



**The ACCSEPT project:
Report from
Consultation Workshop
Bonn May 10th and 11th 2007**

**Deliverable D4.3 (a) from ACCSEPT
Intermediary report from ACCSEPT**

Jason Anderson, Heleen de Coninck, Christopher Norton, David Reiner, Simon Shackley, Froydis Eldevik, Gudmundur Sigurthorsson



Date of first issue:	Project No:	DET NORSKE VERITAS AS Research & Innovation <i>Energy programme</i>
Approved by:	Organisational unit: Energy programme	A3 1322 Høvik Norway
Client: EC - DG Research	Client ref.: D4.3 (a)	Tel: Fax: http://www.dnv.com NO 945 748 931 MVA
<p>Summary:</p> <p>This report is an intermediary report in ACCSEPT that summarizes the Consultation Workshop held in Bonn on May 10th and 11th. The presentations and discussions in the meeting contributed to focusing on issues that will be central in the debates among important stakeholder groups in the process of preparing for safe and permanent capture, transport and storage of CO2 in and beyond Europe. This focus that the project participants have drawn out of analysis of the discussions and some parallel input from similar sources is primarily related to the following key areas:</p> <p>A) CCS, Renewables and Nuclear - conflict or cooperation. B) Perception and Management of Storage Risk and Liabilities C) Acceptability of CCS in the CDM, developing countries as guinea pigs?</p> <p>This will give guidance for the remaining work related to balance and priorities between the gaps already identified by the project. (Ref. report on deliverable 3.2 “Identified gaps within thematic areas of CCS” available on the Accsept web page.) It will also influence a further review of other potential gaps related to each of the three points above that may not have been given priority so far but may become important in policy development and in further work on stakeholder and public communications</p>		

Report No:	Subject Group:	
Report title:		
Work carried out by: Jason Anderson, IEEP Heleen de Coninck, ECN Chris Norton, Baker & McKenzie Simon Shackley, Univ. of Manchester David Reiner, Judge Business School Froydis Eldevik, DNV Gudmundur Sigurthorsson, DNV		
Work verified by: Gudmundur Sigurthorsson, DNV		
Date of this revision: June 1st 2007	Revision No: <Version 4>	Number of pages: 16

Indexing terms

Keywords Carbon capture and storage	Service Area
	Market Sector

- No distribution without permission from the client or responsible organisational unit (however, free distribution for internal use within DNV after 3 years)
- No distribution without permission from the client or responsible organisational unit.
- Strictly confidential
- Unrestricted distribution

© 2002 Det Norske Veritas AS
All rights reserved. This publication or parts thereof may not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying or recording, without the prior written consent of Det Norske Veritas AS.

<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Consultation Meeting Agenda and list of participants	2 - 3
2. Summary of reflections and conclusions from the meeting	4 - 5
3. Discussion and reflection points: European stakeholder perceptions of CCS	6
4. Discussion and reflection points: Best practice, standards and regulation at local, national and international level	7 - 8
5. Discussion and reflection points: Balancing CCS and renewable energy	9
6. Discussion and reflection points: Liability and Risk Management	10
7. Short notes taken from discussions under all sessions	11 - 16

Note that for practical reasons the presentations made are not included in this report but are available on the Accsept Website.

1. Consultation meeting agenda and list of participants

The agenda was as follows:

Thursday, May 10th, 2007

14:30 - 14:35	Welcome
14.35 - 15.15	Opening Address and discussion <i>Pierre Dechamps, DG Research, European Commission</i>
15.15 - 15.40	The ACCSEPT Project and analysis of gaps <i>Gudmundur Sigurthorsson, DNV</i>
15:40 - 16:30	European stakeholder perceptions of CCS <i>Simon Shackley, University of Manchester</i>
16:30 - 18:00	Best practice, standards and regulation at local, national and international level <i>Jason Anderson, IEEP</i>
19:00 - 22:00	Dinner

Friday, May 11th, 2007

09:00 - 10:30	Balancing CCS and renewable energy <i>Heleen de Coninck, ECN</i> <i>Respondent: Pieter Viebahn, DLR</i>
10:30 – 12:00	Liability and risk management <i>Christopher Norton, Baker & McKenzie</i>
12:00 - 14:00	Lunch & informal discussions
14:00 – 15:30	Policy options in the EU <i>David Reiner, University of Cambridge</i>
15:30 – 16:00	Conclusions and next steps <i>Gudmundur Sigurthorsson, DNV</i>

Some adjustments were made during the second day in order to allow sufficient depth of discussion on items surfacing following the last two sessions on day one, in particular on ways forward on regulations related to concepts for best practices and regulatory approach. Further, time was opened up on the second day to give room for a presentation by Mihai Tomescu from DG Environment which gave an informative and interesting view on the process planned for regulatory development.

The following is a participant list with e-mail addresses of all participants:

Participants		
Stakeholder Meeting in Bonn 10.5./11.5.		
Name	Company	Email address
Victor Aguilera	E3G	victor.aguilera@e3g.org
Michael Blohm	German Ministry of Environment	Michael.Blohm@uba.de
Frede Capellen	Statoil	fca@statoil.com
Pierre Deschamps	DG Research	pierre.dechamps@ec.europa.eu
Gabriela von Goerne	Greenpeace	gabriela.goerne@greenpeace.de
Grant A. Kirkman	UNFCCC, Germany	GKirkman@unfccc.int
Gary Kendall	WWF	GKendall@wwfepo.org
Ludovit Kucharic	State Geological Institute, Slovakia	kucharic@gssr.sk
Sascha Luedge	Vattenfall	sascha.luedge@vattenfall.de
David Lunsford	IETA	lunsford@ieta.org
Mihai Tomescu	DG Environment	mihai.tomescu@ec.europa.eu
Peter Viebahn	DLR	PETER.VIEBAHN@DLR.DE
Jason Anderson	Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP)	JAnderson@ieep.eu
Simon Shackley	University Manchester	SIMON.SHACKLEY@MBS.AC.UK
Christopher Norton	Bakernet	Christopher.Norton@BAKERNET.com
Heleen de Coninck	ECN	deconinck@ecn.nl
Froydis Eldevik	DNV	Froydis.eldevik@dnv.com
Gudmundur Sigurthorsson	DNV	gsig@dnv.com

2. Summary of reflections and conclusions from the meeting By Gudmundur Sigurthorsson and the Project Team

The main purpose of the Acccept project is to contribute to the timely and responsible application of CO2 capture and storage (CCS) by measuring EU social acceptance of CCS; assisting with the establishment of CCS guidelines for the EU ETS and by identifying and addressing gaps in existing socio-economic studies.

The Stakeholder Consultation Workshop in Bonn on May 10th and 11th was held at a time when the project team had:

- finished a broad stakeholder survey across Europe,
- completed identification and prioritization of gaps in the four thematic areas within the project as well as “cross cutting” gaps,
- started the further analysis of those gap to develop the background for the recommendations which will be the end result of the project later this year.

Some of these results as well as related issues were presented in the meeting in order to stimulate the discussions and generate focused input and feedback.

This timing was chosen in order to get further stakeholder input as guidance for the final prioritization and completion of the gap analysis. (A simplified illustration of the project flow is found in Enclosure 1.)

The discussions following each of the presentations were very valuable and are commented individually in sections 3 to 6 in this report and in section 7 there is a short listing of issues brought into the debate. Each of those discussions were valuable in themselves but more importantly, the totality of the discussions were very helpful for the project team to define the “higher level focus” on issues that will be central in the debate going forward and use that as guidance for the remaining work. The definition of those focus issues and how they will link past and current work in the project are under discussion and being worked on further by the project team but as of now we have defined them as follows:

- A) CCS, Renewables and Nuclear - conflict or cooperation.
- B) Perception and Management of Storage Risk and Liabilities
- C) Acceptability of CCS in the CDM, developing countries as guinea pigs?

It is important that the debate on those three key issues is an informed and factual one and seen in a larger context of multiple ways forward over time. It is clear that we are dealing with a broad and complex debate where there will be many different agendas and a dynamic interaction between:

- Societal values
- Perceptions
- Rules and Standards

In this debate, the goal of moving forward over time to a low carbon future must always be in the foreground and we do not believe we always have the luxury of choosing between options but must pursue many in parallel. In this the balance and timing of using market forces and other means must be found.

The project team is grateful to the stakeholders represented at the meeting who generously contributed their time, knowledge and experience to make this project successful. We are open to further comments and will share our results with all the participants as our work moves forward over the coming months.

3. European stakeholder perceptions of CCS **Discussion and reflection points: By Simon Shackley**

(For the presentation by Simon Shackley: see slides on the Acccept web site.)

Discussion points

The following identifies the key points which were raised during the discussion which followed the presentation of the survey results.

1. A question was asked about the statistical analysis of the data. Extensive statistical analysis was undertaken: comparison of means using independent t-test and correlations using the Pearson test. However, there were insufficient respondents from many countries to be able to undertake statistical analysis at the country level except in the case of eight countries. The full details of the statistical analysis are provided in the Technical Summary and Main Report.
2. A question was raised concerning the finding regarding work time on CCS and positive and negative perceptions of CCS. Those who spend more than 50% of their work time on CCS are more likely to perceive it positively and less likely to perceive it negatively than those who spend less than 50% of their work time on CCS. On the other hand, it is not more likely that some one who spends 90% of their work time on CCS is more positive about CCS than some one who spends 60% of their time on CCS. This suggests that there is a threshold effect at about 50%, whereby there is a tailing-off of 'positive' (or lack of negative) impressions of CCS.
3. One question focused upon how to grasp policy messages from the findings? There was a general discussion of this point and some of the questions raised were: How can stakeholder issues feed into the regulatory development? How do stakeholders regard CCS vis-à-vis other options such as nuclear and renewables? This is a question of priority: where do you put your money into? RE or CCS or both? Should the energy system move in another direction, perhaps not to be so dependent on fossil fuels? The focus on CCS might keep future development along the business as usual scenario, and we should arguably strive for more than that.
4. One respondent suggested that the public opinion is still very vague on CCS, but how the public perception will develop in the future is important to follow. NGOs have a pivotal role to play here.

4. Best practice, standards and regulation at local, national and international level

Discussion and reflection points: By Jason Anderson

(For the presentation by Jason Anderson: See slides on the Accsept web site)

Jason Anderson, IEEP, presented on the topic ‘Best Practice, Standards and Regulation at Local, National and International level,’ which was followed by discussion. The presentation outlined gaps in regulatory systems, namely:

- Frameworks that can link site selection, management, closure and post-closure best practices to regulatory criteria.
 - Modelling, site characterisation and monitoring
 - Risk Assessment methodologies
 - EIA/ SEA guidelines
- The regulations themselves: criteria, standards and approaches
- Methodologies for inclusion in crediting systems (EU ETS, CDM, ...)
- Development of appropriate institutional rules and roles

The presentation continued with some background in geology as it relates to storage, and highlighted key questions about leakage, and best practices to predict and avoid it.

A ‘project flowchart’ from the British Geological Survey was shown, which proposes a structured way of defining actions to be done at each stage of the project cycle: pre-, during- and post- injection.

Modelling techniques, and means of selecting them to ensure good knowledge about a site were shown and categorised, and the current knowledge gaps indicated.

The next issue addressed was what types of techniques, standards and rules could be harmonised, and at which level. Various initiatives underway were outlined.

The final section dealt with risk assessment, and went through the main points of a new initiative under the auspices of the CO₂ capture project, called the Certification Framework. It is a quantified risk assessment methodology which attempts to set out guidelines which operationalise a notion of what defines ‘effective trapping’ of CO₂, as opposed to ‘absolute trapping’ – a standard which can not realistically be lived up to. It was noted that quantified risk assessment methodologies are subject to a great deal of variability depending on differing views of experts engaged in the process; hence the quantified outcomes can appear overly definite, or be surrounded by error bars so large as to undercut the usefulness of the result.

The conclusion was that there are several stands of needed action from this point forward:

- Agreeing ‘acceptable’ storage criteria

- Through agreed methodologies
 - Agreed ‘limits and thresholds’
- What level of international harmonisation?
 - Associated with particular agreements (Ospar, London, UNFCCC)
 - Through other international bodies (CSLF, IEA)
 - Through industry-stakeholder processes (WRI, CF)
 - New expert bodies?
- Clearing out unintended regulation
- Adapting existing regulation and practices
 - Waste, Drinking water, EIA/SEA
- Creating new regulation nationally/regionally
- National, local regulation and practices
 - Investigate appropriateness of application
 - Capacity building

In discussion the group was challenged to think about what the ‘bottom lines’ of regulation are: whether stakeholders will insist on certain standards (such as ‘no leakage for 100,000 years’, etc.). They were also asked to consider what kind of harmonisation is necessary and possible, and at what level, and how to engage stakeholders and take their issues into account in a structured manner.

Discussion followed in which it was noted that a regulatory approach based on expertise and data runs the risk of alienating or failing to come to terms with public opinion and the public’s subjective assessment of risks. It was argued that successful policy and regulation should integrate various elements:

- Science-based risk assessments
- Transparency, accountability
- Learning, how to learn from the errors done in the past
- Flexibility
- Independence
- High trust, dialogue

In this way, the science-based risk assessments are not an end point but a beginning for a process which is heavy on dialogue and open to the interpretation of risks by stakeholders – as well as being open to potential solution.

The question was how to bring science-based assessments into the broader dialogue, particularly given the technical and detailed nature of the discussions. NGOs, for example, may or may not even want to collaborate – they pursue different strategies in that regard.

The country context needs also to be taken into account; the situation from country to country is very different when it comes to the national energy supply and demand, the role of NGOs, the national GHG reduction goals etc.

5. Balancing CCS and Renewable energy.

Discussion and reflection points: By Heleen de Coninck

(For the presentation by Peter Viebahn: See slides on the Accsept web site.)

CCS and renewable energy are collaborators and competitors at the same time. On the one hand, both contribute to reforming the energy sector towards lower greenhouse gas emissions. On the other, they feature different characteristics of sustainability, costs, environmental impacts, public perception and compatibility with vested interests, and are therefore often contrasted. The discussion on this topic aimed to deepen the understanding of this “gap in understanding” through one presentation and two discussion questions.

Peter Viebahn (DLR) presented results of a major German study in two parts. Firstly, he showed convincingly that the life-cycle emissions of CCS are higher than commonly assumed as the emissions resulting from the coal-mining required for the energy penalty are substantial, and are normally not taken into account. CCS only reduces GHG emissions by 70-80%, and the name “zero-emission power plant” is therefore hardly appropriate. Secondly, he showed scenarios leading to the decarbonisation of the German energy sector, which showed that deep greenhouse gas emission reductions are possible while phasing out nuclear energy. The presentation gave useful insights on whether CCS is needed and how renewables and CCS compare, which led to the next question: how do renewable energy and CCS compete?

Concrete evidence that renewable energy and CCS compete for research funding, policy effort and media attention is sparse. The group came up with only one clear example, in the Netherlands. Whether there is a real competition depends on the context. There was a general sense that in the private sector, competition between the two mitigation options was less of an issue as there is generally no constraint if both are business opportunities. The picture is more diffuse for the public sector, where it was noted that there is only a certain budget, e.g. for addressing climate change, which needs to be divided among renewable energy and CCS, as well as other mitigation options. Although it was noted that effort level to address climate change should depend on what is the maximum allowable temperature change, and what are the associated GHG concentration levels, it was also noted that the addition of CCS to the portfolio of mitigation options might increase the political will to act on climate change.

**6. Discussion and reflections points:
Liability and Risk Management. By Chris Norton**

Chris Norton , Baker & McKenzie, presented on "Legal issues, risks and legal 'gaps'" in CCS projects, which was followed by discussion. (See presentation on the Accsept web site)

The presentation identified some of the key legal themes in this area including:

1. Gaps or legal issues in public international law and regional norms that could impede the development of CCS projects (with a specific focus on the European Union); and
2. Issues of liability from CCS projects for project participants, governments and the general public.

It was the second theme that drew the most comment during the discussion. A review of the existing legal regime reveals that there are no fundamental bars to the capture and transport of CO₂. Industry already undertakes such activities and although the potential scale of CCS applications is unprecedented, the basic legal architecture is well-understood. Accordingly, legislative provisions for large-scale CO₂ capture and transport activities could be drafted into existing laws or into a bespoke framework in due course.

In contrast to capture and transport, the storage of CO₂ presents significant challenges in terms of risk allocation. Although liability issues do arise in during capture and storage (e.g. leakage from pipelines and during injection), such risks are quantifiable and relatively short-term in nature. Post-injection risks, on the other hand, which give rise to in-situ and climate liability, are relatively unknown and perhaps unknowable. It is in this context that the legal regime for apportioning risk must function.

Of particular importance is striking the right balance in the liability regime between government and private entities. It seems inconceivable that a private company would be prepared to embark on a sequestration project in the knowledge that it may be liable for the release of CO₂ decades or centuries into the future. The legal regime must address the appropriate scope of liability for the private company, ensuring high procedural standards for ensuring the integrity of storage sites, while at the same time guarding against dis-incentivising CCS project development. Having addressed this issue, the legal regime will then need to apportion the remaining risk amongst a number of other actors, which could include those involved in insurance activities, governments and, ultimately, the wider population.

7. Short notes taken from discussions under all sessions

Opening Address – *Pierre Dechamps, DG Research, European Commission*

- New Project Officer of the ACCSEPT Project
- FP 7 – 25 proposals on CCS
- DG Research responsible for CCS; DG Tren responsible for Clean Coal Techn.
- CCS is high on the EU agenda; DG Research; DG Tren; the DG Environment
- European Climate Change Programme – 4 working groups, 1 on CCS. DG Environment responsible
- The Energy Package. 7-8 Com doc to be published. One on Sustainable Fossils Fuels. Energy Council in March 2007: up to 12 large scale demonstration CCS plants before 2012
- The principle of Subsidiarity needs to be taken care of when developing the regulatory framework in the EU

Discussion points

- The EU's view on mineral sequestration: not listed on the priority list, due to the environmental issues
- China: GHG issue a problem of the "rich". Energy supply, classical environmental issues before the GHG issue. Put one of the EU's 12 large scale demo CCS projects in China? The costs of CCS too high for China; the Techn Platform has not yet decided on the location of the demo plants, but the first ones will most likely be in Europe.
- The need for better geological knowledge in countries like China and India. Bilateral cooperation between EU and China? Also should be done with India. The property rights issue is easier related to geology issues/storage capacity, compared with property rights on the capture technology
- Com doc in the end of 2007. Proposal for a Framework Directive could also be a Green paper, before we do the next step
- China: The status of the Coach (?) Project, and the effectiveness of CSLF

The ACCSEPT Project and Exploring Gaps – *Gudmundur Sigurthorsson*

- For the presentation: See attached slides on the share point site
- About the ACCSEPT Project
- The escalating interest and engagement
- The importance of social and public acceptance
- Project organisation and methodology
- Where are we now? Have done the literature review, and the gap identification. Need to do the gap analysis, and the policy recommendations
- Gap identification – prioritised gaps on the thematic areas

European Stakeholder Perceptions of CCS – Simon Shackley

- For the presentation: See attached slides on the share point site

Discussion points

- Extensive statistical analysis was undertaken: comparison of means using independent t-test and correlations using the Pearson test. However, there were insufficient respondents from many countries to be able to undertake statistical analysis at the country level except in the case of eight countries.
- Those who spend more than 50% of their work time on CCS are more likely to perceive it positively and less likely to perceive it negatively than those who spend less than 50% of their work time on CCS. On the other hand, it is not more likely that some one who spends 90% of their work time on CCS is more positive about CCS than some one who spends 60% of their time on CCS. This suggests that there is a threshold effect at about 50%, whereby there is a tailing-off of 'positive' impressions of CCS.
- How to grasp policy messages from this? How can stakeholder issues feed into the regulatory development? How do stakeholders regard CCS vis-à-vis other options such as nuclear and renewables?
- This is a question of priority: where do you put your money into? RE or CCS. Should the energy system move in another direction, not to be dependent on fossil fuels? The focus on CCS, keep the development along the business as usual scenario, and we should strive for more than that.
- We find the public opinion still being vague on CCS, how the public perception will develop in the future important to follow. NGOs a pivotal role here.

Best Practice, Standards and Regulation at Local, National and International level – Jason Anderson

- For the presentation: See attached slides on the share point site

Discussion points

- Needed action slide from Jason
- Questions defined by Jason/the structured issues: the last slide
- Global industry carbon management. Lessons to be learned from the oil and gas industry when it comes to operational standards. There should be analogues from the oil and gas industry to take into account?
- Questions: other parts of the chain that needs to be highlighted? What are bottom lines of regulation? What kind of harmonisation is necessary and possible, and at what level?
- How to engage stakeholder issues, how to take them into account in a structured manner?
- The development of a policy regulation in general, also relevant to CCS, could include the following elements

- The science based facts, risk based
- Transparency, accountability
- Learning, how to learn from the errors done in the past
- Flexibility
- Independence
- High trust, dialogue
- How to develop a useful strategy in order to bring the science based knowledge into the political arena?
- Should NGOs be involved in the detailed decision-making of the investors? Is it possible? Is this a wanted situation?
- The NGOs role, some want to collaborate more than others; the different strategy the NGOs have
- The country context needs also to be taken into account; the situation from country to country is very different when it comes to the national energy supply and demand, the role of NGOs, the national GHG reduction goals etc.

Balancing CCS and renewables – Is CCS the next barrier to renewable energy implementation? - Heleen de Coninck

1. Does CCS lead to an increased use of fossils fuels on the system level? [what are the system-wide impacts of the increased use of fossil fuels arising from CCS?]
2. Do you know examples of genuine competition between CCS and renewables in the fields of research funding, policy effort and media attention?
3. Is CCS enabling more stringent climate policy?

Respondent:
Peter Viebahn

- For the presentation: see slides attached on the share point site

Discussion points

- The LCA-approach is one of several approaches that needs to be taken into account when deciding the portfolio of options
- The infrastructure related to the input factors is not taken into account
- The HSE issue related to coal mines not taken into account
- Not a competition between CCS and renewables, but CCS can be applied on areas where renewables cannot be used
- More push for renewables as a govt push, not the same push on CCS from the govt
- Attention vs competition
- Still unclear on the scale issue on CCS. Is this a large scale opportunity?
- The matter of energy security in segments of the industry where renewables can not compete
- The economic aspects of a energy portfolio. The costs of the different options vs the practical/technical need for more clean energy supply

- We need both options; both directions are important and the R&D budgets on CCS and renewables are independent of each other
- The R&D budget on nuclear has historically been much higher than for clean coal or renewables.
- Two main aspects related to CCS: the increase of renewable energy in Germany only possible if the feed in tariff continuous in the future; the shift from centralised power plant to decentralised CHP plant, that is that the infrastructure of the electricity sector needs to be changed
- Adding more options into the portfolio enables the govt to have harder reduction ambitions; the likelihood of a Kyoto Protocol after 2012 is greater with CCS in the portfolio
- The political support to the different options not to be underestimated
- The govt budget is limited, so the competition related to “the money”, where the capital stream should go, is realistic. This might be different for the private sector

Liability and risk management – Chris Norton

- For the presentation: see attached slides on the share point site

Discussion points

- Liability is a key issue related to CCS
- Operational liability (operational), in situ liability (post-injection), climate liability (post-injection)
- EU Directive on Environmental Liability (2004/35/EC)
- Strict liability vs fault-based liability
- Is this a new business area for the oil companies? What is the motive behind the oil company’s engagement in CCS?
- Yes, this could become an commercial opportunity to become a more “green” company
- How to strike the right balance in the liability regime between the govt and the private corporate entity?
- What are you liable for?
- The storing phase the critical point, how to design the liability regime related to storing CO₂ under the EU ETS?
- How is the liability regime on the Sleipner-field, where the CO₂ is injected into the Utsira formation?

Policy Options in the EU – Mihai Tomescu

- For the presentation: see the attached slides on the share point

Discussion points

- The ambition is to make a Directive Proposal, not “only” a Com doc, before the end of 2007
- The comitology route and/or the subsidiarity principle
- The mandatory obligation vs set technology standards. A mandatory approach more flexible to the member states, and to the industry
- The monitoring requirements related to storing CO₂ vs the operator of the storage site is regulated satisfactory by national legislation

Conclusions and next step – Gudmundur Sigurthorsson

- The messages from this group will be related to the gaps from the gap identification report from the ACCSEPT project
- CCS need to be seen in a larger context – a bridge to the low carbon future
- Dynamic interaction between societal values/perceptions/standards
- Set targets and then find the best policy mix
- Pursue many options in parallel
- The communication of CCS
- The consensus position need to be found – trust, transparency and good information
- The different channels of information, and the different credibility
- Agreement to longer term pathways
- How to create common trust and understanding of the risks
- How to reach consensus on performance criteria (the risks of leakage, HSE risks, financial risk)?
- How to get an informed public debate, vertically and horizontally?
- Who takes what liability and when?
- The role of the market forces?

Accsept main activities overview

