

Seventh Carbon Budget and devolved carbon budgets advice – corrections log

Climate Change Committee

The table below provides a log of corrections to the CCC's Seventh Carbon Budget advice report, published in February 2025, and carbon budgets advice to the Scottish Government, Welsh Government, and Northern Ireland Executive, published in March–May 2025. This table was last updated in September 2025.

The respective reports have not been reissued to include these corrections, with this document instead providing a record of the corrections that apply. These corrections would not change the Committee's recommended level for the Seventh Carbon Budget or the carbon budgets for Scotland, Wales, or Northern Ireland. Neither would they change the Committee's overall conclusions as to the deliverability of our Balanced Pathway or the overall costs of the transition.

Given the interdependencies between variables and sectors in the CCC's modelling, some of the corrections identified will have downstream effects on other values. In many cases, these knock-on impacts are minimal; they are only listed here if they are more substantial.

Table 1 Known corrections		
Location	Description of original	Correction
Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 3.6 (p. 72), Table 3.4 (p. 73), Section 7.1 (pp. 145–159)	The calculation of diesel HGV efficiency improvements in our surface transport modelling leads to them improving by 2% every two years rather than every year.	Efficiencies should improve by 2% every year, resulting in a slightly less emissions-intensive HGV fleet than in our modelled pathway. Over the Seventh Carbon Budget period, this would result in surface transport emissions being an average of 0.4 MtCO _{2e} per year lower than as presented. This correction alone would slightly reduce our modelled emissions pathway but would not change the recommended level of the Seventh Carbon Budget. The correction would also slightly change associated energy demand and cost variables for surface transport.

<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 3.6 (p. 72), Table 3.4 (p. 73), Section 7.2 (pp. 159–173)</p>	<p>The metric 'Emissions: direct abatement N₂O' for residential buildings was reported as non-zero.</p>	<p>This abatement should be zero in all years. The amount of misstated abatement is minimal – this change would result in residential buildings emissions being an average of 0.05 MtCO₂e per year higher over the Seventh Carbon Budget period.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly increase our modelled emissions pathway but would not change the recommended level of the Seventh Carbon Budget.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 3.6 (p. 72), Table 3.4 (p. 73), Section 7.3 (pp. 174–186)</p> <p>Methodology report: Table 8.5 (p. 239), Table 8.8 (p. 250)</p>	<p>The following emissions-saving measure was attributed to the industry sector: Substitution of virgin fossil-based organic feedstocks in chemicals.</p>	<p>This measure reduces the embodied emissions of chemicals. Therefore, the measure does not reduce emissions in industry, but in other sectors, for example waste and fuel supply. From this measure, around 5% of the emissions reduction associated with resource efficiency in industry – equal to around 0.1 MtCO₂e per year on average over the Seventh Carbon Budget period – should therefore be attributed instead to these other sectors.</p> <p>As this is a reassignment of abatement, it does not affect the overall modelled emissions pathway.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 3.6 (p. 72), Table 3.4 (p. 73), Section 7.6 (pp. 222–234)</p>	<p>Emissions from military aviation and emissions savings from demand changes relating to behavioural change (business flights growing with recent trends and a small amount of modal shift) were included in our aviation sectoral modelling but were inadvertently excluded from our aviation baseline and pathway totals.</p>	<p>Including these emissions and emissions savings would result in aviation emissions being an average of 0.4 MtCO₂e per year higher than as presented over the Seventh Carbon Budget period.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly increase our modelled emissions pathway but would not change the recommended level of the Seventh Carbon Budget. The correction would also slightly affect associated energy demand and cost variables for aviation.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 3.6 (p. 72), Table 3.4 (p. 73), Section 7.9 (pp. 251–257), Table 9.1 (p. 253)</p>	<p>Our non-residential buildings modelling slightly underestimated the share of public sector and commercial heat delivered by low-carbon technology, by around one percentage point.</p>	<p>Including the correct share would result in non-residential buildings emissions being an average of 0.03 MtCO₂e per year lower over the Seventh Carbon Budget period.</p> <p>The values shown in Table 7.9.1 for the share of public sector heat delivered by low-carbon technology should read 23% in 2030 and 71% in 2035, while the commercial values should read 43% in 2030, 75% in 2035, and 87% in 2040.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly reduce our modelled emissions pathway but would not change the recommended level of the Seventh Carbon Budget. The correction would also slightly change associated energy demand and cost variables for non-residential buildings.</p>

<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 3.6 (p. 72), Table 3.4 (p. 73), Section 7.12 (pp. 269–279)</p>	<p>The metric 'Emissions: direct abatement N₂O' for BECCS industry, within the engineered removals sector, was reported as non-zero in the years 2028–2050.</p>	<p>This abatement should be zero in all years. The amount of misstated abatement is minimal – this change would result in engineered removals emissions being an average of less than 0.01 MtCO₂e per year higher over the Seventh Carbon Budget period.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly increase our modelled emissions pathway but would not change the recommended level of the Seventh Carbon Budget.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Table 4.1 (p. 92)</p>	<p>The cost of offshore wind in our pathway in 2025 is reported in the table as £1,840/kW.</p>	<p>This should read £2,300/kW. The percentage reduction shown in the table should correspondingly read as 51%.</p> <p>The correct values were used in our modelling, so this has no impact on our estimates of the overall costs of the transition.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 4.6 (p. 97), Figure 5.2 (p. 110), Table 7.12.1 (p. 270), Section 7.12.3 (pp. 275–278), Figure 7.12.2 (p. 277)</p> <p>Methodology report: Figure 18.4 (p. 491)</p>	<p>Too high a cost value for the operating cost of power BECCS was used in our calculations for this subsector.</p>	<p>Correcting this would have the following impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average BECCS cost presented in Figure 4.6, Table 7.12.1, and Section 7.12.3 should be slightly lower than presented. For example, the 2050 value should be £312/tCO₂ rather than £349/tCO₂ as stated. • The average removals cost indicators in Figure 5.2(i) should fall slightly more quickly (to £285/tCO₂ by 2050 rather than £311/tCO₂ as shown). • The average opex for power BECCS should be on average around £200 million per year lower over 2025–2050 than shown in Figure 7.12.2. • The lower end of the BECCS range presented in Figure 18.4 in the methodology report should be lower than shown (£229/tCO₂e rather than £259/tCO₂e). <p>Updated versions of Figures 4.6, 5.2, and 7.12.2 including these corrections are available in the Seventh Carbon Budget charts and data file. More granular data on removals abatement costs are available in the methodology report accompanying data file.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly reduce our assessment of the overall costs of the transition presented in Chapter 4.</p>

<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 4.7 (p. 100)</p> <p>Methodology report: Figure 2.2 (p. 77)</p>	<p>The contribution of electric resistive heating to the lower estimate of public spend for residential buildings has been slightly underestimated, while the contribution of energy efficiency has been slightly overestimated. In addition, the 2025 value for the lower estimate was missed off the data inputs for these charts.</p>	<p>Residential buildings public spend in the lower estimate should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around £100 million per year higher on average than currently shown over 2025–2050 due to the electric resistive heating change. This results in less than a 2% increase in the overall lower public spend estimate. • Around £20 million per year lower on average than currently shown over 2025–2031 due to the energy efficiency change. This results in less than a 1% decrease in the overall lower public spend estimate. • The full public spend value for residential buildings in 2025 in the lower estimate (around £200 million) should be added to these charts. This change does not affect any other years. <p>An updated version of Figure 4.7 including these corrections is available in the Seventh Carbon Budget charts and data file.</p> <p>There is no impact on our estimates of the overall costs of the transition.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 6.4 (p. 139)</p>	<p>The values presented for the surface transport contingency options (2.3, 2.0, and 0.2 MtCO₂e) were stated using the 2040 emissions savings modelled for these measures, rather than the average annual savings over the full Seventh Carbon Budget period.</p>	<p>These values should show the average annual emissions savings over the Seventh Carbon Budget period (2.2, 1.9, and 0.2 MtCO₂e). The correct values are presented in Table 5.5 in the methodology report. An updated version of Figure 6.4 including this correction is available in the Seventh Carbon Budget charts and data file.</p> <p>As this is a correction to a contingency measure, it does not affect the overall modelled emissions pathway.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Section 7.4.2 (p. 196)</p>	<p>Woodland cover area is reported as 19% by 2050.</p>	<p>This should read that woodland cover is 18% by 2050.</p> <p>The correct value was used in the emissions and costs modelling.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Section 7.4.2 (p. 196)</p>	<p>The extent of hedgerows is reported as increasing by 40% by 2050.</p>	<p>This should read that the extent of hedgerows increases by 36% by 2050.</p> <p>The correct value was used in the emissions and costs modelling.</p>
<p>Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 7.4.6 (p. 202)</p>	<p>Baseline capex and opex costs for mobile machinery were based on the level of energy demand following the application of our pathway's land-release measures.</p>	<p>These values should have been based on the EEP-aligned baseline levels of energy demand. Based on the corrected values, by 2040, baseline mobile machinery capex should be around 25% higher than modelled, resulting in the additional capex for mobile machinery being on average</p>

		<p>around £60 million per year lower over 2025–2050 than shown in the figure. Baseline mobile machinery opex should also be around 25% higher, which would result in the additional opex for mobile machinery being on average around £150 million per year lower over 2025–2050 than shown.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly reduce our assessment of the overall costs of the transition presented in Chapter 4.</p>
Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Table 7.5.1 (p. 208)	The table reports the low-carbon dispatchable levelised costs for 2030, 2035, and 2040 as 163–218, 147–188, and 161–191.	<p>These costs should read 221–223, 145–190, and 162–189 respectively.</p> <p>The correct values were used in the emissions and costs modelling.</p>
Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 7.5.6 (p. 218)	The long-run variable costs (LRVCs) for electricity that were used in removing the double counting between energy supply and demand sectors were slightly too low.	<p>The corrected values for electricity LRVCs are on average around 1% higher. This means that the amount of cost removed to adjust for double counting should be slightly larger than shown.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly reduce our assessment of the overall costs of the transition presented in Chapter 4.</p> <p>These LRVCs were also used in calculating the retail electricity price assumptions used in our households analysis in Chapter 8, so this correction would slightly increase the electricity costs presented there.</p>
Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 7.7.4 (p. 243)	Fuel supply costs in 2035 were underestimated by £80 million.	<p>Fuel supply costs in 2035 should be £80 million higher. This change does not affect any other years.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly increase our assessment of the overall costs of the transition presented in Chapter 4.</p>
Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 7.10.3 (p. 263)	The costs of using low-carbon fuels in the inland waterways and leisure subsector were underestimated.	<p>Low-carbon fuels operating costs should be on average £330 million per year higher over 2025–2050 than shown in the figure.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly increase our assessment of the overall costs of the transition presented in Chapter 4.</p>
Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 7.12.2 (p. 277)	The costs of transporting and storing CO ₂ captured using DACCS were omitted from our assessment of the operating and capital costs for engineered removals.	<p>The DACCS operating costs should be on average £45 million per year higher over 2025–2050 and the capital costs on average £98 million per year higher over 2025–2050 than shown in the figure. An updated version of Figure 7.12.2 including this correction is available in the Seventh Carbon Budget charts and data file.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly increase our assessment of the overall costs of the transition presented in Chapter 4.</p>

		These costs were already included in our DACCS abatement cost calculations, so they are not affected.
Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 7.12.2 (p. 277)	Transport and storage costs for CO ₂ captured using CCS in Northern Ireland do not include the additional cost of this CO ₂ being shipped to Great Britain for injection into storage infrastructure.	An additional cost of around £10/tCO ₂ should be added to the opex for CCS in Northern Ireland. This would add around £6 million per year on average over 2025–2050 to the opex shown in the figure. An updated version of Figure 7.12.2 including this correction is available in the Seventh Carbon Budget charts and data file. This correction alone would slightly increase our assessment of the overall costs of the transition presented in Chapter 4. This additional cost was correctly added to our cost estimates in our Northern Ireland Fourth Carbon Budget advice.
Seventh Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 8.3 (p. 308)	The overall figures shown in the chart are correct, but the split between electricity and gas in the 2025 Home energy (bills) bar (around £1,000 for gas and £600 for electricity) was not updated to reflect our final analysis.	The split of this bar between yellow (electricity) and red (gas) should be more even than shown, with around £850 for gas and £750 for electricity. An updated version of Figure 8.3 including this correction is available in the Seventh Carbon Budget charts and data file. There is no impact on our estimates of the overall costs of the transition.
Scotland's Carbon Budgets advice report: Executive Summary (p. 18), Section 1.3 (p. 28)	The original text reads: 'As set out in the Act, the Scottish Government needs to publish a statement setting out how it intends to respond to this advice within three months, and, within 12 months of receiving this advice, lay draft regulations to set the carbon budgets or make a statement to the Scottish Parliament setting out reasons for not doing so. The Scottish Government must also publish a Climate Change Plan containing its proposals and policies to meet legislated emissions reduction targets.' This text is repeated in Section 1.3.	This should read: 'As set out in the Act, the Scottish Government needs to lay draft regulations to set the carbon budgets within three months of receiving this advice. The Scottish Government must also lay before the Scottish Parliament a draft Climate Change Plan (CCP) containing its proposals and policies to meet legislated emissions reduction targets for the relevant period of the CCP within two months of the regulations setting the carbon budgets coming into force.' The same change should also be made in Section 1.3. For clarity in interpreting next steps, we have corrected this description in the version of the report hosted on our website. The original version remains available through the Government web archive.
Scotland's Carbon Budgets advice report: Table 3.8 (p. 83)	The share of commercial heat delivered by low-carbon technology is reported as 38% in 2030, 67% in 2035, 81% in 2040, and 100% in 2045.	These values should read 40%, 74%, 85%, and 94% respectively. The correct value was used in the emissions and costs modelling.

<p>Northern Ireland's Fourth Carbon Budget advice report: Figure 3.1 (p. 53), Section 3.2.2 (pp. 59–61), Figure 3.4 (p. 76)</p>	<p>The uptake rate assumed for electric cars is slower than it should have been.</p> <p>This affects the statistics for the share of electric cars on the road in 2040 (78%), the share of electric cars among new sales in 2027 and 2030 (44% and 85% respectively), and the uptake trajectory shown in Figure 3.4(c).</p>	<p>The uptake rate shown should be faster, with the share of electric cars on the road in 2040 being 81% and the share of electric cars among new sales in 2027 and 2030 being 50% and 91% respectively. This faster uptake should be reflected in the figure.</p> <p>This faster uptake of electric cars would also slightly lower surface transport emissions in Northern Ireland, by around 0.1 MtCO_{2e} per year on average over the Fourth Carbon Budget period.</p> <p>This correction alone would slightly reduce our modelled emissions pathway but would not change the recommended level of the Fourth Carbon Budget.</p>
<p>Northern Ireland Fourth Carbon Budget advice report: Section 3.2.1 (p. 58)</p>	<p>The annual rate of peatland restoration is reported as reaching 1,900 hectares/year by 2035.</p>	<p>This value should read as reaching 9,000 hectares/year by 2035. This is maintained until 2043 when it falls to around 3,200 hectares/year until 2050. The percentage values for the proportion of peatland under natural, rewetted, or restoration conditions given in the text and Figure 3.4(a) are correct.</p> <p>The correct values were used in the emissions and costs modelling.</p>
<p>Methodology report: Figure 1.6 (p. 41)</p>	<p>The red line in the second chart is not labelled in the legend.</p>	<p>The legend for this line should say 'Renewables, % of electricity production (1999–2023)'.</p>
<p>Methodology report: Section 9.4.2 (p. 272)</p>	<p>The sentence 'In our Balanced Pathway, we assume that average yields increase by around 10% by 2050.' should specifically refer to wheat yields. In addition, the value should not be given in percent.</p>	<p>This sentence should read: 'In our Balanced Pathway, we assume that average wheat yields increase to around 10 tonnes/hectare by 2050.'</p>
<p>Notes: (1) In aggregate, these changes do not change our recommendation that the Seventh Carbon Budget should be set at 535 MtCO_{2e} or our assessment that the average cost of the transition over the period from 2025 to 2050 is 0.2% of GDP. They also do not change our recommended levels or assessments of cost for the carbon budgets for Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. (2) We have published an updated version of the Seventh Carbon Budget charts and data file alongside this corrections log.</p>		