

## **ZEP Task Force on Public Communication Eighth meeting, 17 September 2008 – Brussels Minutes**

### **Attendees:**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Klaus Willnow     | Siemens                                  |
| Samuela Vercelli  | Rome University                          |
| Paal Frisvold     | Bellona                                  |
| Eric Drosin       | Communication Manager                    |
| Thierry Chappe    | Schlumberger                             |
| Ronald Penner     | RWE                                      |
| Frank Bao         | RWE                                      |
| Peter Radgen      | E.ON Germany                             |
| Maribel Galvez    | Endesa                                   |
| Svend Søyland     | Bellona                                  |
| Katelijne Stevens | ZEP secretariaat/ PricewaterhouseCoopers |

### **Agenda September 17**

1. Welcome
2. Action items from last meeting
3. Sub-group R&D projects on public acceptance
4. Sub-Group Media Relation
5. Sub-Group Communication Material
6. Sub-Group Event planning
7. Communication Plan 2008-2010
8. ZEP/McKinsey communication
9. Date & venue of next meeting

#### **1. Welcome**

Paal Frisvold welcomes everybody at Bellona. The members present introduce themselves. Klaus Willnow opened the meeting and welcomed all participants and explained the changes to the agenda.

## 2. Action items from last meeting

The actions from the last TFPCOM meeting were discussed:

- TFC7.1 Eric Drosin explains his work until now. He hasn't been able to visit any projects and asked if he can be hosted by companies in the ZEP to visit their sites in order to learn more about CCS and the companies.
- TFC7.2 The Communication plan was drafted by Eric Drosin.
- TFC7.3 Websites of other ETP's have a part that is restricted only for the platform members, so this should also be possible for ZEP. Eric Drosin states that now the information placed at the website is accessible for everybody, some information should not be open (like internal discussion documents) for the general public. The ZEP website should also have a closed part.
- TFC7.4/7.5 Eric Drosin has been working on the COP/MOP meeting, he visited Poznan himself. This topic will be dealt with later in the meeting.

### Actions:

- TFC8.1 Hans Modder of ZEP secretariat will be contacted by Eric Drosin to discuss the development of a part of the website only accessible for the ZEP members.

## 3. Sub-group R&D projects on public acceptance

Samuela Vercelli explained the progress on the FP7 call. The EC didn't decide on assigning the contract for the call on public communication on CCS, the proposals of Samuela Vercelli and David Reiner were assigned the same amount of points.

There is a need for information on CCS and scientific research on public acceptance, how are the people going to respond to the different subjects. The issues are very complex, difficult to handle and are influencing each other.

There are new calls out on CCS, among which the network secretariat tender and a FP7 call on communication. A process or body is needed where all the different initiatives can be combined and discussed. Klaus Willnow states that we should not coordinate this as ZEP, but we should look at the projects to see which are interesting and determine if ZEP parties are interested in applying. A list will be made with interesting calls and tenders.

There is no project on public acceptance going on at the moment.

CO2-geonet made a brochure on the 6 main questions on CCS safety on geological storage. This was made by the scientist in CO2-geonet and will be published in the coming week. A big forum for the 5 years of CO2-geonet is organised where the brochure will be presented. The TF will be invited for the event. The soft copy of the brochure will be sent around among the TF members.

Peter Radgen added that a new tender on research concerning CO2 transport and storage capacities in Europe was set out by the EC. Besides this a study was performed by a German consortium led by the Wuppertal institutes concerning public acceptance. It is a robust study. The key message of the study is: for the general public a general discussion should be held and general information provided and for local projects a focussed discussion with key actors should take place. The report will be distributed among the TF communication members by the secretariat.

**Actions:**

- TFC8.2 A list of research initiatives that concern CCS will be made by sub-group R&D.
- TFC8.3 The CO<sub>2</sub>-geonet brochures and the report of the Wuppertal institute will be send around by the secretariat. Peter Radgen will make it available.

**4. Sub-Group Media Relation**

A discussion took place on the coverage of CCS by the media.

Eric Drosin states that in general for wider audiences there is limited information available on CCS, but the media is becoming more interested (for example at the event of Vattenfalls pilot plant Schwarze Pumpe). Safety and costs are the most important topics covered by the media. Most media when they are well informed on the topics are in favour of CCS. If adequate information is available ZEP can assist and guide the media through the information and the different topics. The knowledge of ZEP should be easy accessible for the media. The media is hungry for information and ZEP should inform the media and provide information.

The media covering the Vattenfall Pilot Plant opening were in principle neutral to positive about CCS.

Eric Drosin states that ZEP should take action on the news hooks cleaning up coal and legislation.

Klaus Willnow states that the media is a target group for the TF Public Communication and ZEP wants to be a credible source of information.

An increase in coverage of CCS in the media is seen. Two articles in the news papers were circled around.

When the economic benefits from CCS are clear, people easily get in favour of CCS. Like the coal area in Spain and a project in Germany were because of the CCS technology the fire brigade could keep on working.

ZEP should monitor the media and analyse which topics are covered and on what source of information they based the articles.

**5. Sub-Group Communication Material**

A new overview brochure and insert was made. These brochures should be distributed as much as possible.

Greenpeace, WWF and Friends of the earth have published a press release in which they are more positive about CCS on a mandatory basis. This shows a change in the opinion of Greenpeace. The position of Greenpeace international is different to Greenpeace Germany. The press release will be circulated among the TF members.

**Actions:**

- TFC8.4 Distribute the press release amongst the members of the TFPCOM.

## 6. Communication Plan 2008-2010

During the last TFPCom meeting the first structure of the communication plan was discussed. Eric Drosin made based on these ideas a first draft of the communication plan. This plan was presented and discussed during the Co-ordination group meeting and Advisory Council meeting.

During the presentation of the plan in the AC meeting a discussion took place. Eric Drosin gave a presentation on the presented Communication plan 2008-2010 and the reactions of the AC<sup>1</sup>. Klaus Willnow states that the TF emphasised to the AC that at this moment no communication budget is available and no communication activities can take place. The reactions of the AC were contradictory.

The general idea the EC has of the ZEP is an advisory group and not a lobby group. The discussion that took place was around the position of ZEP and not around the communication plan itself. The AC asked the TF Public communication to review the communication plan and split into short-term and mid-term activities and come back in the next AC<sup>2</sup>.

Reaction of the AC on the question if ZEP can become the leading voice in CCS related issues was that this generally could be the case.

The TFPCom members ask Eric Drosin to remove the mentioning of scale from the last key message.

### Lunch

The Communication plan 2008-2010 is discussed and the following reactions were:

- Target: is ZEP capable of talking directly with the public, does it have enough money?

The plan is talk with the opinion leaders, this is a small number of the general public, but they are able to spread the news to wider audiences. In the first phase the plan focuses on media, NGO's, policy makers and opinion leaders. In a later stage also a broader public can be addressed with large campaigns.

- On which level is the communication plan? Is it only EU level or also national level? This has implications for the language.

The Member States have different debates with a different status. The communication plan focuses on certain countries, which will be mentioned.

- Is there a link with the national networks?
- In the plan a link is made with hydrogen, but is this interesting and it might open up more questions?

The different applications of CCS are highlighted. In the McKinsey research CCS for other industries is also mentioned. This was meant to show that the communication plan focuses on the CCS as a bridging technology. To avoid confusion the sentence will be rephrased.

- Under speaking opportunities it is mentioned to prepare a presentation: it is annoying to see the same presentation more times.

---

<sup>1</sup> See ETP-ZEP\_TFCom 17Sept2008.ppt

<sup>2</sup> See ETP-ZEP\_TFCom 17Sept2008.ppt

It is meant as a tool-box/set of slides from which different slides can be picked for a presentation based on the type of event and the audience. It is also meant to have a structure and basis, to save time and to define the best way for presenting the ZEP messages.

- Under key messages combating climate change is mentioned: it can be a risk to take this position. If in the future some voice states that CO<sub>2</sub> is not the cause for the climate change, to avoid this it could be changed into carbon footprint.

Within the ZEP this is not debatable; the general idea is that CCS is combating climate change. Without climate change there is no business case and no message. If we use more moderate language, the key message is lost.

- Under media partners only English speaking media are selected, which mostly focussed on the UK. This will not attract audiences from other countries.

The selected media are considered to be reliable sources of pan-European news and are used by European media as news source also by world wide media. The budget is too low to also address the different national news papers.

- Concerning the campaign in news papers this can also have negative effect, because it can result in green washing were people become fed up with this kind of messages and it look like pushing a certain agenda which could be in appropriate.

CCS is presented as one of the possibilities and as information people have to know.

- NGO's will not be influenced by advertisements in the media; they have to be addressed individually. This should be addressed separately and events organised to speak with NGO's and discuss the topics.
- A clear link should be made between the target group (audience) and the tools that will be used. ZEP should be sold to its founders.
- It is better to mention the targets earlier in the document.
- It looks like transport of CO<sub>2</sub> is excluded from the communication activities. There are a lot of questions and concerns around transport.

This is not excluded, but decided to focus on the four pillars mentioned and later drill down to other topics like transport. There are many topics concerning CCS, they had to be prioritised and transport wasn't first.

- How is the new website going to be created?

Technically speaking the public site is on top of the confidential part for the ZEP members.

- How can the communication plan be positioned within the ZEP?

The ZEP members all have two hats which is taken as a given. The fact that there are different interests included in the ZEP is its strength.

- Public acceptance is a local issue. Is it possible to clarify how ZEP can help the local activities? What material will be provided?

If enough resources are allocated a lot of material will be produced that can be used by the local activities. This point will be made clearer in the communication plan.

The TFPCOM discussed the prioritising of activities for 2008:

- The ZEP website and visuals are important and should be dealt with as soon as possible.
- Media monitoring is not necessary. Since all companies are doing that of their own, these results could be shared with ZEP.  
Sharing of monitoring results gives problems with accessibility. Media monitoring is performed by separate agency's who ask fees for their services, the results can't be shared freely with others.
- What is meant with branding?  
It concerns the logo and the layouts, but could also be part of the activities for the website.
- If the logo will be reviewed, shouldn't the name be reviewed as well?  
This is not possible, that is a political discussion. Maybe additional sentences should be added about the use of the name in public.
- Maribel Galvez states that first media monitoring is most important, then website and then branding.
- Is stakeholder research necessary?  
The studies that are available are limited and not showing the same results. The research can also be used as a benchmark and repeated each year to monitor the progress.
- The targets should be made specific by quantifying the activities, like 4 press releases or 5 conferences.
- What kind of research will be performed, since the costs are very high?  
The idea is to speak with the target groups. It is expensive to get to talk to people on the phone in different countries.
- The different activities are interlinked and can not all be seen separately.
- Photo shoots are not necessary, since this is taking time and expenses. It is not necessary to go there, own company photos can be used.

The short term activities have to be approved before the next AC meeting, so actions can be taken before the end of the year. A voting took place on the prioritisation of the different activities for 2008:

- Website
- ID/Branding
- Media monitoring
- Bespoke ZEP Visuals
- Speaking opportunities
- ZEP events
- Media Training

## Next Steps:

The industrial parties are asked to contribute to the communication activities. The AC members, especially the industrial members (now 25 partners), will be approached in the coming week. It's unclear if they all are willing to pay and how much. All items will be presented to the AC and the urgency to start with the activities proposed will be made clear. The AC will be asked for a budget for this year in an e-mail before the next AC meeting, during the next AC meeting a decision will be taken on the whole plan.

## Actions:

TFC8.5 Eric Drosin will revise the communication plan 2008-2010 and ask the AC in the coming week for financial support for the activities in 2008. In addition the AC members will be asked for their opinion on the plan for 2009 – 10 to be prepared for decision at next AC meeting on Nov 26.

## 7. Sub-Group Event planning

### *COP/MOP meeting*

Eric Drosin gave a presentation on the COP/MOP event and his visit to Poznan<sup>1</sup>. The possibilities were discussed with the AC. The AC voting on participation in the COP/MOP event resulted in 12 votes in favour, 7 abstains and 8 against. Based on this voting and the time for getting the requested budget from the members willing to pay it was decided to not organize a ZEP event during the COP/MOP meeting.

A discussion took place on the process and decisions taken by the AC concerning the COP/MOP meeting.

### *GA 2008*

A small team from ZEP is planning the GA 2008. The outline of the event is being drafted at the moment. Topics that will be covered are the flagship program based on the McKinsey report (when finished and agreed upon in time) and the connections with initiatives from outside the EU. The event will be shaped more as an interactive event, with fewer presentations and more discussions. The event will be held in Brussels in the Belfort hotel on 10 November 2008.

The involvement of the TFPCom sub-group Events will be defined in a later stage.

## Actions:

TFC8.6 Eric Drosin will discuss with the GA2008 steering committee what the role of the sub-group Events can be.

### *Other events*

Eric Drosin goes through the list of key CCS events and explains where and how the ZEP will be present<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> See ETP-ZEP TFPCom#8 17-09-2008 presentation

<sup>2</sup> See ETP-ZEP TFPCom #8 key events

The events can be divided in 3 levels: EU events, Events on a global scale and National events in MS. All information concerning events that are not on the list can be send to Eric Drosin.

**Actions:**

TFC8.7        Send all information concerning CCS events on European, global and national scale to Eric Drosin.

**8. ZEP/McKinsey communication**

A discussion took place on the communication of the results of the MC Kinsey research on the set-up of the flagship program. The assignment doesn't include a part for communicating the results. How the messages from the study can be used and the follow-up for the TF communications was discussed. The following points were mentioned;

- The research has impact on the press release during the GA2008.
- There is an ongoing debate on which assumptions can be made.
- The presentation of the McKinsey study is a task of the TFPCom.
- Next week RWE, Vattenfall, Shell and the Climate foundation will present a study they performed on economic viability of CCS. This can be used as input for the McKinsey report on how CCS can be implemented.
- Its potential should be maximised for communication purposes. It should be brought into the GA committee that there should be a follow up of the results from the report and prepare a strategy on beforehand.
- McKinsey is going to present the results from the research if the ZEP want it or not and ZEP can use the results as they want. ZEP should be prepared for the different outcomes of the research.

**Action:**

TFC 8.8        Eric Drosin will discuss with the GA2008 steering committee how the communication around the outcome of the McKinsey research can be dealt with.

**9. Date & venue of next meeting**

There are many issues that the TFPcom should deal with at the moment and also the short-term activities are to be discussed when the AC response on the proposal. The next meeting will be held on short term basis; this will be November 3 at Bellona in Brussels.

**Action list Taskforce Public Communication meeting#8 17 September 2008**

| <b>Number</b> | <b>Action</b>   | <b>Who</b>                   |
|---------------|---|------------------------------|
| TFC 8.1       | Hans Modder of ZEP secretariat will be contacted by Eric Drosin to discuss the development of a part of the website only accessible for the ZEP members.  | Eric Drosin                  |
| TFC8.2        | A list of research initiatives that concern CCS will be made by sub-group R&D.  | Samuela Vercelli             |
| TFC8.3        | The CO2-geonet brochures and the report of the Wuppertal institute will be send around by the secretariat. Peter Radgen will make it available.   | Secretariat                  |
| TFC8.4        | Distribute the press release amongst the members of the TFPCom.   | Secretariat                  |
| TFC8.5        | Eric Drosin will revise the communication plan 2008-2010 and ask the AC in the coming week for financial support for the activities in 2008. In addition the AC members will be asked for their opinion on the plan for 2009 – 10 to be prepared for decision at next AC meeting on Nov 26. | Eric Drosin<br>Klaus Willnow |
| TFC8.6        | Eric Drosin will discuss with the GA2008 steering committee what the role of the sub-group Events can be.   | Eric Drosin                  |
| TFC8.7        | Send all information concerning CCS events on European, global and national scale to Eric Drosin.   | All                          |
| TFC8.8        | Eric Drosin will discuss with the GA2008 steering committee how the communication around the outcome of the McKinsey research can be dealt with.  | Eric Drosin                  |