

Dear Sir/Madam

Sail Line Fish was established in 2010 to research and develop sail-assisted and zero emission fishing. We completed a Smart-Scotland Feasibility Study in 2011 where we developed our now Patented foldable mast system [www.balphamast.com](http://www.balphamast.com) . Our plan now is to take our innovation to the next level building an auto-mated, zero-emission fishing/workboat to operate in Shetland waters.

The Viking Energy Wind Farm and the Shetland subsea connector cable is essential for our project to go ahead as we intend to use sail-electric propulsion for our pioneering fishing vessel. From our shore station in Sullom Voe, Shetland when in port we will charge our vessel batteries from Grid wind generated shore power. We will also charge all equipment (ice making machine, fishing landing equipment and delivery vehicle) from electric power. Our ultimate goal is to strive for a premium market with our zero-emission Scottish Seafood. We also intend to market and demonstrate our auto-mated, sail-electric propulsion system to the Global market, particularly for salmon & shellfish farm workboats.

It is my opinion that Shetland has massive potential to again deliver power to the wider UK market and beyond just as has been done through the oil and gas era. There will be local environmental sacrifices with a shore wind farm of this size but we cannot have a sustainable Shetland if we live on a very un-sustainable planet.

Thank you for considering my well-considered view.

Question 1: *What are your views on the generation scenarios developed and updated by SHE-T? We are particularly interested in views on the likelihood of wind generation on the Shetland Isles developing to the levels predicted by SHE-T's scenarios and any further changes or updates since SHE-T's October 2018 Final Needs Case submission that you think should also be considered.*

With the exception of Viking Energy, no meaningful investigations have been undertaken. Local knowledge tells us that in several areas where these projects are to be sited there are areas of extremely deep peat deposits requiring massive excavation further exacerbating carbon release and invasive infrastructure.

.

Question 2: *What are your views on the demand sensitivity explored by SHE-T?*

I think that the signalling by the Oil and Gas Industry to use renewable energy to meet the manufacturing need is simply a PR exercise to "green" their manufacturing credential. With the fall in oil based prices globally due to Covid-19 it is unlikely that these huge players will ultimately go down this route, at least till there is a significant upturn in demand for their products.

Question 3: *What are your views on the link options considered by SHE-T? We are also interested in views on the options proposed by SHE-T to mitigate against the risks of a second link being needed.*

The proposed link is simply a vehicle to enhance SSE's shareholder offering by tapping into the lucrative constraint payment system and other such subsidy. This link will be vulnerable to disruption from a plethora of causes, natural and otherwise and therefor to ensure robust redundancy a 2<sup>nd</sup> link would be essential, again at huge cost to the consumer.

Question 4: *What are your views on the technical design and costs of the proposed Shetland link?*

See Above.

Question 5: *What are your views on the CBA put forward by the ESO?*

I did not understand the contents of this paper, it having been redacted beyond my comprehension, therefore I cannot, as a lay person comment on it. Suffice it to say however, that in my experience in business, capital costs of any business always increase exponentially once the project has started. Just look at HS2 and the Channel Tunnel. Given the almost certain need for on-island backup and a second cable the project is ludicrous when a perfectly viable alternative is on the table. (see covering note)

Question 6: *What are your views on other approaches we have taken to assess the costs and benefits to GB consumers?*

I fail to see how such a capital intensive project with such a limited operational lifespan could represent value for money to the UK consumer and taxpayer who will ultimately be footing the bill, whether or not power is generated by these windfarms. It is corporate shareholders who will benefit and indeed, this is the whole premise on which this scheme has been developed.

Question 7: *What are your views on our minded-to position to conditionally approve the revised*

*Final Needs Case? Specifically:*

*i) Do you agree with our proposal to approve a 600MW link subject to Ofgem being satisfied, by the end of 2020, that Viking Energy Wind Farm is likely to go ahead?*

I believe this proposal is wrong for the reasons stated above, will be detrimental to our economy and should not proceed.

*ii) Do you have any views on the type of evidence we should expect to see that would confirm that Viking Energy Wind Farm is likely to go ahead?*

Given the uncertainty during these times and into the foreseeable future it is highly unlikely that investors will have the confidence to underwrite the huge costs of this project, particularly as the final estimated cost will be cast into doubt.

*iii) Do you agree with the factors we have considered to reach our minded-to position?*

Further work needs to be done by your department in the light of present circumstances, which, in my opinion change everything and will require further scrutiny and re- assessment.

*iv) Are there any other factors that you consider we should take into account when assessing this proposal*

In the quest for a net-zero carbon energy future, onshore wind power is only one (albeit well tried throughout history) form of renewable generating potential. It is my view that the money saved by NOT consenting this proposal could be better diverted to developing further offshore wind and emerging technologies which will be of far greater potential benefit toward this aim.

Question 8: *Do you agree with the findings of our analysis?*

I do not believe that your analysis properly considers alternative proposals and more work needs to be done.

Question 9: *Are there any additional factors that we should consider as part of our analysis and/or decision on whether to apply the CPM for the Shetland transmission project?*

I cannot comment on this as I do not have the requisite technical knowledge.

In conclusion I would like to state that, as a concerned citizen of the UK, I believe that as a country and resident of a fragile Island community we simply cannot afford the lucrative subsidies and payments being exploited by wealthy Renewable Energy companies for inefficient and intermittent production of electricity.

Signed