

*The National Academies of*  
SCIENCES • ENGINEERING • MEDICINE

**Committee on Developing a Research Agenda for Carbon Dioxide Removal and  
Reliable Sequestration**

Webinar: October 5, 2017, 10 AM - 12 PM (Eastern)

**Direct Air Capture**

**Webinar objective:** *to provide an introduction to Direct Air Capture (DAC) as a carbon dioxide removal approach, specifically panelists will explore the limitations, appropriate scale, and future cost of DAC technology. Panelists will describe technological readiness, current research needs, and potential environmental impact.*

AGENDA

- 10:00 AM    **Opening Remarks**  
Jennifer Wilcox, Committee Member
- 10:10 AM    **Perspectives from Thought Leaders of Direct Air Capture**  
Panelists:  
Klaus Lackner, Arizona State University  
David Keith, Harvard Paulson School of Engineering and Applied Sciences  
Peter Eisenberger, Columbia University
- 10:55 AM    **On the Path to Commercial-Scale Approaches to Direct Air Capture**  
Panelists:  
Jan Wurzbacher - Climeworks  
Alina Chanaewa - Skytree  
Eric Ping - Global Thermostat  
Geoff Holmes - Carbon Engineering
- 11:15 AM    **Discussion**
- 12:00 PM    **Q&A**
- 12:10 PM    **Adjourn Webinar**

**Discussion Participants**

Phil Renforth - Cardiff University  
Geoff Holmes - Carbon Engineering  
Greg Dipple - University of British Columbia  
Niall Mac Dowell - Imperial College of London  
Roger Aines - Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

*The National Academies of*  
SCIENCES • ENGINEERING • MEDICINE

**NOTE FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS:** This meeting is being held to gather information to help the committee conduct its study. This committee will examine the information and material obtained during this, and other public meetings, in an effort to inform its work. Although opinions may be stated and lively discussion may ensue, no conclusions are being drawn at this time; no recommendations will be made. In fact, the committee will deliberate thoroughly before writing its draft report. Moreover, once the draft report is written, it must go through a rigorous review by experts who are anonymous to the committee, and the committee then must respond to this review with appropriate revisions that adequately satisfy the Academies' Report Review Committee and the NAS president before it is considered an official Academies report. Therefore, observers who draw conclusions about the committee's work based on today's discussions will be doing so prematurely.

Furthermore, individual committee members often engage in discussion and questioning for the specific purpose of probing an issue and sharpening an argument. The comments of any given committee member may not necessarily reflect the position he or she may actually hold on the subject under discussion, to say nothing of that person's future position as it may evolve in the course of the project. Any inference about an individual's position regarding findings or recommendations in the final report is therefore also premature.