



From: John Walton [REDACTED]
Date: 11 May 2022 at 19:18:19 BST
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sizewell C

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing in response to your request for further comments from Interested Parties, of which I am one.

My previous submission focused on the evidence of energy experts with unrivalled expertise in civil nuclear power such as Dr Paul Dorfman, Honorary Fellow of my university, UCL.

It is now clear- beyond any shadow of a doubt- that the original proposal for Sizewell C was flawed for a number of reasons, the most important of which are: An out of date technology which has since proved problematic in Finland, France and now China.

The likely costs of generation, now double or indeed treble alternative sources such as offshore wind (including storage).

A net contribution to emissions in the construction phase contributing to an (increasingly likely) early climate “tipping point”.

The vulnerability of the site to the impact of such effects.

My focus now is the existential danger to local populations from the ever more sophisticated forms of hacking used by rogue and State actors. Even more chilling are the potential threat of “unknown unknowns” from the malicious use of AI. An article in the Financial Times of 11 May states that, according to a survey by cyber security group Bridewell, cyber- attacks against the UK’s private sector critical infrastructure have leapt 72% since the start of the war in Ukraine.

Sir Jeremy Fleming, head of GCHQ, indicated on 10 May that Russia’s invasion of Ukraine had created a rapidly evolving cyber battlefield to which the latter’s Western allies, including Britain, were still adapting as the implications of a nascent cyber war and the rapid public release of classified information influenced the

conflict.

The response to my worries, as expressed above, might be : “this chap is a Jeremiah; it will never happen, we will have the answers”.

Forty plus years of experience in financial markets, a part of it acting for clients such as Yale, Columbia, Princeton and other East Coast endowments- with their ferocious attention to risk- has taught me that so-called “fat-tail” or “Black Swan” events occur quite frequently, and almost all of them in the context of a consensus which predicted that the risks were negligible.

Problematic technology, extraordinarily elevated costs, short term adverse effects on emissions, a vulnerable site- any one of these should be sufficient to kill a project put forward years ago. It is now hopelessly out- dated given recent trends, not least the (unexpected) spectacular collapse in the cost of alternatives. But experience of a different kind, the increasing sophistication of cyber- attacks on infrastructure targets, highlight the catastrophic risks in plain sight to the people of East Anglia and beyond, and indeed to the security of our nation.

Projects of this kind tend to move with a momentum of their own. This one has been entirely overtaken by events.

Yours sincerely,

John Walton, Fellow UCL.