## Unresolved issues regarding the Aquind Interconnector

**Has the SoS considered the following list of unresolved or disputed issues?**

1. Do the harms of this project not substantially outweigh the benefits?
2. Has the missing NGET feasibility study, requested by Justice Lieven in the High Court Appeal Case and the then Secretary of State, been found, validated and made public?
3. Should not Ninfield and other substations to the East be brought into consideration?
4. Has the impact of the possibly misleading evidence presented by the applicant in support of the project been thoroughly considered?
5. Should the fact that the project has been comprehensively rejected by the French local government not be a decisive factor?
6. Is this project not a National Security risk, as has been repeatedly highlighted by Portsmouth city MPs?
7. How does this Interconnector cable, equally likely to export UK energy as to import European energy, add to our national energy resilience?
8. Is it not appropriate to question the designation of this project as an NSIP? It is a means of transporting energy not a producer of energy. Should it have ever been compared to a power station generating electricity ? Does it not lead to no actual energy gain?
9.  Is it a sensible option to slice through the second most densely populated and highly congested city, with dangerous levels of pollution, in the UK when there  is a known risk of disturbing toxic waste ?
10. In view of the passage of time, over three years since the original completion date, should the project not be completely re-evaluated in light of the changes in national and international affairs, climate change urgency, national energy demands and of course all government policies which will have changed during this time period?
11. Could the embedded commercial tele-communication part of the FOC (fibre optic cable) be considered a risk to national security?
12. Can we rely on the company, Aquind, with no proven record of delivery in the energy sector, to deliver this project?