>Comment:</b> summarise position on LCA – some sort of evaluation that shows why CCU is preferable to other applications – something that could give us a consistent comparison – which CCU methods are comparable to CCS</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> danger of making LCA comparison with CCS could lead to the conclusion that you don't need CCU if you can do CCS and dispersed sites might be suggested to do nothing and become stranded if they can't do CCS</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> bring timeframe element in – some sites will be able to operate before the T&amp;S network is operational</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> highlight all the elements that would not be possible without CCU i.e. benefits for dispersed sites, co-products etc.</p> <p><u>Section 4: The CO<sub>2</sub> abatement potential of CCU</u></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> we need a merit order of decarbonisation order and implement the one that's more closely available to you</p> <p><b>Question:</b> is there a time boundary for this position paper?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> depends on the assets' lifecycle</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> 5 different examples of real projects (lab-scale or larger). Do we have any project examples of technology that goes beyond the traditional carbon capture space e.g. using CO<sub>2</sub> in food production?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> ensure that position paper is evidence-based – could include some one-sentence case studies of projects?</p> <p><u>Section 5: Value of CCU for dispersed sites</u></p> <p><b>Comment:</b> instead of calling them dispersed sites, we should call them stranded assets (agreed)</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> move section 5 earlier in the position paper and use section 4 as the synthesising section bringing everything together</p>
<b>Actions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Action for CCSA &amp; members:</b> Update Sections 1 -5 of the position paper. CCSA will lead and contact members of today's meeting for their input based on the points raised.</li> <li>• <b>Action for members:</b> Submit any further considerations or comments regarding the wording redrafting of the position paper.</li> <li>• <b>Action for CCSA Secretariat:</b> Attach Ramirez paper on system boundaries when sharing the meeting materials.</li> <li>• <b>Action for members:</b> A convenor is needed for this subgroup. If anybody is interested or would like to know more, please contact Beth Hebditch.</li> </ul>
<b>Next Meeting Date</b>	TBC
<p>All working group materials can be found <a href="#">here</a></p>	