

AN INDUSTRY BRIEFING FROM GRAIL

What's Changing in Your Capital Story

Your next €100M of capital. The IRR you sign. The thesis your board and your infrastructure-fund LP can recite back. Three questions that look separate, but are actually one. A briefing for CFOs at mid-market European energy and environmental-services firms.

PREPARED BY

Johan Grönstedt · GRAIL

FOR

European mid-market
energy and environment CFOs

DATE

April 2026

Monday morning, capex committee Thursday

Every CFO at a mid-cap European renewables developer, energy-services firm, or infrastructure-fund portfolio company has had the same Monday morning. Four things on the screen at 8:00. Q3 production on the 180 MW onshore book came in seven percent below P50 for the second consecutive quarter. The Swedish bidding-zone price landed at forty percent of the plan assumption and nobody on the FP&A bench can split the variance between grid price, curtailment, and availability in the meeting. Your COO wants €40M next capex cycle for an AI-ops rebuild across the asset book, and her one-page calls it "digitalisation investment." Your infrastructure-fund partner forwarded a Bloomberg story yesterday about an AI-native operator closing diligence on a 280 MW portfolio in three days, with a single line: curious how this changes your own diligence cadence before the next underwriting conversation.

You have signed fifteen project-IRR memos for this board. The pattern used to be simple. Hold the hurdle, hold the capex phasing, hit the FID gate. Close the quarter on the covenant. Keep the auditor happy on the impairment test. The business was understandable.

Something changed. Your production is drifting and your team cannot reconstruct the asset-level story in one meeting. Your AI-ops capital is running through the digitalisation line as an operating expense. Your AI-native competitors are compressing diligence from six weeks to three days, and the infrastructure fund is starting to notice. Your Controllers are closing faster than ever. The audit committee is asking about traceability on the AI-generated performance data. The close is clean. The capital-allocation story underneath it is not.

The job has not changed in fifty years. The bar has risen on every measure of doing it, simultaneously, and the trade-offs you have been navigating since you took the seat are suddenly re-openable. The CFOs who treat them as engineering problems run the offensive play. The ones who treat them as permanent trade-offs lose capital-allocation authority to the COO and the CIO within eighteen months.

This briefing covers what is happening in your sector, what it means for the finance function you run, and the three questions your team should answer before the next capex committee.

European energy just lost the underwriting logic that priced the sector for a decade

Every asset you build still earns for thirty years. The decision on where to deploy the next €100M resets the return on every one of them. The Nordic offshore pipeline is moving from 7 GW by 2030 toward 65 GW by 2050. Green hydrogen targets call for 4-6 GW of electrolysis by 2030. Grid-scale battery storage is going from pilot to portfolio asset class inside two years. Every one of these is a new capital-allocation decision the mid-cap CFO is signing off on without fifteen years of precedent to anchor the hurdle. The underwriting logic that priced wind and solar for a decade does not extend cleanly to BESS, hydrogen, or cross-border CfD structures. The firms making this call well are not the ones with the best models. They are the ones who rebuilt the model as a live driver graph off integrated asset-performance, grid-price, and regulatory-precedent data.

Your competitors are not waiting. Larger operators are closing diligence in three days on portfolio deals that used to take six weeks. A 1% faster diligence cycle means three more projects to FID per year. At average project size and project IRR, the NPV differential runs €40-80M per hold cycle for a mid-cap developer. The firms moving first are compressing M&A velocity, re-pricing greenfield development against acquisition, and capturing regulatory-window advantage in markets where a CfD auction closes every eighteen months and the speed to underwrite is the difference between participating and watching.

Your asset book earns for thirty years. The capital-allocation decision you make in the next eighteen months resets the return on every one of them.

The EU Omnibus of February 2026 lifted roughly 80% of firms out of direct CSRD scope. The CFOs who scaled teams 20-30% for CSRD and treated it as a data-foundation project now have an asset feeding portfolio ROIC scenarios and LP updates. The ones who treated it as compliance are watching the investment deflate. And the specialists who built three years of regulatory-precedent intelligence on frontier projects are being recruited by developers at forty percent salary premiums. The knowledge walks out in a day unless the firm has encoded the precedent graph before the departure conversation.

Your capital, your forecast, and your narrative are feeling it every day

Your capital allocation. Your COO's €40M AI-ops request is sitting in the digitalisation line, routed through the same mechanism you use to approve field laptops and SCADA-integration spend. It is not an operating-expense item. It is the largest single capital-allocation decision you will make this cycle, and it deserves the same discipline you bring to greenfield capex and M&A. The finance seats that ship this as a capital line to the board, with alternatives analysis against physical capex, new-geography entry, and tuck-in consolidation, keep capital-allocation authority for the next decade. The ones who sign the digitalisation line hand authorship to the COO and the CIO by default.

Your forecast. The team built the annual plan on a P50 production curve and a forward grid-price assumption. Q3 production came in seven percent below P50. Grid price landed at forty percent of the plan. Your Head of FP&A cannot reconstruct the asset-level variance story because the production signal lives in SCADA exports the OEM owns, the grid-price signal lives in ISO settlement data on a separate system, and the curtailment signal lives in the transmission operator's scheduling log nobody on her team has accessed. The plan is not wrong because the forecast was aggressive. It is exposed because the data architecture underneath it was built for monthly asset reporting, not for continuous reconstruction of the project-IRR story.

Your diligence cadence. Your M&A pipeline has three portfolio deals in flight and a CfD auction closing in Q3. Your current diligence cycle is six weeks per asset. An AI-native operator in your market is closing the same data-room pass in three days. That is not a productivity argument. That is a capital-deployment-speed argument. Three more projects reach FID per year. At average project NPV, that differential is worth €40-80M per hold cycle, and it compounds across the next auction cycle.

Your Controller and FP&A bench. The PPA mark-to-model work, the project-IRR spreadsheet maintenance, the standard variance decomposition, the first-draft impairment tests that used to train a junior controller into a Senior Controller into a VP Finance are running on agents now. The Q1 headcount win is real. The 2031 succession bench is empty. The finance function that cuts the junior layer without rebuilding the entry pathway has a cheaper quarter this year and no internal CFO candidate in five.

Your economic thesis. Your board has asked for the strategy-day preview. Your infrastructure-fund partner has asked for the AI-and-asset-operations update. Your chair has asked how the firm stays ahead of the AI-native operators closing diligence in days. Three audiences, three different documents, each drafted by a different team. None of them are anchored in the same data. The CFOs pulling ahead write the thesis once and let the three audiences draw from the same architecture. The ones behind them are editing three decks and hoping the IRR numbers reconcile.

You do not have three scorecard problems. You have one.

Your sector is being underwritten faster because AI-native operators bring integrated data architecture to every diligence pass and the rest of the market is rebuilding spreadsheet trees. Your finance function is stretched because forecast credibility, capital-allocation authority, and the economic thesis are each being managed as a separate programme, each drawing on a different data layer, each drafted by a different team. Same force, two altitudes. But there is a third thing happening that most mid-cap E&E CFOs have not named yet, and it is the one that matters most.

Capital allocation without forecast credibility is guessing. Forecast credibility without a narrative is scorekeeping. A narrative without an integrated data architecture underneath it is marketing. The finance seat that holds all three holds one asset, not three separate programmes. Every capital-allocation question, every forecast-credibility gap, every narrative weakness is a symptom of the same missing layer: the integrated capital-intelligence infrastructure that feeds all three from the same asset-performance, grid-price, regulatory-precedent, and project-diligence data.

This is the grid-modernisation decision of this decade. Every CFO in your cohort is making it right now, whether they see it or not. The ones who personally owned the multi-decade infrastructure decisions of the 1970s and 80s kept capital-allocation authority for a generation. The ones who signed the engineering requisition because "that was an engineering decision" watched the technical leader take the board seat and the next CFO hire come from outside. The shape is the same. The asset under decision is different. The cost of getting it wrong in 2026 is compressed into eighteen months instead of five years.

You can tell which camp a firm is in from a single question. Can your team revalue any project-IRR memo, refresh the portfolio ROIC, and update the LP report from the same data layer, in the same meeting? Most mid-cap E&E cannot. The ones that can have already made the shift, and they are the ones the infrastructure-fund LPs are already backing at the next raise.

You have twelve to eighteen months. The capital-deployment window on the 65 GW Nordic pipeline is narrow. The CFOs who own this decision personally run the offensive play. The ones who do not become the CFO the board replaces when the successor walks in with a thesis.

What most firms are doing. What the winners are doing instead.

Every E&E CFO has had the AI conversation. Most are making the same four decisions. A smaller group is making different ones. Default looks cleaner for three quarters. Winners compound from month fifteen.

THE DEFAULT PATH

Route AI-ops through the digitalisation line

Sign the COO's requisition. Operating expense in the annual plan. CIO owns the roadmap within eighteen months.

Hold the diligence cadence at six weeks

Pass on deals the AI-native operator underwrote in three days. CfD auction window closes. Next cycle is eighteen months away.

Run the IRR on a spreadsheet tree

One-week revaluation when any PPA assumption changes. Below-plan quarters produce no asset-level story until post-mortem.

Cut the controller layer for the Q1 win

Headcount down 15-25%. Empty succession bench in 2031. External CFO hire the year after at a premium.

THE WINNERS' PATH

Route AI-ops through the capex hurdle

Alternatives analysis against physical capex, new geography, tuck-in M&A. Board sees one capital line with five options.

Compress diligence to three days

Raise the acquisition funnel 3-5x. Capture the regulatory-window advantage. NPV differential compounds across the auction cycle.

Rebuild IRR as a live driver graph

Ten scenarios in an afternoon. Below-plan quarters produce the asset-level story in the same board meeting.

Redesign the junior pathway around judgment

New hires pair with agents on project-IRR scenarios, capex exposure, diligence work. Bench rebuilds faster.

The default path shows a cleaner Q1. The winners' path has visible friction for three quarters and compounds from month fifteen. The difference is whether the CFO is authoring the capital or administering it.

Capital Allocation. Forecast Credibility. Value-Creation Narrative.

Three questions every E&E CFO is tracking. The first is the crux. The other two are how you earn the right to answer it.

01 · CAPITAL ALLOCATION

Where does the next €100M actually compound?

More physical capex on the next generation and storage tranche? AI-ops infrastructure across the existing asset book? New market geography, pushing into UK CfD or German EEG auctions? Tuck-in acquisition of an AI-native operator? Working-capital financing for the turbine-delivery queue? Today's default: the COO asks for capex, the CIO asks for digitalisation spend, and nobody puts the ROIC comparison on one page. The question is whose decision this is.

02 · FORECAST CREDIBILITY

Why did production print below P50, and what is the asset-level story?

Your board voted on a 10.5% project IRR. Your portfolio is printing 8.2%. Your Head of FP&A cannot walk the audit committee through the variance because the production signal sits in SCADA the OEM owns, the grid-price signal sits in ISO settlement data, and the curtailment signal sits in the transmission operator's scheduling log. Three grid-price scenarios used to take a week. They now run in an afternoon.

03 · VALUE-CREATION NARRATIVE

What does this firm do that compounds faster than peers?

Your board wants the strategy-day preview. Your infrastructure-fund partner wants the AI-ops-and-diligence note. Your chair wants the how-we-stay-ahead answer. Three audiences, three documents, three teams, and the IRR numbers underneath do not match. The CFOs pulling ahead write the thesis once and refresh it continuously from the same data architecture. The three audiences read excerpts of the same document.

What the firms winning this play are actually doing

Four concrete moves any E&E CFO can start this quarter. Each addresses one lever. Pulled together, they become one capital-intelligence asset the firm runs on.

1

Capital: route the AI-ops decision through the capex hurdle, not the digitalisation line

Your COO's €40M request is a capital-allocation decision. Treat it like one. Present the alternatives on one page: AI-ops rebuild across the book, physical capex on the next 200 MW tranche, new-geography entry into UK CfD or German EEG, tuck-in acquisition of an AI-native operator, working-capital financing for turbine delivery. ROIC-scored against the same hurdle you use for greenfield. Name what you are choosing not to fund to protect the thing you are funding. That is the sentence that keeps authorship at the seat.

2

Forecast: rebuild the IRR as a live driver graph, not a spreadsheet tree

Your project-IRR model should draw from live asset-performance data, live grid-price scenarios, live curtailment data, and live regulatory-tailwind signals, as one graph rather than five spreadsheets stitched together. Three grid-price scenarios compress from a week to an afternoon. Below-P50 quarters produce the asset-level story in the same board meeting, not in the post-mortem. The forecast stops being a deliverable on a cadence and becomes a live artefact the CFO invests in continuously.

3

Diligence: compress the cycle from six weeks to three days

Your M&A and greenfield-underwriting pipeline runs through six-week diligence passes. AI-native operators in your market are closing the same work in three days. Rebuild the diligence engine around agents handling data-room synthesis, technical due diligence, regulatory-precedent lookup, and first-pass model construction. Senior time concentrates on the deal-killer judgment calls. The acquisition funnel raises 3-5x. The CfD auction window shifts from "we may not be ready" to "we can underwrite two tranches, not one."

4

Narrative: write the economic thesis once, refresh continuously

Three sentences on one page. What does this firm do that compounds faster than peers? What capital gets starved to protect it? What gets fed? Refresh the thesis continuously off the same driver graph that runs the IRR forecast. Infrastructure-fund LP update excerpts the thesis. Audit-committee prep excerpts the thesis. Strategy-day deck excerpts the thesis. Green-bond investor memo excerpts the thesis. Four audiences, one artefact, four registers. The CFO authors the narrative. The board recites it back.

The only firm that joins capital authorship to working infrastructure

The E&E CFO has four places to go. None can do what we do.

The big energy-transition practices will sell a twelve-to-twenty-four-month ESG and finance-transformation programme staffed by a partner and analysts billing hours. Their audit arm constrains their advice on impairment and tax-equity work. Their billable-day model requires selling substrate that agents commoditise.

The asset-management software vendors will sell platform licences and a long implementation on performance dashboards. Your moat has to sit on firm-owned infrastructure or it becomes a vendor asset at renegotiation.

The specialist energy advisories bring domain depth on offshore wind, hydrogen, BESS, or environmental assessment. Their billable-day model requires selling senior hours on substrate work that is compressing fastest.

The big-three strategy houses will write the energy-transition thesis in a quarterly engagement. They cannot put working project-IRR infrastructure in the CFO's hands in three weeks.

The market offers four things you have already said no to. GRAIL is the fifth option.

WHAT YOU GET

Senior advisory that speaks board-room, not deck-room

Working infrastructure your team uses the same week

Custom agents built on your asset book, your data, your PPAs

The start of a capital-intelligence layer your FP&A owns

No vendor lock-in at any phase of the engagement

WHY IT MATTERS

Founded by operators who have carried CFO-adjacent seats

Business first, technology second

Three weeks from first meeting to working infrastructure

Your team keeps the infrastructure, you own the IP

Every next step earned by what just shipped, never assumed

Three sessions with your finance leadership. Working infrastructure from week one.

We start with your finance leadership team because the change cannot outrun the team's personal understanding of what is possible. Three workshops. Each delivers standalone value. Each earns the right to the next.

WORKSHOP 01

How to think

Walk through what is happening in your sector and inside your finance function. Build the first piece of infrastructure in the room: a live project-IRR agent on your real asset book, running against your real production, grid-price, and PPA data. Your leadership team leaves with a shared view of what to do next and the first piece of working infrastructure already in their hands.

WORKSHOP 02

Your finance infrastructure

A half-day build. Your Controller, Head of FP&A, Treasurer, and Head of IR each leave with five to ten pieces of working infrastructure tuned to their function. Portfolio-IRR scenario agents. Diligence-compression agents for M&A. Covenant and DSCR monitoring. LP-update narrative drafting. Infrastructure your team is using the same week, not decks about infrastructure.

WORKSHOP 03

Ready to run

Refined infrastructure based on real use. The rollout plan to the wider finance organisation. The capital-allocation-thesis document for the next capex committee. The diligence playbook for the next auction. And the board and LP conversation with numbers they can check: ROIC alternatives, scenario ranges, diligence-compression NPV math.

Three weeks. No IT project. No board approval needed to start. The infrastructure your finance function is already running on when we finish.

For your next capex committee

The questions where your finance leadership cannot agree on an answer are the ones worth an hour on the agenda. Ask these honestly.

Your COO wants €40M for AI-ops across the asset book. Is it in the digitalisation line as operating expense, or on the capital page as one option among five? If the former, what would it take to move it before the next capex cycle?

Your board voted on a 10.5% project IRR. Your portfolio is printing 8.2%. Can your team walk the audit committee through the asset-level variance in the same meeting, or does it take a post-mortem? If the latter, what data architecture is missing?

Your diligence cycle is six weeks. An AI-native operator in your market is closing the same pass in three days. What is the twelve-month plan to compress your diligence engine, and who on your team is authoring it?

Your LP, your chair, and your CEO have each asked for a different AI-and-asset-operations document in the last ninety days. Are they excerpting the same thesis, or are your teams drafting three documents whose IRR numbers do not reconcile?

Of the junior controllers and FP&A analysts you are cutting to agents this year, how many are the people who would have made your 2031 succession bench? What are you doing instead to build that bench?

If any of these produces a disagreement in your finance leadership, that is the conversation worth having before the board asks.

IN THIS SERIES

There's a version of this briefing for every seat at the table.

GRAIL has produced industry briefings calibrated to the specific reality of each C-suite role.

CEO

Revenue. Margin. Valuation.

Three numbers your board reads. AI is rewriting all three in your industry.

CFO

▶ YOU ARE READING

Capital. Forecast. Story.

What you allocate this year is the story your board reads next year.

COO

Cheaper. Better. Faster.

The triple threat that used to be a tradeoff is now table stakes.

CHRO

Capacity. Capability. Promise.

The biggest talent transition of a career. Compete on capacity, not headcount.

CPTO

Moat. Speed. Allocation.

The platform moat that survives 2028 is being chosen this year.

CCO

Margin. Pace. Position.

The whole GTM playbook is being rewritten in real time, across every commercial team at once.

Visit grail.works for the full series.

GRAIL

An AI-native management consultancy helping European mid-market leadership teams figure out what fundamentally changes about their business as AI enters their industry.

www.grail.works