ZEP Advisory Council 60

Wednesday 25th September 2019

Agenda Item 1: Introduction and welcome

1.a. AC60 Agenda

Appended to this paper is the agenda for the 60th meeting of the Advisory Council.

1.b. AC59 Draft Minutes

Appended to this paper are the draft minutes for the 59th meeting of the Advisory Council, which took place on Wednesday 5th June.

The Advisory Council are invited to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

1.c. ACEC July Meeting Minutes

Appended to this paper are the minutes for the July meeting of the ACEC.

1.d. ACEC August Draft Meeting Minutes

Appended to this paper are the draft minutes for the August meeting of the ACEC.

1.e. Chair's update

Appended to this paper is a summary of the Chair's external meetings since the AC59 in June, and an update on SET-plan IWG9 CCS and CCU activities.

ZEP 60th Advisory Council meeting

Wednesday 25th September 2019

10:30-17:00

European Commission – DG NEAR
Room 09/MED1
Rue de la Loi 15, 1000 Brussels

Item		Lead Presenter	Time
1	Introduction and welcome	Graeme Sweeney	10:30 – 11:00
2	Secretariat Update	Luke Warren	11:00 – 11:10
3	The role of CCS and CCU in the EU Industrial Strategy	Peter Handley, DG GROW	11:10 – 11:40
4	Commission updates: • DG CLIMA • DG RTD • DG ENER	 Maria Velkova Vassilios Kougionas Peter Horvath	11:40 – 12:30
	Lunch		*12:30 – 13:15*
5	Overview of EU related activities	Per-Olof Granström	13:15 – 13:30
6	OGCI update on CCUS developments	Lamberto Eldering Kim Bye Bruun	13:30 – 13:50
7	Norwegian Government update on the London Protocol	Sofie Fogstad Vold	13:50 – 14:15
8	Business models for CCS and CCU: presentation and discussion on findings from the CCUS Advisory Group report	Patrick Dixon	14:15– 15:15
9	Review of Network Work Programmes Network Policy and Economics update: • TWG Policy and Funding • TWG PCIs • EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance Network Technology update: • TWG Collaboration across the CCS chain • TWG CCU and Sink Factor Methodology	 Lamberto Eldering, Kim Bye Bruun & Jonas Helseth Graeme Sweeney Filip Neele & Arthur Heberle	15:15 – 16:15

10	External Relations Group update	Jonas Helseth, Helen Bray	16:15 – 16:45
11	AOB and closing remarks	Graeme Sweeney	16:45 – 17:00

ZEP Advisory Council 59 – 05th June 2019

Draft Minutes

Attendance

Advisory Council members

Chris Littlecott	E3G
Didier Bonijoly	BRGM
Filip Neele	TNO
Florence Delprat-Jannaud	IFP Energies Nouvelles
Graeme Sweeney	ZEP Chairman
Helen Bray (alternate)	Shell
Jonas Helseth (alternate)	Bellona
Lamberto Eldering	Equinor
Marie Bysveen (alternate)	SINTEF
Philippa Parmiter (alternate)	SCCS
Rob van der Meer	HeidelbergCement
Ward Goldthorpe	Sustainable Decisions

Observers and other attendees

Angus Gillespie	GCCSI
Anne Cavendish	Equinor
Annya Schneider	GCCSI
Brian Murphy	ERVIA
Caterina de Matteis	IOGP
Claudia Vivalda	Vivalda Scientific
Damien Dallemagne	CO2 Value Europe
Egil Kåre Meisingset	Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, Government of Norway
Eric de Coninck	ArcelorMittal
Irma Pacevičiūtė	Equinor
Justus Andreas	Bellona
Keith Burnard	IEA GHG
Martijn Van de Sande	Netherlands Enterprise Agency
Sean Kidney	Climate Bonds
Sofie Vold Fogstad	Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, Government of Norway
Ståle Aakenes	Gassnova
Stijn Santen	CO2 Net
Svend Munkejord	SINTEF

ZEP Secretariat

Luke Warren	ZEP Secretariat
Marine d'Elloy	ZEP Secretariat

Commission

Arne Eriksson	DG ENER
Maria Velkova	DG CLIMA
Peter Horvath	DG ENER
Vassilios Kougionas	DG RTD

Item 1: Introduction

GS welcomed AC members and observers. The agenda for the meeting was adopted and the minutes from AC58 were approved.

There were no matters arising from the April and May ACEC minutes.

Chair's update

GS said that ZEP will support the European Commission in organising a workshop in early September at the EU-Norway CCS conference, which will be attended by the Commissioner. To ensure that all major stakeholders are invited and represented at the workshop, it was agreed that the Commission and ZEP will share contacts and the attendance list.

GS said that the SET-Plan activities on CCS and CCU are from the 1st May 2019, supported by a H2020 consortium ("Impacts9") of CCSA (Coordinator), BGS, CO2 Value Europe and Sintef. This will enable materially greater support to be provided to support deliver of the SET-Plan's CCS and CCU targets. The current focus of the IWG9 is on 1) collaboration across EU-funded CCS-related activities; 2) greater and broader Member State participation.

GS updated the AC on the engagement programme. GS met with the Permanent Representation of Romania to the EU, discussing views on the Energy Council's conclusions. GS highlighted the importance of this file, representing the legacy of the current Commission for the next college. GS said it is expected that discussions will continue in the autumn under the Finnish presidency.

Regarding the review of National Climate and Energy Plans (NECPs), GS said that ZEP will share its analysis with DG CLIMA and ENER.

ZEP had a discussion with the Secretariat General on the transition to net-zero and the treatment of cross-cutting issues between climate, energy and industrial policy. There were several mentions to the role of hydrogen; however, it seemed that there was no clear reflection on policies that will be needed to trigger its uptake. An outcome of the meeting is the request for ZEP to write a legacy paper with policy recommendations and specific asks for the new Commission, which the Secretariat will develop.

Item 2: Secretariat update

Actions from AC58

LW provided an update on actions from the last AC meeting.

All actions from previous meetings have been completed or are ongoing. ZEP distributed the slides on the EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance, prepared a draft template for CCS, presented policy recommendations at the Madrid Forum Workshop, identified Member States who have minimal or no mention to CCUS in their draft NECPs, updated the forward workplan, completed the CO2 safety report and followed-up with DG CLIMA regarding the organisation of the Innovation Fund workshop.

It was noted that an ongoing development is the preparation of a Gantt chart of EU projects in preparation of the Innovation Fund workshop.

2019 ZEP-C budget

LW said the AC58 adopted a revised 2019 ZEP-C budget which included two additional elements:

- €45,000 has been allocated towards increased communication activity in 2019. These funds are held by ZEP-C and the ERG will identify enhanced communication opportunities. The ERG has agreed that at present these funds should be retained for opportunities in the 2H 2019 when the new Brussels institutions are established.
- ZEP-C will seek to generate a budget surplus in 2019 of €50,000 which will allow the development of reserves to cover any potential future funding shortfalls.

Regarding the 2019 income, LW said that since the last AC, the invoices from BP, Equinor and Shell have been settled. The Crown Estate has informed ZEP that they are not in a position to support ZEP-C in 2019. This is largely a result of not having sufficient internal resources to engage with ZEP activities. In 2018 The Crown Estate provided €12,500 of support and so forecast income for 2019 is now €167,500.

LW said that given the reduction in income from the loss of the Crown Estate the forecast surplus is less than anticipated. The ACEC considered this matter and noted that there may still be under spend from Public Affairs which could mean that the surplus returns to the previously forecast level. The ACEC therefore remains comfortable with the forecast 2019 budgeted expenditure.

The AC confirmed it also remains comfortable with the forecast expenditure.

Item 3: ZEP-C AGM

ZEP-C members agreed that as a non-member GS could chair the AGM. GS confirmed the meeting to be quorate.

GS asked for approval of the annual accounts. This was unanimously approved.

GS informed the ZEP-C members that Gardiner Hill wishes to be dismissed as member of the board of directors and LE wishes to be appointed. This change was unanimously approved.

Item 4: Presentation and discussion on guidelines on LCA4CCU (CO2 Value Europe)

See presentation slides.

DD highlighted the lack of standards for LCA and presented the LCA4CCU methodology, highlighting that this methodology will be scrutinised by the Commission.

The consortium leading the work presented on LCA will look at guidance for low TRLs and developing guidelines for policy makers as part of the next phase of their work.

DD also introduced a study from Umwelt Bundesamt looking at integrating CCU into the ETS (‘Support for the revision of the Monitoring and Reporting Regulation for the 4th trading period, focus: Carbon Capture and Utilisation (CCU)’).

There was a discussion about the study’s framework and boundary definitions.

JH highlighted the issue of increased demand for baseload supply.

JH said that CO2 sources (DACCs, biomass, etc.) should not be ignored since the mitigation potential of CCU technologies also depends on the CO2 source. JH explained that when CO2

sources are not taken into, the outcome from a climate perspective is that it looks better to take CO2 from a coal plant than from the air because of the energy input that is needed.

GS explained the differences between a distributive LCA – which DD presented – and a consequential LCA which considers questions such as electricity production. GS explained why using a consequential LCA is important (without a consequential LCA it would be difficult to argue that the stock has been reduced).

Following this discussion, RvdM presented the work from the ZEP TWG on CCU, which assessed the Ramboll study. The work concludes that 4 key questions on the relevance and future of CCU technologies remain to be answered in political and legal terms:

- How relevant will CCU be in Europe?
- What is the real mitigation effect of CCU technologies?
  What emissions free (electrical and thermal) energy demand will be needed to achieve abatement by CCU projects?
- What legal framework is needed to achieve the implementation of CCU technologies?

RvdM also explained ZEP's view on the answers to these questions (see presentation slides).

DD and HB showed interest in joining the TWG and it was agreed that they would be invited to join the next TWG meetings.

Item 5: Commission Updates

DG CLIMA *MV*:

In response to Damien's presentation, MV said that DG CLIMA have moved away from the idea of requesting a full LCA for the Innovation Fund and are currently working with JRC on a methodology to calculate GHG emissions savings from CCU. JRC are therefore currently developing two sets of guidelines: 1) on the acceptance of CCU fuels under REDII; 2) for the selection of projects under the Innovation Fund.

This work is ongoing and JRC will organise a workshop to present the second methodology early next year. This will be followed by a public consultation. MV highlighted that the JRC are open and looking from input from any ongoing LCA project. NV noted that the methodology developed would not only affect CCU projects under the Innovation Fund but also projects that produce hydrogen.

Regarding the treatment of CCU under the ETS, MV confirmed that the ETS monitoring report is under revision and discussion are currently ongoing between Member at the Climate Change Committee.

In response to Rob's presentation, MV explained that some of the questions he mentioned could not be answered by Ramboll due to the lack of peer-reviewed data (i.e. on mineralisation). However, MV highlighted an important finding from Ramboll; the study concludes that using grid energy in particular would not be beneficial from a climate mitigation perspective. Taking Germany as reference, the percentage of renewable electricity would have to be a minimum of 86% in order to break-even in net carbon emissions between CO2-based and conventional fossil-based products.

Following-up on Rob's policy recommendations, MV said that no changes to the ETS would be made before 2030. However, MV said that the thinking is interesting and encouraged ZEP to continue its work in the area. MV added that it is important to think about potential new frameworks; nonetheless it is also equally important to think about the transition to these proposed frameworks.

MV updated the AC on the Innovation Fund. DG CLIMA are in the process of preparing the first call, aiming at publishing it in the second half of 2020. DG CLIMA are currently organising sectoral workshops with industry to discuss issues that are likely to emerge, especially with regards to selection criteria. The sectoral workshop on CCU will take place on 19th September and will be co-organised by CO2 Value Europe. The workshop on bioenergy will take place on 12th September.

With regards to the EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance, MV thanked CO2 GeoNet for the valuable evidence they provided. MV also noted that many climate and energy do not fully understand the principles underpinning CO2 storage. MV added that there is a need for better communication on CO2 storage safety, which would help raising the awareness of EU climate experts.

GS said that a very small constituency in the Expert Group had a very strong opinion against CO2 storage, GS added that the Ketzin report was deliberately misinterpreted.

DG RTD *VK*

VK updated the AC on a Horizon Europe call for experts for the mission on 'climate neutral and smart cities', which closes on 11th June. VK said that 15 independent experts with a broad expertise on clean energy will be appointed as part of the process. VK encouraged the CCUS community to put forward a candidate.

VK updated the AC on Horizon 2020's 2019 & 2020 calls.

VK said that a new Mission Innovation CCUS event will take place in Trondheim, Norway on 19-20th June. The workshop is held back to back with the TCCS-10 Conference. The workshop is organised by SINTEF Energy Research on behalf of the Mission Innovation Challenge CCUS. VK said that ZEP did good work on Mission Innovation and asked NWT to continue supporting this process.

VK talked about the EU-China Energy Cooperation Platform, which will meet in September 2019. VK said that discussion during the last meeting in Beijing highlighted the important role of CCS and hydrogen in the energy transition.

VK updated the AC on the ERA-NET ACT CCUS programme.

GS highlighted the need for cross-cutting structures to underpin Horizon Europe.

DG ENER *PH*

PH said that Commissioner Cañete will attend the EU-Norway CCS conference on 5th September. This will be a two days event followed by the Innovation Fund workshop. Invitations will go to energy Ministers of all EU countries and their attendance will allow measuring EU countries' interest in CCS.

PH talked about the 10th Clean Energy Ministerial which took place in Vancouver on 27th May, which featured a high-level CCS side-event supported by Canadian ministers, the United States Secretary for Energy and the IEA.

During the event, the Clean Energy Ministerial CCUS Initiative and the Oil & Gas Climate Initiative announced their collaboration on accelerating CCUS. The parties agreed to explore ways to further their collaboration which may include:

- Identifying possible new strategic investment opportunities, in both OGCI and CEM CCUS countries and beyond, with emphasis on CCUS hubs and major "anchor projects" at commercial scale;
- Considering processes to collaborate to support the development of joint projects through the early stages, up to FEED stage, and further to FID as appropriate;
- Advancing CCUS globally by creating and fostering sustained dialogue on policy, regulatory and risk-sharing mechanisms and principles to support CCUS project development; and by sharing non-proprietary knowledge gained from projects;
- Accelerating the development of new and existing CCUS technologies and reducing costs;
- Investigating the role of financial institutions, and whether commercial banks or development banks, should be encouraged to join the process.

OGCI and CEM CCUS Initiative will establish a joint Task Group to explore this potential collaboration in further detail.

PH said the IEA launched their latest report in CCU and CCS for industry.

PH said that the CCUS Projects Network held its first meeting with projects.

Item 6: Overview of European Parliament, Council & other relevant activities

MD updated the AC on the EU Long-Term Strategy. Several Council meetings were held in March and an Informal Summit of European Leaders took place on 9th May. Significant expectations were placed on the Sibiu Summit, the results were however limited, given that leaders will only decide on the EU's Strategic Agenda for 2019-2024 and high-level appointments at the Summit on 20-21 June.

The Sibiu Declaration agreed by the leaders consists of 10 commitments that the leaders will move forward in supporting the EU. It however only mentions tackling climate change as part of combating major global issues, without providing more substance. Nonetheless, nine Member States (Belgium, Denmark, France, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Sweden) signed a non-paper on climate in the margins of the informal. These countries have expressed support for the following points:

- Achieving net-zero emissions by 2050 and support for the Commission's draft Long-Term Strategy on EU energy and climate policy, stressing the urgency of acting on climate change now.
- Strengthening European competitiveness in a global climate neutral future. Innovation budgets must be heavily focused on making clean energies accessible to all people in all regions.
- EU industry to seize the opportunities of the transition to enhance EU position as a major industrial powerhouse.
- The new MFF to strongly support decarbonisation, and these Member States highly support the Commission's MFF target of spending 25% of EU funding towards combating climate change.
- Strong support for sustainable finance.

The Council process on the Long-Term Strategy is set to continue at the 20-21 June Summit, where the leaders are expected to adopt dedicated Conclusions. The Energy and Environment Councils of

25 and 26 June would be left in reserve for further discussions on the long-term strategy should that prove necessary.

MD also updated the AC on Energy Council discussions, the Connecting Europe Facility, the status of NECPs and Horizon Europe (see presentation slides).

MD gave an overview of the new EU Parliament and provisional results. MD said that the elections saw a rise in voter turnout, to more than 50 per cent for the first time in 20 years. Overall, traditional parties have come out from the elections somewhat weakened, but the pro-European core has not suffered as much as projected. The European People's Party (EPP) came in first, followed by the Socialist and Democrats (S&D), a centrist-liberal coalition led by French President Emmanuel Macron and Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte (ALDE&R), and the Greens.

Importantly, the two largest groupings in the Parliament, the EPP and the S&D, lost their majority for the first time in 40 years. ALDE-R, on the other hand, can be considered as a winner of the election, having gained additional seats as well as becoming an important partner for any future coalition-building among pro-European groups in efforts to reach a majority. Similarly, the Greens have come out of the elections strengthened, confirming that climate issues are likely to top policy-making agenda during the Parliament's next term.

Eurosceptic groups, represented in the previous Parliament by the European Conservatives (ECR), the Europe of Nations and Freedom group (ENF) and the Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy group (EFDD), will now hold around 25% of seats in the new Parliament. MD said that Eurosceptic and far-right parties represent a relatively disparate group, and it is not yet clear whether and to what extent they will be able to effectively coordinate in the new Parliament.

MD said it is expected that the new European Parliament will become more fragmented. This means that decision-making within the Parliament is likely to go through a transformation where voting alliances are likely to be increasingly made on issue-by-issue basis, with potentially smaller majorities depending on votes of each MEP. This could in turn make policy-making less predictable and make it harder for stakeholders to have their voice heard and reflected in the Parliament's decisions.

GS and JH said that Chris Davies (CD) is now an MEP working for the Alliance for Liberals and Democrats in Europe (ALDE).

Item 7: Presentation from Norwegian Government on London Protocol

See presentation slides.

SVF discussed the London Protocol issue on cross-border transport of CO2 storage for the purpose of storage and the interim solution on which the Norwegian Government is currently working.

SVF highlighted that the 2009 amendment to article 6 has been ratified/accepted by 6 parties: UK, Netherlands, Norway, Finland, Iran and Estonia. Two thirds of parties must ratify the amendment for it to enter into force. The interim solution is to use Article 25b of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which states:

A treaty or part of a treat is applied provisionally pending its entry into force if:

a) The treaty itself so provides or:
b) The negotiating states have in some other manner so agreed

This means that countries which ratify the impending amendment are able to operate with other ratifying countries provisionally whilst the amendment is still pending. The resolution will be prepared by 5th July, where it will be released for comments/feedback by 16th August. The Norwegian, Dutch and UK Government will then present the joint resolution at the Meeting of the Parties 7-11 October 2019.

AG talked about the exclusion of CO2 transported by ships under the EU ETS and asked whether the Ministry sees this issue as manageable given the timeframe. EM confirmed that the shipping element would be less challenging that the legal barrier underpinning the London Protocol.

Item 8: Presentation on CCUS Projects Network

See presentation slides.

PP presented the aims and forward work programme of the CCUS Projects Network.

DB asked about the long-term objectives of the Network. PP said that hopefully the Network will continue after the end of the contract with the European Commission.

DB invited the Projects Network to join the Carbon Sequestration Forum.

LE asked how many projects participate in the Network. PP said that 8 projects are now members (including ACORN, Northern Lights, ERVIA's Cork project and ArcelorMittal's steel project) and a further 8 projects showed interest. The intention is to have around 25 projects participating in the Network.

WG asked whether the projects that will receive funding from the Innovation Fund will be formally requested to join the Network. PP said there will not be a legal obligation. Ideally, however, the Network will be used to promote knowledge sharing amongst CCS projects supported by the Innovation Fund.

WG asked whether there is some work done on lessons learned from the previous CCS Projects Network. PP said that there will be a continuity between both Networks and lessons from previous projects will be taken into account. With regards to knowledge transfer, the Network is currently looking into confidentiality issues.

GS said it would be great if the Network could attend the AC meetings and provide regular updates on their work.

Item 9: Presentation on ELEGANCY Programmes

See presentation slides.

SV presented different work streams and case studies under the ELEGANCY programme.

Item 10: Update on EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance

See presentation slides for more detail.

SK presented the work from the Energy Group. SK said that the report from the Expert Group will be released on 18th June.

There was a discussion on the effect of the ETS price on the Taxonomy.

AG questioned the statement that fugitive emissions need to be measured rather than estimated (production of electricity slide). SK said that this could be done through flyovers with methane detection cameras.

With reference to the point stating that pipelines that only carried CO2 "mainly" for sequestration would qualify as sustainable ("energy other" slide), AG said that a better definition of what "mainly" means is needed.

LW asked clarifications about how the Do No Significant Harm criteria will be managed. There is a concern that some stakeholders may argue that CCS should not be supported because it does not promote a circular economy. SK said that this should not be an issue for this round, however, the criteria is likely to change/evolve in the future.

PP requested a minor amendment to the slides (replacing the wording on 'gas' by 'methane').

JH asked about the eligibility of biofuels and underlying assumptions.

SK talked about criteria for aviation and long-term shipping.

SK described the political timeline and engagement activities around the Taxonomy.

It was agreed that all comments from the AC will be collected by LW and feed into ZEP's response to the consultation on the Taxonomy.

Note that a stakeholder dialogue will take place on 24th June to discuss progress and outcomes of the technical expert group's work. It was agreed that ZEP would attend this event.

Item 11: Review of Network Work Programmes & Item 12: ERG update

Due to time constraints, pre-reads for agenda items 11 & 12 were taken as read.

The AC discussed the following items:

- The CO2 storage report, which was unanimously approved.
- The next steps for the TWG on CCU. It was suggested that the TWG could prepare a short brief on the 4 questions that need to be answered when assessing CCU. It was also agreed that this paper should not be directly related to the Ramboll study and should highlight the complementarity between CCU and CCS.
- The High-Level Group on EIIs. LW said he will attend the next subgroup meetings on 24th and 25th September and report back on work progress.
- GS said that the Secretariat will draft a letter for DG RTD on DG GROW's involvement in the ETIP.

Item 13: AOB

N/A

Actions

Item	Action	Owner
1.	ZEP to share NECPs analysis with DG ENER and DG CLIMA	NWPE
1.	Sec to prepare policy legacy paper with specific asks for the next Commission (for Sec Gen)	NWPE, Sec
1.	NWPE to prepare Gantt chart of EU CCUS projects	NWPE, Sec
10.	ZEP to attend Stakeholder Dialogue on EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance on 24th June	ERG
11.	TWG CCU to prepare short one pager outlining the four questions raised by the TWG and presented at the AC.	NWT
12.	LW to attend 24th and 25th June meetings of the HLG on EIIs and report back on work progress	LW
13.	Sec to prepare letter for DG RTD (RE: DG GROW's involvement in the ETIP)	Sec

Advisory Council Executive Committee

Draft Minutes: Conference call – 16th July 2019

Draft Minutes

Attendance

Graeme Sweeney	ZEP Chairman (proxy Rob van der Meer)
Lamberto Eldering	Equinor
Kim Bye Brunn	Shell
Jonas Helseth	Bellona (proxy Frederic Hauge)
Helen Bray	Shell
Arthur Heberle	Mitsubishi
Luke Warren	ZEP Secretariat
Marine d'Elloy	ZEP Secretariat
Chris Gent	ZEP Secretariat

1. Introduction and general update (open session)

Introduction & actions from last meeting

GS updated the ACEC on work progress.

The AC meeting minutes were reviewed. There was a minor comment from HB. The actions were reviewed and have either been completed or are being progressed.

LW and GS updated the ACEC on SET-Plan progress. LW talked about the monitoring and report templates, which will be used by the used by the Commission to assess progress on the SET-Plan. These will be an important vehicle by which the CCS and CCU community can update the Commission on the progress or lack of progress in specific areas.

The European Commission's R&I days will take place on 24th, 25th and 26th September and consortium partners have agreed to attend the policy conference.

GS talked about the importance of cross-cutting clusters under Horizon Europe. A cross-cutting group for CCS would allow applying CCS to both industrial and energy activities. The ACEC agreed that this will need to be discussed with the new Commission.

GS suggested that the IWG9 undertakes work on the NECPs. GS said that Member States could be invited to present their draft NECPs at the next SET-Plan meeting.

LE said a teleconference will take place on 17th July to discuss collaboration between the Projects Network and subgroup 1.

2. Network and Temporary Working Group updates (open session)

a. Network Technology

AH updated the ACEC on work progress within Network Technology. The last meeting was held in Brussels on the 4th June and considered how to progress the new work item activities identified in

the 2019-2020 work programme. There was interest in progressing the discussions on capture rates. NWT will prepare a policy brief on capture rates, which will be shared with NWPE for comment.

It has also been proposed that there may be a need to undertake further work on CO2 transport. Draft ToR will be prepared and presented at the Advisory Council meeting in September.

MD noted that there is a renewed interest in Mission Innovation. MD agreed to contact FN and NR regarding the potential for further ZEP work.

TWG Collaboration across the CCS chain
WS1's (storage-related risks) draft report has been approved at the June AC. Since then, working group members provided additional comments which the Secretariat will address. The report will then be shared for final internal approval.

WS2 will draft a report summarising conclusions from the workshop and policy recommendations from the TWG.

TWG CCU and Sink Factor Methodology
ZEP developed a short position on CCU and LCA building on the Ramboll study released by the European Commission (DG CLIMA).

The TWG will meet in September to discuss the LCA4CCU workshop which was organised by the Commission (DG ENER) on 9th July. AH agreed to share the slides from the meeting with the ACEC.

There was a conversation on the LCA guidelines under REDII, which conflict with the recommendations from the Taxonomy TEG. It is expected that this topic will require substantial work in the autumn. It was agreed that a separate call will be organised to discuss different initiatives and how ZEP can best contribute to the discussion.

b. Network Policy and Economics

There was a discussion on the joint ZEP / EU Commission / Norwegian Government Innovation Fund workshop on CCS. LE noted that DG CLIMA sent a list of questions intended for project developers. This will be shared with attendees ahead of the workshop. It is therefore expected that projects will be well prepared for the workshop.

LE said that all CCS projects have now been included in the temporary PCI list. This means that projects have been approved by Member States.

c. ERG

Updates were provided on recent engagement activities which reached out to the Secretariat General, the Finish Presidency, the Croatian Permanent Representation to the EU and DG GROW.

Following the meeting with the Sec Gen, it was agreed that ZEP will prepare a legacy paper with specific asks for the next Commission.

GS said there is an expectation that several important files, including the Taxonomy, will be handed over to the Croatian Presidency. GS emphasised the importance of engaging with the Croatian Perm Rep.

LW updated the ACEC on the meetings held with the Commission. LW noted that the way in which funding is allocated across different DGs within the Commission will change. Whereas DG CLIMA,

DG ENER and DG RTD used to receive independent pots of money, the Commission intends to create a common spending pot for all DGs to be allocated across different technology families. Therefore, it will be important to ensure that ZEP has the right links into these DGs.

The ACEC discussed the National Energy and Climate Plans (NECPs). Important leverage will be needed in the coming months to ensure that Member States' plans reflect strong ambition on CCS.

There was a discussion on the HLG on EIIs. It was agreed that ZEP should attend the Sherpa meeting in September.

HB noted that the ERG will undertake a review of the twitter feed and calendar after the summer.

It was noted that the EU sustainable energy week conference was a successful event.

d. Sustainable Taxonomy

GS provided an update on the Taxonomy. The energy work is focussed on delivering emissions thresholds that are consistent with net-zero by 2050.

On CCS, it has been argued that this should be considered an economic activity in its own right that delivers emission reductions in other economic areas, enabling them to be considered a sustainable investment.

The Technical Expert Group (TEG) held a webinar on 5th July mapping out current work status and forward timetable. The TEG also circulated a spreadsheet with the threshold calculations. There were no significant pushbacks on Electricity Production and CCS during the webinar. However, there were discussions on the following issues:

- LCA and REDII: Whilst REDII builds on a distributive LCA, the Taxonomy proposes a consequential LCA. The TEG will do more work on this issue but their primary advice is to submit clear positions through the Consultation for the Commission to deal with this at a later stage. This is true for the whole Bio section, with participants raising Biochar as a matter not dealt with.
- Nuclear & the Do No Significant Harm (DNSH) criteria: There is still no consensus on this issue. Consideration of nuclear energy by the TEG from a climate mitigation perspective was warranted. However, the TEG has not recommended the inclusion of nuclear energy in the Taxonomy from a DNSH perspective, arguing that more extensive technical work should be undertaken on the DNSH aspects of nuclear energy. Nuclear is currently pending and requires passing the DNSH criteria. It will be included if DNSH aspect is satisfactorily resolved. The Energy Group does not have line of sight to the DNSH group.
- Solid Carbon: Will sequestered solid carbon comply? Case was Pyrolysis to make H2 with solid output buried in disused coal mines. In principle yes, but this is put in the Consultation.
- Common Agricultural Policy revision: Will the CAP adopt the Biomass production thresholds? No views were expressed.
- What to do with activities that almost qualify or have not been evaluated (and so are excluded from this round)? The TEG favours a straightforward 'in or out' approach, however, the Commission supports operating an Expert Group led process which would allow those industrial activities to apply for inclusion. This would be of significance for refining, waste-to-energy, a range of Bio activities, and CCU. This needs to be raised in the consultation input if ZEP wants it to happen.
- Does a pipeline upgrade to H2 need a clear commitment to a plan to distribute the hydrogen?
- Eurogas are asking for pathways to execution. This is something the TEG will not get involved in.

GS said that the TEG will be disbanded by the end of the year. Moving forward, the TEG's primary focus will be on securing stakeholder support. Graeme reported that responses from the financial community have been positive, whilst responses from NGOs have been more mixed – mainly reflecting concerns about the governance process.

The TEG expects to submit its final report to the European Commission in November. The Commission will be responsible for creating a new regulatory instrument. It is expected that changes to the current draft will be minor. The intention is to only change clear or obvious errors arising from the consultation (which closes on 13th September). This means that, to a large extent, the target for the consultation is the European Commission rather than the TEG.

GS said that ZEP's response should include the following points:

- Highlight the need for a robust governance process that:
  - Is impartial and transparent (i.e. prevents the lobbying of experts or Commission to include/omit certain technologies).
  - Allows for and supports the evaluation of activities that were excluded from this round (i.e. CCU, waste-to-heat, refining, etc.). As such, ZEP intends to recommend the establishment of an expert group to ensure the Commission is iteratively assessing technologies for sustainability.
- Encourage that appropriate time frames are emplaced in a process for the introduction/reassessment of technologies for the taxonomy.
- Encourage future modelling of industrial/climate scenarios based on the revised definitions for taxonomy thresholds – to assess their effectiveness at achieving a net-zero 2050 Europe.

With regards to the political process, GS said that significant work will need to be done with all institutions over the autumn.

It was agreed that the slides from the webinar and the calculations spreadsheet will be shared with TWG on the Taxonomy. ZEP will also seek feedback from the TWG on the consultation.

JH emphasised the need to engage with the steel sector.

3. AC60 agenda

MD presented the draft AC60 agenda and sought feedback on suggested external presentations.

KB suggested to include a slot for an update from OGCI on CCUS developments in the AC 60 agenda. LE, HB and GS agreed.

4. Finance update

Pre-reads for agenda item 4 were taken as read.

5. AOB

N/A

Actions

Actions		Owner
1	Secretariat to share SET-Plan draft monitoring and reporting template with ACEC	Secretariat
2	NWT to prepare a policy brief on capture rates. NWT to invite NWPE to provide feedback	NWT
2	AH to circulate slides from 9th July European Commission workshop on LCA4CCU	AH
2	MD to contact FN and NR about Mission Innovation	MD
2	ERG to review twitter feed and calendar after the summer	ERG
2	ZEP to attend HLG on EIIs Sherpa meeting in September	ERG
2	ZEP to circulate legacy paper (with specific asks for the next Commission) to the Sec Gen before summer recession	ERG
2	Sec to share the slides from the Taxonomy webinar and the spreadsheet with the ZEP TWG on the Taxonomy. ZEP to seek feedback from the TWG on the Taxonomy consultation	Sec
3	Sec to include a slot for an update from OGCI in AC60 draft agenda	Sec

Advisory Council Executive Committee

Draft Minutes: Conference call – 13th August 2019

Draft Minutes

Attendance

Graeme Sweeney	ZEP Chairman
Lamberto Eldering	Equinor
Theo Mitchell	Enerfair (proxy Frederic Hauge, Jonas Helseth and Helen Bray)
Marie Bysveen	Sintef (proxy Nils Røkke)
Luke Warren	ZEP Secretariat
Per-Olof Granström	ZEP Secretariat
Marine d'Elloy	ZEP Secretariat
Chris Gent	ZEP Secretariat

1. Introduction and general update (open session)

Introduction & actions from last meeting

The meeting from the ACEC July meeting were reviewed and approved.

LW updated the ACEC on the progress of actions from the last call.

GS talked about the Sustainable Taxonomy call that was held on Friday 9th August. It was agreed that ZEP's response to the TWG will cover the following three elements; clear and obvious errors, answers to consultation questions and suggestions on the governance process. This will need to be completed by 13th September – before the next AC/EC meeting. It agreed that GS will approve this piece of work on behalf of the ACEC at the beginning of September.

It was agreed that the Secretariat will share the summary note from the call with the ACEC.

LW discussed SET-Plan monitoring and reporting templates.

2. Network and Temporary Working Group updates (open session)

a. Network Technology

GS updated the ACEC on work progress on behalf of FN and AH. There are no major updates since the last ACEC. Work on capture rates with the IEA GHG and on CO2 transport with UCL has been initiated. However, due to the summer recession there has been limited progress so far.

MD said that the Secretariat works on addressing final comments from the TWG on the storage risks report.

MD said that the CCU TWG will meet in September. A preparation call will be held with Rob ahead of the meeting.

b. Network Policy and Economics

LE provided a summary of the last NWPE meeting and updated the ACEC on both the ETS/shipping and London Protocol discussion.

There was a discussion on the preparation of the Innovation Fund workshop. There is an action for the ACEC to review the current attendance list and identify any major gaps.

CG said ZEP will write a paper on the outcomes of the workshop which will be shared with the European Commission after the workshop. It was agreed that this paper will also be shared as part of the pre-reads for the next AC.

CG was asked to check GS and TM's registration status.

c. ERG

TM updated the ACEC on work progress.

There was a discussion on the concept note for a ZEP conference at the European Parliament, including budget.

LE suggested that ZEP seeks to align its conference date with that of the CCUS Projects Network or with the PCIs announcement. This would allow to limit a time burden on projects.

It was agreed that the Secretariat will provide an update on the progress of this item at the AC in September.

3. AC60 agenda

LW presented the draft AC60 agenda and sought feedback on suggested external presentations.

LW suggested that ZEP approaches the European Commission to understand current positions with regards to the Gas Package, which will have important implications for CCS and hydrogen going forward.

It was agreed that it would be a good idea to have a presentation on the work from the CCUS Advisory Group (CAG) on business models focusing on industrial CCUS, power production, CO2 transport and storage, and hydrogen production.

GS highlighted the need to allow time in the agenda for a review of the Sustainable Taxonomy input, the upcoming engagement programme and the Innovation Fund workshop outcomes.

4. Finance update

LW said there has been no further invoices settled since the AC59. There are two invoices that have been issued (Port of Rotterdam and Total) and remain outstanding. The secretariat has followed up with the Port of Rotterdam to request payment. The invoice for Total has been reissued with new purchase order details. It is expected that an invoice to Gassnova for €15,000 will be made in the 4Q 2019. Forecast income for 2019 remains €167,500.

LW said the secretariat met recently with the ZEP-C accountants. The accountants made two recommendations for expenditure which would lower costs;

- Currently the accounts are managed on a monthly basis. The view of the accountant is that as the ZEP-C accounts have become much simpler and the organisation no longer has to manage a negative equity position then it might be appropriate to move to a quarterly processing of the accounts. This is expected to save around €600 p.a.
- The accountants have also offered to host the ZEP-C registered office. The opening of the secretariat's office in Brussels means that it can receive ZEP mail and so this service is not required in Brussels. The accountants would not charge to host the office and so the saving to ZEP-C would be around €1,700 p.a.

The ACEC approved both recommendations. The Secretariat will make a note of this for ratification at the next AC.

5. AOB

GS received an invitation to be part of the Advisory Board of a project call under H2020. This will be looking at the manufacturing of synthetic fuels. ZEP's participation will be pending until has an official position on the methodology needed to assess such projects.

Actions

Actions		Owner
1	Sec to share Sustainable Taxonomy notes from 9th August call with the ACEC	Sec
2	ACEC to review Innovation Fund attendance list and identify any major gaps	ACEC
2	Sec to check registration status of GS and TM for the Innovation Fund workshop	CG
2	Sec to include Innovation Fund workshop summary paper in the pre-reads for the AC60	CG
3	Sec to invite representatives from the CAG to present business models work at the AC 60	LW
4	Sec to prepare note on recommendations for expenditure from accountants to lower costs for ratification at the AC	LW

ZEP Advisory Council 60

25th September 2019

Agenda Item 1.e: Chair's update

External engagement

Since the last AC59 meeting, the ZEP Chair has taken part in the following meetings with external stakeholders and processes:

- **Gwenole Cozigou**, Director at DG GROW, and **Carsten Bemig**, Cabinet member to Commissioner Elżbieta Bienkowska
- **Adalbert Jahnz**, Cabinet Maros Sefcovic
- **Petr Binhack**, Energy Attache, **Aleš Hilčer**, Climate Attache, **Pavla Řezáčová**, Attache Industry and Innovation, Permanent Representation of the Czech Republic
- **Malgorzata Wenerska-Craps**, Minister Counsellor for Competitiveness and Energy, Permanent Representation of Poland
- **Grzegorz Radziejewski**, Member of Cabinet of Vice President Jyrki Katainen
- **Hans Bergman**, Head of Unit Governance and Effort Sharing, DG CLIMA
- **Jenni Hakala**, Senior Specialist, Single Market and industrial policy and **Miika Tommila**, Senior Specialist, Energy, Permanent Representation Finland
- **Ioan Pogea**, HoU Unit Energy Policy, and **Cosmina Miu**, HoU Industry
- **Paula Pinho**, HoU A1 Energy Policy, **Haitze Siemers**, Head of Unit C.2 New energy technologies, innovation and clean coal, DG ENER
- **Duncan Johnstone**, Dpt HOU Natural Resources, Energy Union & Sustainability, Secretariat General + colleagues
- **Dr. Ralf Kuder**, Head of Department for Energy and Telecommunications, Representation of North Rhine Westphalia
- **Robert Schroeder**, Cabinet Member of Commissioner Carlos Moedas
- **Maria Jimenez Navarro**, Energy Attaché, **Alberto Ruiz Rodriguez**, Industry Attaché, Spanish Permanent Representation

A summary note of these meetings can be found as pre-read 1.e.i.

SET-Plan IWG9 CCS and CCU activities

The SET-Plan IWG9 CCS and CCU activities are, from the 1st May 2019, supported by a H2020 consortium ("Impacts9") of CCSA (Coordinator), BGS, CO2 Value Europe and Sintef. This enables materially greater support to be provided to support the delivery of the SET-Plan's CCS and CCU targets.

IMPACTS 9 held their kick-off meeting and General Assembly in Amsterdam on 21st June. As part of the meeting, partners discussed progress on work packages, deliverables and forward work programme. It was agreed that the consortium will hold monthly teleconferences to ensure work progress.

The consortium currently works on the SET-Plan IWG9 monitoring and reporting annual report. This needs to be submitted to the European Commission by the end of September. A first draft has been shared with the IWG9, including Member State representatives, for input and feedback. This process is clearly important since the report will be used to periodically review progress towards the delivery of the R&I activities. It will also allow identifying both gaps and synergies within the SET-Plan and support greater alignment and coherency across different EU and national programmes.

The IMPACTS9 consortium discussed the potential for collaboration with the PV Impact project, which intends to set up an EU-level database of projects and funding programmes relevant to the SET-Plan. A call will be organised shortly to discuss this initiative further.

The next Strategic Coordination Group meeting takes place on 3rd October and will include a session on IWG9 communications and overall strategy. This will be led by an external consultant specialising in Theory of Change approaches. The objectives are to help the IMPACTS9 consortium to think about how to best 1) frame and articulate the IWG9's core messages; and 2) deliver the desired outcomes: *greater alignment of activities and resources across European stakeholders towards the deployment of CCUS*.

The outcomes of the Strategic Coordination Group meeting will be discussed at the SET-Plan plenary meeting on 17th October in the Hague. A draft agenda is attached as pre-read 1.e.ii. The plenary meeting will also focus on discussing; 1) actions to promote greater collaboration and coordination amongst SET-Plan and other EU initiatives (ACT, Mission Innovation, NECOs, etc.) and; 2) the future of the CCS/CCU Implementation Plan.

ZEP Engagement Programme
22-23 May and 4 June 2019 - Recap Note
CONFIDENTIAL

Introduction and key outcomes

A series of meetings with key interlocutors was organised at the end of May and early June. Meetings were held with the following officials:

1. **Gwenole Cozigou, Director at DG GROW, and Carsten Bemig, Cabinet member to Commissioner Elżbieta Bienkowska**
2. **Adalbert Jahnz, Cabinet Maros Sefcovic**
3. **Petr Binhack, Energy Attache, Aleš Hilčer, Climate Attache, Pavla Řezáčová, Attache Industry and Innovation, Permanent Representation of the Czech Republic**
4. **Malgorzata Wenerska-Craps, Minister Counsellor for Competitiveness and Energy, Permanent Representation of Poland**
5. **Grzegorz Radziejewski, Member of Cabinet of Vice President Jyrki Katainen**
6. **Hans Bergman, Head of Unit Governance and Effort Sharing, DG CLIMA**
7. **Jenni Hakala, Senior Specialist, Single Market and industrial policy and Miika Tommila, Senior Specialist, Energy, Permanent Representation Finland**
8. **Ioan Pogea, HoU Unit Energy Policy, and Cosmina Miu, HoU Industry**
9. **Paula Pinho, HoU A1 Energy Policy, Haitze Siemers, Head of Unit C.2 New energy technologies, innovation and clean coal, DG ENER**
10. **Duncan Johnstone, Dpt HOU Natural Resources, Energy Union & Sustainability, Secretariat General + colleagues**

Note that the meetings scheduled with the Permanent Representations of Sweden and Croatia were cancelled at the last moment. We will seek to organise these meetings at another stage.

Key outcomes:

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- Gwenole Cozigou welcomed the idea of a closer involvement with the ETIP and suggested that ZEP makes a formal request. He also welcomed ZEP's involvement in the HLG EnII and suggested that ZEP sends a letter to DG RTD including both requests with DG GROW in copy.
- Gwenole Cozigou agreed that CCS is one of two elements for European industry to transition to 2050, with circular economy being the other. He noted that the main challenge is to convince civil society. He agreed with the point that CCS should ultimately seek to benefit from the structural funds.
- In terms of next steps for the HLG EnII, Gwenole Cozigou indicated that the 2nd phase is to finalise the master plan. This may be accompanied by country-level recommendations. He stressed that there are about 8 or 9 DGs involved at the moment. Another meeting of the HLG is scheduled for October.
- Adalbert Jahnz noted that this is the right time to speak about how the upcoming gas market reform could be used to help update the regulatory framework for CO2 infrastructure. The scoping for the review is currently going on.
- Adalbert Jahnz indicated that the EU's Battery Initiative is seen as an industrial policy paradigm and that ZEP should engage VP Sefcovic to see how the 'CCS pitch' can be modelled along those lines.
- The Czech, Polish, Finnish and Romanian Perm Reps lamented the lack of attention for blue hydrogen. The Romanian Perm Rep called on ZEP to create more awareness around the link between CCS and hydrogen.
- Finland sees potential for CCS in industry, as well as bio-CCS in the future. Although there have not been any big investments for now. He agreed that other Member States cannot hold those who want to pursue CCS hostage. This one-size-fits-all approach does not work.
- The Finnish Presidency intends to discuss technologies in light of the LTS during its term, adding that Europe needs technologies to become cheaper and CCS is one of the technologies needed.
- Haitze Siemers indicated that he would look at the support action and suggested a meeting with all supporters of Action 9. He said there was scope for more detailed discussions on the implementation and financing of the Action, adding that some of the agreed actions may no longer be up to date.
- Paula Pinho welcomed the idea of linking the NECPs to the SET Plan, but noted that the Governance Regulation does not mandate this, adding that there limits to what the Commission can require. She considered this similar to the issue of regional cooperation, while noting that this is actually an immense opportunity when speaking about CCS.
- Haitze Siemers agreed with the need for a 'complete' hydrogen plan. He mentioned two concerns - cost and speed - and stated that a discussion is needed on this.
- Duncan Johnstone asked if ZEP could produce a high-level 1-pager that could be shared with the new Commission.

Key follow up actions:

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- ERG/WS to draft letter to RTD to ask ZEP involvement in HLG EnII and DG GROW's involvement in ETIP.
- SEC/WS to prepare 1-2 pager on CCS as industrial value chain and building block of the transition.
- WS to follow up with Adalbert Jahnz on a possible participation in EC/Business Europe event.
- ERG/WS to consider how to engage the Commission on the gas market reform.
- WS to include Director General Jean-Eric Paquet as part of future ZEP engagement.
- ZEP to prepare recommendations on draft NECPs (CCU/S, hydrogen, SET Plan, regional cooperation).
- WS to follow-up with Hans Bergman on involvement in NECP meetings with Member States.
- ZEP/WS to prepare and share material with the Romanian Perm Rep on hydrogen for heating.
- ZEP to consider potential for an event in Romania on CCS and hydrogen.
- ZEP to consider preparing 1-pager for the SecGen with asks for the new Commission.

Please find below a detailed overview of the meetings.

Detailed overview of the meetings

1. Gwenole Cozigou, Director at DG GROW, and Carsten Bemig, Cabinet member to Commissioner Elżbieta Bienkowska

Participants:

Commission: Gwenole Cozigou (GZ), Carsten Bemig (CB)

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- This meeting was intended to build on the ongoing conversations held by Luke Warren as part of the HLG EnII. The HLG's industrial masterplan should feed into the drafting of the New Industrial Strategy due by the end of this year. It was also an opportunity to speak about the Sustainable Taxonomy, as well as a potentially closer involvement of DG GROW with the ETIP.
- GZ welcomed the idea of a closer involvement with the ETIP and suggested that ZEP makes this a formal request. He also welcomed ZEP's involvement in the HLG EnII and suggested that ZEP sends a letter to DG RTD including both requests with DG GROW in copy.
- GZ stressed that CCS is already mentioned in many of the Commission's policy documents. He agreed that CCS is one of two elements for European industry to transition to 2050, with circular economy being the other. He noted that the main challenge is to convince civil society.
- On the HLG EnII, GZ noted that CCS is recognised in the roadmap, while adding that it was not yet clear under which sub-group it should fall. He indicated that it had been brought up in two of the sub-groups and stressed that CCS is not forgotten, adding that while it is clear to them that CCS is a solution, this is not recognised everywhere.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- On strategic industrial value chains, he recalled the ones identified around low-carbon industry and CO2 valorisation.
- On the Sustainable Taxonomy, GZ considered that the intention is that all activities become cleaner; i.e. no one left behind. However, he believed the initiative had started on a wrong footing. He also considered that DG GROW is late in the process when it comes to the taxonomy.
- In terms of next steps, GZ indicated that the 2nd phase of the HLG EnII is to finalise the master plan. This may be accompanied by some country-level recommendations. He stressed that there are about 8 or 9 DGs involved at the moment. Another meeting of the HLG is scheduled for October.
- Finally, GZ agreed with the point that CCS should ultimately seek to benefit from the structural funds.

Next steps:

- WS to send thank you note (done).
- ZEP to send letter to RTD to ask ZEP involvement in HLG EnII and DG GROW's involvement in ETIP.
- ZEP to share 1-2 pager on CCS as industrial value chain and building block of the transition.

2. Adalbert Jahnz, Cabinet Member to Vice-President Maros Sefcovic

Participants:

Commission: Adalbert Jahnz (AJ)

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- This was an introductory meeting as he has only recently started in this position, having taken over from Peter Van Kemseke. It was also intended to inform the cabinet member about ZEP's positions on the role of CCS in the EU's long-term energy and industrial transition.
- AJ agreed that even though the LTS mentions CCS prominently, this is not much translated to the Commission's public commentaries. He considered that this may have to do with the coal conflation, detracting from Member States' efforts to move away from coal, and that it is difficult to speak about CCS in subtle terms. He found there has been little discussion within the Commission about CCS.
- AJ asked for input around what needs to be done in the 2020-2030 period for CCS. He understood the importance of large volumes of blue hydrogen to create the market, but wondered how economical it is compared to large electrolysers.
- AJ asked whether ZEP was more hopeful about the Innovation Fund than the NER300, while welcoming the suggestion that it might be better spent on a CO2 transport and storage infrastructure as a regulated asset, facilitated by the 'CCS Directive'.
- GS suggested that the upcoming gas market reform could be used to help update the regulatory framework for CO2 infrastructure. AJ stressed that this is the right time to make such suggestions as the scoping for the review is currently going on.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- AJ wondered to what extend the London Protocol is covered by EU policy. He acknowledged that showing the fault lines by showing them in practice may be the best way forward.
- On the LTS, AJ noted that it also mentions hydrogen, but cautioned that it not a strategy but a set of options. Moreover, it was not clear to him what the process is within the Council nor what outcome can be expected. He considered that there is little control over the process and wondered whether this should be the Finnish Presidency or the office of President Tusk.
- On the industrial strategy, he noted that his cabinet has limited involvement at the moment, adding that it will likely come to fruition in the next College. He further indicated that the EU's Battery Initiative is seen as a paradigm and that ZEP should engage VP Sefcovic if he remains in the Commission to see how the 'CCS pitch' can be modelled along those lines.
- AJ noted that the Commission and BusinessEurope are preparing an event in July on the LTS and suggested that ZEP may want to seek involvement.
- On CCU, AJ recognised that it is not a real climate mitigation activity but rather industrial. At the same time, he stressed that the Commission needs to pay lip service to CCU as this is important for some communities to justify their transitions.
- AJ welcomed the idea of a high-level 1-2 pager from ZEP on the role of CCS in the LTS and the New Industrial Strategy.
- AJ finally suggested that ZEP engages with the people involved in Horizon Europe's mission-based work. He also suggested that ZEP engages with Director General Jean-Eric Paquet, DG RTD.

Next steps:

- WS to send thank you note (done).
- WS to follow up with AJ on a possible participation in the Commission/Business Europe event (ongoing).
- ZEP to share 1-2 pager on CCS as industrial value chain and building block of the transition.
- ZEP to consider how to engage the Commission on the gas market reform.
- WS to include Director General Jean-Eric Paquet as part of future ZEP engagement.

3. Petr Binhack, Energy Attache, Aleš Hilčer, Climate Attache, Pavla Řezáčová, Attache Industry and Innovation

Participants:

Member State: Petr Binhack, Aleš Hilčer, Pavla Řezáčová

ZEP: Helen Bray (HB)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- This was an introductory meeting. It was intended to broaden the base of support for CCS within the Council beyond the usual EU suspects of the UK and the Netherlands. It was also an

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

opportunity to engage the Czech Republic on its draft NECP (mentions CCS for power) and its long-term energy and climate plan due at the end of this year.

- AH stated that no one questions CCS from a technology point of view, but some do question the cost and efficiency. He also considered that the foreseen role for CCS has declined in the Commission's LTS compared to the last low carbon roadmap.
- AH noted that his country had investigated the possibility for CO2 storage onshore and that it was concluded that storage is not feasible.
- On the LTS, AH noted that his country's main mission is to prevent a target of climate neutrality by 2050. He said that the most ambitious for his country is an 80% GHG emissions reduction.
- PB highlighted that his country had signed the Hydrogen Memorandum, adding that it however remains an issue that only green hydrogen is discussed. This is not technologically neutral.
- PB was not optimistic about CCS, noting the cleavage existing within the Council. He considered that CCU brings more added value, noting a pilot project in his country at a steel plant.
- PB wondered what ZEP intends to do around the gas market reform.
- AH indicated that his country's LTS will be reviewed in 2021 and that this will look at climate neutral scenarios.

Next steps:

- WS to send a thank you note (done).

4. Barbara Rudnicka, Second Secretary Economic and Trade Section, Permanent Representation of Poland (replaced her colleague)

Participants:

Member State: Barbara Rudnicka (BR)

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- This was an introductory meeting. It was intended to broaden the base of support for CCS within the Council beyond the usual EU suspects of the UK and the Netherlands. It was also an opportunity to engage the Poland on its draft NECP and its long-term energy and climate plan.
- BR noted that hydrogen is an issue among Member States as some ambitious ones only want green hydrogen. The Hydrogen Memorandum is now used to push only green hydrogen.
- BR indicated that ZEP's position on the need for blue hydrogen is in line with that of Poland, adding that her country is trying to move away from coal.
- On the June Energy Council Conclusions, she confirmed that Luxembourg, Sweden and Austria were actively pushing against the inclusion of CCS, with Germany rather neutral.
- On the Taxonomy, she noted that it is not yet clear how the Finnish Presidency is going to move forward.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

Next steps:

- WS to send a thank you note (done).
- WS to send SET Plan material and opportunity for Poland to join (done).
- ZEP to share 1-2 pager on CCS as industrial value chain and building block of the transition.

5. Grzegorz Radziejewski, Member of Cabinet of Vice President Jyrki Katainen

Participants:

Parliament: Grzegorz Radziejewski (GR)

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- This (brief) meeting was intended to feed into the Commission's thinking around the New Industrial Strategy. It was also an opportunity to shape the handover to the new Commission when it comes to the funding structures available to CCS projects and especially infrastructure.
- GR noted that he did not know enough about the sustainable taxonomy work to judge ZEP's input, but considered it legitimate for ZEP to take part. He asked whether ZEP considers the thresholds that have been defined as too high.
- On the LTS, GR noted that it is now time to become more concrete, since at present it remains only an idea. He welcomed the idea of framing CCS as an industrial value chain. He noted that the next Commission will set up the structures, adding that nothing will be left behind.

Next steps:

- WS to send a thank you note (done).
- WS to share Sustainable Taxonomy outcome on energy and manufacturing.
- ZEP to share 1-2 pager on CCS as industrial value chain and building block of the transition.

6. Hans Bergman, Head of Unit Hans Bergman Governance and Effort sharing (C2), DG Climate Action, European Commission

Participants:

Commission: Hans Bergman (HB)

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS)

Weber Shandwick: Viktor Borecky (VB)

Recap of the meeting:

- This meeting was part of a set meetings with Units in the DG CLIMA and DG ENER responsible for evaluating the draft National Energy and Climate Plans (NECPs). It provided possibility of explaining the need for CCU/S now and the need for CCS for the production of blue hydrogen

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- GS explained the need for ensuring that the NECPs are in line with the long-term plans and that 2030/2050 is a false distinction, as investments made in light of 2030 targets and the plans need to comply with the 2050 trajectory. HB asked about how this would fit with building gas power plants, and GS indicated they would only be sustainable in conjunction with CCS.
- HB had little awareness of blue hydrogen. He also was not certain how CCS would be able to deal with the lack of public acceptance. However, he noted that there seems to be more support from politicians for CCU as part of circularity.
- HB asked whether ZEP could share its position on NECPs and CCU/S.
- GS also suggested that the co-chairs of SET Plan should meet with HB after the Commission concludes the assessment of the NECPs. This would help the SET plan in engaging with Member States. HB would be willing to meet after June.
- HB invited GS to speak at one of the NECP meetings where the Commission and Member States discuss the ongoing analysis.

Next steps:

- WS to send thank you note (done).
- ZEP to share recommendations on draft NECPs (CCU/S, hydrogen, SET Plan, regional cooperation).
- WS to follow-up on suggested involvement in the NECP meetings with Member States (done).

7. Jenni Hakala, Senior Specialist, Single Market and industrial policy and Miika Tommila, Senior Specialist, Energy, Permanent Representation Finland

Participants:

Member State: Jenni Hakala (JH), Miika Tommila (MT)

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS), Jonas Helseth (JH)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- This was the first meeting that ZEP has held with the Perm Rep in recent years. It was intended to feed into Finland's preparations for the Council Presidency, as well as its own long-term energy and climate planning, and the opportunities for regional cooperation.
- JH noted that energy and competition sit within the same ministry in Finland.
- MT stressed that Finland pursues three strategic principles when it comes to electrification: Technological neutrality, market-based, and system integration.
- He noted that Finland sees potential for CCS in industry, as well as bio-CCS in the future. Although there have not been any big investments for now. He agreed that other Member States cannot hold those who want to pursue CCS hostage. This one-size-fits-all approach does not work.
- MT noted that the Finnish Presidency intends to discuss technologies in light of the LTS during its term, adding that Europe needs technologies to become cheaper and CCS is one of the technologies needed.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- MT wondered whether the EU needs a more direct instrument to ensure progress on climate action, rather than the indirect approach via the Sustainable Taxonomy. He agreed that the Taxonomy is in reality more an industrial than financial policy discussion.
- He queried whether there has been any thinking around linking up the Sustainable taxonomy with the ETS, adding that this should not be an issue if we speak about aligning the benchmarks.
- MT acknowledged that the lack of support for blue hydrogen is an issue and that this is not technologically neutral, but considered the Commission's lack of support the problem.
- JH considered the meeting very timely with the new Finnish Government coming in and the Presidency programme this under discussion.
- She stressed that the lack of legislative files means that the Presidency will focus heavily on the high-level strategic discussions. Of particular interest to them is the link between industrial policy, internal market, sustainability, fairness, competitiveness, and digital.
- MT thanked ZEP for the suggestion to provide support to the Presidency programming. HL added that she was convinced about the sense of urgency around CCS.

Next steps:

- WS to send a thank you note (done).
- WS to send information about PORTHOS and Northern Lights (done).
- ERG/WS to share idea on Nordic cooperation.
- ZEP to consider suggestions for input into Council Presidency programming.
- ZEP to share 1-2 pager on CCS as industrial value chain and building block of the transition.

8. Ioan Pogea, HoU Unit Energy Policy, and Cosmina Miu, HoU Industry

Participants:

Member State: Ioan Pogea (IP) Cosmina Miu (CM)

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- This meeting was intended to engage the Romanian Presidency around the June Energy Council Conclusions. It was also an opportunity to broaden the base of support for CCS within the Council beyond the usual EU suspects of the UK and the Netherlands, as well as to engage the Romanians on their draft NECP and its long-term energy and climate plan.
- CM considered it important to raise more awareness of the link between CCS and hydrogen as many do not understand it.
- IP highlighted the challenges with including CCS in the June Energy Council Conclusions, noting that some Member States are also pushing to remove CCS but keep CCU in such as the Czech Republic. He noted that Italy and Luxembourg heavily opposed the inclusion of CCS.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- He noted that the fall-back option would be to refer only to 'carbon capture technologies'. This was already proposed in the second version of the text, but it was the Commission that called for bringing CCS and CCU back in.
- IP added that it has proven impossible to decouple the Conclusions on the future of Europe's energy systems from the LTS discussion, adding that the focus is really on the post-2020 period.
- GS noted that common standards are currently being developed for CO2 transport and storage, which may dispel some fears among Member States about the risk of unsafe practices.
- CM highlighted the recent COMPET Council Conclusions as successful, adding that industry was a priority for the Romanians. She expressed her fear that the New Industrial Strategy will actually become a paper on industrial decarbonisation to near-zero emissions. But when the Presidency wanted to include a reference in the Conclusions to the costs of the industrial transformation, some Member States opposed having any mention of financial measures.
- CM asked about hydrogen for heating purposes. She stressed that putting this in place requires engineering skills. She would ask the ministries about how Romania sees the role of hydrogen in its national transition as they have direct relations with the relevant companies.
- We discussed a potential event in Romania on CCS and hydrogen and she would check internally if there is interest in something like that.

Next steps:

- WS to send a thank you note (done).
- ZEP/WS to prepare and share Sustainable Taxonomy outcome on energy and manufacturing.
- ZEP/WS to prepare and share material on hydrogen for heating.
- ZEP to consider potential for an event in Romania on CCS and hydrogen.

9. Paula Pinho, HoU A1 Energy Policy, Haitze Siemers, Head of Unit C.2 New energy technologies, innovation and clean coal, DG ENER

Participants:

Commission: Paula Pinho (PP), Haitze Siemers (HS)

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS), Jonas Helseth (JH)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- This meeting was intended to feed into the Commission's evaluation of the draft NECPs and the recommendations it will issue to Member States.
- PP noted that the Commission is still in the process of assessing the draft NECPs, adding that where needed it will come with recommendations to individual Member States. She wants to make the most out of the process and activate the Member States to work together around issues of common interest.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- GS indicated that the plans should also add up to the SET Plan Declaration of Intent for Action 9, where this is relevant, adding that some Member States may need assistance for this. He noted that there is not always a proper understanding of the optionality that certain technologies bring.
- HS asked if the mentioned lack of competence concerns the SET Plan or the NECPs, adding that a long conversation would need to be held if this entails allocation of budget from the SET Plan. He added that technical support to the NECPs should be paid for by the Member States, or it would need budget allocation in real terms directly from Action 9.
- He also wondered why some Member States disconnected from the SET Plan Action 9 work and whether this was for technical or political reasons.
- HS indicated that he would take a look at the support action and suggested that a meeting is held with all the supporters of Action 9. He agreed to work on this. He said there was scope for more detailed discussions on the implementation of the Action, adding that some of the agreed actions may no longer be up to date.
- PP welcomed the idea of linking the NECPs to the SET Plan, but noted that the Governance Regulation does not mandate this, adding that there limits to what the Commission can require. She considered this similar to the issue of regional cooperation, while noting that this is actually an immense opportunity when speaking about CCS.
- On hydrogen, HS noted that the Commission is supporting some hydrogen reduction furnace projects, but agreed with the need for a 'complete' hydrogen plan. He mentioned two concerns - cost and speed - and stated that a discussion is needed on this.

Next steps:

- WS to send a thank you note (done).
- WS to share ZEP paper on full electrification of industry.
- ZEP to share recommendations on draft NECPs (CCU/S, hydrogen, SET Plan, regional cooperation).

10. Duncan Johnstone, Dpt HOU Natural Resources, Energy Union & Sustainability, Secretariat General + colleagues

Participants

Commission: Duncan Johnstone (DJ) + colleagues

ZEP: Graeme Sweeney (GS), Jonas Helseth (JH)

Weber Shandwick: Christiaan Gevers Deynoot (CGD)

Recap of the meeting:

- DJ noted that the Commission treats the LTS and the New Industrial Strategy as linked.
- On the Innovation Fund, he recognised the need to recognise the role of CO2 infrastructure as key, adding that he would seek to socialise this among his colleagues in the Commission.
- DJ further noted that the DGs are discussing the notion of future proofing gas infrastructure to allow for hydrogen transport. He however wondered about the acceptability of CO2 storage.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- He asked about how to capture localised emissions from heating and cooling, and about co-mingling hydrogen and methane in pipes.
- His colleague asked about the regulatory framework, noting that the Taxonomy gives clarity and the new Gas Package can resolve the TSO issue. He asked about the CCS Directive.
- On the regulatory framework, DJ asked if ZEP could produce a high-level 1-pager that could be shared with the new Commission.
- He advised ZEP to speak to DG ENER on the repurposing of gas infrastructure.

Next steps:

- WS to send a thank you note.
- ZEP to consider preparing 1-pager with asks to the new Commission.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

ZEP Engagement Programme
19 June 2019 - Recap Note
CONFIDENTIAL

Introduction and key outcomes

Following a series of meetings with key interlocutors was organised at the end of May and early June, we continued with engagements with officials on 19 June. Meetings were held with the following officials:

11. **Dr. Ralf Kuder, Head of Department for Energy and Telecommunications, Representation of North Rhine Westphalia**
12. **Robert Schroeder, Cabinet Member of Commissioner Carlos Moedas**
13. **Maria Jimenez Navarro, Energy Attaché, Alberto Ruiz Rodriguez, Industry Attaché, Spanish Permanent Representation**

Key outcomes:

- NRW does not want to be the first mover on CCS due to the political risk involved. However, NRW continues to be interested and views this as a pathway to maintaining their industrial powerhouse status in Germany.
- Ralf Kuder of the NRW Representation invited ZEP to participate in the IN4Climate.NRW programme and to attend its event in Brussels on 11 September. NRW Minister Andreas Pinkwaer is expected to attend, giving ZEP a prime opportunity for a bilateral meeting.
- Robert Schroeder was not very convinced of the potential of CCS breaking out and stressed the need to prove its economic value. He suggested that there would be limited funds for CCS under Horizon Europe and that the Innovation Fund would be the real key.
- On the next steps with SET Plan and the ETIP, Robert Schroeder said this has been left to the next Commission and that the outgoing Commission is taking a step back. As a final reflection, he stated that CCS now needs to be a clear part of the industrial strategy.
- The Spanish diplomats noted that Spain does not have a defined position on CCS and has been neutral. Both diplomats raised concerns on costs of hydrogen and expressed interest in getting a better understanding of how this could be realised cost-effectively.

Key follow up actions:

- ZEP (JA drafting) to send a letter to Minister Adreas Pinkwaer to ask ZEP involvement in IN4Climate.NRW.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- ZEP to consider attending IN4Climate.NRW conference on 11 September and consider requesting a bilateral meeting with Minister Pinkwaer on the sidelines.
- WS to follow up with Spanish Perm Rep to have a Spanish expert in the SET Plan (done).

Please find below a detailed overview of the meetings.

Detailed overview of the meetings

1. **Dr. Ralf Kuder, Head of Department for Energy and Telecommunications, Representation of North Rhine Westphalia**

Participants:

NRW: Ralf Kuder (RK)

ZEP: Luke Warren (LW), Justus Andreas (JA)

Weber Shandwick: Viktor Borecky (VB)

Recap of the meeting:

- This meeting was intended to build on the ongoing discussion with NRW on pursuing CCS/U/H2 opportunities in the region.
- RK stressed that NRW wants to remain an industrial powerhouse and it has set up a programme called "In4Climate.NRW", in order to find how to combine climate neutrality with competitiveness and upscaling of technology.
- On State aid rules, RK noted that there are bilateral discussions between DE Government and DG Competition. State aid rules have to be reviewed to strengthen the decarbonisation dimension.
- RK noted that natural gas and decarbonised gas will have to pick up in the power sector. JA underscored that CCS should not be seen as a technology for the power sector. Moreover, JA stressed that the narrative that CCS is dead for Germany must be broken, as it is a viable option for industry.
- RK started that NRW closely follows developments around CCS/U, but they are waiting for others to run with it first. His Minister (Andreas Pinkwart, Minister for Economic Affairs, Innovation, Digitalisation and Energy of the State of NRW) does not want to take such a political risk. Chancellor Merkel's recent reference to CCS should be seen as opening a discussion on alternative technologies rather than a clear commitment to CCS.
- LW asked what ZEP could do to support NRW. RK suggested participating in the NRW conference on 11 September (see event registration here) and seek to join the IN4Climate.NRW initiative to show CCS as a pathway for NRW to maintain its industrial status.
- On hydrogen, RK agreed that green H2 would be more difficult to aggregate compared to blue hydrogen.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

Next steps:

- WS to send thank you note.
- ZEP (JA drafting) to send a letter to Minister Adreas Pinkwaer to ask ZEP involvement in IN4Climate.NRW.
- ZEP to attend IN4Climate.NRW conference on 11 September and consider requesting a bilateral meeting with Minister Pinkwaer on the sidelines.

2. Robert Schroeder, Cabinet member to Commissioner Carlos Moedas

Participants:

Commission: Robert Schroeder (RS)

ZEP: Luke Warren (LW)

Weber Shandwick: Viktor Borecky (VB)

Recap of the meeting:

- This was an introductory meeting for LW, but RS met Graeme previously a number of times regarding NER300.
- RS noted that the Commission is considering changing types of financing, providing more than just grants. The Commission will also look to channel private-side investments to help de-risk grants.
- LW explained that CCS should be viewed through the infrastructure angel. Disaggregating CCS would help reduce market uptake barriers. RS showed concern with who would take up such as an approach, but LW noted that this could work for industrial regions like NRW.
- RS asked about the main cost factor for CCS; LW pointed to infrastructure costs. These could be drastically reduced in case of economies of scale.
- LW pointed out that the narrative has to move away from an old narrative of emissions reductions for coal-fired power plant. CCS has far greater potential in reducing hundreds of millions of tonnes of CO2 from industrial emissions.
- Asked about EU policies and programmes of interest, LW pointed out ZEP's particular interest in the EU's New Industrial Strategy, the future of gas, and the Connecting Europe Facility.
- On Horizon Europe, RS noted that it will not seek to drive projects but rather to reduce costs of technologies. LW pointed out the problem that CCU sits in Horizon Europe's industrial missions while CCS sits in energy missions. RS pointed out that more details would become available soon. Mission Boards are to be announced in July 2019 and will first meet in September. RS stated that they will be preparing a more detailed input.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- On Horizon Europe, RS foresees limited funding available under missions compared to Horizon 2020. ZEP could still find funding under specific calls. RS also noted bureaucratic changes to Horizon Europe. The budget responsibility has been moved from specific DGs, and now they will have to agree jointly. Each cluster has its money.
- On the Innovation Fund, RS finds this to be the best means of ZEP finding funding for CCS projects. DG RTD has a formal role in the Innovation Fund, but it is certainly not leading.
- On the SET Plan and the ETIP, LW asked RS what would be the focus going forward. RS said this has been left to the next Commission and that the outgoing Commission is taking a step back.
- As a final reflection on CCS/U, RS stated that it now needs to be a clear part of the industrial strategy. The framework is there but it needs to happen now. The Commission will have limited resources for CCUS – it would have to prove economic results.

Next steps:

- WS to send thank you note.

3. **María Jiménez Navarro, Energy Attaché, Alberto Ruiz Rodríguez Industry Attache, Spanish Permanent Representation**

Participants:

Member State: María Jiménez Navarro (MJN), Alberto Ruiz Rodríguez (ARR)

ZEP: Luke Warrant (LW)

Weber Shandwick: Viktor Borecky (VB)

Recap of the meeting:

- This was an introductory meeting and focused on explaining the issues of CCS/U and blue hydrogen to the Spanish Perm. Rep.
- MJN informed LW of the difficult position that CCS has in Council discussion. Spain does not have a defined position on CCS and has been neutral. Both diplomats however raised their concerns on costs of hydrogen, and noted that the costs/benefits of various types of hydrogen will depend which type of hydrogen they lean towards.
- MJN pointed out that Spain does not have natural storage sites suitable for CCS and asked about using existing gas storage facilities. LW noted that this would make it more cost effective.
- LW underscored that in the next 5 years the Commission and specific Member States need to rally behind flagship projects to make sure that wider adoption happens. He pointed at numerous examples of CCS outside the EU.
- LW explained the costs associated with full electrification, noting that hydrogen will be needed to decarbonise both electricity and transport sectors.

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

- ARR did not see that they would have the right financial conditions for CCS. LW gave the example of Northern Lights and retrofitting LPG ships to deliver CO2 to Norway. MJN found this approach convincing and noted that this alternative should be considered in future reform proposals, i.e. Gas Market Reform.
- LW asked whether it would be possible to see a Spanish expert attend SET Plan forum. MJN and ARR said that they would look into this.

Next steps:

- WS to send a thank you note (done).
- WS to share Leeds University study (done).
- WS to follow up with MJN and ARR to pursue having a Spanish expert in the SET Plan (done).

 © WEBER SHANDWICK 2019 All rights reserved

SET-Plan Action 9 CCS and CCU
Meeting Agenda 17th October 2019

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate, Bezuidenhoutseweg 73, 2594 AC Den Haag, Netherlands

Time	**Agenda item**
9:30	*Arrival*
10:00	**Introduction** • Chairs' update • Commission update

10:30	**Communications & IWG9 strategic direction**
	• Outcome of the strategy session (theory of change workshop) ***– for feedback***
	• Communications plan (WP4, deliverables 4.1-4.3) ***– for approval***
	  ○ Summary report of the dissemination and communication activities to be presented to the IWG9, project website and social media accounts live
	  ○ Workshop with stakeholders n1

11:40	**Promoting greater collaboration and coordination** • Coordination amongst SET-Plan and other EU initiatives ***– for feedback***
	Lunch will be served at 12.00
12.45	**Promoting greater collaboration and coordination, cont.** • ACT update • Mission Innovation update • National Energy and Climate Plans (NECPs) presentation • Update on upcoming funding potential: PCI status, Innovation Fund, hydrogen partnerships and Horizon Europe

14:45	**Future of the CCS/CCU Implementation Plan**
	• Progress on CCS and CCU goals and opportunity to update
	  ○ Feedback on monitoring & reporting templates
	  ○ Opportunities to update
	• Forward work
	  ○ Forward work programme (work package 1, deliverables 1.1 &1.2) ***– for approval***
	  ○ Establish a forward work programme and review stakeholders to ensure that the IWG9 has appropriate representation
	  ○ Develop data management plan for the Pilot on Open Research Data
	  ○ Storage Atlas ***– for approval***

16:00	**Next steps & other items for discussion**
16:30	*End of the meeting*