



Implementation of the CO₂ Geological Storage Directive in Hungary:

experiences, problems and their
solutions in a „new“ EU country

Gyorgy FALUS, ELGI



Tamas HAMOR, HOMG



Schedule

- Decision of the EU Parliament and Council 04/2009,
- Publication in the OJ 06/2009 setting mandatory implementation deadline end 06/2011 for MS, (sanctions?)
- Setting up the implementation procedure in Hungary



General challenges

- Directive negotiated by environmental Coreper
Less efficient implementation process – mistrust, lack of awareness in CCS technologies
- According to the Environmental stakeholders the Directive should have been harmonized as an Environmental law. Other ministries (3 others involved) would have only been involved through interservice consultation.
- Debated by the Ministry of Economy (responsible for Energy) from the very beginning.

Major problem: energy and climate issues belonged to different ministries



Shifting gears in 2010

- After immatriculation of the new Government in Spring, 2010, the Governmental structure was significantly re-organized and the climate-energy issues were brought to a single ministry (Ministry of National Development).
- Hungarian Office for Mining and Geology (HOMG) nominated as the competent authority leading the transposition process **without compromising any environmental aspects.**



New dilemma



→ Prospecting rights

→ Liberalized approach: first-come-first-served

or

→ concession tender

Decision made
end 2010

„...classified the entire territory of Hungary as a closed area with regard to hydrocarbons, **carbon dioxide**, coal-bed methane, hard coal and ores (including bauxite)“

(2011/C 124/11)



High-speed transposition

- Changing of the Mining Law and the associated executive decree.
- Decision was made that a single executive decree will harmonize 85-90% of the EU Directive.



Consultation

- Currently administrative (intra-governmental) consultation
- Contemporaneously discussion with research institutes and NGOs
- Followed by public consultation



Expected timing of transposition

- ➔ Predominant portion of the Directive to be harmonized in due time. Some of the minor modifications may slip out of the deadline...
- ➔ 1 remaining conflict with Environmental stakeholders:
Monitoring in separate executive decree

HOMG-ELGI in appendix using GD as starting point



Critics

- New terms such as *storage complex*, *significant irregularities*, *etc...* did not help the transposition procedure. Furthermore, gave ground to CCS-sceptics to hinder implementation and CCS actions.



Lessons learned

→ CE-countries

- Build awareness
- Build trust
- Try to find personal contact, try to engage your contact to CCS
- Be ready to answer any questions precisely and quickly



→ EC & e.g. CGS EU...

- Communicate clearly and regularly at different levels
- Keep track of the effect
- Find national „allies“ and educate them
- „One-fits-all“ is not a good approach – nation specific



Thank you!

