

VCS Module

VMD0058

CO² STORAGE IN SALINE AQUIFERS AND DEPLETED HYDROCARBON RESERVOIRS

Version 1.0

24 October 2024

Sectoral Scope 16: Carbon Capture and Storage

This module was developed by the CCS+ Initiative and Verra. The CCS+ Initiative is a collaboration of 48 member companies. Perspectives Climate Group GmbH and South Pole Carbon Asset Management Ltd. served as the secretariat and consultants to the initiative throughout this methodology.

CONTENTS

1 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

This module provides procedures and requirements for project activities that store $CO₂$ in saline aquifers or depleted hydrocarbon reservoirs for eligible carbon capture and storage (CCS) project activities under *VM0049 Carbon Capture and Storage*.

Project emissions from storage *(PESto,y)* are calculated in Equation [\(1\).](#page-8-1)

Leakage emissions from storage (*LESto,y*) are calculated in Equation [\(10\).](#page-14-1)

2 SOURCES

This module is used in combination with the most recent versions of *VM0049* and the following methodologies, modules, and tools: [1](#page-3-2)

Capture Modules

- *VMD0056 CO² Capture from Air (Direct Air Capture)*
- *VMD00XX CO² Capture from Bioenergy Combustion*
- *VMD00XX CO² Capture from Bioproduction Processes*
- *VMD00XX CO² Capture from Post-combustion Flue Gases in Fossil Fuel Power and Heat Generation*
- *VMD00XX CO² Capture from Industrial Processes*
- *VMD00XX CO² Capture from Oil and Gas Production and Processing*
- *VMD00XX CO² Capture from Precombustion Processes in Fossil Fuel Power and Heat Generation*
- *VMD00XX CO² Capture from Oxyfuel Combustion in Fossil Fuel Power and Heat Generation*

Transport Module

• *VMD0057 Project Emissions from CO² Transport for CCS Projects*

Other Modules, Tools, and Requirements

- *VT0010 Emissions from Electricity Consumption* (t CO2e)
- *VT00XX Differentiating Reductions and Removals in CCS Projects*
- *VT00XX Accounting Non-VCS CO² in CCS Projects*

¹ Modules labeled "*VMD00XX"* and tools labeled "*VT00XX*" are under development.

- Geologic Carbon Storage (GCS) Non-Permanence Risk Tool
- *GCS Requirements*

3 DEFINITIONS

In addition to the definitions set out in the *VCS Program Definitions* and *VM0049*, the following definitions apply to this module.

Conformance

The degree of agreement among reservoir model predictions, current measurement data, and performance for the storage reservoir in a geologic carbon storage project

Depleted hydrocarbon reservoir

A subsurface reservoir that holds residual hydrocarbons (e.g., oil or gas) and has been produced by drilling of legacy wells

Legacy wells

Wells that have been drilled prior to the project activity in the storage site. They must be included in the site characterization and monitoring plan.

Saline aquifer

An underground water source with total dissolved solids greater than 3000 mg/L

Storage site

Refers to all of the components within the storage module boundary.

4 APPLICABILITY CONDITIONS

This module applies to project activities that store $CO₂$ safely and permanently in saline aquifers or depleted hydrocarbon reservoirs per the criteria and procedures established in the most recent version of VM0049.

This module is applicable when all of the following conditions are met:

- 1) The project activity injects a $CO₂$ stream for permanent storage into a saline aquifer or depleted hydrocarbon reservoir.
- 2) The project activity has mandatory monitoring point(s) for $CO₂$ injection downstream of all intermediate storage, compression, and other CO₂ stream conditioning (per Section [6.3\)](#page-32-0).

3) The project activity has at least one isolation valve on each wellhead or within 10 m of the point where the CO₂ stream enters the subsurface by run-of-pipe to isolate the surface and subsurface.

This module is not applicable under the following conditions:

4) The project activity consists solely of upgrades to existing CCS storage facilities or changes in operational practices leading to improved storage efficiency.

Note – For storage projects already registered under VCS, such improvements may occur and are considered in calculating the baseline and project emissions over the crediting period.

- 5) The project activity includes injection of $CO₂$ for enhanced oil recovery (EOR) or enhanced gas recovery (EGR).
- 6) The project activity intentionally extracts $CO₂$ from the reservoir for purposes unrelated to operation and maintenance of the storage site.

5 PROCEDURES

5.1 Module Boundary

The module boundary includes the surface facilities and subsurface equipment at the injection site, including the injection and monitoring wells and all monitoring equipment. The boundary also includes the area of review and the extent of the CO₂ plume within the geological storage complex. Projects with a point of custody transfer may use that as the upstream extent of the module boundary.

Commonly used processes to be considered in determining project emissions under this module are:

- Intermediate storage of CO₂
- Final compression and/or conditioning of CO₂ before injection
- Injection pipelines and wells, legacy wells, wellhead piping, valves, and monitoring instrumentation
- Supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA)/communication equipment
- Injection well workovers or other maintenance operations
- CO² booster pumps, seal losses, and electricity consumption
- CO₂ compression with interstage cooling, valve/seal losses, and electricity consumption or fuel use
- Dehydration units (e.g., tri-ethylene glycol (TEG), desiccants, refrigeration) and associated reboilers or regeneration units

Section 5 of the most recent version of *VM0049* provides further details on determining the module boundary. The project proponent must ensure that equipment is not omitted or double counted.

This module calculates the total emissions from the sources listed in [Table 1.](#page-7-0) In cases where non-VC[S](#page-6-0)² CO² flows through the project boundary, the most recent version of *VT00XX Accounting non-VCS CO² in CCS Projects* must be used to calculate the proportion of emissions from project sources associated with that non-VCS CO2.

The boundary for this module is shown in [Figure 1.](#page-6-1)

Figure 1 - Module boundary for CO² storage in saline aquifers or depleted hydrocarbon reservoirs

Emission sources, including both primary and secondary effects included in this module, are shown in [Figure 2.](#page-7-1)

 2 Non-VCS CO₂ is defined as "CO₂ that flows through a CCS project boundary that is not eligible for crediting in the VCS" in *VT00XX Accounting non-VCS CO² in CCS Projects.*

Figure 2 - Included greenhouse gas sources

The greenhouse gases (GHGs) included in or excluded from the module boundary are detailed in Table 1. This module assumes that no storage of $CO₂$ relevant to the project activities took place in the baseline scenario. As such, no emissions sources associated with the baseline scenario are included in [Table 1.](#page-7-0)

5.2 Quantification of Project Emissions

Project emissions are calculated as follows:

$$
PE_{Sto,y} = PE_{Comb_{Fuel,y}} + PE_{Elec,y} + PE_{Fuel_{FV,y}} + ID_{Surface,y} + UD_{Surface,y}
$$

+ $ID_{Subsurface,y} + UD_{Subsurface,y} - PE_{nonVCS\,CO2,y}$ (1)

Where:

5.2.1 Project Emissions from Fuel Combustion

Project emissions from fossil fuel combustion for mobile equipment, and power and heat generation are calculated as follows:

$$
PE_{Comb_{Fuel, y}} = \sum_{d} (Q_{Fuel, d, y} \times EF_{Fuel, CO2, d})
$$

+
$$
\sum_{d} (Q_{Fuel, d, y} \times EF_{Fuel, CH4, d}) \times GWP_{CH4}
$$

+
$$
\sum_{d} (Q_{Fuel, d, y} \times EF_{Fuel, N20, d}) \times GWP_{N20}
$$
 (2)

Where:

³ Sustainable biomass is defined in the most recent version of *VT00XX Differentiating Reductions and Removals in CCS Projects.*

Where no separate information on combustion emissions and upstream emissions is available for a given fuel, a combined emissions factor may be used as *EFFuel,d* in Equation [\(2\).](#page-9-1)

Off-site Fuel Consumption

The quantity of power or heat supplied from a directly connected off-site facility, *QFuel,d,y*, is determined using Equation [\(3\).](#page-10-0)

$$
Q_{Fuel,d,y} = Q_{cogen,d,y} \times \frac{(Heat_{Sto,y}/\eta_{Heat,y} + Electricity_{Sto,y}/\eta_{Elec,y})}{(Heat_{cogen,y}/\eta_{Heat,y} + Electricity_{cogen,y}/\eta_{Elec,y})}
$$
(3)

Where:

Waste Heat

Project emissions from the consumption of waste heat may be assumed to be zero for heat sources that meet the definition of waste heat in *VM0049*. The emissions associated with the generation of heat that does not meet the definition of waste heat must be accounted for in Equation [\(2\)](#page-9-1) or [\(3\)](#page-10-0) as appropriate.

5.2.2 Fugitive and Venting Emissions from On-site Fuel Use

Project activities using natural gas must quantify fugitive and venting emissions during facility operations. Quantification is based on component counts and respective emission factors, fugitive emissions are quantified following the approach in the US Environmental Protection Agency's *Electronic Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 40, Part 98, Subpart W, § 98.233 (r).[4](#page-10-1)

⁴ Available at[: https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-98/subpart-W/section-98.233](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-98/subpart-W/section-98.233)

Examples of emission sources for fugitive emissions include components such as valves, pipe fittings/connectors, open-ended pipes, pressure relief valves, flanges, meters, and instruments.

$$
PE_{Fuel_{FV},y} = (\sum_{n} Count_{n,y} \times EF_{n} \times T_{n,y} \times 0.001 + \sum_{m} V_{m}) \times GWP_{CH_{4}}
$$
(4)

5.2.3 Project Emissions from Intentional Discharges

Project emissions from intentional discharges are a result of venting that is downstream of mandatory monitoring points. Venting events can be differentiated by whether they originate from surface facilities (*IDSurface) or* the subsurface (*IDSubsurface)*.

Surface venting includes activities resulting from operator intervention (e.g., blowdown of piping and/or pigging operations) or an automated system response to process conditions (e.g., pressure safety valve releasing in response to high pressure as per design). These activities must be related to the operation and maintenance of the storage site. Extraction of $CO₂$ from the reservoir for utilization or other commercial interests is not allowed.

For surface venting, the project proponent must measure the quantity of $CO₂$ according to the conditions given in Approaches 1, 2, or 3 below.

Subsurface venting includes activities related to injection well maintenance. For subsurface venting, the project proponent must determine the quantity of $CO₂$ according to Approach 1.

The project proponent must actively monitor and report intentional discharge emissions using the approaches below. Please refer to Section 8.1 of VM0049 to determine CO₂ flow, density, and concentration.

Note - For projects registering in the VCS Program, emissions from intentional discharges may be assumed to be zero in the Project Description Template.

Approach 1: Measurement of Venting

Under this approach intentional discharges in year *y* must be calculated using either mass flow or volumetric flow.

Option 1: Mass flow

$$
ID_{\text{surface},y} \text{ or } ID_{\text{Sub-surface},y} = \sum_{h} FR_{\text{mass},h} \times \% CO2_{\text{mass},h} \times T_{,h}
$$
 (5)

Where:

Option 2: Volumetric flow

$$
ID_{surface,y} \ or \ ID_{Sub-surface,y} = \sum_{h} FR_{vol(STP),h} \times \%CO2_{vol(STP),h} \times \rho CO2_{(STP)} \times T_h \tag{6}
$$

Where:

Approach 2: Estimation of Surface Venting for Isolated Volumes

Where any part of an isolated section of pipe is downstream of the mandatory monitoring point and is depressurized, project proponents must estimate the vented mass of CO2 using the volume of the isolated pipe and Equation [\(7\)](#page-12-0).

$$
ID_{\text{Surface},y} = \sum_{m} \sum_{n} v_{n,m(\text{STP})} \times \%CO2_{\text{vol}(\text{STP})} \times \rho CO2_{(\text{STP})}
$$
(7)

Where:

vn,m(STP)

= on actual process conditions (m³) The actual internal volume of each pipe, pipe fitting, and component *n* in the isolated vent section for venting event *m,* converted to a STP volume based

Approach 3: Estimation of Surface Venting for Non-Isolated Volumes

Where Approaches 1 and 2 are not applicable for surface venting (e.g., where the volume of the isolated pipe cannot be determined or the venting event was from a non-isolated and flowing pipe), use Approach 3.

The project proponent must determine the quantity of vented CO² (*IDSurface,y*) by transient flow rate calculations for compressible fluids appropriate for the expected evolving conditions in the pipeline or component (e.g., gaseous, dense, super-critical fluids using a critical flow model) based on the approximate geometry of the escaping flow and pipelines/components connected to the venting. The project proponent must justify the appropriateness of all calculations, models, correlations, or empirical relationships used and demonstrate the result is conservative.

5.2.4 Project Emissions from Unintentional Discharges at the Surface

The project proponent must actively monitor and report unintentional discharge emissions using the approaches below. The potential emission sources for unintentional discharges of CO² include components (e.g., valves, pipe fittings/connectors, open-ended pipes, pressure relief valves, flanges, meters, instruments) and pipelines.

Note - For projects registering in the VCS Program, emissions from unintentional discharges may be assumed to be zero in the Project Description Template.

Two emission sources are considered for unintentional discharge of $CO₂$ at the surface.

Emission Source 1: Fugitive Emissions Downstream of the Mandatory Monitoring Point

In this scenario, *UDSurface,y* for pipelines and other components is determined as follows:

$$
UD_{\text{Surface},y} = \sum_{p} EF_p \times T_{p,y} \times b \times 0.001 + \sum_{n} EF_n \times T_{n,y} \times 0.001 \tag{8}
$$

Where*:*

Emission Source 2: Rupture or Line-Break Downstream of Mandatory Monitoring Point

A rupture or line-break failure is considered to have occurred where the flow rate through the failure is substantial enough to be considered a safety hazard as defined in local requirements off-site nuisance due to odor or noise. Failures that qualify as a safety hazard must be corrected in accordance with local requirements upon detection and ahead of the calculations that follow. Otherwise, the failure may be considered a fugitive emission.

Where a component or pipeline that is downstream of the mandatory monitoring point and upstream of the wellhead and reservoir suffers a rupture or line-break failure, the proponent must:

- 1) Isolate the failure; and
- 2) Quantify the loss of CO² (*UDSurface,y*) through:
	- a) Emissions before isolation: Determine the quantity of lost $CO₂$ by estimating the flow rate through the failure using transient flow rate calculations for compressible fluids appropriate for the expected conditions in the pipeline or component (e.g., gaseous, dense, super-critical) based on the approximate geometry of the escaping flow and pipelines/components connected to the failure. The estimation must be for the approximate time between when the failure occurred and when the release was stopped. Where the approximate time at which the failure occurred is unknown, the leakage event duration must be estimated conservatively by assuming the leakage event existed from the last known and documented regular operation (e.g., last inspection) until the release was stopped.
	- b) Emissions after isolation: Use Approach 3 in Section [5.2.3](#page-11-0) to calculate leaked emissions.

5.2.5 Project Emissions from Unintentional Discharges from Subsurface Storage

Project emissions from unintentional discharges from the subsurface are CO₂ leaks (loss event) from the geological storage complex. They are calculated according to the following equation.

$$
UD_{Subsurface,y} = \sum_{a} (Q_{LE,a}) + Q_{Threshold,y}
$$
\n(9)

Where:

the monitoring plan (tonnes)

Section [6.3](#page-32-0) provides guidance on determining *QLE,a* and *QThreshold,y.*

5.3 Quantification of Leakage

Equation [\(10\)](#page-14-2) accounts for leakage emissions in this module.

$$
LE_{Sto,y} = LE_{fuel,y} + LE_{Elec,y} - LE_{nonVCS\,CO2,y} \tag{10}
$$

Where:

 (10)

5.3.1 Leakage Emissions from Fuel Consumption

Upstream emissions from the production and transportation of fuel to the storage site and directly connected off-site facilities are calculated using Equation [\(11\).](#page-15-1)

Equation [\(11\)](#page-15-1) is not required if an emissions factor covering both fuel combustion (*EFFuel,d*) and upstream emissions (*EFUpstream_Fuel,d,y*) was used in Equation [\(2\).](#page-9-1)

$$
LE_{Fuel,y} = \sum_{d} (Q_{Fuel,d,y} \times EF_{upstream_Fuel,d,y})
$$
 (11)

Where:

QFuel,d,y = Quantity of fuel type *d* used to operate on-site and/or third-party (for off-site heat/steam supply) equipment in year *y* (m³ or kg or GJ) *EFUpstream_Fuel,d,y* = Emission factor for upstream sources related to fuel type *d* used in equipment in the storage module boundary in year *y* (t CO₂e/m³ or t CO₂e/kg or t CO₂e/GJ)

Where power and heat are supplied from an off-site facility, *QFuel,d,y* must be determined as a proportion of the total fuel used to generate the total electricity and heat at the directly connected facility using Equation [\(3\).](#page-10-0)

5.4 Uncertainty

The main source of uncertainty identified for the project activities covered in this module is measurement error. Significant uncertainty may exist in the project-specific monitoring program for unintentional discharges (i.e., leaks from the reservoir) but is discounted through the conservative deduction *QThreshold* (see Section [6.3\)](#page-32-0) and may be ignored. All other potential sources of uncertainty are either considered de minimis or accounted for in the conservativeness of the default factors.

Uncertainty of measurement error related to project emissions from fuel combustion for storage activities is considered de minimis where the metering equipment used for determining fuel volumes, *Qfuel,d,y*, uses a custody transfer meter or fiscal metering for a transaction.

Uncertainty of measurement or estimation error from intentional discharges at the storage site is considered de minimis where the magnitude of the emissions from venting is less than 2% of the net emission reduction or removal benefit of the project.

Proponents whose projects do not meet the above conditions for a source of uncertainty must include that source of uncertainty in their uncertainty assessment.

6 DATA AND PARAMETERS

Additional data and parameters are defined in *VM0049* and related tools (VCS and CDM) as applicable.

6.1 Data and Parameters Available at Validation

6.2 Data and Parameters Monitored

Data/Parameter *EFFuel,CO2,d*

the control of the control of the control of the

Vm

⁵ State or national government data on a fuel's carbon intensity are also acceptable sources of data for determining emission factors for fuels used by the transport facility.

⁶ The Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions and Energy use in Technologies (GREET) model. Available at: <https://greet.es.anl.gov/>

⁷ Model for Life Cycle Assessment of Transportation Fuels. Available at:<https://www.ghgenius.ca/>

⁸ Peer-reviewed literature must be indexed in the Web of Science: Science Citation Index (SCI; available at https://mjl.clarivate.com), as specified in Section 2.5.2 of the *VCS Methodology Requirements, v4.4*.

6.3 Description of the Monitoring Plan

Each project must have a monitoring plan that supports the permanent storage of $CO₂$ injected by ensuring the containment of the plume over time. In addition to the requirements given in the *VCS Standard* and the *GCS Requirements*, the monitoring plan must:

- 1) Outline the mandatory monitoring point(s) for $CO₂$ injection downstream of all intermediate storage, compression, or other $CO₂$ conditioning.
	- a) For onshore injection wells:
		- i) Where multiple injection wellheads are served by one mandatory monitoring point, it must be located 500 m or less by run-of-pipe from all injection wellhead(s).
		- ii) Where one injection wellhead is served by one mandatory monitoring point, it must be located 300 m or less by run-of-pipe from the injection wellhead.
	- b) For offshore injection wells:
		- i) Where offshore wells are connected by sub-sea pipeline to onshore facilities, the mandatory monitoring point must be located 500 m or less by run-of-pipe from the pipeline landfall point.
		- ii) Where offshore wells are connected to fixed or floating platforms, the mandatory monitoring point must be located 500 m or less by run-of-pipe from the submersion point.
- 2) Describe techniques used to detect, localize, and quantify subsurface CO₂ movement outside the geological storage complex of the project, including relevant parameters of each technique such as the detection threshold, probability of detection, resolution, and frequency.
- 3) Define a specific detection threshold to detect a loss of containment (e.g., t CO2/year or t CO2) for each monitoring technique.
- 4) Define the expected mean time to detect a loss of containment at the project-specific threshold for each intermittent monitoring technique (considering the planned frequency of use). The specific detection threshold to detect a loss of containment and the expected mean time to detection must also be specified in the project description.
- 5) Outline how the reservoir model and monitoring approaches are used to localize and quantify the loss of containment.
- 6) Define the maximum undetected leak (*QThreshold,y*) by considering all of the following:
	- a) Leak estimations for each likely pathway (based on each unique loss of containment incident) and the summation of the emissions released from each pathway respectively (total sum);

- b) For continuous monitoring approaches, the threshold for detection as defined in the monitoring plan, and
- c) For discontinuous monitoring approaches, the threshold for detection and the expected mean time to detect a loss of containment as defined in the monitoring plan.

6.3.1 Loss of Conformance and Containment Events

The monitoring plan must be able to detect losses of conformance and containment.

A loss of conformance occurs where the injected CO₂ does not adhere to the predicted behavior based on the reservoir model but remains within the target geological storage complex and does not migrate outside of a seal(s). A loss of conformance may lead to a loss of containment.

A loss of containment occurs where the injected CO² migrates out of the geological storage complex and its respective seal(s). A loss of containment may occur in another subsurface layer or directly in the atmosphere. For example, this may occur along a wellbore or natural or induced fractures.

A simplified representation of the subsurface is provided in [Figure 3.](#page-34-0) Acknowledging the complexity and heterogeneity of the subsurface, only one type of reservoir and several potential flow pathways are provided as examples.

$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$ vcs

Figure 3: Simplified representation of losses of containment (red arrows) and conformance (blue arrow) examples for A) saline aquifers and B) depleted hydrocarbon reservoirs

Upon identification of a loss of $CO₂$ conformance, and prior to the subsequent verification, the project proponent must:

- 1) Evaluate the potential for current or future release to the atmosphere,
- 2) Identify the root cause(s) for the loss of conformance, and
- 3) Revise the monitoring plan to reflect the changed $CO₂$ migration.

Upon detecting a loss of containment, the project proponent must halt injection at the affected storage site.

Upon localizing and quantifying a loss of containment, the project proponent must determine whether the loss of containment can be repaired. Injection at the concerned storage site must not resume until containment has been fully re-established.

At the concerned storage site, the project cannot generate emission reduction or removal credits until the following conditions are resolved:

- a) The loss of containment is stopped,
- b) Permanent storage is restored, and
- c) The loss of containment is quantified.

Projects are no longer eligible where the quantity of $CO₂$ lost is more than 10% of the total $CO₂$ injected in the project.

The procedures of the *VCS Registration and Issuance Process* and the *GCS Non-Permanence Risk Tool* apply where a loss of containment occurs. If in a monitoring period, the net emission reduction or removal benefits are negative as a result of a loss event, the proponent must submit a loss event report using the *Loss Event Report Template*.

7 REFERENCES

Alberta Government (2015). *Quantification protocol for CO² capture and permanent storage in deep saline aquifers*. Alberta Government. Available at: <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/9780778572213>

American Carbon Registry (2021). *Methodology for the quantification, monitoring, reporting, and verification of greenhouse gas emissions reductions and removals from carbon capture and storage projects, v1.1*. ACR at Winrock International. Available at: <https://acrcarbon.org/methodology/carbon-capture-and-storage-projects/>

Australian Government (2021). *Carbon capture and storage method: Proposed new method under the Emissions Reduction Fund*. Australian Government. <https://consult.industry.gov.au/cer/carbon-capture-and-storage-draft-method/>

California Air Resources Board (2018). *Carbon capture and sequestration protocol under the Low Carbon Fuel Standard*. California Air Resources Board. Available at: [https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/CCS_Protocol_Under_LCFS_8-13-](https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/CCS_Protocol_Under_LCFS_8-13-18_ada.pdf) [18_ada.pdf](https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/CCS_Protocol_Under_LCFS_8-13-18_ada.pdf)

European Commission (2022). *Impact assessment report Part 1/2 and Part 2/2. Accompanying documents to Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Union certification framework for carbon removals*. European Commission Staff Working Document. European Commission.

European Parliament (2009). Directive 2009/31/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the geological storage of carbon dioxide and amending Council Directive 85/337/EEC, European Parliament and Council Directives 2000/60/EC, 2001/80/EC, 2004/35/EC, 2006/12/EC, 2008/1/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 (1). *Official Journal of the European Union 2009*, L140/114–L140/135. Available at: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2009/31/oj>

Forbes, S. M., Verma, P., Curry, T. E., Friedmann, S. J., & Wade, S. M. (2008). *Guidelines for carbon dioxide capture, transport and storage*. World Resources Institute. Available at: https://files.wri.org/d8/s3fs-public/pdf/ccs_guidelines.pdf

IETA (2022). *High-level criteria for crediting carbon geostorage activities, v1.0*. PowerPoint Presentation. Available at: [https://ieta.b-cdn.net/wp](https://ieta.b-cdn.net/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/IETA_HighLevelCriteriaforCreditingGeostorageActivities.pdf)[content/uploads/2023/09/IETA_HighLevelCriteriaforCreditingGeostorageActivities.pdf](https://ieta.b-cdn.net/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/IETA_HighLevelCriteriaforCreditingGeostorageActivities.pdf)

International Organization for Standardization (2017). *ISO/TR27915:2017 Carbon dioxide capture, transportation and geological storage — Quantification and verification*. International Organization for Standardization.

IPCC (2005). *IPCC special report on carbon dioxide capture and storage*. Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Metz, B., Davidson, O., de Coninck, H. C., Loos, M., & Meyer, L. A (Eds.)]. Cambridge University Press. Available at: https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/srccs_wholereport-1.pdf

IPCC (2006). *2006 IPCC guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventories*. Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston, H. S., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., & Tanabe, K. (Eds.). Institute for Global Environmental Strategies. Available at: <https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/>

IPCC (2019). *2019 refinement to the 2006 IPCC guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventories*. Calvo Buendia, E., Tanabe, K., Kranjc, A., Baasansuren, J., Fukuda, M., Ngarize, S., Osako, A., Pyrozhenko, Y., Shermanau, P., & Federici, S. (Eds.). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

McCormick, M. (2012). *A greenhouse gas accounting framework for carbon capture and storage projects*. Center For Climate and Energy Solutions. Available at: <https://www.c2es.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/CCS-framework.pdf>

UNFCCC (2011). *Carbon dioxide capture and storage in geological formations as CDM project activities*.<https://cdm.unfccc.int/about/ccs/index.html>

US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (n.d.). *Electronic Code of Federal Regulations (Title 40, Part 98, Subpart W, § 98.233(a)(1)).* Available at: [https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-98/subpart-W/section-98.233#p-98.233(a)(1))[40/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-98/subpart-W/section-98.233#p-98.233\(a\)\(1\)](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-98/subpart-W/section-98.233#p-98.233(a)(1))

US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (2010). *General technical support document for injection and geologic sequestration of carbon dioxide: Subparts RR and UU greenhouse gas reporting program*. Office of Air and Radiation. Available at: <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=P1010C7P.txt>

DOCUMENT HISTORY

