SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY RESEARCH GROUP LGI

CentraleSupélec | université PARIS-SACLAY

SERG WP SERIES 2026-5 · OCTOBER 2026

RESEARCH FOR A SUSTAINABLE TOMORROW

Implications of Design Choices in the Allocation of Carbon Contracts for Difference

A Review of the Literature

Katharina Menke · Albert Banal-Estañol · Olivier Massol



Carbon Contracts for Difference are central to industrial decarbonization, but their effectiveness and cost-efficiency depend on how they are allocated – on eligibility rules, award procedures, and award criteria.

Carbon Contracts for Difference (CCfDs) have quickly moved from theory to practice as a **central tool for industrial decarbonization**. These long-term contracts between governments and project developers guarantee a fixed carbon price for verified emission reductions, reducing risk and closing part of the cost gap between low-carbon and conventional production. As CCfD programs scale up, one central question is **how to allocate them: determining who receives contracts and under what conditions**.

This paper **reviews and organizes the emerging literature on CCfD allocation and its implications**. It distinguishes three groups of design choices: eligibility rules, award procedures, and award criteria. These elements are assessed against four criteria: effectiveness (emissions reduced), static efficiency (support cost per ton), dynamic efficiency (innovation and cost reductions over time), and practical and legal feasibility.

The review shows that **allocation design involves clear trade-offs**. Narrow eligibility rules and strict maturity requirements can reduce the risk of project failure, but may exclude innovative projects that matter for long-term technology development. Broad, technology-neutral competitions favor the cheapest options and improve short-term cost efficiency, yet can lead to technological lock-in. By contrast, technology- or sector-specific pots, quotas, or scaling factors promote diversity and learning, but at higher average support costs.

Auctions are widely recommended to harness competition, reveal private cost information, and limit windfall profits, yet their performance depends on the number and structure of bidders. In concentrated or highly capital-intensive sectors, auctions risk weak competition and renegotiations, so negotiated or hybrid approaches are discussed as complements.

Overall, the paper finds that **research on CCfD allocation is still at an early stage**. Much of the work is qualitative and based on gray literature, and important topics – such as penalties and non-compliance, bidding strategies, budget buffers, and interactions with broader CCfD contract design – remain lightly explored. To support evidence-based policy, the paper calls for quantitative analyses, such as empirical analyses of implemented schemes, and auction simulations, to complement the current conceptual debate.

Key points

1. **Allocation design matters**. Design elements determine which projects are financed, how much emissions are reduced and at what public cost.
2. **Trade-offs are inherent.** Choices that improve short-term cost-efficiency can reduce long-term innovation and technology diversity.
3. **Auctions can have limits.** Auctions can have limits. Their suitability for CCfD allocation depends on sector concentration and technology uncertainty.
4. **Design details have big effects.** Sector pots, price caps and project maturity requirements all shift project risks and allocation results.
5. **Evidence is still limited.** Most insights rely on qualitative and gray literature, underscoring the need for quantitative studies.

Main takeaway

CCfDs are not a one-size-fits-all instrument. Durable, cost-effective support for industrial decarbonization requires thoughtful allocation design that balances short-term cost efficiency, long-term innovation, and political and legal feasibility, rather than relying on any single allocation rule.

katharina.menke@centralesupelec.fr