

# Presentation on

# Financing Issues For Policy Group (CSLF)

By

R.V. Shahi , Secretary (Power)

Government of India

September, 2005

# Overview of the Presentation

- **Introduction.**
- **Need for financing the CSLF projects from a separate fund.**
- **Various options considered.**
- **Suggested option.**

# Introduction

- **CSLF Charter was signed in 2003.**
- **Objective was to encourage collaborative R&D in Carbon Sequestration Technologies.**
- **Developing countries are yet to be involved in such R&D projects.**

# Need for Financing CSLF projects

- **Collaboration for R&D of CCS technologies needs to be effective by way of associating all the member countries.**
- **To achieve this, there is need for networking of projects which are financed from a common source.**
- **This arrangement would ensure sharing of results of R&D efforts among all the member countries.**

Contd....

- **Developing Countries not in a position to make available funds for these R&D projects because of their other pressing developmental needs.**
- **Therefore, there is a need for identifying sources for financing such R&D activities in developing countries.**

# Various Options Considered

- **Possibilities of availing funds for CSLF R&D projects from existing sources like World Bank, IEA, UNEP were explored .**
- **General consensus in London LRF workshop that such an option not feasible.**
- **Need for alternative source of funding.**

Contd....

## Various Options Considered contd..

- **Melbourne meeting in 2004 entrusted this issue to a Financial Task Force led by India.**
- **It was proposed to associate Mexico, China, South Africa and Canada alongwith US & EC with this Task Force.**
- **CSLF Secretariat was approached. But the Task Force could not meet.**

Contd....

- **It has been suggested again to attempt at making CCS projects eligible for support from GEF in reference to recent IPCC Special Report.**
  
- **This option is not considered feasible as :**
  - **CCS projects would compete with the existing pipeline of projects already eligible under GEF charter.**
  - **It could also generate resistance from environment groups as CCS is yet to be accepted as a viable option.**

# Suggested Option

- **Preferable option is to create a separate fund for promotion of CSLF projects in developing countries with suitable contribution from developed country members.**
- **Example of US indicating commitment of USD 50 million under Methane to Market Partnership.**
- **Fund size may be modest to begin with (USD 100 million).**
- **Contribution may be on the basis of a reasonable criteria.**
- **Per Capita CO<sub>2</sub> emission could be a basis.**

# Per Capita CO2 Emission

Country	Tones of CO2	Country	Tones of CO2
United States	19.66	Italy	7.47
Australia	17.36	Norway	7.28
Canada	16.93	South Africa	6.65
Netherlands	11.02	France	6.16
Russia	10.43	Mexico	3.64
Germany	10.15	China	2.57
Denmark	9.52	Brazil	1.77
Korea	9.48	Colombia	1.26
Japan	9.47	<b>India</b>	<b>0.97</b>
United Kingdom	8.94	<b>World Avg.</b>	<b>3.89</b>

Source : Key World Statistics (2004) by International Energy Agency

➤ **Suggested Contributions :**

• **USA**

**USD 30 million**

• **Other Developed Countries**

**USD 5 to 10 million**

# Thank you

Website of the Ministry of Power

[www.powermin.nic.in](http://www.powermin.nic.in)

