

EU REGULATION OF CROSS-BORDER CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE

ENERGY & LAW SERIES

1. *European Energy Law Report I*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and Ulf Hammer (eds.)
2. *The Regulation of Power Exchanges in Europe*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and François Boisseleau (eds.)
3. *European Energy Law Report II*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and Ulf Hammer (eds.)
4. *European Energy Law Report III*, Ulf Hammer and Martha M. Roggenkamp (eds.)
5. *European Energy Law Report IV*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and Ulf Hammer (eds.)
6. *A Functional Legal Design for Reliable Electricity Supply*, Hamilcar P.A. Knops
7. *European Energy Law Report V*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and Ulf Hammer (eds.)
8. *European Energy and Law Report VI*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and Ulf Hammer (eds.)
9. *Electricity and Gas Supply Network Unbundling in Germany, Great Britain and the Netherlands and the Law of the European Union: A Comparison*, E. Ehlers
10. *Legal Design of Carbon Capture and Storage – Developments in the Netherlands from an International and EU Perspective*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and E. Woerdman (eds.)
11. *European Energy Law Report VII*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and Ulf Hammer (eds.)
12. *European Energy Law Report VIII*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and Ulf Hammer (eds.)
13. *European Energy Law Report IX*, Martha M. Roggenkamp and Ulf Hammer (eds.)
14. *EU Regulation of Cross-Border Carbon capture and Storage*, Marijn Holwerda

EU REGULATION OF CROSS-
BORDER CARBON CAPTURE
AND STORAGE

Legal Issues under the Directive
on the Geological Storage of CO₂
in the light of Primary EU Law

Marijn HOLWERDA



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Publishing Ltd.

Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road

Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 1223 393 753 | Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK:

NBN International

Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road

Plymouth, PL6 7 PP

United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331

Email: orders@nbninternational.com

Distribution for the USA and Canada:

International Specialized Book Services

920 NE 58th Ave. Suite 300

Portland, OR 97213

USA

Tel.: +1 800 944 6190 (toll free)

Email: info@isbs.com

Distribution for Austria:

Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag

Argentinerstraße 42/6

1040 Wien

Austria

Tel.: +43 1 535 61 03 24

Email: office@nwv.at

Distribution for other countries:

Intersentia Publishing nv

Groenstraat 31

2640 Mortsel

Belgium

Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50

Email: mail@intersentia.be

The Energy & Law Series

The Energy & Law Series is published in parallel with the Dutch series *Energie & Recht*.

Members of the editorial committee are:

Prof. Dr. Martha M. Roggenkamp, University of Groningen and Simmons & Simmons, Rotterdam (editor in chief)

Prof. Dr. Kurt Deketelaere, Institute of Environmental and Energy Law, University of Leuven

Prof. Dr. Leigh Hancher, Allen & Overy, Amsterdam and Tilburg University, Tilburg and Council Member, WRR

Dr. Tom Vanden Borre, Chief Counsellor, Commission for the Regulation of Electricity and Gas (CREG) and University of Leuven

EU Regulation of Cross-Border Carbon Capture and Storage. Legal issues under the Directive on the geological storage of CO₂ in the light of primary EU law

Marijn Holwerda

© 2014 Intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Cover photograph © Nikolay Sereda – Dreamstime.com

ISBN 978-1-78068-190-0

D/2014/7849/32

NUR 828

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

FOREWORD

Those who have written a PhD thesis know what a trying process it can be. Having started with my thesis in the fall of 2009, I am extremely happy to have finished in the fall of 2013. At the beginning of these four years, I sometimes got the impression that a lot of people see the writing of a PhD thesis as an unavoidable never-ending horror story or, even worse, a mission impossible. Needless to say that such an approach is not particularly encouraging for the new PhD researcher. I hope that this thesis shows young PhD researchers that it is far from a mission impossible and can perhaps even be fun.

It is only because of the help of a lot of people that I have been able to bring this PhD project to a good end. Many of these people I have already thanked or will thank in person soon. However, I would like to expressly thank a few here.

First of all, I would like to thank RWE AG and Essent B.V. and all the people from both companies who were involved in my project for their support. Without the (financial) support provided by RWE and Essent, this PhD project would not have existed in the first place. Second, I would like to thank the Dutch national research and development programme for CO₂ capture, transport and storage (CATO-2) for letting me be part of such a stimulating and successful research programme. Third, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisors, Professors Martha Roggenkamp and Hans Vedder, for supervising my PhD and helping me bring this project to a good end. Fourth, I would like to thank the members of the PhD reading committee for reading my work, despite their busy schedules and summer holidays: Professors Hans Christian Bugge, Jan Jans and John Paterson. Fifth, I would like to thank my university roommate Hannah for four years of academic discussions, mind challenging and support. Finally, I would like to thank my love and life, Marieke, for her endless support and patience.

Marijn Holwerda
Groningen, September 2013

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	v
Introduction	1
The CCS Directive	1
Cross-border CCS deployment	5
Approach	7
Contribution	9
Structure	10
Chapter I.	
Carbon Capture and Storage: Concept and Technology	17
1.1 Capture technologies	18
1.1.1 Capture from industrial process streams	18
1.1.2 Post-combustion capture	19
1.1.3 Oxy-fuel combustion capture	20
1.1.4 Pre-combustion capture	21
1.1.5 Carbon capturing and power plant efficiency	22
1.2 Compression technologies	22
1.3 Transport technologies	23
1.4 Storage technologies	26
1.4.1 Geological storage of CO ₂	26
1.4.1.1 Underground CO ₂ behaviour	27
1.4.1.2 CO ₂ storage mechanisms	28
1.4.1.3 Storage formations	29
a) Oil and gas fields	29
b) Saline formations	30
c) Unmineable coal beds and other storage options ...	31
1.4.1.4 Global geological storage capacity estimates	31
Chapter II.	
The CCS Directive: a Brief Overview	33
2.1 Scope of the CCS Directive	33
2.2 Incentivising CCS deployment	34

2.3	CO ₂ capture.....	36
2.3.1	CO ₂ stream purity.....	36
2.3.2	Environmental impact assessment.....	36
2.3.3	Obliging CO ₂ capture.....	37
2.4	CO ₂ transport.....	39
2.4.1	Third-party access.....	40
2.5	CO ₂ storage.....	40
2.5.1	Pre-storage.....	41
2.5.1.1	Storage site selection.....	41
2.5.1.2	Permitting procedures.....	41
2.5.2	Operation.....	42
2.5.2.1	Monitoring.....	42
2.5.2.2	Inspections.....	43
2.5.2.3	When something goes wrong.....	43
2.5.2.4	Liabilities.....	43
2.5.3	Closure and post-closure.....	44
2.5.3.1	Closure.....	44
2.5.3.2	Transfer of responsibility.....	45
2.5.3.3	Financial mechanism.....	46
2.6	Implementing the CCS Directive.....	46

Chapter III.

CO₂ Stream Purity and Member States' Scope to Impose Stricter Norms.... 49

3.1	Introduction.....	49
3.2	Article 12 of the CCS Directive and the Commission's guidelines.....	52
3.2.1	Article 12 of the CCS Directive.....	52
3.2.2	The Commission's guidelines on CO ₂ stream composition.....	56
3.3	Qualifying captured CO ₂ for storage under EU internal market provisions.....	58
3.4	Assessing the scope for stricter environmental protection measures....	60
3.4.1	Exhaustion.....	60
3.4.2	(Minimum) harmonisation.....	61
3.5	Article 193 TFEU and secondary EU environmental law.....	62
3.5.1	Case C-318/98 <i>Fornasar</i>	64
3.5.2	Case C-510/99 <i>Tridon</i>	66
3.5.3	Case C-6/03 <i>Deponiezweckverband</i>	67
3.5.4	Other cases (2007–2010).....	68
3.6	Member States' scope to adopt stricter CO ₂ stream-purity criteria.....	69
3.6.1	Exhaustion and CO ₂ stream purity under EU law.....	69
3.6.2	The degree of harmonisation of Article 12 of the CCS Directive.....	72

3.6.3	The conformity of stricter CO ₂ stream-purity criteria with primary EU law	78
3.7	Lessons for Member States seeking to adopt stricter CO ₂ stream-purity criteria	81

Chapter IV.

Storage Site Stewardship Financing and the Cross-Border Storage of CO₂ . . 83

4.1	Introduction	83
4.2	Articles 19 and 20 of the CCS Directive and the financing of storage site stewardship	86
4.3	Captured CO ₂ for storage under EU internal market provisions	89
4.4	Article 110 TFEU	95
4.4.1	Purpose	95
4.4.2	Scope and content	96
4.4.3	Article 110(1) TFEU	100
4.4.4	Article 110(2) TFEU	104
4.4.5	The (exemption) system applied by the ECJ	107
4.5	Selected Article 110 TFEU cases	112
4.5.1	Case C-213/96 <i>Outokumpu</i>	113
4.5.2	Case C-221/06 <i>Stadtgemeinde Frohnleiten</i>	117
4.5.3	Case C-74/06 <i>Commission v. Greece</i>	122
4.6	Lessons for the design of financial security/mechanism charges.	126

Chapter V.

Refusing Access to CCS Infrastructure and the General EU Law Principle of Loyalty 129

5.1	Introduction	129
5.2	Article 21(2)(b) of the CCS Directive	132
5.3	General principles of EU law	136
5.4	The general EU law principle of loyalty	141
5.5	Article 194(1) TFEU	143
5.6	The conformity of Article 21(2)(b) CCS Directive with Articles 4(3) TEU and 194(1)(c) TFEU	146
5.7	Articles 4(3) TEU and 194(1)(c) TFEU and Member States' implementation of Article 21(2)(b) CCS Directive	147
5.7.1	Article 4(3) TEU	148
5.7.2	Article 194(1)(c) TFEU	152
5.7.3	The direct effect of Treaty provisions	155
5.7.4	The direct effect of Article 4(3) TEU	158
5.7.4.1	The scholarly debate	158
5.7.4.2	Article 4(3) TEU and the Courts' criteria	163
5.7.5	The direct effect of Article 194(1)(c) TFEU	165

5.8	Lessons for the design of Member States' regimes for third-party access to CO ₂ transport and storage infrastructure	166
-----	---	-----

Chapter VI.

	Refusing Access to CCS Infrastructure and Article 102 TFEU	169
--	---	------------

6.1	Introduction	169
6.2	Article 21(2)(c) of the CCS Directive	171
6.3	Article 102 TFEU: abuse of a dominant position	175
6.3.1	Dominance and CO ₂ transport and storage operators	177
6.3.1.1	A position of 'dominance'	177
6.3.1.2	The relevant CCS product markets	180
6.3.1.3	The relevant CCS geographic markets	184
6.3.1.4	The competitive position of CO ₂ transport and storage operators	191
6.3.2	Abuse and dominant CO ₂ transport and storage operators	200
6.3.2.1	'Abuse' of a dominant position	200
6.3.2.2	Refusing to deal	202
a)	The concept of refusal to deal	202
b)	The requirement of two separate but vertically related markets	204
c)	Changes following the Commission's guidance notice	207
6.3.2.3	Refusing to grant access to CO ₂ transport and storage infrastructure	213
6.4	Justifications and exceptions	218
6.4.1	Objective justification	218
6.4.2	The 'state action defence'	222
6.4.2.1	<i>Deutsche Telekom</i> : decision 2003/707/EC and cases T-271/03 and C-280/08 P	223
6.4.3	Article 106(2) TFEU	228
6.5	Lessons for CO ₂ transport and storage operators	230

Chapter VII.

	The Development and Management of CO₂ Transport Infrastructure and EU Antitrust Law	235
--	---	------------

7.1	Introduction	235
7.2	Comparing natural gas and CO ₂ transport (infrastructure)	237
7.3	<i>GDF</i> (39.316)	239
7.4	<i>RWE</i> (39.402)	244
7.5	<i>E.ON</i> (39.317)	247

7.6	<i>ENI</i> (cases A358 and 39.315)	250
7.6.1	The Italian <i>ENI</i> case (A358)	250
7.6.2	The EU <i>ENI</i> case (39.315)	253
7.6.2.1	Case 39.315.	253
7.6.2.2	The concept of strategic underinvestment	257
	a) Debating the concept of strategic underinvestment	257
	b) The (economic) validity of the concept of strategic underinvestment	260
7.7	Lessons for the development and management of CO ₂ transport infrastructure	268
Chapter VIII.		
Centralising CO₂ Storage Site Selection under EU Law		
8.1	Introduction	271
8.2	Articles 192 and 194 TFEU	275
8.2.1	Article 192 TFEU	275
	8.2.1.1 Measures affecting quantitative management of water resources	276
	8.2.1.2 Measures affecting land use	280
	8.2.1.3 Measures significantly affecting a Member State's energy source choice	282
	8.2.2 Article 194 TFEU	285
8.3	Article 345 TFEU	287
	8.3.1 Literature	287
	8.3.2 Case law	293
	8.3.2.1 General lessons	293
	8.3.2.2 Selected Article 345 TFEU cases	296
	a) The golden shares cases	296
	b) Cases C-491/01 <i>British American Tobacco</i> and T-65/98 <i>Van den Bergh Foods</i>	301
	c) The implications of an amended Article 4(1) of the CCS Directive	305
8.4	Lessons for an amendment of Article 4(1) of the CCS Directive	307
Chapter IX.		
Public Funding of CCS Infrastructure and EU State Aid Law		
9.1	Introduction	311
9.2	Article 107 TFEU	314
9.3	Article 107(1) TFEU and the financing of services of general economic interest	316

9.4	Case C-280/00 <i>Altmark</i>	319
9.4.1	The ruling	319
9.4.2	Interpretation of the ruling	321
9.5	The (fourth) <i>Altmark</i> efficiency criterion	323
9.5.1	Interpreting the <i>Altmark</i> efficiency criterion	323
9.5.2	Joined cases C-83/01 P, C-93/01 P and C-94/01 P <i>Chronopost</i> . . .	326
9.5.3	Interpreting <i>Chronopost</i>	328
9.6	The efficiency criterion in post- <i>Altmark</i> decision practice and case law	330
9.6.1	The Commission's post- <i>Altmark</i> decision practice on infrastructure development	330
9.6.1.1	Case N 475/2003 <i>CADA</i>	331
9.6.1.2	Cases N 381/2004, N 382/2004 and N 331/2008 <i>French broadband cases</i>	332
9.6.1.3	Case C 35/2005 <i>Breedbandnetwerk Appingedam</i>	334
9.6.1.4	Case N 362/2009 <i>Sociétés concessionnaires d'autoroutes</i>	335
9.6.1.5	Case N 630/2009 <i>Projet T3 Est Parisien</i>	336
9.6.2	The Commission's 2011 <i>Altmark</i> package	337
9.6.3	The post- <i>Altmark</i> case law	342
9.6.3.1	Case T-289/03 <i>BUPA</i>	342
9.6.3.2	Case T-442/03 <i>SIC II</i>	346
9.6.3.3	Case T-274/01 <i>Valmont</i>	348
9.6.3.4	Joined Cases T-309/04, T-317/04, T-329/04 and T-336/04 <i>TV2/Danmark</i>	349
9.6.3.5	Case T-388/03 <i>Deutsche Post and DHL</i>	350
9.7	Lessons for public funding of CO ₂ transport and storage infrastructure	352
	Conclusions	355
	Legal issues examined in Chapters III–IX	355
	Consequences of the legislative approach chosen	363
	<i>Bibliography</i>	369