

LionLink 2nd Public Consultation Feedback Guide

We have found in the past that consultation FEEDBACK FORMS are skewed to the project's benefit and suggest you write/email direct using the contact details supplied on the project's information sheet (below). However, should you wish to fill out the form here is some guidance to use as you wish. As a reminder, NGV is an unregulated, commercial, profit-maximising company and LIONLINK is not a producer of energy, it buys and sells it.

Submit feedback:

- **PAPER FORM** - Using the Feedback form (from the consultations or available at local libraries). Download and print the paper form tinyurl.com/LL2paperform
- **ONLINE FORM** - To complete the feedback form online and for all LionLink consultation materials click tinyurl.com/LL2onlineform (scroll down to find the questionnaire)
- **LEAFLET** – Read the LionLink consultation leaflet with dates/locations tinyurl.com/LL2dates
- **CONTACT** - LionLink contact details:
 - Freephone: 0800 083 1787
 - Email: info@lionlink.nationalgrid.com
 - Website: nationalgrid.com/lionlink

Feedback Guidance Link: tinyurl.com/LL2fback

As with all questionnaires the questions are skewed to the askers benefit, we therefore suggest the following:

- Q4: Ignore/Do not answer
- Q5-6: Use the text box to put for example, 'None of the options outlined are suitable. We urge you to pool the energy from offshore wind farms (e.g. EA1N & EA2) to an offshore LionLink interconnector platform thereby transporting the energy using subsea HVDC cables to landfall at brownfield sites (e.g. Bradwell), closer to where the power is needed and more suited to onshore infrastructure.
- Q10-11: Strongly agree
- Q12: Don't know. This question is loaded so we suggest you select 'Don't know'. National Grid have been presenting misleadingly costs to the media re building an offshore grid and have disingenuously suggested that solutions which produce most profit for NG will keep

energy costs down. Also, a Holistic Network Design (HND) analysis might conclude that other factors mean it's not the cheapest solution that is best in the long term.

- Q13-14: Strongly disagree. None of these projects should be coming in to Suffolk's Heritage Coast. It is the wrong place and should be located in pre-industrialised or brownfield sites.
- Q15: Don't know. Whilst we want National Grid Ventures (NGV) to pool SPR's EA1N /EA2 energy offshore, NGV may well use agreement with this statement to justify their onshore co-location plans within their very narrow design plans, as opposed to considering offshore coordination scenarios. SPR did not volunteer for the Offshore Coordination Support Scheme (OCSS) so no offshore coordination has been forthcoming – we need to keep asking for this to happen.
- Q16: Use the text box to explain why you put 'Don't know' above and you could finish off with what you do want - for example, 'NGV should be negotiating with Scottish Power Renewables to pool the energy from EA1N and EA2 wind farms to a LIONLINK Interconnector Platform offshore, and then to take this energy using subsea HVDC cables to landfall at brownfield sites (e.g. Bradwell), closer to where the power is needed and more suited to onshore infrastructure.'
- Q17: Ignore/Do not answer
- Q18: Ignore/Do not answer
- Q19: Select 'Yes, there is additional criteria that needs to be considered', then in the text box for example, 'Alternative offshore transmission network design scenarios need to also be considered, including pooling energy offshore, including using brownfield sites closer to demand for landfall and onshore infrastructure, and then comparatively evaluating these alternatives using HND criteria and independent costings (East Anglia was unfairly scoped out of the NG ESO HND process).'
- Q20: Use suggested text for Q5-6
- Q21: 'It is not relevant' + use suggested text for Q5-6
- Q22: No

Any questions please contact info@suffolkenergyactionsolutions.co.uk

Thank-you so much for your ongoing support

The SEAS Team