

Zero discharge measures – overview of technology

Production – produced water, drainage water, well clean-up, sand cleaning, etc.

Principle 1 - Reduce water production

| Technologies | Effect on other discharges /emissions | Reduction potential (water quantity %) | Technology status | References | Application/limitations |
|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Better reservoir management - <i>4D seismology</i> - <i>Smart wells</i> - <i>Underbalanced drilling</i> - <i>Recompletion of old wells</i> | | 0 - 40 on the field | The technology is available/being developed | | Smart wells and underbalanced drilling are most relevant for new wells. |
| Blocking of water zones/ water cut-off - <i>Reperforation, side tracking</i> | <p>May lead to both increased and reduced discharge of chemicals.</p> <p>Reduced water production and reduced need for gas lift lead to reduced gas compression and reduced emissions to air.</p> <p>Water cut-off may give a longer production time and increased total water production.</p> | 0 - 40 per well | The technology is available/being developed | Ongoing activities in the industry. | <p>Some of the technologies may be influenced by changes in reservoir conditions, a limited life-span, reservoir mobility and the capacity of the seal between the reservoir zones.</p> <p><u>Water cut-off</u> Some of the technologies cannot be used in old wells due to high temperature, scaling, types of completion, cracks in the formation and the flow behind the casing.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>- Mechanical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanical plug, • Straddle packer, • Sliding sleeve, • Patch flex • Inflatable plugs | | | | <p>In use on Statfjord, Norne, Gyda, Heidrun, Åsgard, Yme, Sleipner,</p> <p>Patch flex: tested on Velsefrikk</p> <p>Being considered for Oseberg</p> | <p><u>Mechanical plug</u>: only suitable for completions of the "monodrill" type.</p> <p><u>Straddle packer</u>: only suitable if there is no flow behind the casings.</p> <p><u>Inflatable plugs</u>: Not permanent, sensitive to changes in pressure and temperature.</p> |
| <p>- Chemical (cement, gel, resin, foam cement, carbonate, microbial)</p> | | | | <p>In use on Ula, the Ekofisk area, Statfjord</p> <p>Being considered for Oseberg C</p> | |
| <p>- Remote operated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCRAMS (Surface controlled reservoir analysis and management system) • DIACS (Downhole instrumentation and control system) • Smart wells (surface-operated equipment down in the well, such as valves, zone isolation packers) | | | | | <p><u>SCRAMS</u>: limitations related to sand control</p> <p>Microbial: not suitable for a high temperature?</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Downhole separation</p> <p><i>- Vertical (hydrocyclone)</i></p> | | 70 - 90 per well under normal conditions | Further testing required | Vertical separation being developed by Baker Hughes, Framo. | <p>The potential is greatest for new installations/satellites. Challenges regarding maintenance, well interventions, level gauging, difficult to implement in existing wells.</p> <p>Can be used for water cut-off > 50 % and a low gas/liquid ratio. One limitation is that the production wells often are too small. Used abroad.</p> |
| <p><i>- Horizontal</i></p> | Energy-saving, can reduce emissions to air | | | <p>Horizontal separation, tests being done by Hydro on Ullrigg.</p> <p>Considered on Brage</p> | <p>Can be used for water cut-off 0-100 %, should be usable both in new and old wells, but may be difficult to install in old wells. Problems with sand and chalk particles. Requires a suitable geological formation for injection.</p> |
| <p>Seabed separation</p> | <p>Can reduce the consumption of chemicals</p> <p>Can reduce the need for energy and emissions to air</p> | 0 - 95 per separation | The technology is available/being developed. | <p>Troll Pilot – Troll C, separates oil and water on three wells</p> <p>Being considered for satellites up towards Norne.</p> | <p>High potential on new installations/satellites.</p> <p>Little potential on existing installations.</p> |

Principle 2 - Reuse

| Technologies | Effect on other discharges | Reduction potential (water quantity %) | Technology status | References | Application/limitations |
|--|--|--|------------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Reinjection of produced water (PWRI) (pressure support)</p> | <p>May lead to increase emissions to air due to reduced re-injectability later</p> | <p>80 - 95</p> | <p>The technology is available</p> | <p>Balder and Ringhorne, Frigg, Ekofisk, Glitne, Brage, Grane, Gyda, Heimdal, Heidrun (in part), Jotun, Norne (in part), Oseberg Sør, Oseberg Øst (> 90%), Snorre B, Tambar, Tor, Ula (91%), Valhall (2003), Veslefrikk, Visund, Brage (>70%)</p> <p>Planned on Skirne/Byggve, Staffjord C – the pilot injection is completed, expanded injection to 18 000 m³/day autumn 2003.</p> <p>Being considered for Oseberg Field Center, Oseberg C , the West Flank and Draugen</p> | <p>Costs and energy requirements will be field-specific.</p> <p>Risk of acidification – and scaling if mixed with sea water. Can only be tested after water breakthrough.</p> <p>Can lead to acidification of reservoir / H2S production Need for nitrate injection?</p> <p>Can cause wear and tear on water inj. pumps due to sand and deposits and loss of injectability due to oil content and high temperatures in produced water.</p> |

Principle 3 - Disposal (cf. Utsira injection, last page of Appendix 5)

| Technologies | Effect on other discharges/emissions | Reduction potential (water quantity %) | Technology status | References | Application/limitations |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Injection of produced water | | | | | |
| a) in the reservoir | Increases the emissions of CO ₂ and NO _x | | | Heimdal | |
| b) in other formation or aquifer | May increase emissions of CO ₂ and NO _x | 80 - 95 | The technology is available | Kvitebjørn Being investigated for Oseberg Field Center and Oseberg C | Requires waste wells, suitable formations. |
| Injection of produced sand | May increase emissions of CO ₂ and NO _x | 50 - 100 | The technology is available | Snorre B, Valhall, Visund, Oseberg Sør | |
| Injection of drainage water | May increase emissions of CO ₂ and NO _x | 80 - 95 | The technology is available | Valhall, Balder, Jotun, Oseberg C, Kvitebjørn, Heidrun, Brage, Oseberg Field Center, Oseberg Sør and Oseberg Øst, Njord, Visund, Snorre B | |
| Injection of well fluids | Reduces emissions of CO ₂ and NO _x | 50 - 100 % of the oil volume that otherwise would have been discharged to sea with produced water | The technology is available | Gullfaks, Statfjord, Veslefrikk, Sleipner, Åsgard Gyda, Ula and Valhall | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well clean-up /testing (avoid burning above flare boom) • Well treatment | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | Brage, Troll B, Troll C, Oseberg Sør, Oseberg Øst, Snorre B, Snorre TLP | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Principle 4 a) – Cleaning produced water

| Technologies | Cleans what | Cleaning effect (given as % and/or mg/l) | Technology status | References | Application/limitations |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| C-Tour <i>(placed upstream of hydrocyclones)</i> 1) <i>Extraction with condensate without fractionating</i> | Dispersed oils and dissolved aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH, phenols) | Effective removal in lab. Potential for reduction of dissolved comp. and dispersed with 80-90%. | The technology is available, expected to be qualified?? in 2003. | Tested on Statfjord B in 2002 with promising results, long-term test in 2003. Has been tested out by Hydro in Porsgrunn and "qualified" in relation to Hydro's platforms. | The BTEX level increases (doubling Statfjord B) if a fractionating column is not installed. Can be used on large quantities of water. Needs little room and no extra source of energy. Requires a certain pressure and temperature and condensate quality. Particles in the well stream may be limiting. Most effective with condensate qualities in the area C3/C4, with a tail that is as light as possible. |
| | 2) <i>Extraction with condensate with fractionating</i> | Dispersed oils and dissolved aromatic hydrocarbons (BTEX, PAH, phenols) | | | |
| | 3) <i>Extraction with pure propane</i> | Dispersed oils and dissolved aromatic hydrocarbons (BTEX, PAH, phenols) | | | |
| EPCON 1) <i>Mechanical "soft cyclone" stage - CFU (Compact Flotation Unit)</i> | Dispersed oil, particles > 1 micron | Down towards?? 10 – 15 mg/l | The technology is available | CFU has been tested on Oseberg C and the Field Center, Brage and Ekofisk, plus tested on slop water on Åsgard . Will be installed on Brage and Snorre TLP, Ekofisk and Oseberg | Capacity: 10 – 300 m ³ /hour Several small units are more effective than one large unit. Doesn't require much in terms of weight and room, little maintenance needed This process is very useful for severely polluted sub-streams. Can handle small water volumes like drainage water. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | Field Center. Drainage water from Troll C is cleaned in EPCON. | sandy water (being tested), well-cleaning, etc. Can replace degassing drum and hydrocyclones or produced water separators and flocculation units. There may be a need for flotation gas and flocculent. |
| 2) <i>Filtration Unit</i> | Dissolved components incl. PAH and the heavier alkyl phenols. | 5 mg/l | The technology is being developed | CFU and FU have been tested on Gullfaks B and Oseberg C. | Critical concerning scale, particles and droplets of oil. |
| CETCO CrudeSep – Vertical compact unit | Dispersed oils, particles and some dissolved organic material plus exhaust gases. | | Tests in progress | I used e.g. on Ekofisk in connection with PWRI-pilot. | Takes up a lot of space if the water volumes are large. |
| CrudeSorb – Filter technology | Removes dispersed oil, PAH, phenols and alkyl phenols, and reduces the heavy metal content | | The technology is available/being used | Used for well clean-up; Heidrun, Sleipner, Gullfaks satellites, Jotun and internationally, Kristin | Filter mass with a long lifetime which can be reinjected or burnt. (Being tested.) Still questions concerning maintenance? May generate special waste |
| Flotation cells <i>Technology for meeting the requirement of 40 mg/l</i> <i>Flotation</i> | Dispersed oil | 20 – 60 mg/l | The technology is available | In use on several installations | High capacity, but needs a relatively high retention time and takes up much space |
| hydrocyclones <i>Technology for meeting the 40 mg/l requirement</i> | Dispersed oil | Removes approx. 50-95% depending on liquid characteristics 20-50 mg/l With the effect from a degassing | The technology is available | In use | May be connected in series New hydrocyclones have a higher efficiency due to new design, a lower rate per cyclone and a higher reject ratio. Variable efficiency and capacity. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | drum, the oil content in the water may in favorable conditions get as low as 10 – 15 mg/l | | | Inefficient for small-sized droplets, which are often found in water from condensate fields. The cleaning effect depends on chemicals being added during the process. |
| MPPE (Macro Porous Polymer Extraction) <i>Liquid – liquid extraction and steam stripping with a fixed matrix</i> | Dissolved components (PAH, BTEX) and volatile part of dispersed oil | Possible to remove 90% of dissolved components and 20 to 30% of dispersed oil | The technology is available | Tested on Åsgard A in 2001 with a good result, removed approx. 50% of dispersed oil in an overdimensioned test facility (decided not to install). Being considered on Troll Used in the Netherlands | May be used on gas platforms Can only handle small volumes Requires a lot of space Energy-demanding |
| Droplet growth technologies <i>A fiber material that increases the size of the oil droplets in the hydrocyclones</i> PECT-F | Reduces oil in water | 20 - 40% reduction of oil after cleaning in hydrocyclones | The technology is available | Installed on Draugen in 2001, shows less efficiency than during testing. Tested on Ekofisk, Eldfisk and Jotun. Installed on Heidrun in 2001 – improved efficiency towards 60%, but the hydrocyclones became clogged with naphthenes after a week. | The technologies have the greatest potential when the droplet size is such that moderate droplet growth leads to a great improvement in the efficiency of the hydrocyclones. According to the supplier, this is the case for condensate fields May be used in existing and new hydrocyclones. Capacity depends on the hydrocyclone. Problems with clogging of particles. Similar technology to Mares Tail. Needs no control system, requires little space, weight and maintenance. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Mares Tail <i>Corresponding technology to PECT-F.</i> | | | | The technology is considered for testing on Sleipner. | Must be placed upstream of the hydrocyclones. This makes it possible to install two units in parallel, where replacing the fiber spool can take place much faster than replacing the matrix in PECT-F, which has this one in the inlet chamber on the hydrocyclone vessel. |
| Hydroflock and G-Floc | | | | Tested on Draugen | Technologies which through moderate stirring within the chamber, where small amounts of coagulant and flocculent may also be added, achieve a cleaning effect corresponding to PECT-F and Mares Tail. |
| Centrifuges <i>Gravitation</i> | Dispersed oil and dispersed condensate | Effective for dispersed oil 5-25 mg/l | The technology is available | Troll A? and C. Used to clean drainage water on most of Hydro's installations | Application limited to moderate volumes of water. Used on drainage water and gas fields. <u>Advantages</u> Compact, no additives needed, handles variable water flows, the return flow is clean <u>Disadvantages</u> High investment, operation and maintenance costs, energy-demanding |

Principle 4 b) – Cleaning of produced sand

| Technologies | Cleans what | Cleaning effect | Technology status | References | Application/limitations |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Sand cyclones | Oily sand | < 1% adherence | The technology is available | Approved for installation on Gullfaks | |
| More robust hydrocyclones | Oily sand | < 1% adherence | The technology is available | Pre-project on Statfjord, under consideration on Vigdis | |
| Washing plant | Oily sand | < 1% adherence | The technology is available | Snorre B | In order to function optimally, the implementation of the technology should be planned in the design phase. Modifications on existing installations are expensive. |

Chemicals – Production

| Principle | Method | Reduces what /Effect on use and other discharges | Chemicals status | References | Applications/limitations |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|------------------|--|---|
| Avoid use of chemicals | Choice of materials | | Available | Used in several places on the Norwegian Shelf | Use of chromium steel in pipelines and production equipment in order to avoid injection of corrosion inhibitor |
| | Mechanical operations | Replaces wax inhibitors | | Nitrate injection in the water injection system is used full-scale on Veslefrikk and Gullfaks in order to eliminate use of biocides. | Use of nitrate in order to reduce the need for other chemicals (H2S) Increased pigging frequency as a replacement for wax inhibitors |
| Substitution/Reduction of chemicals | Development and replacement of chemicals | | Available | In process on all installations on the Norwegian Shelf | |
| | Optimization - <i>“Online meter” for oil in water</i> - <i>Move injection point</i> | | Available | Continuous work on all fields Online-meter on Oseberg C | Gives early warning of problems. |
| | ”Sko-flo” <i>Better control of chemicals</i> | | Available | Troll C, Oseberg Field Center, Oseberg C, Oseberg Sør, Oseberg Øst. Study carried out on Brage | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| | Framo contactor <i>(mixes chemicals)</i> | Framo-contactor reduces 30-35% of H ₂ S scavenger consumption | Available | Åsgard B, being considered on Gullfaks, Veslefrikk | |
| | Reuse of H₂S remover Recycling of MEG/TEG | Approx. 50% reuse when the H ₂ S remover is recycled | Installed on Ekofisk 1998 Recycling of MEG/TEG through gas dehydration and addition to prevent the formation of hydrates. | Ekofisk 2/4-J Planned on Skirne/Byggve E.g. Heimdal | |
| Reuse | Washing chemicals etc. | | Available | | |
| Disposal (injection) | Amino plant <i>Removal of H₂S</i> | | | Åsgard | |
| Discharge | Absorbs dissolved components and PAH | | Available | Being tested on Statfjord B and C, Draugen | Degree of separation increases with increasing temperature and salinity. Rest product in the form of mud. |
| Nature <i>Flocculent that is added upstream of the crude oil, i.e. before degassing drums</i> | | | | | |

Drilling and well

Principle 1 – Reduce the amount of drilling waste

| Technologies | Effect on other emissions/ discharges | Reduction potential (drilling waste %) | Technology status | References | Applications/limitations |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Reduce well diameter Replace 26”pipes with 17 ½” | | 50% reduction in discharge of drilling fluids, cement and cuttings in the top hole section | The technology is available | Gulfaks, Norne, Draugen | |
| Slim hole drilling Changing well design, casings | Reduces emissions to air | 80% reduction in discharge of drilling fluids, cement and cuttings | The technology is available | Statfjord, Sleipner | |
| Branch drilling | Reduces emissions to air Reduces amounts of drill cuttings, drilling fluid and chemicals | | The technology is available | Troll B, Troll C, etc | |
| Monodiameter well design Thomas – Rife Gas Unit | Reduces emissions to air | Reduction of drill cuttings up to 50%. | Tested by Shell onshore in Texas. Planned used offshore in the Gulf of Mexico in 2003 (SepCo) | Well no. 15 Stan County, Texas. | Replaces conventional well design from top hole to bottom |

Principle 2 - Reuse

| Technologies/methods | Effect on other emissions/ discharges | Reduction potential % | Technology status | References | Applications/limitations |
|------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|--|---|
| Water-based drilling fluids | Increased emissions to air (during transport) | 30% reduction in discharges of drilling fluids | | Gullfaks, Statfjord, Veslefrikk, Huldra, Norne, Heidrun, Draugen, being planned on Mikkell On average, 88% of water-based drilling fluids are reused on all of Hydro's drilling installations. A base for reuse has been established at Mongstad. | Can limit the choice of drilling fluids. Reuse of drilling fluids reduces the use of chemicals, but may lead to a somewhat more uncertain data collection (geology/petrophysics). |
| Oil-based drilling fluids | Increased emissions to air (during transport) | Reduction in total consumption | | Ula and Gyda, Valhall Oseberg B, Oseberg Sør, Brage | Reuse of drilling fluids reduces the use of chemicals, but may lead to a somewhat more uncertain data collection (geology/petrophysics). Requires drill cutting injection /transport to land – zero discharge to sea |
| Synthetic drilling fluids | Increased emissions to air (during transport) | Reduction in total consumption | | Planned on Skirne/Byggve Hydro: All OBM or POBM are reused. A bank for reuse has been established at Mongstad. | |
| Completion fluid/chemicals | | 30 % reduction in discharge of chemicals | | Gullfaks, Statfjord, Huldra, Norne, Heidrun, all Hydro's fields | |
| NeoDrills "Preconduct" | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Pre-installation of conductor pipes for subsea wells | No discharge, cuttings reduced by 30-50 m ³ cuttings per well | | The technology has been partially tested. | Studies in process or completed for Glitne, Tampen and Goliat. | |
| Riserless Mud Return System - RMR | | | The technology is under assessment | | Possibility of safeguarding drilling fluids and drilled-out mass from the top hole section. |

Principle 3 – Disposal

| Technologies | Effect on other emissions/ discharges | Reduction potential % | Technology status | References | Applications/limitations |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Injection of drill cuttings | Lower emissions to air than with transport/ processing on land. | | The technology is available | Brage, Ekofisk, Eldfisk, Ringhorne, Gullfaks, Statfjord (A+B+C), Gyda, Valhall, Jotun, Oseberg B (Field Center), Oseberg C, Oseberg Sør and Øst, Sleipner Vest, Varg, Snorre B (being considered for Snorre TLP), being considered for Heidrun Tambar, Visund, Veslefrikk, Ula, Grane and Kvitebjørn (planning cuttings) | Applicable to oil-based drilling fluids. Alternative to transport to land for processing. |
| Injection of slop (residue of oil and chemicals) | | | | All installations that have injection of cuttings | |
| Injection of used drilling fluids | | | | All installations that have injection of cuttings | |
| Injection of cementing chemicals (mixing water) | Increases emissions of CO ₂ and NO _x | 95 % reduction in emission | | Gyda, Ula, Valhall, Norne, Oseberg C, Oseberg Field Center, Brage | |
| Injection of completion chemicals | Increases emissions of CO ₂ and NO _x | 95 % reduction in emission | | Gyda, Ula, Valhall, Jotun, Oseberg C, Oseberg Field Center, Brage | |

Principle 4 – Emissions/discharges

| Methods/materials/chemicals | Effects on other emissions/discharges | Reduction potential % | Technology status | References | Applications/limitations |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Ilmenite <i>(alternative weight material – black color)</i> | Increased consumption of washing chemicals | Reduced emission/dischARGE of heavy metals | Further tests will be conducted | Is used on Hod, Norne, Ekofisk, Eldfisk, Gyda, Ula, Draugen Considered for use on Heidrun, Valhall, Åsgard, Kristin | Leak tests have been conducted, these do not document whether they are biologically available. Functions operationally. More dust is formed (visual impression), which leads to increased need for cleaning/painting. |
| Hematite <i>(alternative weight material – red color due to iron)</i> | | | Available | Hydro has conducted tests, used by Agip in the Barents Sea. Will be tested on a Hydro well in 2003. | Functions operationally. Iron may affect the drilling stability in directional drilling. |
| Heavy salt solutions | | | Available | Considered for use on Kristin (must have oil-based as a backup) Tune | |
| Water-based drilling fluids in all sections | Reduced emissions to air Increased discharge of chemicals | Reduced consumption of oil-based drilling fluids | Available | Heidrun, Draugen, Troll A, Troll B and C pre-drilling, Grane exploration drilling Being considered for Mikkell | Limited to simple well paths. The current technology is not good enough to replace oil-based drilling fluids. On Troll, Hydro uses this with up to three branches. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--------------------|--|
| New procedures for reduced consumption of chemicals - <i>Washing chemicals</i> - <i>Cement chemicals</i> | | | Available | Statfjord Norne | |
|---|--|--|-----------|--------------------|--|

Pipelines

| Principle | Method | Reduces what/ Effect on other emissions/ discharges | Chemical status | References | Applications/limitations |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|---|---|
| Avoid use of chemicals | Choice of materials Use of fresh water when laying pipelines | Reduces use of oxygen scavenger/biocide | Available Available | Grane | When landing – fresh water from land Also possible in connection with short pipeline stretches offshore, tie-ins of satellites, etc. Depends of the fresh water resources offshore. |
| Substitution/ Reduction of chemicals | Start-up - <i>reduce the use of dyes</i> - <i>reduce the use of biocide</i> - <i>reduce the use of corrosion inhibitor</i> - <i>use of fresh water and NaOH</i> | Reduces the use of corrosion inhibitor | Available Available | Draugen Draugen activity planned without use OTS to Sture | Dye as pellet – to be placed at the joint Preventive treatment to avoid growth of bacteria Run the cleaning pig regularly to avoid deposits which prevents the corrosion inhibitor from working properly and encourage bacteria growth. |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| | <i>Start-up/operation</i> - <i>Electrical heating</i> | Reduced the use of hydrate inhibitor and gives less flaring, but increases consumption of energy | | Åsgard | Less MeOH in the gas export pipeline |
|--|---|--|--|--------|--------------------------------------|

Utsira injection

Utsira is a shallow sandstone formation containing approximately 40% salty water.

The salinity in the Utsira water is more or less the same as the salinity in produced water from Statfjord B. The Utsira formation stretches across large sections of the North Sea, encompassing an area of approximately 26 000 km² and a volume of around 550 billion m³.

Utsira is a shallow formation, about 1000 meters under the seabed, with low pressure. The formation has good injectivity. Even though the pressure is low, a considerable increase in emissions to air of CO₂ and NO_x may occur when large quantities of water are injected.

Oily drill cuttings have been injected via the annulus into Utsira from several fields over the last eight to ten years. Associated gas from Glitne is injected into Utsira. Produced water from Kvitebjørn will be injected into Utsira. Brage uses sulfate-free Utsira water as injection water. Separated CO₂ from the Sleipner Vest gas is injected into Utsira.

A layer of shale above Utsira makes the formation leak-proof. The EU-sponsored research project SACS ("Saline Aquifer CO₂ Storage") has monitored the storage of CO₂ in the Utsira formation. The conclusion is that no CO₂ is leaking out from the Utsira formation.

A study has been conducted in the Statfjord late phase project with regard to produced water injection into Utsira/Hordaland. The study concludes that Utsira/Hordaland has the potential to receive the entire or parts of the produced water flow from Statfjord. The costs of an injection solution are calculated to be high, since most of the water must be injected from seabed wells that first have to be drilled. Any effects on other fields' exploitation of Utsira are expected to be marginal.