

Response form for the consultation on the proposed offshore carbon dioxide storage licensing regime URN 09D/753RF

**Implementing the Energy Act 2008** 

September 2009

## Consultation on the proposed offshore carbon dioxide storage licensing regime

## **Consultation Response Form**

The closing date for this consultation is 30<sup>th</sup> December 2009.

You may find it helpful to set out your responses to the consultation using this response form.

Please send your responses by email (preferably) to: Ricki.kiff@decc.gsi.gov.uk

Alternatively please send your response in hard copy form to:

Ricki Kiff
Team: Energy Development Unit
Department of Energy and Climate Change
3 Whitehall Place
London
SW1A 2AW

Please complete the following details.

Respondent's Name

Dr Christopher Pater

Respondent Organisation's name and remit (if applicable):

Marine Planner, English Heritage

## Contact details:

Maritime Archaeology Team, English Heritage, Fort Cumberland, Portsmouth PO4 9LD

Please cross one box from the following list of options that best describes you.			
	Developer or developers' representative organisation		
	Marine environment user (e.g. navigational, fishing interests)		
X E	Environment or heritage organisation		
	Central Government organisation, Agency or statutory adviser		
	Devolved Administration		
	ocal Government		
	Regional organisation		
	aw firm		
A	Academic institution		
	Consultant		
☐ Ir	ndividual		
	Other (please specify)		
Please feel free to answer as many or as few questions as you wish. It is helpful if you can explain your views as fully as possible in the comments boxes, especially where you disagree with the proposals set out in the consultation paper.			
Q.1 Do you agree that the approach outlined above in relation to the priority rights for an incumbent petroleum licensee wishing to apply for a carbon storage licence is appropriate? If not, please explain what other approach you recommend and why.			
Yes:	No: No view: X		
Comments			
No comment to offer			
	-		

Q2. Do you agree with the time periods proposed for the appraisal period and submission of a storage permit application? What time period might be appropriate where a deep saline formation is being characterised rather than a petroleum formation?				
Yes:	No:	No view: <b>X</b>		
0				
No comment to of	fer			
Q3. Do you have any views on the suggested structure of the licensing regime outlined in Stages 2-4? Do you agree with the proposal for a framework licence which covers the development from the appraisal phase right though to the post closure period, and provides a framework for the application for and consenting to a storage permit?				
Yes: X	No:	No view:		
Comments				
The approach pro	posed seems to b	e appropriate.		
Q4. We would Public Register a Would a purely w	welcome views a and additionally v	e appropriate.  as to what exactly should be in the what form the register should take. ter (open to all) be satisfactory or oduced by the Department?		
Q4. We would Public Register a Would a purely w	welcome views a and additionally v	as to what exactly should be in the what form the register should take. ter (open to all) be satisfactory or		
Q4. We would Public Register a Would a purely w should a hard co	welcome views a and additionally web based Regist py version be pr	as to what exactly should be in the what form the register should take. ter (open to all) be satisfactory or oduced by the Department?		
Q4. We would Public Register a Would a purely with should a hard co	welcome views a and additionally v yeb based Regist py version be pr	as to what exactly should be in the what form the register should take. ter (open to all) be satisfactory or oduced by the Department?		
Q4. We would Public Register a Would a purely w should a hard co  Yes: X  Comments  The Department s  Q5. Do you h	welcome views and additionally veb based Registry version be productionally with the production of the	as to what exactly should be in the what form the register should take. ter (open to all) be satisfactory or oduced by the Department?  No view:		

Comments			
No comment to offer			
Q6. Do you have any comments on the Draft transposition Regulation, implementing Directive 2009/31/EC on the geological storage of carbon dioxide into UK law, attached at Annex B?			
Yes: No: No view: X			
Comments			
No comment to offer			
Q7. Do you have any other comments on the proposals put forward in this consultation package? Are there other issues which should be covered by the licensing regime but are not addressed here?			
Yes: No: No view: X			
Comments			
No comment to offer			
Q8. Provided on the home page to this consultation is a partial Impact Assessment on the cost to industry and Government on administering the offshore carbon dioxide storage regime. We would welcome further information on the costs and benefits outlined in the document, in particular on the costs of providing financial security, to assist us in finalising this Impact Assessment.			
Yes: No: No view: X			
Comments			
No comment to offer			

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views!

The following typo was noted: Application fee for consent to the permit. Paragraph 89 – "A large degree of resource input will be required from DECC in helping a developer progress an application for a consent for storage operations to the <u>pint</u> of consent."