

TECHNICAL AND COMMERCIAL PROGRESS TOWARDS VIABLE CO₂ STORAGE

A techno-economic investigation
commissioned by the members of the
Carbon Dioxide Capture & Conversion (CO₂CC) Program

Client Private
July 2019



The Carbon Dioxide Capture & Conversion (CO₂CC) Program

The **CO₂CC Program** is a membership-directed consortium whose members are involved in the development, monitoring and utilization of the “state-of-the-art” in technological progress and commercial implementation of carbon dioxide capture/clean-up and conversion. By the direction of the member companies (through balloting and other interactive means), the program delivers a range of timely and insightful information and analyses which are accessible exclusively to members and protected by confidentiality agreements. The objective is to document technically and commercially viable options for CO₂ capture/clean-up as well as its conversion into useful products which meaningfully address the challenges posed by CO₂ life-cycle and overall sustainability issues.

Members receive three in-depth **CO₂CC Techno-economic Reports** which are written by leading scientists and experienced industry professionals in areas selected by the membership (via ballot); weekly *CO₂CC Communiqués* (delivered via e-mail) which provide the latest updates on technical breakthroughs, commercial events and exclusive development opportunities; and attendance at the CO₂CC Program **Annual Meeting**.

The **Carbon Dioxide Capture & Conversion (CO₂CC) Program** is available on a membership basis from The Catalyst Group Resources (TCGR). For further details, please contact John J. Murphy at John.J.Murphy@catalystgrp.com or +1.215.628.4447 (x1121).



P.O. Box 680
Spring House, PA 19477 U.S.A
ph: +1.215.628.4447

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xxiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.2 REPORT CONTENTS.....	1
1.3 REPORT METHODOLOGY.....	2
1.4 REPORT CONTRIBUTORS	2
2. THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT FOR CO₂ STORAGE AND TRANSPORT	5
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	5
2.2 CO ₂ STORAGE LEGISLATION	6
2.2.1 History and Recent Developments	7
2.2.2 Primary Drivers of CO ₂ Storage-Related Legislation and Policy: EOR, Climate Change, and Energy Security	8
2.2.2.1 Global Climate Change	8
2.2.2.2 Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR).....	8
2.2.2.3 Energy Security	8
2.2.3 Overview of Technical Standards for CO ₂ Storage.....	9
2.2.3.1 Elements of a CO ₂ Storage Regime	9
2.2.3.2 Supporting CCS Storage Projects Through Policies	10
2.2.4 Legislation by Region	11
2.2.4.1 Global Overview	11
2.2.4.2 Europe	15
2.2.4.3 North America.....	21
2.2.4.4 Asia-Pacific	29
2.2.4.5 Australia	30
2.2.4.6 Rest of World	30
2.2.5 Remaining Hurdles.....	30
2.2.6 Summary	31
2.2.7 Outlook.....	31
2.3 CO ₂ TRANSPORT LEGISLATION.....	31

2.3.1	History and Recent Developments	32
2.3.2	Primary Drivers of CO ₂ Transport-Related Legislation and Policy: EOR, ECBMR, EGR and CO ₂ For Industrial Purposes	33
2.3.3	Overview of Technical Standards for CO ₂ Pipelines	34
2.3.3.1	United States: CFR Part 195	35
2.3.3.2	Canada: CSA Z662.....	36
2.3.3.3	Europe: DNV-RP-J202	36
2.3.3.4	International ISO/TC 265	36
2.3.3.5	Australia: AS2885	36
2.3.4	CO ₂ Transport Legislation by Region	36
2.3.4.1	Global	36
2.3.4.2	Europe	38
2.3.4.3	North America.....	40
2.3.4.4	Asia-Pacific	43
2.3.5	Remaining Hurdles.....	45
2.3.6	Summary	45
2.3.7	Outlook.....	45
2.4	REFERENCES.....	45
3.	TRANSPORTATION METHODS.....	51
3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	51
3.2	PRE-TRANSPORTATION PREPARATION	53
3.2.1	CO ₂ Phase Preparation	53
3.2.2	CO ₂ Separation Techniques	55
3.2.2.1	Technology Descriptions.....	55
3.2.2.2	Technology Selection	58
3.2.3	Commercial Developments	58
3.3	CO ₂ PIPELINE.....	59
3.3.1	Advantages of pipeline transportation.....	59
3.3.2	Technological developments.....	60
3.3.3	Cost Analysis.....	62
3.3.4	Limitations of pipeline transportation	64
3.3.5	Commercial Developments	68
3.3.6	Feasibility	70

3.4 SHIP TANKER	72
3.4.1 Advantages of Ship transportation	72
3.4.2 Technological Developments	73
3.4.3 Cost analysis.....	76
3.4.4 Limitations of Ship Transportation	78
3.4.5 Commercial Developments	79
3.4.6 Feasibility	80
3.5 TRANSPORTATION BENCHMARKS	81
3.5.1 Economic Comparison	81
3.5.2 Sustainability Comparison	82
3.5.3 Legislative Factors	83
3.6 REMAINING HURDLES.....	83
3.6.1 Leakage	84
3.6.2 Risk Assessment.....	84
3.6.3 Other	85
3.7 SUMMARY & OUTLOOK.....	86
3.7.1 Comparison of Methods	86
3.7.2 Current Feasibility.....	87
3.7.3 Future Directions.....	87
3.8 REFERENCES:.....	89
4. STORAGE TECHNOLOGIES.....	97
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	97
4.2 INJECTION METHODS	97
4.2.1 Injection Method Considerations	98
4.2.1.1 Physical Properties of CO ₂	98
4.2.1.2 CO ₂ Phase Behavior	99
4.2.1.3 CO ₂ Injection Rate.....	100
4.2.2 Effect of Reservoir Heterogeneity.....	100
4.2.3 Enhanced Water Recovery	102
4.2.4 Co-injection of Water & CO ₂	103
4.2.5 Extended Reach & Horizontal Wells	104
4.2.6 Commercial Vendors.....	106

4.2.7	Injection Methods Summary	106
4.3	GEOLOGICAL STORAGE.....	107
4.3.1	Role of Geological CO ₂ Storage	109
4.3.2	Depleted Oil & Gas Reservoirs.....	111
4.3.3	Deep Saline Aquifers	113
4.3.4	Unmineable Coal Beds.....	114
4.3.5	Commercial Vendors.....	116
4.3.6	Geological Storage Summary.....	116
4.4	STORAGE BENCHMARKS.....	118
4.4.1	Economic Comparison	118
4.4.1.1	Reservoir Type, Site Location & Infrastructure	118
4.4.1.2	Effect of Reservoir Scale.....	123
4.4.1.3	Utilization Options During CO ₂ Storage.....	124
4.4.1.4	Economic Uncertainties	125
4.4.2	Sustainability Comparison	126
4.4.2.1	Efficiency of Different Storage Technologies	126
4.4.2.2	Suitability for Large-Scale Deployment	128
4.4.2.3	Uncertainties Related to Long-Term CO ₂ Storage.....	128
4.4.3	Legislative Factors	129
4.4.3.1	Law & Regulation – Critical Factors & Key Provisions.....	129
4.5	REMAINING HURDLES.....	130
4.5.1	Storage Cost Reduction.....	130
4.5.2	Political Confidence (Carbon Taxing, Legal & Regulatory Frameworks)	130
4.5.3	Uncertainty of Storage Capacity Estimates.....	131
4.5.4	Implementation of Full-Chain CCS Projects at Industrial Scale.....	132
4.5.5	Monitoring & Verification of Large-Scale Storage Operations.....	133
4.5.6	Environmental Concerns	133
4.5.6.1	Leakage	134
4.5.6.2	(Micro-)Seismicity	134
4.5.6.3	Surface Deformation	134
4.5.7	Public Perception & Acceptance.....	135
4.6	SUMMARY & OUTLOOK.....	136

4.6.1	Storage Technology.....	136
4.6.2	Economics Summary.....	137
4.6.3	Sustainability Summary	138
4.6.4	Outlook.....	139
4.7	REFERENCES.....	140
5.	INDEX	147

FIGURES

Figure ES-1	Comparison of CCS Volume for 15% Global CO ₂ Emission to Oil Ecosystem (adapted from Cembalest, 2019).....	xxiv
Figure ES-2	The CO ₂ transport chain (Audun Aspelund, 2007).....	xxvi
Figure ES-3	CO ₂ transportation cost for the different reservoir cases at a shipping distance of 800 km	xxvii
Figure ES-4	Sleipner CO ₂ Reservoir and Injection Wells	xxx
Figure ES-5	Different storage options for CO ₂ (after IPCC, 2005).....	xxxi
Figure ES-6	Cost decrease per t of CO ₂ stored associated with the scale effect during CO ₂ storage in a deep saline aquifer onshore (adapted from ZEP, 2011). Note that scale effect includes cost reduction due to higher storage capacity and longer lifetime of commercial-scale projects; other includes an additional monitoring well for demo projects, amongst others.	xxxiii
Figure 2.1.1	Comparison of CCS Volume for 15% Global CO ₂ Emission to Oil Ecosystem (adapted from Cembalest, 2019).....	6
Figure 2.2.3.1.1	Common Elements of a Regulatory Regime for CO ₂ Storage (adapted from IEA, 2019).....	9
Figure 2.2.3.2.1	Primary policies and project characteristics that have overcome barriers to CCS investment (adapted from GCCSI Policy Priorities, 2019).....	10
Figure 2.2.4.1.1	Comparing 2018 CCS Policy Indicator Results and the 2018 Inherent CCS Interest Scores for Countries (adapted from GCCSI PI, 2018).....	13
Figure 2.2.4.1.2	Legal and Regulatory Indicator for CCS (adapted from GCCSI LRI, 2018).....	13
Figure 2.2.4.3.1.1	45Q Tax Credit Available for Difference Sources and Uses of CO ₂ (adapted from EFI, 2018).....	23
Figure 2.2.4.3.1.2	Non-Renewable Resources Eligible for RPS Compliance (adapted from NARUC, 2018).....	27

Figure 2.2.4.3.1.3	Interrelation of the LCFS with 45Q, the EPA’s UIC, and Subpart RR or UU of the EPA’s GHG Reporting Program (adapted from GCCSI, LCFS 2019).	28
Figure 2.3.3.1	Project Development Cycle for Large CO ₂ Pipeline Project	35
Figure 3.1.1	Optimal CO ₂ pipeline network in 2050.	53
Figure 3.2.1.1	The phase diagram of CO ₂ (Løvseth et al., 2013).....	54
Figure 3.2.1.2	The CO ₂ transport chain (Audun Aspelund, 2007).	55
Figure 3.2.2.1.1	Schematic representation of pre- and post-combustion carbon capture (Global CCS Institute, 2017).....	56
Figure 3.2.2.1.2	Schematic representation of post-combustion CO ₂ capture via amine scrubbing (Global CCS Institute, 2012).....	56
Figure 3.3.4.1	A view of the explosion from the ENE direction, and the fractured pipe and crater formed by the pipeline rupture.	67
Figure 3.3.6.1	Integrity Management System DNV-RP-116 (DNV, 2010).....	71
Figure 3.4.2.1	General arrangement for proposed 30,000m ³ CO ₂ carrier, conventional design (Vermeulen, 2011).....	75
Figure 3.4.2.2	General arrangement of proposed X-Bow design 30,000m ³ CO ₂ carrier (Vermeulen, 2011)	75
Figure 3.4.3.1	Multi-criteria analysis of the pipeline and shipping transport chains	77
Figure 3.4.3.2	CO ₂ transportation cost for the different reservoir cases at a shipping distance of 800 km	77
Figure 4.2.1.1.1	Density and volume change of CO ₂ with depth for a typical geothermal gradient (adapted from Benson and Cole, 2008).....	99
Figure 4.2.1.2.1	Phase diagram of CO ₂	100
Figure 4.2.2.1	The impact of reservoir heterogeneity on the vertical spread of CO ₂ . When CO ₂ is injected at the bottom of a 100 m thick reservoir, the internal heterogeneity forced CO ₂ to spread out laterally. Due to this cascade-like movement, the buoyant rise of CO ₂ to the top of the reservoir is reduced thereby increasing storage efficiency (and security). Note that S _g is CO ₂ saturation; the higher S _g , the more CO ₂ is present (adapted from Green et al., 2009).	101
Figure 4.2.3.1	The CO ₂ -EWR technology uses a brine production well to extract native brine from the reservoir. This way the reservoir pressure is lowered and the risk of potential environmental impacts is reduced (adapted from Buscheck et al., 2016).....	103

Figure 4.2.5.1	This simplified profile section of the Sleipner site illustrates the context in which horizontal wells (here the CO ₂ injection well) and extended reach wells (here the gas production wells) are used in deep subsurface applications (adapted from IPCC, 2005).....	105
Figure 4.3.1	A: Illustration of the different trapping mechanisms (adapted from Harrison et al., 2019). B: Schematic evolution of the different trapping mechanisms of CO ₂ over time (IPCC, 2005). Note that the actual trapping mechanisms and their individual time-dependent evolution are highly site specific.	109
Figure 4.3.1.1	Different storage options for CO ₂ (after IPCC, 2005).....	110
Figure 4.3.2.1	The process of enhanced oil recovery (EOR). When CO ₂ is injected into an oil reservoir it will flow towards the production well. Thereby, additional oil can be recovered at the production well (adapted from IPCC, 2005).....	112
Figure 4.4.1.1.2.1	The effect of reservoir permeability on costs in US2005\$/t CO ₂ avoided (adapted from Neal et al., 2006).....	120
Figure 4.4.1.2.1	Cost decrease per t of CO ₂ stored associated with the scale effect during CO ₂ storage in a deep saline aquifer onshore (adapted from ZEP, 2011). Note that scale effect includes cost reduction due to higher storage capacity and longer lifetime of commercial-scale projects; other includes an additional monitoring well for demo projects, amongst others.	124
Figure 4.4.1.4.1	Illustrative cost trajectory of an advanced technology from first-of-a-kind (FOAK) to mature N th -of-a-kind (NOAK).....	125
Figure 4.5.6.3.1	Potential environmental concerns related to CO ₂ storage. Leakage of CO ₂ may occur along faults and the well; (micro-)seismicity may be triggered within the reservoir and caprock; surface deformation may occur over a wider spatial extent or localized (changed after Rutqvist, 2012).....	135

TABLES

Table ES-1	Actual costs for selected CO ₂ pipelines (Global CCS Institute, 2014) .	xxvii
Table ES-2	Storage capacities and efficiencies of the three main geological CO ₂ storage options.....	xxxii
Table 2.2.1	Listing of Covered CO ₂ Storage Policies and Legislation	7
Table 2.2.4.1.1.1	Numbers of projects registered, projects issued with certified emission reductions and certified emission reductions issued (including programmes of activities) since 2011 (UNFCCC EB, 2018).....	14
Table 2.2.4.3.1.1	Summary of U.S. State CCS Legislation (adapted from NCSL, 2017)	24
Table 2.3.1	Listing of Covered CO ₂ Transport Policies and Legislation	32

Table 2.3.1.1	Current and Planned CO ₂ Pipeline Projects (Peletiri, 2018).....	33
Table 2.3.2.1	Primary Drivers of CO ₂ Pipeline Projects.....	34
Table 2.3.4.3.1.1	U.S. states authorized to act as interstate agents as of 2015	41
Table 2.3.4.3.1.2	U.S. states granted intrastate authority as of 2015	41
Table 2.3.4.3.1.3	Examples of U.S. State Eminent Domain Provisions for CO ₂ Pipelines	42
Table 3.1.1	Geographic areas with large-scale CO ₂ pipeline systems operating currently in the U.S.	52
Table 3.2.3.1	Major CO ₂ Capture Plants (Desideri et al., 1998).....	59
Table 3.3.2.1	Representative CO ₂ Transport Projects (National Energy Technology Laboratory, 2015).....	61
Table 3.3.3.1	Actual costs for selected CO ₂ pipelines	64
Table 3.3.4.1	Lower (x _{i,min}) and upper (x _{i,max}) range of typical impurity mole fractions from different capture processes. From (Boot-Handford et al., 2014) based on data from (Pedro José Côte et al., 2015)	66
Table 3.3.5.1	Existing and planned CO ₂ pipeline projects (Aghajani et al., 2017; Oosterkamp et al., 2008)	69
Table 3.3.6.1	Identified threats to pipeline: typical and specific to CO ₂ pipelines	72
Table 3.5.1.1	Overall Comparison of pros of both pipelines and ships	82
Table 4.3.1.1	Storage capacities for the different reservoir types (adapted from IPCC, 2005).	110
Table 4.3.2.1	Advantages and disadvantages during CO ₂ storage in depleted oil and gas reservoirs.	113
Table 4.3.3.1	Advantages and disadvantages of CO ₂ storage in deep saline aquifers. ...	114
Table 4.4.1.1.1.1	Ranges of cost estimates for reservoir type, infrastructure and site location (data taken from Koelbl et al., 2014 and Rubin et al., 2015).	119
Table 4.4.1.1.2.1	Geological characteristics for „poor“ and „good“ CO ₂ storage reservoirs (data taken from GCCSI, 2011).	120
Table 4.4.1.1.2.2	Cost for wells during CO ₂ storage operations in the USA (adapted from GCCSI, 2011).....	121
Table 4.4.1.1.3.1	Investment costs for commercial-scale CO ₂ storage projects. Data based on Torp and Brown (2005) for Sleipner and Kårstad (2002) for Snøhvit. Table adapted from IPCC (2005). Note that Sleipner started in 1996, Snøhvit in 2006.	122
Table 4.4.2.1.1	The efficiency of the geological CO ₂ storage options.....	127