



# Report from Breakout Session I Monitoring & Reporting

**Moderator:** Haydn Jones, Environment Agency, England, UK  
**Rapporteur:** Christian Heller, Umweltbundesamt GmbH, AT  
(Alex Pijnenburg, NEA, NL)

**7<sup>th</sup> EU ETS Compliance Conference  
Brussels, 8 & 9 November 2016**

# Main discussion points

- *Which level of detail of monitoring procedures is needed in the MP? How does this interact with Article 13?*
- *In which cases are improvement reports useful and effectively and efficiently leading to improvements?*
- *Which administrative procedures and which involvement of CA's is needed?*
- *Are provisions in Article 13 on simplified MP clear and which simplifications in MP and verification are possible? ?*
- *What is the scope of Article 13: Should each MS identify simple installation or should the MRR have fixed criteria?*
- *Is verification needed every year for simple installations?*

# Main discussion points

- *Is changing Article 26 of tier requirements needed or is changing tier requirements too confusing for operators? Is there still added value for the 3-years transitional period?*
- *How to address future developments for transport/venting of CO<sub>2</sub> for CCS in the MRR? Who is identified as an operator if CO<sub>2</sub> is transported by ships/trucks? Who is liable? Involved are capture plant, transporter, and storage facility. Should Art. 24 opt-in be considered? How to treated vented CO<sub>2</sub>?*
- *Do we need an MRV for activity data, and how and who to pick up this issue?*

# Conclusions

- *A two level approach on MP-procedures is feasible and could be useful for both improving robustness of the monitoring plan and simplifications.*
- *In general improvement report is a useful tool. Elements of the improvement cycle as well as the need for such as well as approval in all cases should be evaluated.*
- *Article 13 is not widely used. There are different opinions about the need for rewriting Article 13. More clarification and guidance for introducing simplified MP's is needed.*

# Conclusions

- *Useful to explore possible improvements in Article 26, especially how to deal with 3 years period*
- *Future MRV should address CO2 transport not in pipelines. CCS from biomass and CO2-venting are policy issues for the WPE. Art. 24 opt-in should be considered.*
- *MRV for activity data for allocation is needed to ensure data quality, efficiency and credibility for allocation. Cooperation with TWG-Benchmarking is needed.*

# Recommendations – Next Steps

- *The TF Monitoring is asked to continue to discuss*
  - **How can a two level approach for monitoring plan procedures work out in practice**
  - **Evaluation of the need for different improvement reports, and the MS role in the approval process**
  - **Evaluation of Article 26 (including the 3 years transactional period for possible improvement and simplification.**
- *MS are invited to add suggestions and comments on MRR-2020 sheets (→ Task Force)*

# Recommendations – Next Steps

- *The Commission is asked to publish an example of a simplified monitoring plan, including guidance and clarification.*
- *TF CCS is asked to cooperate with TF monitoring to explore which consequences other transportation modalities have for MRR and other legislation.*
- *The need for a MRR on allocation data should be addressed in the TWG on Benchmarking and the WPE.*