



UNECE

TECHNOLOGY BRIEF

CARBON CAPTURE, USE AND STORAGE (CCUS)

All rights reserved worldwide

Requests to reproduce excerpts or to photocopy should be addressed to the Copyright Clearance Center at copyright.com. All other queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to: United Nations Publications, 405 East 42nd St, S-09FW001, New York, NY 10017, United States of America.

Email: permissions@un.org

website: <https://shop.un.org>

The findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations or its officials or member States.

The designation employed and the presentation of material on any map in this work do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Mention of any firm, licensed process or commercial products does not imply endorsement by the United Nations. This publication is issued in English and Russian.

United Nations publication issued by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This technology brief is one of the outcomes of the project called “Enhancing understanding of the implications and opportunities of moving to carbon neutrality in the UNECE region across the power and energy intensive industries by 2050”. The project was managed by Iva Brkic with support from Walker Darke and Yezi Lyu and under strategic guidance and advice of Stefanie Held, Chief of the Sustainable Energy Section and Scott Foster, Director of Sustainable Energy Division.

The project was run under the auspices of the Group of Experts on Cleaner Energy Systems with continuous support from countries and the whole UNECE Sustainable Energy Programme.

This brief was prepared by the UNECE Task Force on Carbon Neutrality and a dedicated team of high-level international experts who offered quality control, advice, and validation of findings. The project team greatly thanks to Carolina Coll, Jon Gibbins, Sigurd Heiberg, Wolfgang Heidug, Denis Hicks, Alexander Krowka, Andrew Minchener and Grant Wach for their expertise and continuous support.

The project team and the authors wish to thank Shuyue Li for providing visual communication and design services for this technology brief.

Cover photo: ©Marcin Jozwiak, Pexels

Disclaimer

The document does not necessarily reflect the position of reviewers and partners listed above who provided their comments and helped to develop this publication.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
Key Takeaways	1
Capacity Building	2
1. Introduction	4
2. Engineered Technologies for Capture	6
2.1 CCUS from Point Sources	6
2.2 BECCS and DACCS	7
3. Technologies for Storage	8
3.1 Aquifers for Sequestration of CO ₂	8
3.2 Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR)	9
4. Carbon Storage Readiness	10
5. Solutions for Carbon Utilization	11
6. Comparative Analysis of CCUS Technologies	13
6.1 CCUS Technologies Cost Curve and Carbon Capture Potential	13
6.2 How Can Policy Makers Support the Private Sector to Act on Climate Change?	14
6.3 Comparative Analysis - CCUS Readiness Level	15
6.4 Comparative Analysis - CCUS Readiness Level Across UNECE Region	16
Annex I – UNFC as Means to Verify CCUS Potential with International Cooperation	17
Annex II – List of CCUS Projects Across UNECE Region	18
Abbreviations	25
References	26

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Access to energy has been recognized by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) as critical for assuring quality of life. At present, 80% of the energy usage in the UNECE region is fossil-fuel based. Many countries are reliant on non-renewable sources for their energy security and economic well-being, yet there is a growing global urgency to transition to a more sustainable energy future with increased dependence on renewable energy sources, improved energy efficiency, and reduced global carbon emissions.”

Carbon capture, use and storage (CCUS) technology is an essential step towards mitigating climate change. CCUS allows UNECE member States to establish a pathway to carbon neutrality and stay within their emission targets. Political agreement is required for long-term engagement and societal commitment, recognizing the scale and cost of the industry that needs to develop in a very short time – billions of tonnes of CO₂ and trillions of US\$.

We are running out of time

Structural change will be much deeper than most people expect and needs to start now. The greater the delay, the greater the change required.

Scale up favorable conditions

Legal, financial and regulatory frameworks must be developed with infrastructure and banking institutions. Government support can provide initial momentum that will get industry engaged.

Sharing good practice is needed

Inclusive multi-stakeholder initiatives can bestrengthened by public-private partnerships. Government and industry support is key.

Working together beyond borders

A sub-regional approach to share knowledge and best practices is needed to improve cost efficiencies for large infrastructure projects.

Industry commits to wide ranging greening

The private sector should lead the structural change through design, material efficiency, sustainable energy technology interplay and requires government support.

Act now, CCUS unlocks full decarbonization of energy sector

Countries need to include CCUS in long-term strategies and commence retrofitting existing infrastructure.

CAPACITY BUILDING

The UNECE has taken action to support countries in implementing CCUS technologies and attaining carbon neutrality. This action has focused on three core aims. These are to:



Raise awareness

Recognize CCUS as an essential climate mitigation option and consider it when developing national plans.



Accept technology

Develop and integrate policies to allow full use of CCUS technologies for energy and intensive industries.



Finance project

Create funding mechanism for CCUS and direct investments towards modernization of energy infrastructure.


High level roundtables, policy dialogues and development of financial guidelines continue to raise awareness with stakeholders about the potential of CCUS technologies to attain carbon neutrality in the UNECE region.

UNECE convened a Task Force on Carbon Neutrality under the auspices of the Group of Experts on Cleaner Electricity Systems to understand the potential of CCUS technologies across the UNECE region.

This work has been conducted by the Task Force on Carbon Neutrality as part of implementation of the extrabudgetary project on “Enhancing the understanding of the implications and opportunities of moving to carbon neutrality in the UNECE region across the power and energy intensive industries by 2050”.


CARBON CAPTURE, USE AND STORAGE (CCUS)

CCUS is essential to unlock the full potential of decarbonization and attain carbon neutrality




Point Sources of CO₂ in Industry

CO₂ from industries (cement, steel), hydrogen production from fossil fuels, or power generation is captured before it reaches the atmosphere and is then compressed and injected into porous rock layers.



Biomass Energy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS)




Direct Air Carbon Capture and Storage (DACCS)

Net negative emissions technologies are key to reach net-zero and then net negative emissions. In BECCS, CO₂ is taken out of the atmosphere by vegetation, then recovered from the combustion products when the biomass is burnt. In DACCS, CO₂ is captured directly from the air.


Aquifers for Sequestration of CO₂

Aquifers are geological formations containing brine in porous rock at depths over 1km. CO₂ can be pumped down into the rock for sequestration.



Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR)

EOR is a family of techniques that increases the recovery of oil and gas while storing CO₂. Dependent on operational choices, the volume of CO₂ stored could exceed the CO₂ content of the produced hydrocarbons.



Solutions for Carbon Utilization



Building Materials
Aggregate, concrete



Chemicals
Methanol, ethanol



Plastics
Polymers



Mineralization
Carbonates

Carbon utilization can unlock the commerciality of CCUS projects for the industrial, steel, cement and chemical sectors. CO₂ captured can be used as a feedstock to produce a range of products, such as concrete, methanol, ethanol, carbonates, plastics etc.



Awareness

Recognise CCUS as a viable climate mitigation option and consider it when developing national plans.



Acceptance

Develop and integrate policies to allow full commercialisation of CCUS technologies.



Finance

Create a funding mechanism for CCUS and direct investments towards modernization of energy infrastructure.

1. INTRODUCTION

Energy is critical for assuring quality of life and underpins attainment of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda). The role that energy plays in modern society is recognized, but there remains an important disconnect between countries' agreed energy and climate targets and what countries are doing in reality.

This brief builds on the recommendations from the Pathways to Sustainable Energy project and is the first in a series of technology briefs that directly support implementation of the Carbon Neutrality project. The underlying objectives of this brief are:


- Introduce member states to a portfolio of CCUS technologies
- Help policy makers to evaluate the benefits of the CCUS technologies
- Build capacity in economies in transition with regard to CCUS

Reality Check and Rationale for CCUS Technologies

The countries from the UNECE would need both to reduce their dependence on fossil fuels from over 80% to around 50% by 2050, and to achieve significant negative carbon emissions. The countries in the UNECE region need to cut or capture at least 90Gt of CO₂ emissions by 2050 to stay on a pathway to meet the 2°C target (see chart).

As fossil fuels are likely to continue to play an important role for UNECE member States in the short and medium term, achieving carbon neutrality will require deployment of CCUS technologies to allow reduced and negative carbon emissions to bridge the gap until innovative, next generation low-, zero-, or negative- carbon energy technologies are commercialized and to keep hard-to-abate sectors operating.

Figure 1.1 CO₂ emissions in the UNECE region by policy scenario for the energy sector. Assuming long term economic growth and the cost projections of renewable, low carbon and fossil fuel energy technologies



The **reference scenario** is a forecast of CO₂ emissions based on maintaining economic growth. It assumes a 'Middle of the Road' scenario for socio-economic, market and energy technology developments. The model estimates energy demand and the lowest cost option to supply that energy. If constraints are placed on CO₂ emissions this changes how the model satisfies the forecast demand by shifting investments towards low carbon and renewable energy. The **NDC scenario** assumes the constraints imposed by Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement up to 2030 and maintains them indefinitely. The **P2C scenario** constrains emissions to those consistent with less than 2 degrees Celsius global warming.

Source: Pathways to Sustainable Energy, UNECE 2020a

Scope and Structure

This brief introduces a portfolio of CCUS technologies and solutions, and proposes possible policy actions to allow their faster commercialization and wider deployment across the region. It further conducts comparative analysis of the CCUS technologies based on carbon capture potential, cost, technology readiness level, commercial readiness level, social readiness level as well as environmental impact.

Figure 1.2 Carbon flows in CCUS chain





Figure 1.3 Portfolio of carbon capture and use technologies



Carbon Sequestration Technologies are the Key to Unlock the Full Decarbonization Potential

Removing carbon dioxide begins with carbon capture. CCUS is a proven technology with costs on strong downwards trajectory. The cost of CO₂ capture depends on the source of CO₂ and separation method. We can differentiate between mobile and point CO₂ sources as well as the atmosphere (see chart).

High concentration sources typically have lower costs for CCUS. The potential of CCUS as a technology solution can be assessed along the value chain. CO₂ can be captured at the source of the emissions, such as power plants, or can be directly captured from the air itself using membranes or solvents. Captured concentrated CO₂ can be transferred via pipelines to be later used as a feedstock or stored underground.

This brief reviews a portfolio of CCUS technologies as well as natural carbon sinks. The technologies are divided into engineered technologies for carbon capture – fossil fuels with CCS, direct air capture (DACCS), energy from biomass with CCS (BECCS), and technologies for carbon storage – storage into aquifers, enhanced oil recovery and technologies for use of carbon.

While some CCUS technologies might be considered mature, such as capture of CO₂ from high-purity sources or EOR as a storage option, the deployment of integrated, commercial CCS projects is still an aspiration. Large-scale capture of CO₂ is demonstrated in power generation and some industry sectors with large-scale demonstrations projects in operation or coming onstream. Still, more is needed to scale up and overcome the current lack of experience while developing and integrating capture, transport and storage infrastructure.

CCUS is also an enabler for production of low-carbon hydrogen that is expected to play a key role in attaining carbon neutrality. [note: a separate brief on hydrogen is in preparation]. This is mostly relevant in countries with low-cost natural gas resources and available CO₂ storage, and might be attractive for significant parts of UNECE membership in the east.

The next section of the brief gives an overview of a range of CCUS technologies. The following technology “snapshots” introduce the technology, discuss their sequestration potential, highlight where the know-how is still needed to scale it up and reach full commercialization, and propose some policy actions.

2. ENGINEERED TECHNOLOGIES FOR CAPTURE

2.1 CCUS from Point Sources

In CCS from point sources, CO₂ is captured before it reaches the atmosphere in industries such as cement and steel production, hydrogen production from fossil fuels, incineration of waste, and power generation. It is then compressed to over 100 atmospheres and injected into porous rock layers a kilometre or more underground, beneath impermeable rocks that will keep it in place for tens of thousands to millions of years. Alternatively, the CO₂ can be incorporated into products such as building materials, as long as they give the same long-term storage.

CO₂ can be captured from point sources efficiently with a capture level of over 90% using a range of different engineering approaches. Costs will vary, in the order of 10-100 \$/tCO₂. Although more expensive than for the greenfield projects, carbon capture equipment can be retrofitted in existing fossil infrastructure to avoid stranded assets while delivering on net zero strategies.

CO₂ captured then needs to be transported to a secure storage site by pipeline or ship. Some locations will have easier access to storage than others but even long-distance pipelines can have low unit costs for large amounts of CO₂.

Storage may need to be in other countries, so common standards and confidence for coordinated long-term investments are essential.

CCUS will be critical for achieving net zero emissions fast enough to avoid dangerous climate change and meeting sustainable development goals for the world's population.

All of the elements of CCUS have examples in use, but deployment and learning-by-doing are needed to refine and improve techniques and bring capture costs down. Transport and storage costs can also be cut by economies of scale for shared infrastructure; individual industries can install capture but need somewhere to send the CO₂. To achieve this CCUS needs focused support in a similar way to that provided to renewable energy, such as wind and solar PV.

Know-How Required

- **Geological:** Geological: to identify, engineer and manage secure subsurface storage.
- **Engineering:** to build equipment to capture CO₂ from a wide range of sources.
- **Infrastructure planning:** for large, transformational projects that cannot be achieved by ad hoc incremental development.


Sequestration Potential

- **Annual:** CCS 10-30 Gt CO₂/yr by 2050, limited by CO₂ transport and storage infrastructure development and support for early and rapid sector growth.
- **Total:** Essentially unlimited. CCS storage capacities potential exceed the fossil fuel storage capacities.

Appropriate Policy Action

- **Governments need to establish regulatory environment to allow CCUS technologies to be deployed** at scale and early to establish a new industry sector. CCUS potential to attain net-zero is vast.
- **Build CO₂ transport and storage infrastructure at scale to bring down costs and encourage CCUS uptake by industries.** This is something that individual businesses cannot do themselves.
- **Plan all the way to net zero.** CCUS cannot be added effectively to an energy and industry system that was really designed for only marginal CO₂ emission reductions.
- **Prepare international standards and arrangements to share CO₂ storage.** CO₂ transport and storage infrastructure needs to be as international as that for electricity, gas and oil supplies.

Figure 2.1 Carbon capture options



Source: Adapted from IPCC Special Report on CCS, 2005

2.2 BECCS and DACCS

BECCS – Biomass Energy with Carbon Capture and Storage DACCS – Direct Air Carbon Capture and Storage

Negative Emissions Technologies (NETs) return carbon from fossil fuels that has been released as CO₂ into the atmosphere back to permanent and secure storage underground.

In BECCS, CO₂ is taken out of the atmosphere by vegetation, then recovered from the combustion products when the biomass is burnt. In DACCS, CO₂ is captured directly from the air. In both cases, the captured CO₂ is compressed and then injected into porous rock layers a kilometre or more underground, beneath impermeable rocks that will keep it in place for tens of thousands to millions of years.

BECCS and DACCS can in effect capture CO₂ from the air from any fuel source anywhere in the world. BECCS is expected to be cheaper, at maybe \$50-200/tCO₂ removed and stored, while DACCS might be roughly twice the cost. But DACCS is able to remove large amounts of CO₂ from the atmosphere without the demands on natural systems required by growing biomass.

Often it will be cheaper to capture, or avoid, CO₂ emissions at source, rather than capture them from the air. BECCS and DACCS can capture the same quantity of CO₂ generated by mobile, natural or infrequent emissions.

NETs will also have to be used to remove CO₂ if net zero is not achieved quickly enough to avoid dangerous climate change.

Know-How required

- **Land management for BECCS:** Biomass must be resourced in a sustainable way, that ideally also enhances carbon sequestration in soils and minimises the use of industrial fertilizers
- **Engineering:** to build equipment to concentrate CO₂ from biomass combustion products or air, compress it and transport it by pipelines or ships.
- **Geological:** to identify and manage secure storage sites.

Sequestration Potential

- **Annual:** BECCS 5-20 Gt CO₂/yr by 2050, limited by biomass availability; DACCS 5-20 Gt CO₂/yr.
- **Total:** essentially unlimited, since geological storage can be anywhere in the world.


Appropriate Policy Action

- **Plan all the way to net zero.** BECCS / DACCS cannot work effectively in an energy and land use system that was designed for only marginal CO₂ emission reductions.
- **Develop technology and deploy at scale to reduce cost and set a carbon price.** DACCS can represent the carbon price needed for achieving net zero.
- **Prepare international verification and negative emission trading standards.** Verification of the effective CO₂ captured is essential whether the negative emissions are traded or used internally. (Note: especially if fertilizers are used for BECCS)
- **Ensure BECCS/DACCS are used fairly.** Avoid burden on future generations of the cost of retrospectively capturing CO₂. Recognise food-water-energy nexus approach to avoid jeopardising global food or water security to produce biomass for BECCS.

Figure 2.2 BECCS and DACCS

Biomass Energy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS)

Direct Air Carbon Capture and Storage (DACCS)



Net negative emissions technologies are key to reach net-zero and then net negative emissions. In BECCS, CO₂ is taken out of the atmosphere by vegetation, then recovered from the combustion products when the biomass is burnt. In DACCS, CO₂ is captured directly from the air.

3. TECHNOLOGIES FOR STORAGE

3.1 Aquifers for Sequestration of CO₂

Aquifers are geological formations containing brine (salt water) in porous rock. Suitable aquifers are in sedimentary rock underneath a 'caprock' which is impermeable. They are vast and found all over the world at depths over 1km. It is probably the most significant CCS option available.

CO₂ can be pumped down into the rock for sequestration. At such depths CO₂ is pressured to a density of 200-800kg/m³. In the aquifer, CO₂ displaces brine and forms a plume from the injection point that tends to move to the top of the aquifer. At the CO₂/brine interface, CO₂ will dissolve in brine (about 1-2% solubility) and some water will dissolve in CO₂ plume. These effects cause an increase in acidity affecting the normal chemical reactions and biome in the aquifer. Over tens of thousands/millions of years the CO₂ can mineralise to rock. Comprehensive reservoir engineering are required to characterise the rock properties prior to any sequestration, to avoid costly topside infrastructure developments that will be redundant if the aquifers do not have the storage capacity.

Rate of injection and total capacity of the aquifer is determined by geology and pressure limits in the aquifer. The pressure in the aquifer must be limited to ensure that CO₂ in the plume or brine cannot escape. It depends on the rate of CO₂ injection and how quickly the brine permeates through rock. Once injection stops, the pressure decreases over centuries as the CO₂ continues to dissolve and mineralise. But there can also be dissolution of the caprock/seal dependent upon the rock properties due to the acidity. This can impact the integrity of the storage and sequestration in the reservoir.

Adverse effects can occur if CO₂ or brine leak into sources of drinking water or soils. This leakage can be from geological faults, abandoned oil or gas wells (often found in the same location), movement of brine into adjacent geological formations, closure of the injection point when the site is abandoned

(acidification is a concern for the metals and concrete used). Monitoring is necessary by various seismic and other techniques during and after injection to identify if leakage may be occurring and prevent it.

Know-How Required

- **Oil & Gas Industry:** The technique is used to today at a scale of several million tonnes per year where CO₂ emissions from operations incur high cost penalties.

Sequestration Potential


- Estimated at “**more than a trillion tonnes CO₂**”. The costs of operations at the injection head are low, <\$30/te storage cost only (excluding collection, transport and pressurisation of CO₂).

Appropriate Policy Action

- **Recognise the scale and cost of the industry** that needs to develop in a very short time – billions of tonnes CO₂ and trillions of US\$.
- **Harmonize national and international frameworks governing rights to sub-surface resources.** Ensure that laws do not restrict the use of aquifers and protect other users from adverse effects such as contamination of drinking water aquifers. Consider the financial and legal conditions in the event of any leakage.
- **Develop infrastructure to overcome location issues.** CO₂ sources and aquifers are not all co-located. Distribution infrastructure and DACCS will be required. Cooperation will be needed to access unused capacity across countries.
- **Cover the costs.** No revenue streams of significance are

anticipated, hence a funding mechanism must be created to cover costs of storage, collection, clean up and transportation of CO₂.

- **Raise awareness to gain public acceptance.** Funds are required to complete geological investigations, scale up to 100's millions tonnes/yr and ensure the technology is safe.



Source: Adapted from M. Hefny (et. al) 2020

3.2 Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR)

EOR is a family of techniques to increase the recovery of oil and gas. One EOR technique is to inject CO₂ into the well at pressure. At depths greater than 700m, CO₂ becomes supercritical and acts as a good solvent to release oil and gas from rock strata and flush them to the well head. CO₂ can also be co-injected with water. First tried in 1972, EOR is a common technique applied in mature oil & gas wells. Injected CO₂ can be used as a secondary drive mechanism to push out remaining hydrocarbons in an oil and gas reservoir. CO₂-injection technology is an EOR method that is gaining most popularity. The source of CO₂ used is based on lowest locally available cost and the majority is from natural sources.

The interest in CO₂ EOR is that once the field is exhausted, some CO₂ can be left in the reservoir, sequestering it for centuries or millennia. The reservoir, possibly including its aquifers, may have capacity to store CO₂ created when the subsequent production is combusted. In special cases, therefore further production can be carbon neutral.

As there are many ways to produce oil and gas, CO₂ EOR must be economically competitive versus opening new wells and other EOR techniques (for example, Thermal EOR uses steam to heat the oil in the well and reduce its viscosity, Chemical EOR uses acids or alkalis to chemically release the hydrocarbons, and Polymer EOR uses polymers to increase the viscosity of water flushing out the hydrocarbon). The competitiveness of CO₂ EOR depends on suitability of the reservoir, the payback period required because of the relatively high capital costs, the local cost of CO₂ and availability of technical resources to do it.

Know-How Required

- **Oil & Gas Industry:** Integration of existing technology into the economic production of oil.
- **Other industries:** Processing concentrated sources of CO₂ so that it can be transported and used for EOR.


Carbon Storage Potential

- **Total:** 50 – 350 Gt (IEA 2015 estimate)
- Onshore has the largest CO₂ EOR potential globally, but some good offshore candidates exist. Based on Rystad Energy data, of all global producing fields with potential for CO₂ storage, over 80% are onshore fields.

Appropriate Policy Action

- **Strengthen the competitiveness of CO₂ EOR for the oil and gas industry.** Reduce the relative costs of CO₂ EOR in comparison to other oil recovery methods (Capex, cost of CO₂ and regulations making other production techniques relatively more expensive).
- **Encourage the oil and gas industry to use CO₂ EOR.** A system of credits based on future CO₂ sequestration once the well is closed or hydrocarbons marketed from well using CO₂ EOR. Encourage more CO₂ to be sequestered than is required just for oil recovery.
- **Incentivise CO₂ capture from anthropogenic sources.** Encourage collaboration between industrial sources of CO₂ and users of EOR.
- **Increase the amount of CO₂ stored (EOR+).** Promote and disseminate research into techniques to increase CO₂ sequestration above that needed for EOR. Classify sources of hydrocarbons based on a net carbon emission after EOR (standardised life cycle analysis).

Figure 3.2 Enhanced oil recovery



Source: Mai Bui (et.al) 2018


4. CARBON STORAGE READINESS

Large scale deployment of carbon capture and storage technologies will require availability of vast geological storage capacity across the whole UNECE region. Information on the geographical distribution of storage potential and its quantitative characterization is important to understand the role of CCUS in stabilizing atmospheric concentration of CO₂ and for developing effective and efficient policies for CCUS. Countries in the UNECE region have relatively high carbon storage potential (see chart).

At present, known suitable sedimentary basins in the UNECE region have been identified in North America and Western Europe, namely the UK, the Netherlands and Norway. Assessments still have not been conducted in the eastern part of UNECE region - in the Russian Federation (Volga Urals, West Siberia, Caspian subregion) nor in Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan Caspian Sea. (UNECE is also preparing a study on Geological CO₂ storage in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia.)

Access to secure geological CO₂ storage will be an issue in some countries in the UNECE region. Geology does not recognise, nor is controlled by geopolitical boundaries. Cooperation amongst member states will provide the most effective and efficient mitigation strategies for the subsurface storage and sequestration of CO₂. There is an urgent need to cooperate on shared, regional CO₂ transport and storage infrastructure, including via CO₂ shipping, if CCUS is to be deployed at a scale capable of making a substantial contribution to attaining carbon neutrality.

Figure 4.1 Carbon storage potential



Source: Bradshaw, J. and Dance, T.(2004)

5. SOLUTIONS FOR CARBON UTILIZATION

Carbon utilization is the use of CO₂ to create products with economic value. A widespread application in some UNECE countries is EOR (increasing the recovery factor from oil/gas).

Utilization can be subdivided in 3 main areas (Mineralization, Biological and Chemical) as observed below. It is important to note that certain carbon application options, such as the use of CO₂ in some chemicals processes, fire suppression products, etc. (see Figure 5.1.) are not equal to permanent sequestration solutions such as concrete or carbonates. Coupling with DACCS is needed to neutralise the issue of re-releasing CO₂ and to attain carbon neutrality.


Due to its current market size, the conversion of CO₂ into products makes a small but important contribution to GHG targets for climate change. In a future hydrogen economy, carbon from CO₂ can be used to make many of the chemicals and plastics currently made using fossil fuels.

Carbon utilization can unlock the commerciality of these projects for the industrial sector, steel, cement and chemical.

Utilization Potential

- **Mineralization:** Incorporating CO₂ into concrete has the most potential to become a large market for CO₂ in the near term. Cement, one of the components of concrete, is responsible for 8% of the total GHG. This process is energy efficient using minimal external energy.
- **Chemicals:** CO₂ is currently used in small quantities to make urea fertiliser and some special polymers. In a future hydrogen economy, CO₂ could be combined with H₂ to make synthetic fuels, syngas and methanol. Syngas and methanol are basic chemical feedstock from which many chemicals and polymers can be made.
- **Biological:** CO₂ is used to promote plant growth and can be captured in soils by using biochar to increase soil quality.

Figure 5.1 CO₂ applications



* Products that use carbon but do not sequester carbon permanently

Source: Mission Innovation Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage Workshop, September 2017

Outlook

- **CO₂ utilization** will require large energy consumption due to the many reaction and separation steps involved. Industrial scale carbon capture will create a source of CO₂ which is required to attract industrial users into a future CCUS value chain.
- **Benefit analysis** of these new technologies could look at market, cost and carbon use potential.
- **Life cycle assessments** (use, disposal and recycling) are essential to understanding the true merits of a product including how long the CO₂ can be sequestered.

Appropriate Policy Action

- **Establish an overall policy strategy and pathway for CCUS** in industry, incorporating the necessary R&D priorities, commercialization potential, incentive policy mechanisms, and enabling legal frameworks.
- **Promote R&D programs** and initiatives that can unlock the economic potential of CO₂ utilization. Pursue large-scale demonstration for CCUS in industry in national and regional programmes.
- **Set standards to help industry develop products with CO₂** and promote use of products that sink CO₂ (e.g. concrete industry).
- **Introduce financing mechanisms**, such as tax credits, carbon prices & taxes, mandate & standards, carbon financing in development countries.

Figure 5.2 Utilization markets and potential CO₂ demand

Product	Price (\$/t)	Demand (Mt/yr)	CO ₂ Use (tCO ₂ /t)
Aggregate	10	55,000	0.25
Concrete	100	20,000	0.025
Methanol*	350	140	1.37
Ethanol	475	100	1.91
Sodium carbonate	150	60	0.42
Calcium carbonate	200	10	0.44
Polymers*	1,900	24	0.08

Source: BloombergNEF. March 2020

* For chemical products, CO₂ utilization is only a net benefit if it replaces petrochemicals. Chemical products are too short lived to be considered as carbon sinks. For higher environmental impact, CO₂ must come from BECCS, DACCS or waste streams.

Emerging Uses for CO₂

Besides EOR, many products are emerging as potential sinks that could increase demand in the future.

Products indicated in the table above can use CO₂ as a feedstock to produce the material. Many start-up companies are emerging with the objective of producing more economic and environmentally friendly paths to sink CO₂ into products rather than into underground geological storage.

Aggregate and concrete produced from CO₂ have the greatest potential to sink CO₂ with a combined annual market size of about 2500bn \$/yr. However, the low price of existing products make market penetration of such products challenging.

Production of methanol and ethanol also creates opportunities for sinking of CO₂ in products, but since liquid fuels are eventually burnt they are not considered as long-term CO₂ sink solutions unless combined with DACCS, BECCS and green hydrogen to create fuels that replace fossil fuels.

The rest of the products have limited potential to fully emerge as CO₂ sink solutions, as markets for these products are small compared to the market for fossil fuels and processing costs are high.

As CO₂ use increases for aggregate, concrete and chemicals production, low-cost CO₂ availability will limit its use for chemical production. Partnerships between CCUS technology providers and the chemical industry will be needed to develop new capture capacity and infrastructure.

6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CCUS TECHNOLOGIES


6.1 CCUS Technologies Cost Curves and Carbon Capture Potential

Cost is perceived as one of the main barriers for the development of CCUS projects. It is forecasted the cost of CCUS planned development for Europe could cost up to 50 billion euros. The speed at which CCUS costs can be reduced will drive rapid deployment of large-scale CCUS technologies.

CCUS technologies have evolved quickly over the last 5 years through testing in multiple R&D pilot projects around the world and through experience gained during deployment of large-scale projects, which has triggered further optimization of the technologies. There is quite a lot of uncertainty around the costs for the different carbon abatement technology options as observed in the figure below. The cost of natural sinks including reforestation, afforestation and agro-forestry is the lowest cost at around USD 50/ton CO₂ sequestered or below. CCUS cost of technologies that capture CO₂ from point sources for the Industrial sector vary considerably for different technologies depending on the concentration of the CO₂ with the Cement CCS and BECCS being the more expensive sources. DACCS technologies have the larger costs (more than USD 100/ton CO₂). The uncertainty in DACCS cost is the highest with some costs reported as high as USD 400/ton CO₂, however these technologies have a high potential to capture CO₂ from sources beyond the industrial sector 28 Gt CO₂ and up to 36 Gt/CO₂.

As the quantity of CO₂ to be captures is far greater than any potential market for the CO₂ (with the exception of the gasoline pool), these investments will not be paid back but should be seen as the cost to society of avoiding unacceptable climate change.

Figure 6.1 Carbon sequestration cost curve (US\$/tn CO₂ eq) and the GHG emissions abatement potential (GtCO₂ eq)



*Indicates technologies still in early (pilot) stage of development

Source: Goldman Sachs, Equity Research 2020

CCUS may be expensive, but it is an affordable option for an economy that aspires to be carbon neutral. Figure 6.1 gives the broad estimated costs of the main CCUS technologies. In order to appreciate how these costs affect the cost of using fossil fuels in a transition period, the arrow indicates the cost of CCUS, \$150 per tonne of CO₂, that implies a doubling of energy costs, assuming an oil price of \$60/barrel and approximately 0.4 tonnes of CO₂ emitted per barrel used. Even a doubling of energy costs is still within the historical high oil price range. All the CCUS technologies are viable in this scenario.

Source: World Resource Institute 2016

6.2 How Can Policy Makers Support the Private Sector to Act on Climate Change?

Technology readiness levels (TRLs) are a method for estimating the maturity of technology.

Commercial readiness levels (CRLs) are a method that assesses various indicators which influence the commercial and market conditions beyond just the technology maturity.

Social readiness levels (SRLs) are a method that assesses to what extent new ideas and innovations resonate with individuals and groups and whether they will be integrated into society and reach decisions concerning their adoption in the form of a regulatory and financial regime.


Many CCUS technologies are now at, or close to, TRL 9. Experience on other energy technologies indicates that applicable TRL1-9 research, including for upgrades in service, only stops when the last plants are closed. Many of the technologies required to move towards carbon neutrality would benefit and progress faster with the appropriate public sector alignment and support. Governments should fund R&D that will evolve CCUS technologies on CRL scale to continue beyond CRL 3 and TRL 9 and kick off with commercial scale up of CCUS technologies.

Policy makers risk delaying CCUS deployment because they are lagging behind in embracing CCUS technologies in their national action plans. There is a need for enabling policy and regulatory environment to allow full commercialization of CCUS technologies. Open access is required for two-way information flow between deployment and research and innovation activities, especially when most is government funded.

As can be seen on the next page, for many CCUS technologies, the Social Readiness Levels are lagging behind the Technology and Commercial Readiness Levels. This is delaying implementation, increases the costs incurred and contributing to even more drastic measures as the carbon budget is used up.


Figure 6.2.1 Technology, Commercial and Social Readiness Level

Carbon neutrality will need major changes to the way economies work. Any rapid introduction of change requires coordination of technology development, commercialization and the social acceptance. 'Readiness Levels' are a commonly used indicator of describing what needs to be addressed during the introduction of a change. Figure 6.2.1 shows how these can be used coordinate public and private actors. If the steps are not synchronised there will be delays, additional costs and, potentially, a failure to enact the change.



Sources: Developed based on Based on Bruce Adderley (et. al) 2016, Greg Kelsall 2020 and Denis Hicks 2020


6.3 Comparative Analysis - CCUS Readiness Level



Source: Natural Petroleum Council: Draft Summary Report, Meeting the Dual Challenge, A Roadmap to At-Scale Deployment of Carbon Capture, Use, and Storage, December 2019 (adapted for commercial and social readiness level)

6.4. Comparative Analysis - CCUS Readiness Level across UNECE Region

Full list of CCUS projects in appendix page 18



APPENDIX I


United Nations Framework Classification (UNFC) as Means to Verify CCUS Potential with International Cooperation

A number of resource classification systems have evolved over time in response to various sectoral needs and local requirements. These systems have witnessed progression towards a unifying global standard, UNFC. UNFC is a global, principles-based and user-friendly system for classifying, managing and reporting mineral, petroleum, renewable energy, groundwater, anthropogenic resources and injection projects. UNFC is a unique system in which resource quantities are classified on the basis of three fundamental criteria that reflect technical, socio-economic and planning dimensions.

Benefits of using UNFC:

- Structured framework of principles, rules and guidelines
- Aligned to major international and national classification systems
- Provides simplicity without sacrificing completeness or flexibility
- Leverages global communications
- Numerical and language independent coding scheme.

Figure 7 United Nations Framework Classification (UNFC)




The UNFC classifies projects where categories marked 1 indicate most mature categories and highest confidence according to estimates.

Projects are classified by their E and F categories, while the G categories reflect the degree of confidence in the estimate. The E-F categorization is shown in Figure 7. Estimates have traditionally been evaluations of resource quantities. As the UNFC by nature is a classification of projects, also other quantitative information carried by the projects and the assets associated with them may be included. Examples are quantities of costs, revenues, emissions, labour etc. and indicators of environmental and social contingencies etc.

Source: UNECE 2020b, United Nations Framework Classification (UNFC)


APPENDIX 2



CCUS projects in EUROPE

1. Leilac
2. Port of Antwerp
3. Carbon Connect Delta (Port of Ghent)
4. CO₂ EOR Project Croatia
5. iCORD
6. Bio-Refinery plant
7. Greensand
8. Lacq
9. DMX Demonstration in Dunkirk

NO	LOCATION	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INDUSTRY	DESCRIPTION	CO ₂ CAPTURED/ YEAR	STARTING DATE (OPERATION)	STATUS OF THE PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS	IOGP MEMBERS INVOLVED
1	Belgium	Leilac	Industrial capture	Cement	Cement plant carbon capture (pilot project)	N/A	2018-2020	2-year CO ₂ capture test	Heidelberg Cement, Calix	
2	Belgium <i>Antwerp</i>	Antwerp@C (Port of Antwerp)	Industrial capture	N/A	CCS-equipped industrial cluster, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea and reuse	N/A	N/A	Feasibility study	Air Liquide, BASF, Borealis, INEOS, ExxonMobil, Fluxys, Port of Antwerp and Total	ExxonMobil, Total
3	Belgium <i>Ghent</i>	Carbon Connect Delta (Port of Ghent)	Industrial capture	N/A	Connected to the cross-border Carbon Connect Delta in the Netherlands	1 Mt by 2023, 6,5 Mt by 2030	2023	Pre-feasibility	Smart Delta Resources, North Sea Port, ArcelorMittal, Dow Benelux, PZEM, Yara, Zeeland Refinery, Gasunie, Fluxys	
4	Croatia <i>Zagreb County</i>	CO ₂ EOR Project Croatia	EOR	N/A	EOR project started in 2014. Injected 1.400 kt CO ₂ in the EOR fields Ivanić and Žutica near Ivanić Grad (Zagreb County). The pipeline Molve-Ivanić is 88 km long (30 bar)	0,560 Mt/y	2015	In operation	INA MOL	MOL
5	Croatia <i>Central Croatia</i>	iCORD	Industrial capture	Fertilizer	Capturing the CO ₂ produced at a fertilizer plant at Location in central Croatia and at a concrete production plant at Location in eastern Croatia, and storing it at Moslavina basin oil fields and Pannonia basin oil fields as part of INA EOR project	Approx. 1Mt/y	2025	Feasibility study to be ordered by end of 2019, and to be prepared by Q3 2020	INA MOL	MOL
6	Croatia <i>Sisak-Moslavina County</i>	Bio-Refinery plant	Industrial capture	Bioethanol production	Bio-Refinery plant (bio-Ethanol production) on the Sisak Refinery location. On the existing pipeline route, new pipe of 16km will be built for CO ₂ storage, for the yearly production of 60kt of CO ₂	0,06 Mt/y (additional potential on location 300-400 kt)	2024	Signing the contracts for basic design and technology selection	NA MOL	MOL
7	Denmark <i>Greensand</i>	Greensand	Capture storage	Natural gas	Project purpose is to prove that the Paleocene sand in the depleted Danish North Sea oil- and gas fields and the associated infrastructure can be used for safe, long-term storage of CO ₂ . When in operation, the Project will allow for storage of 0.5-1 mill ton/ CO ₂ per year.	0.5-1 Mt stored CO ₂ /year	Pilot CO ₂ injection project by 2023; full field by 2025	Phase 1: Feasibility study stage, current TRL 2-3, aim is TRL 6 for launching the pilot (Phase 2)	INEOS Oil & Gas Denmark, Wintershall Dea GmbH, Maersk Drilling	Wintershall Dea
8	France <i>Pyrenees</i>	Lacq	Capture storage (oxy-combustion)	Natural gas	CCS Oxy fuel combustion CO ₂ captured and storage in depleted natural gas field at Rousee (Pyrenees)	Approx. total 50,000 tonnes	2009	Capture and storage phase ended on 15/03/2013	Total	Total
9	France <i>Dunkirk</i>	DMX Demonstration in Dunkirk	Industrial capture	Steelmaking	CCS-equipped steel-making plant, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea	Approx. 1 Mtpa	2025		ArcelorMittal, IFPEN, Axens, Total, ACP, Brevik Engineering, CMI, DTU, Gassco, RWTH, Uetikon	Total




CCUS projects in EUROPE

- 10. H2morrow
- 11. ERVIA
- 12. Orca
- 13. Hellisheidi
- 14. CCS Ravenna Hub
- 15. Porthos
- 16. Athos
- 17. Magnum

NO	LOCATION	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INDUSTRY	DESCRIPTION	CO ₂ CAPTURED/ YEAR	STARTING DATE (OPERATION)	STATUS OF THE PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS	IOGP MEMBERS INVOLVED
10	Germany <i>North Rhine-Westphalia</i>	H2morrow	Natural gas to H ₂ (pre-combustion)	Natural gas	Reforming natural gas imported from Norway to hydrogen with CO ₂ capture and storage offshore. Supplying industry and other end users in North Rhine-Westphalia with 8.6 terawatt hours of hydrogen per year from decarbonised natural gas	N/A	N/A	Feasibility study	Equinor, OGE	Equinor
11	Ireland	ERVIA	Power and capture (post-combustion)	Natural gas power and refining	CCS-equipped CCGTs and refinery, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the Celtic Sea	2Mtpa	2028	Feasibility study	ERVIA	
12	Iceland	Orca	Direct air capture	Power generation	Orca will combine Climeworks' direct air capture technology with the underground CO ₂ storage provided by Carbfix, capturing 4,000 tons/yr of CO ₂ - making the largest direct air capture plant to date. The energy required to run the direct air capture process will be provided by ON Power's nearby Hellisheidi Geothermal Power Plant	4000 tonnes	N/A	Under construction	Carbfix, Climeworks, ON Power	
13	Iceland	Hellisheidi	Industrial capture	Power generation	The industrial scale capture at the Hellisheidi Geothermal Power Plant in Iceland has significantly reduce CO ₂ and H ₂ S emissions from the power plant since 2014, following successful pilot-scale injections in 2012. The gases are co-captured in a scrubbing tower with annual capacity of about 12,000 tonnes of CO ₂ and 6,000 tonnes of H ₂ S, about 30% and 75% of the plant's emissions respectively. Cost of industrial scale operations at Hellisheidi are less than \$25/ton	12,000 tonnes	In operation	Under construction	Carbfix, ON Power	
14	Italy <i>Pianura Padana</i>	CCS Ravenna Hub	Power and capture (post-combustion), blue Hydrogen	Power generation and potential H ₂ production	CO ₂ capture in North of Italy (Pianura Padana Area) from Industrial Complex (i.e. Ravenna), transportation and storage exhausted natural gas fields. With a storage capacity of between 300 and 500 million tonnes	0.04-5,0 Mtpa phased program	2025-2028	Prefeasibility study	Eni	Eni
15	The Netherlands <i>Port of Rotterdam</i>	Porthos	Industrial capture	Chemical, refining	CCS-equipped industrial cluster, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea	Approx. 5Mtpa	2024	Feasibility study	Gasunie, the Port Authority and EBN	BP, Shell
16	The Netherlands <i>IJmond</i>	Athos	Industrial capture	Steelmaking	CCUS network capturing CO ₂ from TATA steel plant and reusing it or storing it in empty gas fields under the North Sea	7.5 MT CO ₂ per year	2030	Feasibility study	Gasunie, Port of Amsterdam, EBN and TATA Steel	
17	The Netherlands <i>Eemshaven</i>	Magnum	Natural gas to H ₂ (pre-combustion)	Hydrogen production	CCS-equipped production of hydrogen for power generation, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea	Approx. 4 Mtpa	2023	Feasibility study	Equinor, Vattenfall, Gasunie, MHPS	Equinor


Source: Global CCS Institute and IOGP data



CCUS projects in EUROPE

- 18. Aramis
- 19. Carbon Connect Delta
- 20. Sleipner CO₂ Storage
- 21. Snøhvit CO₂ Storage
- 22. Longship
(including Northern Lights)
- 23. Preem CCS
- 24. Stockholm Exergi Bio-CCS

NO	LOCATION	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INDUSTRY	DESCRIPTION	CO ₂ CAPTURED/ YEAR	STARTING DATE (OPERATION)	STATUS OF THE PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS	IOGP MEMBERS INVOLVED
18	The Netherlands <i>Den Helder</i>	Aramis	Industrial capture		CO ₂ supplied by third parties from Den Helder and stored in the North Sea floor. This CO ₂ can be brought to Den Helder by boat or by pipeline (for example from IJmuiden)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
19	The Netherlands <i>Ports of Terneuzen and Vlissingen</i>	Carbon Connect Delta	Industrial capture	N/A	With CCUS, CO ₂ emissions can be reduced by 30% in the port area of North Sea Port. A consortium of Belgian and Dutch companies expects to complete the Carbon Connect Delta feasibility study at the end of 2020, after which the project will be further developed for realization. The consortium works simultaneously across industrial sectors (chemicals, petrochemicals and steel), as well as with relevant governments in both countries to create unique synergies and opportunities	1 Mt by 2023, 6,5 Mt by 2030	2023	Pre-feasibility	Smart Delta Resources, North Sea Port, Arce-lorMittal, Dow Benelux, PZEM, Yara, Zeeland Refinery, Gasunie, Fluxys	
20	Norway <i>North Sea</i>	Sleipner CO ₂ Storage	Industrial capture	Natural gas	CCS-equipped natural gas production, CO ₂ directly injected into North Sea reservoirs	Approx. 1 Mtpa, and over 17 million tonnes has been injected since inception to date	1996	Operational	Equinor (operator), Vår Energi, Total	Equinor (operator), Vår Energi, Total
21	Norway <i>Barents Sea</i>	Snøhvit CO ₂ Storage	Industrial capture	LNG facility	CCS-equipped LNG facility, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the Barents Sea	0.70 Mtpa	2008	Operational	Equinor (operator) Petoro, Total, Engie, Norsk Hydro, Hess Norge	Statoil, Total, Hess
22	Norway	Longship (including Northern Lights)	Industrial capture	Cement and waste-to-energy	Capturing CO ₂ from HeidelbergCement Norcem's cement factory in Brevik and Fortum Oslo Varme's waste incineration facility in Oslo and transporting it for offshore storage in the North Sea basin. Equinor, Shell and Total form the transport and storage consortium of Northern Lights.	0.8 Mtpa from possible 2 industrial plants: cement and waste to energy	2023–2024	Final investment decision (FID)	Shell, Equinor, Total	Shell, Equinor, Total
23	Sweden	Preem CCS	Industrial capture, natural gas-to-H ₂ (pre-combustion)	Refining	CCS-equipped hydrogen production unit at a refinery, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea	500,000 tonnes (at full scale)	2025	Pilot phase	Preem, Chalmers University of Technology, SINTEF Energy Research, Equinor and Aker Solutions	Equinor, Aker Solutions
24	Sweden <i>Stockholm</i>	Stockholm Exergi Bio-CCS	Power & capture (post-combustion), BECCS	Bioenergy	A pilot plant at the Värtan biomass-fired CHP plant enables the capture of CO ₂ from the biomass fuel in the post-combustion flue gases. The CO ₂ will be compressed into liquid form and stored in underground rock formations. A large-scale facility for BECCS will cover all parts from CO ₂ capture to storage and will create major negative emissions each year.	Est. 0.8 Mt (at full scale)	N/A	Pilot phase	Stockholm Exergi, Northern Lights consortium (Equinor, Shell, Total)	Equinor, Shell, Total




CCUS projects in EUROPE

- 25. Acorn
- 26. Caledonia Clean Energy
- 27. H21 North of England
- 28. Liverpool-Manchester Hydrogen Cluster
- 29. Net Zero Teesside
- 30. Humber Zero Carbon Cluster
- 31. Liverpool Bay Area CCS Project

NO	LOCATION	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INDUSTRY	DESCRIPTION	CO ₂ CAPTURED/ YEAR	STARTING DATE (OPERATION)	STATUS OF THE PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS	IOGP MEMBERS INVOLVED
25	UK <i>Scotland St Fergus</i>	Acorn	Industrial capture	Natural Gas power	CCS-equipped natural gas processing plant, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea	The Reference Case assumes a flat rate of 200,000T/yr can be captured from one of the gas terminals at St Fergus	2023	Feasibility study	Project is led by Pale Blue Dot Energy, with funding and support from industry partners (Chrysaor, Shell and Total) the UK and Scottish Governments	Chrysaor, Shell, Total
26	UK <i>Scotland Grangemouth</i>	Caledonia Clean Energy	Power & capture	Natural gas power	Examining construction of a new natural gas feedstock power plant (The Caledonia Plant) with integrated CO ₂ capture facilities. Power is developing the Caledonia Clean Energy Project (CCEP), an electricity generating station of up to 1GW located near Grangemouth, central Scotland. The project would use a natural gas feedstock with integrated carbon capture, and has the potential to also co-produce clean hydrogen for modern heat and transport applications	3 Mtpa	2023	Feasibility study	Summit Power	
27	UK <i>North of England</i>	H21 North of England	Natural gas to H ₂ (pre-combustion)	Hydrogen production	Natural gas-to-hydrogen conversion with CCS, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea and salt caverns	Approx. 3 Mtpa	2020s	Feasibility study	Northern Gas Networks, Cadent and Equinor	Equinor
28	UK <i>Liverpool Manchester</i>	Liverpool-Manchester Hydrogen Cluster	Natural gas to H ₂ (pre-combustion)	Hydrogen production	Natural gas-to-hydrogen conversion with CCS, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea	1.5Mtpa (10% H ₂) - 9.5Mtpa (100% H ₂)	2020s	Feasibility study	CADENT	
29	UK <i>Southern North Sea</i>	Net Zero Teesside	Power & capture (post-combustion)	Natural gas power	CCS-equipped natural gas power plant, CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea	5 Mtpa	2026	Technical evaluation and business model options	BP, OGI	BP, Eni, Repsol, Shell, Equinor, Total
30	UK <i>North Sea</i>	Humber Zero Carbon Cluster	Industrial capture	H ₂ production, bioenergy	CCS-equipped industrial cluster, CCS equipped hydrogen production, bioenergy with CCS (BECCS), CO ₂ transportation and storage in the North Sea	N/A	2020s	Technical evaluation and business model options	Drax Group, Equinor, National Grid Ventures	Equinor
31	UK <i>East Irish Sea</i>	Liverpool Bay Area CCS Project	Carbon capture sequestration	Chemical, refining, hydrogen production	CO ₂ capture from the existing industrial facilities and new hydrogen production plant in the North West of England	1-3 Mtpa phased program	2025	Concept selection phase	Eni	Eni


Source: Global CCS Institute and IOGP data



CCUS projects in NORTH AMERICA

1. Quest
2. Boundary Dam CCS
3. Alberta Carbon Trunk Line (ACTL) with North West Redwater Partnership's Sturgeon Refinery CO₂ Stream
4. Lehigh's Edmonton plant
5. Alberta Carbon Trunk Line (ACTL) with Agrium CO₂ Stream
6. Illinois Industrial Carbon Capture and Storage (ICCS)
7. Petra Nova

NO	LOCATION	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INDUSTRY	DESCRIPTION	CO ₂ CAPTURED/ YEAR	STARTING DATE (OPERATION)	STATUS OF THE PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS	IOGP MEMBERS INVOLVED
1	Canada Alberta	Quest	Industrial capture, EOR	Hydrogen production for oil refining	Retrofitted CO ₂ capture facility to steam methane reformers, transportation via pipeline to a dedicated geological storage	1 Mtpa	2015	Operational	Shell	Shell
2	Canada Saskatchewan	Boundary Dam CCS	Power and capture (post-combustion), EOR	Power generation	It combines post-combustion CCS with coal-fired power generation, some captured CO ₂ goes for EOR use in the Weyburn oil unit, a portion of the CO ₂ is stored permanently under the ground at the Aquistore project	1 Mtpa	2014	Operational	SaskPower	
3	Canada Alberta	Alberta Carbon Trunk Line (ACTL) with North West Redwater Partnership's Sturgeon Refinery CO ₂ Stream	Industrial capture, EOR	Oil refining	Carbon dioxide captured from Agrium's Redwater fertiliser plant and the North West Redwater Partnership's Sturgeon refinery. CO ₂ recovered from the fertiliser plant's emission streams put through inlet cooling, separation, compression, dehydration and refrigeration to produce liquefied CO ₂ . The project plans to transport CO ₂ from a number of sources in the future coming from Alberta's Industrial Heartland	1.2-1.4 Mtpa	2020	Operational	Enhance Energy Inc. (and - North West Redwater Partnership)	
4	Canada Alberta	Lehigh's Edmonton plant	Industrial capture	Cement industry	Capture the majority of the carbon dioxide (CO ₂) from the flue gas of Lehigh's Edmonton, Alberta cement plant	Estimated 600,000 tonnes annually		Feasibility study	Lehigh Cement and the International CCS Knowledge Centre	
5	Canada Alberta	Alberta Carbon Trunk Line (ACTL) with Agrium CO ₂ Stream	Industrial capture, EOR	Fertilizer production	At the NWR refinery, CO ₂ will be captured within the gasification hydrogen supply unit, which will use unconverted petroleum bottoms (asphaltene) as feedstock to create synthesis gas (syngas)	0.3-06 Mta	2020	Operational	Enhance Energy Inc.	
6	USA Illinois	Illinois Industrial Carbon Capture and Storage (ICCS)	Industrial capture	Ethanol production	CO ₂ captured from the fermentation process used to produce ethanol at an industrial corn processing complex in Decatur, Illinois, Transportation to a dedicated geological storage site	1 Mtpa	2017	Operational	Administered by the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Fossil Energy and managed by the National Energy Technology Laboratory and by a cost share agreement with the Archer Daniels Midland Company, University of Illinois through the Illinois State Geological Survey, Schlumberger Carbon Services, and Richland Community College	
7	USA Texas	Petra Nova	Power and capture (post-combustion), EOR	Power generation	Texas power plant retrofitted with post-combustion CO ₂ capture facility, transportation near Houston for EOR	1.4 Mtpa	2017	Operational		




CCUS projects in NORTH AMERICA

- 8. Coffeyville Gasification Plant
- 9. Air Products Steam Methane Reformer
- 10. Lost Cabin Gas Plant
- 11. Century Plant
- 12. Great Plains Synfuels Plant and Weyburn-Midale
- 13. Shute Creek Gas Processing Plant
- 14. Enid Fertilizer
- 15. Terrell Natural Gas Processing Plant (formerly Del Verde)
- 16. Wabash CO₂ Sequestration
- 17. Lake Charles Methanol

NO	LOCATION	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INDUSTRY	DESCRIPTION	CO ₂ CAPTURED/ YEAR	STARTING DATE (OPERATION)	STATUS OF THE PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS	IOGP MEMBERS INVOLVED
8	USA <i>Kansas</i>	Coffeyville Gasification Plant	Industrial capture, fertilizer production, EOR	Fertilizer production	Fertilizer plant in Coffeyville retrofitted with CO ₂ compression and dehydration facilities, oil delivery to the North Burbank oil unit in Osage county, Oklahoma for EOR	1 Mtpa	2013	Operational	Coffeyville Resources Nitrogen Fertilizers, LLC, Chapparral Energy and Blue Source	
9	USA <i>Texas</i>	Air Products Steam Methane Reformer	Industrial capture, EOR	Hydrogen production for oil refinery	Air products retrofitted of steam methane reformer within a refinery at Port Arthur, Texas, transportation to oil field in Texas for EOR	1 Mtpa	2013	Operational	Air Products, Covestro	
10	USA <i>Wyoming</i>	Lost Cabin Gas Plant	Industrial capture, EOR	Natural gas processing	Gas plantg in Wyoming supplies CO ₂ to compression facility, transport and delivery via pipeline to the Bell Creek oil field in Montana for EOR	Approx. 1 Mtpa	2013	Operational	ConocoPhillips	ConocoPhillips
11	USA <i>Texas</i>	Century Plant	Industrial capture, EOR	Natural gas processing	Natural gas treatment facility in Texas, transportation via pipeline for EOR	8.4 Mtpa	2010	Operational	Occidental Petroleum	
12	USA <i>North Dakota</i>	Great Plains Synfuels Plant and Weyburn-Midale	Industrial capture (pre-combustion), EOR	Synthetic natural gas	The plant in North Dakota produces CO ₂ as part of a coal gasification process, transportation to the Weyburn and Midale oil units for EOR	3 Mtpa	2000	Operational	Dakota Gasification Company	
13	USA <i>Wyoming</i>	Shute Creek Gas Processing Plant	Industrial capture, EOR	Natural gas processing	Gas treating facility in Wyoming, some CO ₂ injected for sequestration/disposal, some for EOR	7 Mtpa	1986	Operational	ExxonMobil	ExxonMobil
14	USA <i>Oklahoma</i>	Enid Fertilizer	Industrial capture, fertilizer production, EOR	Fertilizer production	CO ₂ captured from the manufacture of fertilizer, transportation for use in EOR at the Golden Trend oilfield and the Sko-Vel-Tum oilfield, south of Oklahoma City	0.7 Mtpa	1982	Operational	Koch Nitrogen Company	
15	USA <i>Texas</i>	Terrell Natural Gas Processing Plant (formerly Del Verde)	Industrial capture, EOR	Natural gas processing	CO ₂ capture at natural gas processing plant, CO ₂ transportation via Valverde pipeline to McCamey, Texas, and the Canyon Reef Carriers CRC pipeline and the Pecos pipeline, CO ₂ for EOR	Approx 0.5 Mtpa	1972	Operational	Blue Source and others	
16	USA <i>Indiana</i>	Wabash CO ₂ Sequestration	Industrial capture	Fertilizer production	Gasification plant in Indiana to be converted into an anhydrous ammonia production plant and CCS plant, dedicated geological storage in the Wabash carbonSAFE CO ₂ storage hub	1.5-1.75 Mtpa	2022	Advance development	WABASH Valley Resources (WVR)	
17	USA <i>Louisiana</i>	Lake Charles Methanol	Industrial capture, EOR	Chemical production	Gasification facility in Louisiana capturing from synthetic gas syngas to make methanol and other products, captured CO ₂ to be used for EOR in Texas	Approx 4 Mtpa	2024	Advance development	Leucadia Energy	

Source: Global CCS Institute and IOGP data



CCUS projects in NORTH AMERICA

- 18. Dry Fork Integrated Commercial CCS
- 19. CarbonSAFE Illinois - Macon County
- 20. Project Tundra
- 21. Integrated Mid-Continent Stacked Carbon Storage Hub*
- 22. Oxy and White Energy Ethanol EOR Facility
- 23. Oxy and Carbon Engineering Direct Air Capture and EOR Facility
- 24. Project ECO₂S: Early CO₂ Storage Complex in Kemper County

NO	LOCATION	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT TYPE	INDUSTRY	DESCRIPTION	CO ₂ CAPTURED/ YEAR	STARTING DATE (OPERATION)	STATUS OF THE PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS	IOGP MEMBERS INVOLVED
18	USA <i>Wyoming</i>	Dry Fork Integrated Commercial CCS	Power and capture (postcombustion), EOR	Power generation	Dry Fork coal-fired power station in Wyoming, targeting adjacent geological storage formations currently under study. EOR under consideration	3 Mtpa	2025	Advance development	The Basin Electric Power Cooperative	
19	USA <i>Illinois</i>	CarbonSAFE Illinois - Macon County	Power and industrial capture (postcombustion), EOR	Power generation and ethanol production	CCS integration of a compression and dehydration facilities to an ethanol plant, transportation and injection in a dedicated geological storage	2-5 Mtpa	2025	Advance development	Carbon Storage Assurance Facility Enterprise (CarbonSAFE) of the U.S. Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory (DOENETL)	
20	USA <i>North Dakota</i>	Project Tundra	Power and capture (postcombustion), EOR	Power generation	Retrofit CO ₂ capture plant to the Milton R. Young coal fire power station in North Dakota with a dedicated storage site. EOR under study	3.1-3.6 Mtpa	2025-2026	Advance development	Minnkota Power Cooperative	
21	USA <i>Nebraska, Kansas</i>	Integrated Mid-Continent Stacked Carbon Storage Hub	Ethanol production, power generation and/or refinery, EOR	Ethanol production, power generation and/or refinery	CO ₂ collection from ethanol plants, power plants and refineries with integrated storage in Kansas and Nebraska	Approx 2 Mtpa	2025-2035	Advance development	The team is led by Battelle Memorial Institute and includes: Archer Daniels Midland Company (ADM), the Kansas Geologic Survey (KGS), the Energy and Environmental Research Center (EERC) at the University of North Dakota, Schlumberger, the Conservation and Survey Division (CSD) at the University of Nebraska- Lincoln (UNL) and others	Schlumberger
22	USA <i>Texas</i>	Oxy and White Energy Ethanol EOR Facility	Industrial capture, EOR	Ethanol production	CO ₂ capture from two ethanol facilities in Hereford and Plainview, Texas. The captured CO ₂ will be stored via EOR at Occidental's oil fields in Premian basin	0.6-0.7 Mtpa	2021	Early development	Occidental Petroleum Corporation and White Energy	
23	USA <i>Texas</i>	Oxy and Carbon Engineering Direct Air Capture and EOR Facility	Direct air capture, EOR	N/A	CO ₂ capture from an Occidental oil field in the Permian Basin, and used for EOR	1 Mtpa	2025	Early development	Oxy Low Carbon Ventures and Carbon Engineering Ltd	
24	USA <i>Mississippi</i>	Project ECO ₂ S: Early CO ₂ Storage Complex in Kemper County	Under evaluation	N/A	Regional CO ₂ storage hub near the Keper County Energy Facility in Mississippi from power and industrial sources	3 Mtpa	2026	Early development	In identification (capture) - Project ECO ₂ S, a DOE-supported CarbonSAFE program	

ABBREVIATIONS

BECCS	Biomass energy with carbon capture and storage
CCUS	Carbon capture, use and storage
CO₂	Carbon dioxide
CRL	Commercial readiness level
DACCS	Direct air carbon capture and storage
ECBM	Enhanced coal bed methane
EGR	Exhaust gas recirculation
EOR	Enhanced oil recovery
GHG	Greenhouse gas
Gt	Gigatonne
NET	Negative emissions technologies
R&D	Research and development
SRL	Social readiness level
TRL	Technology readiness level
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNFC	United Nations Framework Classification

REFERENCES

Adderley, B., J. Carey, J. Gibbins, M. Lucquiaud and R. Smith, 2016, Post-Combustion Carbon Dioxide Capture Cost Reduction to 2030 and beyond, Faraday Discussion on CCS, July 2016, <http://pubs.rsc.org/en/Content/ArticleLanding/2016/FD/c6fd00046k#!divAbstract> accessed September 2020

BloombergNEF, 2020, CCUS costs and opportunities for long-term CO₂ disposal, March 2020

Bradshaw, J. and T. Dance, 2004, Mapping geological storage perspectivity of CO₂ for the world's sedimentary basins and regional source to sink matching, in (E.S. Rubin, D.W. Keith and C.F. Gilboy eds.), GHGT-7, Proc. Seventh International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, September 5-9, 2004

Bui, M. (et. al), 2018, Carbon capture and storage (CCS): the way forward, Energy Environ. Sci., 2018, 11, page 1062-1176, doi: 10.1039/C7EE02342A

Celia, M. A., S. Bachu, J. M. Nordbotten, and K. W. Bandilla 2015, Status of CO₂ storage in deep saline aquifers with emphasis on modeling approaches and practical simulations, WaterResour. Res., 51, 6846–6892, doi:10.1002/2015WR017609

Consoli, C., N. Wildgust, 2017, Current status of global storage resources, Energy Procedia 114 (2017) 4623 – 4628, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1866

Global CCS Institute, 2019, Targeting Climate Change: Growing Momentum for Carbon Capture and Storage, <https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/resources/global-status-report/> accessed August 2020

GoldmanSachs, Equity Research, Carbonomics Q&A: Five key questions from investors, published on 3 February 2020

Greg Kelsall, “CCUS – status, barriers and potential”, April 2020, IEA Clean Coal Centre

Hefny M., C. Qin, M. Saar and A. Ebigo, 2020, Synchrotron-based pore-network modeling of two-phase flow in Nubian Sandstone and implications for capillary trapping of carbon dioxide

Hicks, D., 2020, Improved forecasting of the Energy Transition? The use of simple Technology Readiness and Social Readiness Levels (TRL and SRL) in energy transition models, July 2020

IOGP 2020a, CCUS Projects in Europe, <https://gtw1h238bgv3dmbvo37kcoow-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Map-of-EU-CCS-Projects.pdf> accessed January 2021

IOGP 2020b, CCUS Global Projects, <https://32zn56499nov99m251h4e9t8-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/bookstore/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/06/Global-CCS-Projects-Map.pdf> accesses December 2021

IPCC, 2005, Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage, Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Metz, B., O. Davidson, H. C. de Coninck, M. Loos, and L. A. Meyer (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/carbon-dioxide-capture-and-storage/>

IPCC, 2018, Special Report on 1.5 degrees, Summary for Policymakers, <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/chapter/spm/> accessed August 2020

International Energy Agency, 2015, Storing CO₂ through Enhanced Oil Recovery, <https://www.iea.org/reports/storing-co2-through-enhanced-oil-recovery> accessed September 2020

Kelsall, G., 2020, CCUS – status, barriers and potential, IEA Clean Coal Centre, <https://www.iea-coal.org/report/carbon-capture-utilisation-and-storage-status-barriers-and-potential-ccc-304/> accessed September 2020

McKinsey Quarterly, 2020, Driving CO₂ emissions to zero (and beyond) with CCUS, June 2020, <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/sustainability/our-insights/driving-co2-emissions-to-zero-and-beyond-with-carbon-capture-use-and-storage#> accessed August 2020

National Academies of Sciences, 2015, Engineering and Medicine, Climate Intervention: Carbon Dioxide Removal and Reliable Sequestration, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/18805>

National Academies of Sciences, 2019, Engineering and Medicine, Negative Emissions Technologies and Reliable Sequestration: A Research Agenda. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25259>

Natural Petroleum Council, 2019, Meeting the dual challenge: A roadmap at scale deployment of CCUS, <https://dualchallenge.npc.org/downloads.php>, accessed October 2020

Panel on Climate Change [Metz, B., O. Davidson, H. C. de Coninck, M. Loos, and L. A. Meyer (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/carbon-dioxide-capture-and-storage/>

Royal Society, 2018, Greenhouse Gas Removal, <https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/projects/greenhouse-gas-removal/> accessed August 2020

UNECE, 2020a, Pathways to Sustainable Energy - Accelerating Energy Transition in the UNECE Region, https://unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/energy/se/pdfs/CSE/Publications/Final_Report_PathwaysToSE.pdf

UNECE, 2020b, United Nations Framework Classification for Resources, Update 2019, https://unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/energy/se/pdfs/UNFC/publ/UNFC_ES61_Update_2019.pdf

World Resources Institute, 2015, A Recommended Methodology for Estimating and Reporting the Potential Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Fossil Fuel Reserves, <https://www.wri.org/publication/methodology-calculating-potential-emissions-fossil-fuel-reserves> accessed January 2021



Information Service
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Palais des Nations
CH - 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland
Telephone: +41(0)22 917 12 34
Fax: +41(0)22 917 05 05
E-mail: unece_info@un.org
Website: <http://www.unece.org>