IET response to the Environmental Audit Committees inquiry on The Seventh Carbon Budget

About the IET

The IET is a trusted adviser of independent, impartial, evidence-based engineering and technology expertise. We are a registered charity and one of the world's leading professional societies for the engineering and technology community with over 157,000 members worldwide in 148 countries. Our strength is in working collaboratively with government, industry and academia to engineer solutions for our greatest societal challenges. We believe that professional guidance, especially in highly technological areas, is critical to good policy making. For further details on the evidence submitted, please contact policy@theiet.org

Introduction

The Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET) welcomes the Environmental Audit Committee's (EAC) decision to undertake this inquiry. However, the Seventh Carbon Budget (CB7) makes limited reference to preceding Carbon Budgets. It would be beneficial if a review of previous Budgets within CB7 was undertaken, this would enable the Climate Change Committee (CCC) to draw upon progress reports and thereby enhance transparency and understanding of the underlying assumptions and evidence base.

In addition, in several instances it was not possible to identify the evidence supporting specific assumptions. The repeated use of the term "CCC analysis", without citation, hinders scrutiny and limits confidence in the robustness of the conclusions. Furthermore, it introduces ambiguity regarding the claims made in CB7 and the mechanisms proposed to deliver its intended outcomes.

The IET recommends:

- **A whole-system approach needs to be taken to identify, address and leverage interdependencies and synergies:** The next Carbon Budget should be underpinned by a robust whole-systems approach that reflects real world performance, engineering interdependencies and operational data. Current assumptions, particularly those relating to renewable energy yields, should be retested and validated to ensure consistency with observed performance. A whole-system approach also enables the identification of synergies across sectors and technologies and is the only way to progressively and logically determine what an optimal overall energy system might look like. This requires taking account of all individual components, interfaces and interdependencies, and weighing them collectively against key system performance metrics including cost, reliability, resilience and efficiency. Reinforcing a systems perspective will ensure that modelling reflects the full complexity of interactions across generation, long duration storage, transmission and both baseline, demand side response, interconnection as well as other energy vectors such as hydrogen. This will improve the resilience of the overall pathway and ensure that system dependencies are recognised, optimised and effectively managed.

- **Increased emphasis must be given to costs and engineering deliverability:** An effective Carbon Budget must be technically deliverable and economically realistic. The engineering feasibility, system design implications, and cost assumptions

underpinning CB7 should be thoroughly evaluated, as current assumptions are optimistic. Without a clear engineering validation process, there is a risk of setting a legally binding budget that cannot be delivered in practice, undermining policy credibility and investor confidence. Transparency on cost assumptions, drivers, and supply chain capacity is essential to ensure affordability and maintain stakeholder confidence.

- **There needs to be greater transparency and a reassessment of imported carbon:** CB7 should include a comprehensive reassessment of historical carbon budget methodologies to include greater focus on imported carbon, territorial emissions, and higher levels of transparency on modelling assumptions and forecasting. Focusing solely on territorial emissions risks shifting carbon intensive production overseas, masking the UK's true carbon footprint; potentially creating a perverse incentive for further UK de-industrialisation as an unintended consequence. Government and the CCC should ensure that emissions reduction pathways consider global supply chain impacts and do not credit carbon reduction to deindustrialisation here where it may be displaced elsewhere. Carbon border adjustment mechanisms (due to be introduced in 2027) and transparent consumption-based metrics should be explored as part of Carbon Budgets.

1. CCC's assumptions behind the budget

1. *How adequate and deliverable are the CCC's headline assumptions underpinning the 'balanced pathway' (e.g. sectoral reductions, technology deployment, economic circumstances, public behaviour) in ensuring compliance with the UK's statutory carbon budgets under the Climate Change Act, including in light of the new Carbon Budget Delivery Plan?*

General observations
We are concerned that the CCC's headline assumptions significantly understate the challenges of ensuring that the 'Balanced Pathway' is both deliverable and investable. The assumptions appear overly optimistic in relation to costs by using historic data, for example assumptions on future costs are now being challenged in the latest CfD rounds, which may undermine the credibility of the proposed pathway and the ability to attract sustained investment. While reduced reliance on fossil fuels is often cited as improving energy security, we would like to see more detailed evidence for this being used to underpin the CB7 analysis.

The resilience of our energy system needs to be fully considered in terms of costs and mitigations. Existing resilience has increasingly become dependent upon imported gas and future resilience, in the periods being considered by CB7, will depend on the resilience of unproven long duration storage and the physical security of offshore assets in an uncertain world. These resilience costs will be significant to energy users and need to be part of a least cost system approach that integrates markets and engineering design together in systems framework.

Evidence base and cost assumptions
As the central component of the CB7 is the associated energy cost, there isn't any evidence of a comprehensive analysis underpinning the projected figures. In particular no clear justification for the estimated £26 billion cost impact offset by £22 billion of savings. Large scale integrated energy systems are highly complex and their performance, both technical and economical, can be counterintuitive. We believe that it is not sufficient to rely upon

levelized costs. There needs to be comprehensive and detailed multi-vector energy system modelling to assess the economic and technical consequences of the Balanced Pathway.

At this stage of development of CB7, there should also be a ‘cost uncertainty’ range and an indication of the variability of the likely costs and savings dependent upon whether underlying assumptions are realised or not.

The cost of energy for renewables that many of these projected savings depend cannot be substantiated based on the evidence currently provided.

Imported emissions and overall carbon position
The level of imported emissions (Figure 10.12) also warrants reassessment. Since 1990, imported emissions have risen from approximately one third of total emissions to nearly equivalent levels.

When these are accounted for alongside UK territorial emissions, the UK’s overall carbon position appears significantly less favourable than indicated, suggesting a need for a more comprehensive accounting framework. Focusing solely on territorial emissions risks shifting carbon intensive production overseas, masking the UK’s true carbon footprint. Government and the CCC should ensure that emissions reduction pathways consider global supply chain impacts, and the pathways are not underpinned by deindustrialisation, the cost of which is not properly accounted for.

Assessing the Impact of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM)
The Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), scheduled for introduction in 2027, will apply a carbon price to emissions-intensive industrial goods. While its intent is to reduce carbon leakage, its broader economic impacts have not been assessed within the current Carbon Budget analysis. Government assessments suggest only a modest effect, implying limited benefit in addressing carbon leakage but potential cost implications for UK industry and consumers. A detailed assessment of CBAM’s interaction with UK carbon pricing, competitiveness and supply chains is therefore required to ensure that its implementation supports, rather than undermines, the UK’s economic and decarbonisation objectives.

Deliverability and the Carbon Budget Delivery Plan (CBDP)
While the CCC’s ‘Balanced Pathway’ sufficiently advises government on how to achieve CB7, the associated delivery risks must be explicitly identified and key enablers prioritised.

The CBDP should serve as the principal benchmark for assessing policy credibility and quantifying sectoral savings.

Government should therefore publish CB7 using the CBDP framework and indicators, incorporating CCC style credibility scoring and sectoral trajectories. This would enable Parliament to assess deliverability on a consistent and transparent basis. See section ‘Mechanism for real-world feedback’ for governance and publication alignment recommendations.

Answers over the ownership of delivery must also be provided. While DESNZ is arguably the authority, its system-wide role needs clearer definition. NESO’s remit, through the SSEP, CSNP and RESPs, focuses mainly on central energy infrastructure rather than acting as the system architect for the full energy chain from production to end use. Clear accountability and ownership for whole system delivery are essential to ensure coherent and effective implementation of the Carbon Budget.

The role of engineering expertise
The CCC's analysis is predominantly scientific in nature. While this is valuable, it differs from the development of a deliverable, engineering based implementation plan.

This distinction highlights the importance of embedding engineering expertise into policy formulation and delivery oversight. We therefore recommend that Government strengthen the role of engineering advice, potentially through the appointment of a Chief Energy Engineer in DESNZ. This will complement the existing scientific advisory structure adding a louder technical engineering voice to ensure that the UK's carbon budgets are underpinned by robust, practical, and deliverable pathways accounting for technical considerations.

2. *Are there critical interdependencies (e.g. between aviation, agriculture, and energy) that could affect delivery of the statutory targets?*

Systems perspective
As with any challenge of this complexity, a systems engineering approach provides a broader and more integrated perspective than the consideration of individual sectors in isolation. Understanding the interdependencies between sectors such as energy, transport, industry, aviation, agriculture and land use is essential to ensure the coherent and timely delivery of statutory carbon targets.

Key interdependencies:

- **Long duration energy storage:** Long duration energy storage remains a critical enabler of system flexibility and resilience. Current treatment of this issue within the evidence base is inconsistent and lacks sufficient depth. Strengthening this section is essential to support grid stability, accommodate variable renewable generation, maintaining energy security across periods of low renewable output, and providing resilience and security supply in the event of imbalance between supply and demand. There is no mention of long duration energy storage in the report. This is concerning as long term storage is essential for a system highly dependent on intermittent sources unless it remains dependent on imported natural gas supplies. It can be assessed from the energy modelling referred to earlier. For nearly 10 days in October we saw wind drop from circa 15GW to just under 1GW and for 5 days we had less than 1GW). A report on large-scale electricity storage from The Royal Society suggested up to 100TWhr of multi-year storage would be required to fully decarbonise UK electricity supply[1]. Technologies such as H2 salt cavern storage supplying CCGTs should be explored to solve this issue. Storing hydrogen in salt caverns will not resolve system constraints unless there is a corresponding market or offtake for the stored hydrogen. The economics of the development and deployment will significantly impact the costs of the system and how it is recovered will affect the affordability of energy.

- **Power generation and end use**: Electric vehicles (EVs), heat pumps, artificial intelligence models and industrial electrification are all dependent on the timely expansion of low-carbon power generation, flexible system operation and reinforcement of electricity networks. Equally the economic viability of new generation and network development is dependent on the development of these demands to share the costs.

[1] The Royal Society (2023). Large-scale electricity storage. UK government must kick-start the construction of large-scale electricity storage or fail to meet legal binding net zero targets by 2050, warns Royal Society report | Royal Society

The sequencing of generation, network capacity and end-use deployment must be carefully managed to avoid system constraints and affordability issues that could delay decarbonisation progress.
CB7 long term trajectories need to be assessed against recent developments in the demand to support AI technologies and whether this affects any of the assumptions

- **Hydrogen, CCUS clusters and dispatchable power:** The successful deployment of hydrogen and carbon capture, utilisation and storage (CCUS) depends on transport and storage infrastructure being sequenced alongside anchor loads. Power CCS locks in use of the natural gas NTS for a 15 year CfD period -potentially requiring operating gas and H2 NTS systems in parallel. Government should consider whether this is efficient and cost effective.

- **Aviation and engineered removals:** The scale-up of sustainable aviation fuels (SAF) will require complementary investment in engineered carbon removals, supported by a robust (MRV) framework. This must be explicitly recognised to ensure that aviation decarbonisation aligns with the wider national carbon accounting framework.
  The energy implications and interdependencies of the development of alternative fuel industries need to be better understood given their uncertainty. High demand for high value alternatives may drive higher energy prices for energy and could undermine the development of alternative fuels. However, it is important to acknowledge the inefficiencies in these technologies

- **Land use and nature-based solutions:** Effective land management for areas such as peatland and woodland depends on long term finance and skills development. Agriculture, biodiversity and carbon sequestration outcomes are important and require a coordinated approach to deliver climate benefits.

Strategic planning and policy alignment
The forthcoming National Energy System Operator's (NESO) Strategic Spatial Energy Plan (SSEP), expected in 2026, together with the Centralised Strategic Network Plan (CSNP) and the Regional Energy Spatial Plans (RESPs) in 2027, should provide the analytical and planning tool needed to optimise these cross-sector dependencies.

DESNZ policy should have due regard to NESO's outputs when awarding hydrogen and power business models to ensure alignment between strategic system planning and commercial frameworks.

Timing and implementation risks
It is encouraging that the Hydrogen Infrastructure Strategic Planning: Policy Statement begins to address the integration of natural gas and hydrogen systems, which was largely absent from earlier policy documents such as the British Energy Security Strategy. Timely coordination between planning, investment and policy delivery is essential if these interdependencies are to be effectively managed.

3. *How could the CCC communicate uncertainties and flexibilities in its modelling, while maintaining confidence in the headline pathway and its adequacy for meeting legal requirements?*

Mechanism for real-world feedback
To enhance confidence in its modelling, the CCC should establish a mechanism to integrate real-world performance data into projections. This enables early identification of deviations and supports proactive management of delivery risks.

This function could be undertaken by a dedicated oversight or operational body that could ensure that CCC recommendations, once endorsed by Parliament, are implemented. As well as continuous tracking and escalation of emerging risks to the statutory trajectory. Without such a mechanism, key inflection points and intervention opportunities may be missed.

Governance should be strengthened through clear lines of responsibility for monitoring, decision-making, and intervention. An independent oversight or operational delivery body could ensure that CCC recommendations, once endorsed by Parliament, are implemented. As well as continuous tracking and escalation of emerging risks to the statutory trajectory.

Visualising uncertainty and contingencies
Each sector's projected S-curve should be paired with a fan chart illustrating potential outcomes based on uncertainty bands and assumptions, making the degree of flexibility and confidence in the pathway transparent.

A concise Plan B table should accompany each pathway, detailing contingency options and trigger thresholds to demonstrate readiness to adapt if conditions diverge from baseline assumptions.

The CCC's Monitoring Framework should be applied consistently across sectors, including uncertainty bands, delivery mechanisms, and "enabler" scoring, to facilitate transparent scrutiny by Parliament, investors, and the public.

Given the pressures and uncertainties surrounding the balanced pathway, the CCC should clearly set out the balance of risk alongside the chosen balanced pathway. In their annual reporting, the CCC should set out where it sees the risks, its budgets and the likelihood of their achievement/delivery. Other areas with uncertainty, such as weather forecasts, present a range of likely outcomes that visualises uncertainty and illustrates increased confidence modelling.

Maintaining confidence
Presenting uncertainty ranges alongside fully costed contingencies allows the CCC to maintain confidence in the robustness of the overall pathway while acknowledging legitimate areas of risk.

This approach strengthens credibility and investor confidence by showing that CB7 is supported by a flexible, resilient strategy, capable of adapting to future market or policy changes.

2. Technology choices

1. *What is the right balance between proven solutions (e.g. EVs, heat pumps) and emerging technologies (e.g. CCUS, engineered removals) to deliver both the scale of ambition required whilst being confident that the measures proposed are deliverable and realistic to meet the obligations of the Climate Change Act?*

Strategic balance and whole-system perspective
Achieving the ambitions of the Climate Change Act requires a balanced approach between proven, scalable technologies and emerging solutions that can address residual emissions. The key factors should be cost, performance and their associated uncertainties. A systems engineering perspective is essential to ensure that technology deployment aligns with the wider energy system, user needs, and delivery capability.

We support a "low regrets" approach that prioritises proven, low-carbon technologies such as renewable generation, network reinforcement and flexibility, EVs, heat pumps, and industrial

electrification. Carbon capture, utilisation and storage (CCUS) should be deployed primarily for process emissions, with engineered removals reserved for residual emissions that cannot otherwise be mitigated. It needs to be considered that there is a potential that we need all of the aforementioned technologies, albeit on different timescale. It is important to note that both the IEA and ICC assert there is no credible pathway to net zero without CCUS.

This balance is consistent with the whole-system planning principles expected under the SSEP and aligns with the DESNZ hydrogen business models that coordinate production, transport, storage and hydrogen-to-power integration. See section ‘Deliverability and the Carbon Budget Delivery Plan (CBDP)’ and ‘Behavioural change and deliverability’ for discussion of economic and deliverability uncertainties.

Achieving the right balance
The right balance between proven and emerging technologies should be guided by five core principles:

1. **Comprehensive coverage of end-use sectors:** Decarbonisation efforts should address all major energy end-use sectors equitably. Industrial and commercial energy demand accounts for almost 40% of UK consumption, yet current focus remains predominantly on domestic and transport sectors. Neglecting industrial decarbonisation risks achieving emissions reduction through deindustrialisation rather than genuine efficiency gains.

2. **Appropriate application of technology:** Each end-use sector should adopt the most suitable technology solution. No single technology can meet the full range of decarbonisation needs across the economy.

3. **Granular deployment and system fit:** Technologies must be applied where they are most effective. For example, heat pumps may offer an optimal solution for new-build housing but remain challenging for retrofitting the 60 - 85% of the existing housing stock that will still be in use by 2050.

4. **Transparency and flexibility in assumptions:** Policymakers and the CCC should clearly state the assumptions underlying their analysis, recognising uncertainties and allowing flexibility in delivery pathways. A narrow focus on preferred technologies before all variables are understood could undermine the overall decarbonisation effort.

5. **Be guided by cost and performance:** Decisions should prioritise technologies that deliver measurable emissions reductions at the lowest overall system cost while maintaining reliability and performance. Investment should focus on scalable, high-impact solutions that balance affordability for consumers and competitiveness for industry.

Whole-system coordination and conclusion
A holistic, whole-energy-system approach is essential to balance proven and emerging technologies effectively. System integration must consider infrastructure readiness, consumer behaviour, affordability, and industrial competitiveness alongside emissions reduction.

Without such a coordinated perspective, there is a risk of undermining progress before decarbonisation efforts are fully underway. Establishing this balance will be key to ensuring that the UK meets its Climate Change Act obligations through pathways that are ambitious, deliverable and economically sustainable.

2. *What contingency or resilience measures are needed if anticipated technologies or behavioural changes do not deliver at the pace assumed, in order to remain compliant with the statutory trajectory?*

Overview and need for enhanced contingency planning
The current framework provides only limited contingency for deviation from assumed technology deployment rates or behavioural change trajectories. A more detailed assessment of both opportunities and threats is essential to ensure that policymakers and delivery bodies are fully aware of the most material risks. This includes identifying dependencies between sectors, the sensitivity of outcomes to cost and GDP assumptions, and the extent to which those assumptions underpin statutory compliance.

The more significant contingency options presented rely on increased electrification of heat and transport and should be tested against deliverability in terms of building generation, transmission and distribution to support these. It is not evident that this would provide contingencies against, say slower decarbonisation of the electricity system than anticipated.

Assessment of risks and assumptions
The CCC and other relevant organisations have previously examined the viability of different decarbonisation pathways. However, these assessments often stop short of quantifying the magnitude of risk to the budgets where delivery depends heavily on uncertain assumptions.

Key assumptions - particularly around technology cost reduction, behavioural change, and macroeconomic stability - should therefore be tested against a broader range of scenarios. Sensitivity analysis should explicitly show how variations in these assumptions could jeopardise compliance with statutory carbon budgets.

Behavioural change and deliverability
There remains insufficient analysis of behavioural impacts and the real-world deliverability of measures that depend on consumer participation. For example, while some external assessments (such as PwC's analysis) consider labour availability, they do not adequately evaluate the feasibility of large-scale delivery of measures such as heat pump installation or home retrofit.

Deliverability should be explicitly assessed as a key component of uncertainty. This includes not only the availability of skilled labour and supply chains but also the willingness and capacity of households and businesses to adopt low-carbon technologies at the pace assumed.

Political and governance risks
Political uncertainty remains a major factor undermining investor confidence and delivery assurance. Frequent changes in government priorities, policy frameworks, and subsidy mechanisms create instability that deters long-term private investment. Until recently there was political consensus when it came to climate change and net zero, however there has since been differing policies adopted amongst parties. This is coupled with high energy costs and growing concerns that we do not understand the technical risks associated the direction taken.

Building flexibility and system resilience
There is currently little operational slack within the carbon budgets. The Government should therefore adopt flexible, system-based decarbonisation pathways that can be actively managed and adapted over time using evidence and engineering-based methods.

Such flexibility should include pre-agreed contingency options - “Plan B” measures - that can be activated if delivery performance or technology development falls below the assumed trajectory. Examples include:

- Accelerating low-regret measures such as energy efficiency and renewables deployment.
- Expanding support for flexible demand-side solutions and energy storage.
- Scaling up transitional measures (e.g. hybrid heating systems) where immediate decarbonisation options prove unviable.

Operationalising contingency measures
The CCC should define a set of pre-agreed triggers and corresponding response levers linked to the delivery metrics in the Balanced Pathway. These should be transparently published and monitored via a CB7 Delivery Dashboard, enabling Parliament and stakeholders to identify when corrective action is required.

For example, if progress towards heat pump deployment or EV adoption deviates materially from projected trajectories, predefined corrective measures - such as revised incentives, regulatory adjustments, or targeted infrastructure investment - should be automatically activated.

This structured approach would enable proactive management of risks, ensuring that deviations from the statutory pathway are identified and addressed early enough to maintain compliance with the Climate Change Act.

3. Costs, policy choices and economic implications

1. *How will the costs of delivering CB7 be distributed between households, businesses and regions, and what policies are needed to ensure fairness, resilience, and public support?*

Overview and distribution of costs
The distribution of costs associated with delivering CB7 remains highly uncertain. Even the most sophisticated modelling relies on assumptions that have not been adequately benchmarked against real-world data. This is particularly evident in the projected feasibility of large-scale heat pump retrofits and the limited engagement of UK industry beyond the six main industrial clusters.

Industrial and regional disparities
Progress in reducing territorial GHG emissions has, in part, coincided with an increase in imported emissions. This trend risks being reinforced under CB7, as rising domestic energy costs could continue to erode industrial competitiveness and output, particularly in energy-intensive sectors.

Industrial participation and regional engagement are limited in the current framework, with little evidence of comprehensive assessment of operational expenditure (OPEX) assumptions or amortised capital costs (Capex).

Ensuring fairness and public support
The CCC should adopt the CBDP and its associated indicator set to publish a transparent, distributional analysis of costs and benefits by tenure, income group, and region. Clear

regulation, accessible guidance, and visible accountability mechanisms are needed so that both government and delivery bodies can be held responsible for outcomes.

Capital support should be targeted by need and region, with fairness metrics reported on a CB7 Delivery Dashboard. This would help align public investment with areas most affected by transition costs, strengthen public consent, and allow Parliament to test “fairness by design” through transparent, data-led reporting.
Affordability is different to the balance of economic costs and benefits. Assessing affordability against the cost of change would be impactful for fairness and public support.

To ensure public support, communication should focus on tangible benefits to demonstrate the wider societal value of timely action. Government should also avoid technical terminology, use clear and accessible language, and publish straightforward timelines, milestones and indicators to show progress and accountability.

2050 costs and considerations
Energy cost increases are happening as a result of growing volumes of inflation linked and subsidised renewables. Unlike gas prices which have returned to more normal levels, inflation linked non-commodity costs are increasing. In addition, there are constraint and transmission reinforcement costs as well as operational costs associated with intermittency. With the addition of further subsidised tranches of renewables to be supplemented by other subsidised technologies such as nuclear, the prospect for reductions in costs and prices to consumers seems remote. Whilst it is not primarily a mission driven by economic needs the Government should recognise that the delivery of net zero 2050 may have adverse impacts on the economy and the cost of energy. We suggest that a suitable benchmark might be provided by monitoring the average abatement costs of carbon reducing measures and possibly setting a limit before progressing with implementation on a wide scale.

4. Behavioural change

2. *How might wider government strategies for growth, productivity, and regional development influence emissions trajectories under CB7, and what mitigation is needed to ensure continued compliance with the Climate Change Act?*

Whole-systems approaches need to consider how wider strategies impact on the trajectories for carbon budgets. Failure to have the appropriate funding, demands or skills and resources could either lead to a failure of the system that delivers on our climate commitments, or adversely impact peoples lives in trying to deliver them, for example: through excessively expensive energy or unaffordable choices being imposed.

Overview and influence on emissions trajectories
Wider government strategies for growth, productivity and regional development will strongly influence emissions trajectories under the CB7. Decisions on infrastructure sequencing, industrial clustering and investment priorities will determine both the pace and geographical distribution of decarbonisation.

Integration of planning and system development
Growth and regional strategies should be aligned with national decarbonisation planning through the SSEP, CSNP and RESPs.

These mechanisms should be used to integrate power generation, hydrogen production, and CO_2 transport and storage infrastructure with regional industrial and development plans, ensuring that economic expansion supports, rather than hinders, CB7 delivery.

Evidence-based assessment and accountability
Industrial clusters and regional growth projects should be required to evidence their carbon impacts using the Assessing Carbon Impacts (ACI) methodology, including clear system boundaries, causal chains, and semi-quantitative risk ranges. This will enable transparent comparison of regional initiatives and ensure that local development remains consistent with national emissions budgets.

Managing productivity-related emissions risks
Where productivity policies stimulate energy-intensive activity, these impacts should be mitigated by prioritising electrification and hydrogen substitution within affected sectors. Grid connections and infrastructure capacity should be ring-fenced in those locations to support low-carbon alternatives and prevent lock-in to fossil-fuel-based growth.

5. Public engagement

1. *How can the Government engage the public in ways that build understanding, tackle misconceptions, and increase buy-in for the statutory action required under CB7 and Carbon Budget Delivery Plans?*

Transparency and accessibility of evidence
Transparency and open communication promotes trust, ensures fair decision-making, and encourages collaboration across public, private and civil society sectors - key conditions for long-term public consent.

Government should establish a CB7 Evidence Hub, modelled on the CCC monitoring framework, consolidating sectoral targets, delivery enablers, and progress indicators in a single public platform.

This should be accompanied by a public dashboard aligned to CCC sector definitions and credibility scoring, enabling citizens to track measurable progress and outcomes rather than policy announcements. This transparency will strengthen trust and dispel misconceptions by providing verifiable data and consistent metrics.

Government should communicate the rationale behind CB7 changes through clear, relatable tools such as a “CB7 Receipt” for key household-level decisions. This should outline upfront costs, expected changes in running costs, available grants or loans, consumer protections, and a “cost of delay” illustrating the financial and environmental implications of inaction.