

Mott MacDonald Response – Workstream 3

Question 1: Do you agree with the approach we have taken to workstream 3?

We would have welcomed the opportunity to participate in interactive forums to discuss this matter. Only one call for evidence was issued which contained specific questions, some of which were not particularly relevant to our particular organisation. Hence we consider that follow-up interactive discussion sessions with invites issued to all responders would have been a better way to ensure all points were captured.

Question 2: Do you agree with the potential wider impact categories we have focussed on? Are there any other areas we should consider?

Whilst we agree with the categories which have been presented, we consider there are other impact areas which may not have been captured including the following:

- Cost to consumers – we consider that MPIs in particular are likely to facilitate a reduced cost to consumers as a result of reducing the cost of connection for users of the MPP and in the long run reducing the ESO/TO operating costs.
- Environmental impact - The establishment of MPIs would reduce the environmental impact of connections as compared to conventional methods. For instance there could be a single connection back to the mainland as opposed to multiple connections, with associated reduction in disruption to marine habitat, marine landings, onshore cable routes, and onshore substations.

Question 3: Do you think the discussion presented in this document adequately represents the potential impact of interconnection within each category? If not, please explain and provide supporting evidence if possible.

We consider that overall the document provides a good amount of detail to allow readers to develop an informed opinion based on facts.

Question 4: Do agree with our initial views with respect to each potential wider impact category? If not, please explain why.

We agree with the initial views presented.

Question 5: Do you agree with our view on how wider impacts have been captured in past needs case assessments?

We have no comment against this item.

Question 6: How do you think we should approach future needs case assessments within the framework presented in this working paper? Are there any other options we should consider?

We consider that as well as assessing projects in a similar manner to that undertaken presently, an assessment against each of the wider impact areas should be made. In particular we consider it important to factor in the impact each interconnector could have on decarbonisation, sustainability and environmental impact. It could be beneficial to align with ENTSOE as interconnectors are likely to provide links to ENTSOE member states where such an assessment would be required. This could potentially reduce development costs by removing duplication for developers.

Question 7: Do you agree with our initial conclusions? If not, please concisely explain why and provide supporting information if available.

We agree with the initial conclusions presented, taking into consideration our responses to the previous questions.

Question 8: Do you agree with our initial proposals? If not, please concisely explain why and provide supporting information if available.

We agree with your proposals but we consider time to be of the essence in respect of providing certainty to developers allowing projects to form part of the 2030 and 2050 solutions. Therefore we consider that swift action is necessary. We consider that your decision document needs to provide clear and firm steps which will be taken, a timeline, and details as to how stakeholders can become involved. It is important to document who will take ownership of this issue and how a resolution will be reached to enable developers (or others, depending on the outcome), to move forward.

Question 9: Do you have any further feedback on our analysis, conclusions or proposals presented in this consultation document?

No further comment