# Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Network Code – consultation on the indicative Heads of Terms – response form

The consultation is available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/carbon-capture-and-storage-ccs-network-code-updated-heads-of-terms](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.gov.uk%2Fgovernment%2Fconsultations%2Fcarbon-capture-and-storage-ccs-network-code-updated-heads-of-terms&data=05%7C01%7CJennifer.Bernechea%40energysecurity.gov.uk%7C4fa2f3dff3734f8d33b108dbe4fc58ba%7Ccbac700502c143ebb497e6492d1b2dd8%7C0%7C0%7C638355544688149956%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=%2B6dx3foZO8wuM2MYC93Hsyw%2B%2F83GfsEKDXMKeeuNWl4%3D&reserved=0)

The closing date for responses is: 16/02/2024.

Please return completed forms to:

CCS Network Code Team

Department for Energy Security and Net Zero

6th Floor

3-8 Whitehall Place

London

SW1A 2AW

Email: [codes.engagement@energysecurity.gov.uk](mailto:codes.engagement@energysecurity.gov.uk)

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or release to other parties or to disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. Please see the consultation document for further information.

If you want information, including personal data, that you provide to be treated as confidential, please explain to us below why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we shall take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the department.

I want my response to be treated as confidential

Comments: Click here to enter text.

## Questions

Name:  
Organisation (if applicable):  
Address:

|  | Respondent type |
| --- | --- |
|  | Business representative organisation/trade body |
|  | Central government |
|  | Charity or social enterprise |
|  | Individual |
|  | Joint response from a Track-1 cluster |
|  | Large business (over 250 staff) |
|  | Legal representative |
|  | Local government |
|  | Medium business (50 to 250 staff) |
|  | Micro business (up to 9 staff) |
|  | Small business (10 to 49 staff) |
|  | Trade union or staff association |
|  | Other (please describe) |

Question 1

Do you agree with the approach to Code governance as set out in the Heads of Terms?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 2

Do you agree that the approach set out affords appropriate pathways for Users and prospective Users to obtain a new or modified connection, either with or without UK government support being sought?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 3

Do you agree with the proposals set out in Section D?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 4

Do you agree with the proposed approach to Registered Capacity?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 5

Would an approach that allowed aggregate Registered Capacity to be greater than Obligated Network Capacity be beneficial, and would the associated risk be manageable for early projects?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 6

Do you agree that the proposed approach to Nominations and Renominations will support efficient and responsive operation of a cluster, balancing the needs of both Users and T&S Co?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 7

Do you have any information or evidence that would support calibration of the “material” and “persistent” thresholds used to assess deviation between actual flows and Nominations?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 8

Do you agree with the pro rata approach being a fair and equitable default mechanism to manage constraints within the network (noting the exceptions listed above)?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 9

Do you consider that the process and timelines proposed for maintenance are acceptable?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 10

Do you have any feedback on the proposed approach the Code will take to CO₂ metering? Please provide justification in your answer.

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 11

Are the proposed CO₂ specifications and measurement requirements appropriate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 12

Is the proposed approach on the CO₂ Re-use Service appropriate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 13

Is the proposed approach on Industrial Procedures (including the list of proposed Industrial Procedures and the Terms of Reference for each) adequate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 14

How should the proposed Terms of Reference for each listed Industrial Procedure be further developed ahead of the Code being implemented, to ensure sufficient and relevant detail?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 15

Do you agree with the proposed charging structure, Charges and associated definitions?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 16

Do you agree with the use of a Mutualisation Cap to limit Users’ exposure to mutualisation?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 17

Do you agree with the proposed calculation of the Mutualisation Cap?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 18

Are the proposals on invoicing and payment appropriate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 19

How far in advance of the Commercial Operations Date should the Draft Data Annexures be developed?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 20

Are the wider data provisions appropriate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 21

Is the proposed CDS proportionate to meeting the minimum requirements of managing the delivery of public funding?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 22

Do you agree with the scope of financial liability which is allowed for in Section J of the Code?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 23

Do you agree that financial liability between Users and T&S Co should be driven by the concepts of property damage and third-party liability as they exist in law, rather than allowing for any agreement to be made directly between the Parties?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 24

Are you supportive of the liability caps proposed above? If not, please explain your reasoning, with supporting technical documentation where possible?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 25

Is the proposed Code Accession Agreement adequate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 26

Is the proposed structure and content of the Construction Agreement appropriate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 27

Is the proposed structure and content of the Connection Agreement Appropriate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Question 28

Is the CDS Accession Agreement adequate?

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Do you have any other comments that might aid the consultation process as a whole?

Please use this space for any general comments that you may have, comments on the layout of this consultation would also be welcomed.

Click here to enter text.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views on this consultation. We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

We carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be okay if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes No