

Dear Secretary of State,

I refer to your letter of 28 August 2026 regarding Sea Link. As you consider this matter further, I urge you to take full account of the recent reports from Ofgem and the National Audit Office (NAO), which highlight serious questions about Sea Link: cost, deliverability and value for money. Additionally, there are grave concerns that the current regulatory approach does not adequately protect consumers.

I welcome the Government's commitment to reducing energy costs. It is, however, essential that projects are necessary, proportionate and provide genuine value for money for consumers. Sea Link must be evaluated against these criteria.

The NAO's report entitled Value for Money – Upgrading the Electricity Transmission Network, dated 11 September 2026, concluded that the existing system requires stronger oversight, transparent monitoring and the capability for disinterested outside parties to scrutinise costs.

These concerns are particularly relevant to Sea Link.

Ofgem has now estimated that Sea Link will cost approximately £3.2 billion.

During the recent DCO Examination, National Grid presented an estimated project cost of approximately £1.1 billion. This cost was rigorously challenged; Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) presented evidence that the true cost was likely to be around £3.2 billion. Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at approximately £3.2 billion, broadly confirming the figure put forward by SEAS.

That the £1.1 billion figure presented by National Grid during the Examination has proved so badly wrong raises serious concerns about the reliability and transparency of other information National Grid presented during the Examination.

There are several other serious concerns:

- The £3.2 billion cost estimate does not include the cost of identified reinforcement necessary in Kent between Richborough and Canterbury.
- Sea Link was developed on the assumption of a 1,852MW export deficit at Friston. The size of this deficit was associated with the proposed Nautilus interconnector but Nautilus was subsequently relocated from Friston. The projected deficit is now a fraction of the assumption: a massive 6x smaller at approximately 352MW.

- Ofgem has identified unresolved harmony issues on the transmission network before Sea Link can operate compliantly at its intended 2GW capacity. The precise scope and location of these works have yet to be determined.

All this raises the basic but fundamental question: what is the true total cost to consumers of delivering Sea Link?

The NAO's concerns about consumer protection must also prompt renewed scrutiny of LionLink, National Grid Ventures' proposed commercial multipurpose interconnector affecting the Suffolk coast. LionLink is not part of the Great Grid Upgrade. Ofgem expects LionLink to operate predominantly as an export route from Great Britain to the Netherlands. LionLink will therefore lead to an increase in GB wholesale electricity prices compared with the position without LionLink. LionLink will not benefit the British consumer; LionLink will enrich National Grid's shareholders.

I urge the Government to require an independent and transparent reassessment of the economic need and consumer case for LionLink against current 2026 evidence, rather than continuing to regard that case as established by the 2024 regulatory decision.

As part of such a reassessment of LionLink, the Government should accept the compelling case against LionLink's proposed landfall site in Walberswick (G3).

I am very concerned about climate change. I support offshore wind and the transition to Net Zero. I feel strongly, however, that achieving Net Zero should not mean accepting expenditure on major infrastructure projects without first establishing that there are no cheaper, better coordinated and less environmentally damaging alternatives. I also feel that rather than privileging commercial interests focused only on certain specific parts of this endeavour with no consideration of their overall effect, Government policy must assess all the parts when taken together and have a primary regard for our whole national interest.

Yours sincerely,

[Name]

[Address / Postcode]