

Dear European Commission,

The undersigned organizations communicate our deep concern regarding the EU's Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) plans, including the dominant role of the Carbon Capture industry in setting the EU policy agenda.

Today the Industrial Carbon Management Forum kicks off in Pau, France. This forum has been revealed to be [dominated by fossil fuel interests](#) to the exclusion of civil society stakeholders and other expert voices with critical views. The EU Commission has drawn heavily from the Forum's recommendations to inform its CCS plans. Entire sections of the Commission's Industrial Carbon Management Strategy (which proposes a massive scale up of carbon capture projects) closely resemble the Forum's suggestions.

Failure to account for the overwhelming scientific and real-world evidence of CCS failure and its limitations and challenges threatens the EU's climate leadership, reputation, and Paris Agreement commitments - which are critical to achieving 1.5C.

A new report today from IEEFA, [Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis](#) describes the EU's plans to build out carbon capture and storage infrastructure as **"too complex, too expensive, and too late to support net-zero targets"**

It finds the total cost to the taxpayer to build all the proposed projects could weigh in at around **€140 billion**.

The IPCC has labeled CCS as one of the [most costly and least effective](#) emissions reduction methods, and an [Oxford study](#) found high-CCS pathways could cost \$30 trillion more globally than renewable alternatives.

As well as being prohibitively expensive, plans for Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) at scale face overwhelming technical challenges and the records show 50 years of failure. Even with \$83 billion in investment since the 90s, research found that [nearly 80% of large-scale projects fail](#). The industry itself has acknowledged that for all these efforts, only [52Mt of carbon dioxide have ever been stored](#) long-term, highlighting the unlikelihood of achieving the EU's stated goal of storing 280Mt CO₂ by 2040.

The EU is no different, the union has already spent over €3Bn on CCS and hydrogen projects - hydrogen is often paired with CCS to attempt to capture the carbon dioxide emissions released during hydrogen production from fossil fuels in order to label hydrogen a low-carbon fuel. However, this ignores the ineffectiveness of CCS to reduce emissions and the continued use of fossil fuels in the process.

EU policies announced since 2020 have made available between €8-16 billion for CCS and hydrogen projects, and IEEFA estimates the cost could total **€140 billion to deliver on the EU's current proposed CCS projects**.

We cannot afford to give further investments to the fossil fuel industry to gamble with our future and our tax money. Money allotted to CCS would be better spent on the communities and countries that need it most and on ensuring a full and fair phase out of fossil fuels.

Instead of cutting emissions [carbon capture risks producing more emissions than it stores](#) and locking in oil and gas production for many more years:

- Carbon capture technologies have been used to justify new and prolonged fossil fuel production
- Captured carbon is frequently used for Enhanced Oil Recovery, increasing fossil fuel production, emissions and corporate profits
- Carbon capture risks being used to greenwash the image of fossil fuel-intensive industrial sectors, for example in the production of plastics and fertilisers.
- Carbon capture technologies can be used to ‘hide’ the emissions from hydrogen production so it can be falsely labeled low-carbon (“blue”) fuel.
- Carbon capture can help the fossil fuel industry maintain business as usual, while pocketing public subsidies

The transportation and storage of carbon dioxide also comes with [risks to human health](#) and the [local environment](#). Every euro spent on CCS supports the fossil fuel industry and diverts attention from the transition to the safe, clean economy that the EU requires.

Despite this, Carbon Capture and Storage is still being marketed by the fossil fuel industry and its supporters as a way out of the climate crisis. The carbon capture industry, including the ICM Forum, has been a dominant voice in [setting the carbon capture policy agenda](#) for the EU, even defining some key energy policies.

The current fossil fuel industry influence on the EU’s carbon capture policy undermines the EU’s ability to meet its climate goals and responsibilities, and is damaging its reputation and leadership. Rejecting the influence of the fossil fuel industry and investing in climate action that can actually deliver emissions cuts and steer a just transition from the fossil fuel economy is crucial if the EU is to deliver real solutions for climate, nature and people.

The undersigned urge the European Commission to:

- **Stop wasting money on CCS projects and commit to a full phase-out of fossil fuels** - Carbon capture technologies like CCS, Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) and Carbon Capture and Utilisation (CCU) cannot be treated as substitutes for a true transition away from coal, oil and gas, and should be excluded from EU policy-making and funding.
- **Reject the influence of the fossil fuel industry, including from the ICM Forum - [Industry documents](#)** show that CCS is used by the fossil fuel industry to prolong fossil fuel use. CCS benefits the industry, not emissions reduction, and relies on public subsidies since fossil fuel companies are [reluctant to fund the technology themselves](#). Believing industry hype and investing further public money in CCS is throwing good money after bad.

- **Commit to a full consideration of the scientific and real-world evidence of CCS's failures, limitations and challenges** - Broad input from civil society, especially those who hold critical knowledge and positions on carbon capture technologies, is essential to ensure the European Commission and Parliament gain a comprehensive analysis of carbon capture technologies, rather than being led by the carbon capture industry.
- **Invest instead in real climate, health and nature solutions that deliver a transition to a clean, healthy and safe economy** - The EU must conduct transparent and rigorous analysis on the potential cost and effectiveness of CCS compared with a just transition that prioritises renewable energy, energy demand reduction, and energy efficiency.

Europe

1. Agora Association, Turkiye
2. AirClim, Sweden
3. Association for Farmers Rights Defense, AFRD, Tbilisi Georgia
4. Biofuelwatch, Europe/USA
5. Bürgerinitiative gegen CO2-Endlager, Germany
6. Comité Schone Lucht, Netherlands
7. Corporate Europe Observatory, EU
8. Deutsche Umwelthilfe , Germany
9. Earth Thrive, UK & Balkans
10. EcoNexus, United Kingdom
11. Euro Coop, Belgium
12. Fern, EU
13. Food & Water Action Europe, EU
14. Friends of the Earth Malta, Malta
15. Friends of the Earth Scotland, Scotland
16. Klimabevægelsen i Danmark, Denmark
17. Leefmilieu, Netherlands
18. "Miljøforeningen Havnsø-Føllenslev, Denmark
19. Mobilisation for the Environment, Netherlands
20. NOAH Friends of the Earth Denmark, Denmark, EU, International
21. People and Planet Edinburgh , Scotland
22. PowerShift e.V., Germany
23. ReCommon, EU

International

24. Center for International Environmental Law, International
25. ClientEarth , International
26. Global Justice Ecology Project, International
27. Leave it in the Ground Initiative (LINGO), International
28. Oil Change International, International

- 29. SOMO - Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations, International
- 30. urgewald, International

Africa

- 31. AbibiNsroma Foundation, Ghana
- 32. Association pour la Conservation et la Protection des Écosystèmes des Lacs et l'Agriculture Durable, Democratic Republic of Congo
- 33. CEDES, Africa
- 34. Centre for citizens conserving Environment & Mgt(CECIC), Uganda
- 35. Climate Clock , Democratic Republic of Congo
- 36. Global Missions International, West Africa
- 37. SAVE MY WORLD, Democratic Republic of the Congo

Americas

- 38. Center for Biological Diversity, United States
- 39. Centro de Documentación en Derechos Humanos "Segundo Montes Mozo S.J." (CSMM), Ecuador
- 40. Climate Action for Lifelong Learners (CALL), Canada, Ontario
- 41. Earth Action, Inc, United States

Asia

- 42. Association For Promotion Sustainable Development, India

MENA

- 43. Mena Fem Movement for Economic, Development And Ecological Justice, MENA