

Dear Madam,

No you do not understand the point. I am simply advising that the £200B is too small a capital value to provide the nuclear power content never mind the extra aspects of renewables. The period is too short to achieve the full nuclear replacement and needs increasing.

Thank you.

Best regards.

Chris Eaglen

From: Thea Hutchinson >

Subject: RE: £100B short for the next decade

To: Cc: "Project Discovery" Date: Wednesday, 14 October, 2009, 2:08 PM

Dear Chris,

Thank you for your response to the Project Discovery work.

I believe that your email contains i) a query about the split between investment in nuclear and renewable energy sources under the various scenarios and ii) feedback about the importance of nuclear energy.

In relation to your query, I think you might find the breakdown in the table on pp. 95-96 of the report useful. And thank you for your feedback – we are keen to gather as much as possible as part of the consultation process.

If you have any further questions or information, please do not hesitate to contact the Project Discovery team on

Many thanks.

Best wishes,

Thea.

Dear Ian and Chris,

OFGEM may not be providing a complete valuation in the £200B. The nuclear programme would also continue into the next decade albeit at a reduced level.

In the review presented to the IChemE recently £300B was used for forward planning.

Currently I have been reviewing the scope of waste heat recovery and solar thermal preheating for some large projects and find with the current costings and grants it is not economical and in some areas North of Doncaster solar thermal reheating becomes even less commercially viable.

I feel that more categories are required than low/no carbon and renewables to cover the spectrum of methods and techniques. There are methods which still effect the natural atmosphere and are not carbon cycle issues but still are detrimental to the longer term integrity of the atmosphere.

What is of concern is the incredibility of relying on unreliable methods as part of the renewables and low carbon/ green/ clean agenda which are not reproducible or deliverable. For example there is no master plan showing the 33GW of wind is achievable. There is no master plan to show that solar thermal heating is mainly restricted to the SW and some Southern regions but not on the larger buildings because there are practical barriers to plumbing in the methods as an after thought.

I find people and companies are in a position to see through the illusions and statements. This like some other areas is too critical for the UK today as people are genuinely concerned they are in an economically worse situation than in th 70s and 80s.

It would be better to have a nuclear bidding plan not depending on Eon and EDF and others

who have not got the commitment and investment for a £300B (half of GDP) programme.

Thank you

Best regards

Chris Eaglen