

Risk ID	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy
C00492	C1 Feasibility/ Business Case	Whole-Life Cost and Abatement Effectiveness Uncertain	The project's real effectiveness depends on capture rates, uptime, energy penalty, compression/transport losses, storage availability, and long-duration operating costs. If these are overstated or under-specified, the true £/tCO <sub>2</sub> e abated and overall benefit may be materially worse than implied.	A whole-life performance and cost model that is transparent, audited, and sensitivity-tested, with clear ranges for capture performance and £/tCO <sub>2</sub> e under best/expected/worst cases.  <b>What Could Go Wrong?</b> Headline CO <sub>2</sub> e reduction claims are achieved only on paper; actual performance falls short, costs rise, and the scheme becomes dependent on ongoing subsidy or "special pleading" to continue.	Public materials often summarise benefits without fully exposing the modelling assumptions needed for independent validation (availability, degradation, energy source, boundary conditions, measurement methodology).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require publication of the whole-life abatement model and key assumptions (including measurement and verification approach).</li> <li>Demand sensitivity analysis (capture rate, uptime, power price, maintenance, schedule delay, carbon price).</li> <li>Define an operational performance reporting regime (KPIs, audit cadence, public reporting).</li> <li>Compare against alternative abatement options on the same metric basis.</li> </ol>

Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk			Response Type	Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Due Date	Close Date	Last Review Date Notes
Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (Pxl)							
Complex whole-life systems are being simplified for communications, while uncertainty is not presented in decision-grade form.	The project is justified on optimistic performance/cost assumptions that do not hold in delivery and operations.	Lower-than-expected CO <sub>2</sub> e benefit at higher cost, reputational damage, and opportunity cost versus better-value decarbonisation investments.	4	4 H-1 C-1 Q-1 S-1	16	Mitigate	4	12	Winter, David	18Jul26	Open	27Feb26

Mitigating Actions / Response				
ID	Actions	Action Owner	Due Date	Close Date
#1	Publish 'whole life abatement model'	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open
#2	Publish sensitivity analysis.	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open
#3	Establish publicly accessible operational performance reporting.	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open
#4	Compare against alternative abatement options	Winter, David	28Apr26	Open

**Last 10 RM Events (Meetings/Interviews/Workshops).**

Mtg.	Date	Title / Person / Department	Objective	(0 Events held.)

**Comments**

**History**

**Top Risk** 2 **Summary**

Headline emissions reductions may rely on optimistic capture performance, uptime, energy penalty, and cost assumptions. If real-world results underperform, the scheme could deliver poor £/tCO<sub>2</sub>e outcomes, require ongoing subsidy, and divert investment from more effective decarbonisation measures.

**Top Risk Mitigation**

Demand a transparent whole-life abatement model: expected capture rate, availability, degradation, energy requirements, compression/transport losses, storage constraints, and O&M costs. Require sensitivity analysis across key variables (power price, downtime, capture performance, schedule delay, carbon price, maintenance). Establish a measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) plan with clear boundaries and public KPIs. Create operational performance gates (minimum sustained capture and reliability thresholds) tied to continued support. Compare CCS to credible alternatives using consistent metrics (whole-life £/tCO<sub>2</sub>e, deliverability risk, impacts, and timelines), and publish ranges rather than single-point claims.