

**To:** Members of the Technical Advisory Group  
**From:** John Etherington, TAG Chair

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Technical Advisory Group Teleconference</b> <b>2:00-3:05 pm BST Wednesday 8 October 2014</b> <b>FINAL MINUTES</b></p>
---

*Attendees:* John Etherington (Chair), Per Blystad, John Barry, Roger Dixon, Alistair Jones, Michael Lynch-Bell, Danny Trotman, Harikrishnan Tulsidas

*Observers:* Charlotte Griffiths

*Apologies:* Santosh Adhikari, Leesa Carson, Maksim Saakian, David MacDonald

### **Approval of draft agenda**

1. The draft agenda was approved.

### **Draft Minutes of TAG meeting of 8 August 2014**

2. The draft minutes of the 8 August 2014 meeting were approved and Charlotte Griffiths was authorized to post the minutes on the TAG website.

### **Feedback from EGRC Bureau on TAG recommendations re: CRIRSCO Template and Uranium Bridging Document**

3. The Bureau accepted the TAG recommendations supporting the NEA/IAEA Bridging Document which has now been submitted to the Committee on Sustainable Energy for endorsement. The Bureau appreciated that the TAG study included a review of the 3-way mapping of the Uranium classification to the CRIRSCO Template to UNFC-2009.
4. It was noted that Harikrishnan Tulsidas issued an email to the TAG on 8 October 2014 providing an update on the companion guidebook “Application of United Nations Framework Classification – 2009 for uranium and thorium projects”. The TAG will review the document when complete.
5. The Bureau accepted the TAG recommendations regarding the updates to the CRIRSCO Template and UNFC-2009 Bridging Document and requested that the TAG draft a revision to that document. **Roger Dixon** will prepare a “track changes” version showing the amendments for TAG review. There was discussion regarding potential revisions to the UNECE Energy Series 33 mapping document that has more details but this is problematical as that document references UNFC-2004. It was decided to restrict revisions to UNFC-2009 incorporating Specifications” (Series 42 document) but provide a separate text note regards the impact on the details as in Series 33.

### **Update on Solid Minerals Case Study (Steve Henley) Review – John Barry**

6. John Barry emailed a full summary of the issues identified in the Steve Henley review to the TAG on 6 October. The key issues revolve around potential revisions to the Series 42 VI Generic Specifications sections P and R. Henley suggests (and Barry concurs) that these sections apply to petroleum classifications but are not suitable as written for solid minerals reporting. There appears to be confusion regards guidelines for F-axis project maturity

subclasses that, in Henley's opinion, are primarily dependent of the amount of geological information and G-axis sub-classes that are used for relative certainty. Given time constraints in this conference call there was limited discussion that some sort of revision to these sections of Series 42 should be developed by the TAG. Options tabled were to:

- a) Provide separate guidance for solid minerals and petroleum.
- b) Adjust the wording to allow flexibility of application on a commodity-specific basis.
- c) Transfer guidance from Generic Specifications to commodity-specific sections.

7. No resolution was reached and the TAG members were encouraged to research the issue with their colleagues and provide feedback directly to John Barry who will develop alternatives for future discussion. Note also that Barry's email identified several other, but less pressing, issues from Henley's report that require TAG feedback. Comments/feedback should be provided 21 November to allow John time to develop a summary for the next TAG conference call in early December.

#### **Status Update - New GKZ Petroleum Classification Bridging Document – John Etherington**

8. The new Russian Federation petroleum reserves and resources classification (RF-2013) was approved in November 2013 for implementation effective 1 January 2016. On 14 July 2014, the GKZ approached the UNECE requesting a mapping of RF-2013 and UNFC-2009. A formal request to assist in developing a Bridging Document was submitted by the GKZ to the TAG 21 August 2014. John Etherington provided a copy of his 29 September email to the GKZ outlining the TAG's requirements for bridging the Russian Federation's new 2013 petroleum classification to UNFC-2009.

9. More recently, Mr. Igor Shpurov, Director of GKZ, has indicated that they wish to accelerate the process with a target of having an approved document to present to the EGRC at their April 2015 meeting in Geneva. A conference call between Mr. Shpurov, Charlotte Griffiths, and John Etherington is scheduled for 10 October to discuss the work programme.

#### **Status Update: Renewables Generic Specifications - Alistair Jones**

10. The Renewables Task Force is developing Generic and Commodity Specifications for Renewable Energy Resources. The draft Generic Specifications were issued on 12 June and the period for public comment closed on 12 September. A number of comments were received and the Task Force plans to review the comments, prepare a response and possibly update the document. These will then be submitted to the TAG. A table of contents is being defined for the Commodity Specifications so as to provide a common structure. The Task Force plan to share this with the TAG for comment.

11. In support of this work, the Task Force holds regular conference calls and has organized several workshops. The next workshop will be in Geneva 17-18 November on "UNFC-2009 Classification for Renewable Energies, Opportunities and Challenges". The intent is to inform attendees of the Task Force's activities and to solicit stakeholder input.

## **Status Update: Recipient Reservoirs Study - Per Blystad**

12. Work is progressing to finalize the document Draft Specifications for the Application of UNFC to Injection Projects and Geological Storage Projects. The Task Force has to take into consideration an EU Directive (of 23 April 2009) on Geological Storage as it contains definitions of some of the relevant terms that EU member states have to use. This is to avoid introducing definitions that are not in line with the EU Directive. Regarding developing a Glossary, they will take into account the Glossary that is contained in the IPCC report on CCS.

13. The main part of the work that has been done is on Part III, Definition of Categories with Supporting Explanations and Sub-categories. The original UNFC text is modified to reflect the characteristics of injection. For instance, E1 is defined "Injection and geological storage has been confirmed to be economically viable". It is proposed to use of the term "deposit" in the supporting explanation as used in the UNFC, rather than "recipient reservoir" that was proposed initially. Per recommended to the Task Force to retain the term "recipient reservoir" as this signals a potential storage capacity, rather than "deposit" which in this context indicates potential recoverable resource/quantity.

14. Part II, Injection Projects Definitions is still pending.

15. Part IV, Generic Specifications: The specifications are basically the same as for UNFC-2009. The Task Force is now considering if it is necessary to develop additional guidance related to Injection Projects/Geological Storage Projects for each of these specification topics.

16. The Task Force leader is pushing to get progress before the end-of-year reserves reporting starts.

## **TAG Actions Items from UNECE Self-Evaluation Annex V – 26 March 2014 – Charlotte Griffiths**

17. Due to time constraints, it was not feasible to address these projects. It will be added to the agenda for the next conference call.

## **Any Other Business – Chairman Comments**

18. **SKYPE Access:** This was the first conference call where members were given the option to use SYPE to SKYPE access. While this does reduce costs, there were several intervals where the line quality deteriorated such that individual members could not be heard. Charlotte will check if the problem is with the UN system but it appears as if SKYPE to SKYPE connections may not be sufficiently reliable to use in future conference calls

19. **TAG Process Update:** TAG members are now requested to submit a short summary of significant items in their area of responsibility 10 days in advance of the conference call with focus on key issues, action items, updated timetables and specific draft recommendations. This will allow exchange of comments by email before the meeting and a more focused discussion. The meeting minutes will reflect a brief summary of the emailed reports and follow-up TAG actions with defined member responsibility.

20. **Work Distribution:** It is becoming apparent that that the work on TAG project is being concentrated in a subset group. The TAG chair will be more proactive in soliciting volunteers to level the workload. Where members are routinely not participating in discussions or assuming work assignments, the Chair will solicit advice from the Bureau regarding providing alternative candidates.

21. **Project Timing:** It is becoming apparent that each project is targeting completion to be included in the April 2005 EGRC meeting in Geneva. This will lead to a congestion of TAG reviews in early 2015. The Bureau should be aware that it may not be feasible to complete all these reviews by April and some projects will have the status of “TAG Review Pending”.

#### **Next meeting**

22. Charlotte will canvas the TAG members regarding their availability for a conference call on either 12 or 13 December 2014. Charlotte will ensure that these dates do not conflict with Bureau meetings as several TAG members are also Bureau members.

---