

**From:**  
**Sent on:** Thursday, September 19, 2024 10:08:16 AM  
**To:**  
**Subject:** FW: Pathway to 2030 [OFFICIAL Internal Only]  
**Attachments:** OFGEM response 240829.pdf (92.16 KB)

Dear Sir,

I am writing as a member of the public to offer feedback on the consultation which I understand ends tomorrow. If I have directed this email to the wrong place I should be grateful if you would redirect this for me.

Two documents relating to the consultation have crossed my desk, one of which I attach with other viewable through the following link:

The first is from Contin Community Council, which covers an area in which I shall shortly be living. The technical points are beyond my area of expertise but the general points are essentially developed in the second which is a submission from an action group in Deeside. Based on these I would like to make my own comments which are as follows:

1. Consultation process. This has failed due to inadequate notice and total a failure to understand that the public (i.e. communities) should be involved in an outcome which so affects them. If a time extension is required then it should be provided.
2. Funding. The dead hand of lowest cost to the consumer combined with definitions in the TO's procedures not agreed by communities, has led to deeply flawed decisions. As one small example: everything that is not already designated ( e.g. SSSIs, SACs etc.) is treated as equal. Thus, a magnificent landscape that is not already designated, receives no consideration; it is equivalent to a brownfield site, when patently obviously small sums of money could deliver an alternative to an important landscape. Lowest cost has not served successive governments well. What serves the electorate is value; here we are looking at a 50 year timescale; it needs to be got right.
3. Strategy. There appears to be none that can be justified to communities and that decisions are being made in haste when we desperately need to get things right. I am not against building a grid for the nation to redistribute power, but I do want it done well and a network of OHLs is not always the right thing to do. There also appears to be an emphasis on transferring power rather than providing it close to where it's needed.
4. Optioneering. That which has been visible is opaque and deeply flawed.

In conclusion, there are **fundamental** issues still to be resolved.

Yours sincerely,