I only became aware of this consultation today so for the most part will confine myself to comments about the SSEN submission for replacement of the cable to the Uists by TWO different cables which do NOT share the same route & which I fully support

viz:-Pre-emptive replacement of Uist cable rejected (Case Ref: ER3561)-after reading SSEN submission

The SSEN submission is thorough & considered -costs are re-dacted but would act to PREVENT the scenario I have experienced over the past 34 years which has repeatedly happened to Islay (& to a lesser extent Jura) from "visiting" the Uists ie of cable failure aka irreparable "snapping" and months of delay until a new cable may be sourced and then availability of specialist cable vessels ,and the inevitable consequences of frequent power cuts of many hours duration.However my experiences are ALL before the new "cost of living crisis" when EVERYONE's energy costs are expanding exponentially

Of course the investment has a high cost BUT without it the risk of failure of the cable remains v high but also the supply is constrained .

Electricity can flow either way on a cable so "lack of capacity" also means that the potential for local renewable generation CANNOT be progressed (there have been previous concerns from Lewis re on-shore wind-farms which were not progressed with because the ability for onward transmission was not possible.).

This is a constraint quite apart from the charges for transmission of electricity FROM Scotland esp the Highlands & Islands which make it completely financially un-viable to develop renewable projects

Shetland is not yet "on the national grid" so at least has its own resources

Various sites for off-shore wind farms were sold off last year around Scotland but quite apart from everything else there has to be the infra-structure to transmit the power generated, and this suggestion of rejection for the Uists shows the view from the bottom looking upwards whereby the places with greatest potential appear to be "at the uttermost part of the Earth".

I am aware of the proposal for a cable from Norway to Britain for supply of electricity.Supplies from multiple places without such enormously long cables might be more complicated in the beginning but have the potential of not "putting all ones' eggs in the one basket"

I find the main document to be specious  at best.

For an individual household electricity is on/off and this determination NOT to provide resilience to the Uists is simply a recipe for "it" to be off

This is entirely distinct from the "cost of living crisis"..... in a power cut we are all equal

In anticipation of such events "visiting" me I have ordered a delivery of logs -nit because I require or choose to use an open fire but because I do have a hearth and thus a bit of extra potential resilience.

I cannot remember what the cost differential is between use of "emergency" diesel generators & "mains" electrical supply but it is in the order of 50x more expensive -I am sure SSEN will have these figures because of the costs they have had to bear in recent years due to cable failures

and the inherent delays in addressing emergency situations as against "planned" upgrades.

Electricity charges to consumers in the Highlands & Islands are already v high -however the "system" does not discriminate based upon cable failure -but this year has a unique feature of the excelerating (& un-capped) cost of diesel.....

In summary "the perfect storm" of organisational failure is being promulgated ahead of a winter -and potential storms which none of us can predict.

Ofgem frankly have their head in the sand if the concept of total lack of electricity supply to areas which have a great potential for renewable energy generation are subsidiary to "charging points for electric vehicles in urban areas
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