Supplementary information

Glossary

Lexicon

Table B1. General and metrological lexicon.

Table B2. Emissions-related lexicon.

Framework key word descriptions

Table B3. Definitions of types of aim.

Table B4. Examples and definitions of types of stakeholder.

Table B5. Definitions of types of actor.

Actor: An individual or organisation that plays a role in the monitoring

Table B6. Definitions of types of driver.

Driver: a factor that instigates the emission monitoring to happen

Table B7. Definitions of data reporting requirements, properties keywords.

Table B8. Definitions of data reporting requirements, descriptions keywords.

Table B9. Definitions of emissions source, properties keywords

Table B10. Definitions of emissions source, descriptions keywords.

Table B11. Definitions of method, properties keywords.

Table B12. Definitions of method, descriptions keywords

Table B13. Definitions of measurement instrument, properties keywords

Case study - Monitoring methane emissions from onshore LNG facilities

Background

An emissions monitoring campaign was conducted by the National Physical Laboratory which supported a study to better quantify the oil and gas contribution to global emissions of methane⁴. This study was a collaboration between the Environmental Defence Fund, Oil and Gas Methane Partnership, and the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC). The monitoring campaign was specifically aimed at quantifying methane emissions from the main processes and activities involved in the liquid natural gas (LNG) chain, including: the liquefaction of gas (at export terminals), ship loading/unloading, and storage and regasification (at import terminals). LNG was chosen as it is a discrete section of the oil and gas sector with clearly defined activities, and there has been significant growth in LNG activities in recent years with little knowledge of emissions.

The aims referred to as goals⁴ were to provide information on emissions from LNG from selected sites globally to help define industry emission factors (EF) and identify key technological and operational factors that affect emissions. This was achieved by quantifying methane emissions from key functional elements (FE) to allow EFs to be determined for each FE using activity data.

The study provided the opportunity to:

- compare EFs from similar FEs across different sites⁴ during both liquefaction and regasification,
- demonstrate what could be achieved with a larger sample size, improving inventory accuracy and potential methane reduction,

 identify emissions from non-continuous sources and super-emitters – to allow more accurate inventory reporting and targeted maintenance and repair.

An important goal before the campaign was to define the data reporting requirements, select appropriate LNG sites to monitor and define the essential elements of a monitoring method, including evidence of validation. The framework was only developed after this monitoring campaign; therefore, the framework has been applied retrospectively using the relevant information from the campaign. This case study demonstrates how the framework could be used to define the reporting requirements and select a monitoring site. The monitoring methods set of taxonomies were used to define a specification for a method that could meet the data reporting requirements and used to describe the properties of a method (Differential Absorption Lidar) that was deployed to carry out the monitoring work. The difference between the method specification and the properties of a method highlights the compromises that may have to made when choosing a method, such as budget, safety, logistical constraints.

Defining the data reporting requirements

The goal of the monitoring needs taxonomies is to define the data reporting requirements. A prerequisite to defining the data reporting requirements is to define the purpose of, and drivers for, the monitoring, as well as the relevant stakeholders and actors. Readers are referred to Tables B3 to B6 (above) and Figure 2 in the main text for the taxonomy that describes and classifies the purposes for emission monitoring.

The purpose of the monitoring was to establish facts about emissions sources (class: emissions driven, driver: research) to develop EFs, to identify and understand non-continuous sources and large emitters. The data will be used for technological and scientific research activities, will provide evidence for improving emissions inventories (aim: scientific knowledge), and provide information for more targeted maintenance and repair (secondary aim: commercial).

Relevant stakeholders include: Industry sector (oil and gas, LNG), a national measurement institute: UK's National Physical Laboratory (NPL) who were tasked with undertaking the measurement campaign), and the owner(s) and operator(s) of each site. The reported data needed to be publicly available to allow dissemination of information to future potential stakeholders: regulators, research groups, policy makers, method providers – therefore there should be the ability to convey relevant information whilst ensuring that the needs of the operator(s) and owner(s) remain anonymous.

Relevant actors include: NMI (NPL, who were conducting the measurements), the site operator(s) (who provided site activity and process data).

The reporting requirements and emissions source characteristics should be used to choose a method or complimentary suite of methods. However, it is recognised that in practice a compromise will ultimately have to be made between the performance of the chosen method (which will affect the quality of reported data) and the budget. Therefore, metrics such as granularity, uncertainty, and range of emissions (based on lowest quantifiable emissions rate) will most likely be targets set when initially defining the reporting requirements, but these targets may have to be revised at a later time.

Readers are referred to Tables B7 and B8 (above) and Figure 3 in the main text (the data reporting requirements taxonomy).. Based on the aims (scientific knowledge), ideally as much information is required about the emission sources as possible. The required spatial and temporal granularities could initially be defined as:

Spatial granularity:

- Functional element (FE): to investigate the development of EFs (at the FE scale), understand common characteristics of similar FEs, and identify non-continuous and large emitters – ultimately to yield more accurate inventory reporting.
- Site: regassification type and liquification type, to compare EFs across these different sites and obtain site total emissions.
- Regional/National/Global: out of scope for this campaign.

Temporal granularity:

- A periodic high frequency report will provide the highest granularity of data but may be impractical and not cost effective.
- Snapshot: once only at each site but may not provide representative data.

A capture percentage of 100% would include all components, FEs, and sites, and at all times (continuous). However, the feasibility of undertaking such a study is dependent on cost and whether additional sites provide additional value, as well as the logistics, accessibility, and willingness of sites to participate (voluntary programme). Therefore, a survey of sites was conducted to assess the capture percentage that would yield the greatest scientific knowledge within the limitations of the budget.

Based on the aim, the uncertainty target would be set at <30% with a coverage factor of $k = 2.0$ (approximately 95%) for a reported derived-measurement.

Metrological factors: Evidence of validation of the monitoring method (blind testing against a controlled release of methane), traceability, calibration, auditing (of the monitoring method) and method transparency are important factors to highlight during the definition of the data reporting requirements. These are requirements that should ideally be placed on the selection of a method, but this will be a cost versus performance judgement.

Based on the background information provided, the following properties are more straightforward to define:

Measurand: Methane.

Class: Quantification.

Type: Emission rate.

Output type: Emission/technical report and EFs.

Specific: Needs to be able to monitor at any time of the year (and day or night) and the ability to operate outdoors. Possible autonomous operation (although this will be a cost versus performance judgment) and be able to monitor unplanned or planned events. Applicable standards: Industrial Emissions Directive 2010/75/EU Best Available Techniques (BAT) reference document⁵ for the refining of oil and gas provides information on performance, indicative costs, and drawbacks of highlighted methods; European Committee for Standardisation EN 17628².

External factors: Needs to be able to measure on sites with explosive atmospheres and difficult to reach structures (e.g., tanks, pipework). Needs the logistics ability to operate in different countries (shipping, transport, potential movement on site).

Defining the emission source(s)

There are 175 LNG terminals (sites) currently in operation globally⁴. Before the monitoring campaign the International Gas Union (IGU) (IGU World LNG Report⁶, 2017) was used to identify data to collect and potential facilities at which to carry out monitoring campaigns. The suitability of each site was based on various criteria such as: the costs and logistics of transporting the chosen method (which uses a mobile DIAL facility) to each site, access and dimensions of each site, measurement feasibility based on the reporting requirements, how representative the site was of the industry as a whole, and whether the site added scientific value to the study (for example, geographic coverage and range of processes at each site). Due to budget constraints the campaign was limited to five sites.

The emission source taxonomy (refer to Tables B9 and B10 and Figure 4 in the main text) could be used to list prospective sites and potentially list each FE on each site. The criteria would be defined in the properties and descriptive keywords for each emission source, using the taxonomy to help identify the five most appropriate sites to monitor. An advantage of using the taxonomy to help select sites is that prospective sites can be compared using a common basis.

Tables B15 and B16 show examples for two sites: labelled emission source 1 and 2. In these tables each site is described as a single emission source, although in practice each site will consist of multiple sources which could be described by listing all the FEs on site. In turn, each FE could be broken down into its respective components. The taxonomy provides the means to describe emission sources at different spatial scales.

Tables B17 and B18 show examples of two FEs: labelled emission source 3 and 4 located on site 1 and 2 respectively. The scope of this study was to investigate how EFs may differ between similar FE that may be located on the same site or different sites (across different nations). This framework provides a means to categorise FEs and highlight different characteristics and operational factors between similar FE that could affect EF.

Table B15. Emission Source 1 description using Figure 4 in the main text.

Table B16. Emission Source 2 description using Figure 4 in the main text.

Table B17. Emission Source 3 description using Figure 4 in the main text.

Table B18. Emission Source 4 description using Figure 4 in the main text.

Defining a monitoring method

The monitoring method should ideally be based on the data reporting requirements and the characteristics of the emission source(s) and ensuring a chosen method meets all the essential elements. Table B19 shows an example of defining a method specification based on the data reporting requirements and emissions source data.

Table B19. Method properties using Tables B11 and B12 (above) and Figure 5 in the main text.

Defining the method instrument, sampling strategy and emission quantification

The data reporting requirements specify an emission rate, therefore the method must consist of measurement instrument, sampling strategy and emission quantification elements. An example of a method element (i.e. instrument) is shown in Table B20.

Table B20. Instrument properties using Figure 6 in the main text.

Based on the method specification, specific requirements and required method elements a list of candidate methods (and associated method elements) could then be listed along with their associated properties. The candidate methods could then be short listed based on performance versus budget constraints, practicality, logistics and safety factors. The choice of method and its associated elements should be based on holistic consideration of the different types of measurement instrument, sampling strategy, emissions quantification and their properties and descriptions. For example, to report one snapshot for each FE rather than measure periodically on a continuous basis to reduce costs; however, in this case an assumption would be that each snapshot would be a representative sample of the emission rate.

One of the main considerations is whether to use a remote-sensing or point-sensing sampling strategy. Point-sensing may not be possible due to the requirement of measuring areas containing explosive atmospheres, flares and elevated sources. A remote-sensing sampling strategy would require an optical, open path system. To be able to operate day or night the measurement instrument should not necessarily rely on sunlight, therefore an active measurement instrument may be more appropriate than a passive measurement instrument.

For the LNG emissions monitoring, the UK National Physical Laboratory (NPL) mobile differential absorption Lidar (DIAL) method was chosen.

With reference to the measurement instrument taxonomy (Figure 7 in the main text), DIAL is categorised under: optical, absorption spectroscopy, active, open path.

With reference to the sampling strategy (Figure 8 in the main text), the NPL mobile DIAL method would be categorised under: remote-sensor, scanning path, resolved range. The sampling platform would be categorised under: mobile, surface based, vehicle.

However, further information detailing how measurements are combined to produce an emissions report (for each FE as well as the site total) need to be described in the method taxonomy (Figure 5 in the main text) under 'Specific details regarding the sampling strategy and measurement requirements'. An example is given in Table B21.

DIAL combines the concentration data with wind measurements to produce emissions flux⁴. With reference to the emission quantification taxonomy (Figure 9 in the main text): Emissions quantification: measured flow, indirect, box method.

Tables B21 and B22 describe the properties of NPL's mobile DIAL method, the former table describing the generic method properties and latter more specific (method element) properties. These should be compared to the data reporting requirements and specifications shown in Table B19 and B20. Example of comparisons are given:

- In Table B21, metrological factors describe how the specification in Table B19 is met, in this case reference to a published article.
- In Table B22, the operating conditions are specified for the DIAL method which is compared against the criteria in Table B20.

Some properties were not specified in Tables 19 and 20, for example the limitations described in Table B22. In practice it may not be possible to specify all the properties in the associated taxonomies as some may not be relevant (depending on the method) and some would be for consideration in terms of overall cost and logistics.

Table B21. Example Method properties of the NPL mobile DIAL method.

Table B22. Example method element properties of the NPL mobile DIAL method.

Supplementary information references

- 1 International Vocabulary of Metrology Basic and general concepts and associated terms (VIM), 3rd edition, https://www.bipm.org/doi/10.59161/JCGM200-2012, (accessed 22 August 2024).
- 2 EN 17628, https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/cen/1134347e-e278-42cd-9967- 2a4f34ac0fe6/en-17628-2022, (accessed 22 August 2024).
- 3OGMP 2.0 The Oil & Gas Methane Partnership 2.0, https://ogmpartnership.com/, (accessed 22 August 2024).
- 4 F. Innocenti, R. Robinson, T. Gardiner, N. Howes and N. Yarrow, Comparative Assessment of Methane Emissions from Onshore LNG Facilities Measured Using Differential Absorption Lidar, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2023, **57**, 3301–3310.
- 5 European Commission. Joint Research Centre. Institute for Prospective Technological Studies., *Best available techniques (BAT) reference document for the refining of mineral oil and gas industrial emissions: Industrial Emissions Directive 2010/75/EU (integrated pollution prevention and control).*, Publications Office, LU, 2015.
- 6 IGU World LNG Report 2017 IGU, https://www.igu.org/resources/igu-world-lng-report-2017/, (accessed 22 August 2024).
- 7 Remote Sensing | Free Full-Text | Uncertainty Assessment of Differential Absorption Lidar Measurements of Industrial Emissions Concentrations, https://www.mdpi.com/2072- 4292/14/17/4291, (accessed 22 August 2024).
- 8 R. Robinson, T. Gardiner, F. Innocenti, P. Woods and M. Coleman, Infrared differential absorption Lidar (DIAL) measurements of hydrocarbon emissions, *J. Environ. Monit.*, 2011, **13**, 2213–2220.