



Overview

- Objective of the paper
- Impacts and risks to be managed
- Inclusion of CCS in the EU ETS
- Filling remaining gaps with other EU law
- Waste management law does it add anything?
- Outstanding policy questions
- Policy choices



Objective

- To outline the nature of the risks posed, and what is needed in a management framework
- To consider options for regulating these risks using existing EU law
- To stimulate a debate on the most appropriate way forward



Impacts and risks to be managed

1. Emissions of other 1. Pipeline routing	4. Above ground installation siting
pollutants to various media (such as SOx, NOx, solid waste and upstream impacts) 2. Occupational and local environmental health and safety (EHS) risks posed by the presence of large volumes of pressurised CO ₂ , H ₂ , and O ₂ at capture plants; 3. Environmental concerns from	 Above ground installation siting, construction etc. + prospection Global risk - that the stored CO₂ is reemitted to the atmosphere, Local EHS risks - associated with the impacts and effects of CO₂ storage and un-planned loss of containment. These EHS risks can be split into: surface release: asphyxiation and ecosystem impacts (tree roots, ground animals etc.) effects of impurities on the subsurface impacts of CO₂ in the subsurface: e.g. metal or other contaminant mobilisation) quantity-based (physical) effects e.g. induced seismicity, etc local EHS risks posed by the presence of large volumes of pressurised CO₂ at injection facilities and storage sites.



Regulatory needs

- Risk assessment and risk management: enforce risk assessment and management, inc tech stds on design, operation, and closure
- Verification and assurance (consenting regime): to ensure consistent stds for site selection across EU-27
- Enforced closure powers: for unsatisfactory operations
- Liability:
 - Local and global damage
 - Upfront financial provisions
 - Liability transfer



EU ETS – what it could achieve

Regulatory need	Achieved under EU ETS?
Risk assessment	Baseline survey and leakage risk assessment [partial coverage]: Monitoring scheme design must be site specific and risk-based
Risk management	Monitoring & reporting (M&R): under Art 4-6 (GHG Permit) subject to regulatory approval
	Impurities: must be monitored [for accounting purposes]
	Post closure M&R: enforceable so long as GHG permit valid
Liability	Global risk: Any emissions "offset" via EU ETS (so long as zero allocation to installation(s))
	Liability transfer [partial]: on withdrawal of GHG permit, perhaps not?



What EIA, IPPC, Seveso, ELD might add

Regulatory need	Other EU laws
Risk assessment & management	EIA: Site selection+characterisation, site-level risk assessment, risk management system, monitoring receptors, pipeline routing
Enforced closure	IPPC: Technical design standards, monitoring plan, site closure conditions. Trigger enforced closure
	Seveso II: More detailed risk assessment, emergency planning
Verification &	Three-tier approvals structure in place.
assurance	EIA: open to consenting at CA discretion – may be a need to harmonise with <i>de minimis</i> consenting conditions
	IPPC: will require a BREF.
	Seveso II: inclusions is a policy decision
Liability	IPPC: qualification would trigger ELD.
	Liability for damage post-closure
	No financial securities.



Waste designation

- Waste notification provisions: create a "duty of care" for producer. But chain of custody already created under EU ETS. Would allocate liability on producer
- Landfill Directive provisions: ambiguity and unsuitable technical standards. Does create requirement for financial securities

Probably no real advantage to using waste management legislation to regulate CCS



Outstanding policy issues

- 1. Whether there is a need to harmonise consenting procedures for storage sites, through:
 - Prescriptive guidance/legislation?
 - EU level approval (comitology or otherwise)?
- 2. Whether a BREF is the right regulatory instrument for CO₂ storage site tech standards?
- 3. Whether there is a need for financial securities?
- 4. Whether Seveso should be conferred on to CCS?



Regulatory options/choices

- 1. Include each part of chain in EU ETS. Modify EIA, IPPC, Seveso (ELD?) to cover gaps, *absent* of any new-stand alone legislation. Disapply waste law.
- 2. As for 1. (either complete or partial implementation of exisitng EU law) but introduce *new parallel* stand-alone legislation (like LFD). Disapply waste law.
- 3. Similar to 2. but exclude provision of all current laws and create *entirely new* stand-alone legislation.
- 4. Include only capture part in EU ETS. Create new permitting and licensing regime for transport and storage (based around waste law "duty of care")
- 5. Continue on the basis of CCS being a waste disposal activity, and apply waste laws.

