**LORD CLANMORRIS – (CAMPAIGN FOR LOWER ELECTRICITY PRICES)**

**Replies to questions set out in Centralised Strategic Network Plan: Consultation On Stage 1 – Modelling Future Supply And Demand**

**Question one.**

The FSO should retain the scenario option.

The FSA should plan its transmission network based on the highest demand projection in the FES scenarios.

**Question two**

There should be a high low and best estimate for the short term not a single view.

**Question three**

The route to Net zero, should be determined by Government and not by the FSO. Government may well feel that energy security should have priority over any possible route to net zero.

**Question four**

There is no need to extend any projections beyond 2050. Forecasting demand in 2050 is nearly impossible, forecasts beyond that date a waste of effort.

**Question five**

Modelling should always include extreme data ranges as a matter of course, and not just when requested by the FSO. Extreme data ranges should take account of the fact that for over 4,500 hours in the year wind power can only achieve 20% of grid demand. There is no evidence that a major increase in the amount or geographical extent of wind power will somehow materially alter this figure.

**Question six**

We agree that in the short term are constrained network model is appropriate. However, if an unconstrained model scenario is adopted for later years, it should state where and when and at what cost the necessary transmission network should be installed.

**Question seven**

The default position should be total transparency of the assumptions, the algorithms and the data used in modelling. Where information is suppressed the reasons given should be confined to matters of national security, and nothing else.

**Question 8 & 9**

Voters and politicians will acquire cost estimates as part of the data output.

Analysts and Politicians will require wind variability assumptions.

**Question 10**

Regional hub and Industrial hub pathways to 2050 pathways are an unnecessary complication.

**Question 11**

The FES should be published annually as before.

**Question 12**

The variability of wind on an hourly basis should be part of all modelling. Wind variability is a high probability and high impact event. Wind fails to provide 20% of grid demand for 4500 hours or more every year (source: 5 year analysis of Balancing Mechanism Reporting System carried out by CLEP).

Future modelling should also take account of the fact that nuclear power costs for small modular reactors will be considerably lower than the costs of unsubsidised wind and therefore the proportion of nuclear will be likely be much higher than the amount of nuclear power shown in the current FES scenarios. In the four FES 2022 scenarios the forecast proportion of nuclear is in the range 5.2% to 7.8% of supply. This is a major mismatch with the Government’s stated policy that nuclear should provide 25% of supply.

When modelling is carried out FSO must take account of potential sabotage of the undersea cables from offshore wind farms by a hostile foreign power (similar to the sabotage of the North Sea gas pipeline from Russia to Germany). This is a low probability but very high impact event. Because of the very high impact there should be a strict limit to the amount of electricity which is reliant on offshore wind.