NGO Forum – 8th October 2025

Date: Wednesday 8th October
Time: 11:30 – 13:30
Location: Hybrid: DESNZ Head office – 3-5 Whitehall Place and online
Co-Chairs: Chris Heffer (DESNZ) & Alison Downes (NGO member)

	Welcomes	Chairs
1	**SMRs – Update & Questions** Officials to update on the SMR programme	Michael Jones
2	**General Questions** Government GW Target Hinkley Dounreay Sizewell C Uranium	Various Officials
3	**GDF Update and Questions** Officials to provide an update on the GDF.	Jess Parsons
4	**DESNZ response to the Regulatory Review** Opportunity for NGO members to feed in their views to DESNZ ahead of DESNZ formulating its response to the Regulatory Taskforce report.	Diana Siclovan & Sam White
5	**Sizewell C Technical Brief** Sizewell C Officials to provide NGO members with the technical brief for the SZC FID	SZC Team
	Meeting Close	Co-Chairs

Attendees:

DESNZ Senior Officials

Chris Heffer (Co-Chair)

J. Sutton (Secretariat)

Michael Jones

Jess Parsons

Dawn Armstrong

Sam White

Maiti Lahiff

Thomas Papworth

Erin Coghlan, James Widdicks, Michael Lindsay (Sizewell C item)

NGO Forum Members:

Alison Downes (Co Chair) – Stop Sizewell C

Paul Collins – Stop Sizewell C

Christopher Wilson – TASC

Mike Taylor TASC

Douglas Parr - Greenpeace

Peter Burt – member ONR NGO Forum

Andy Blowers - Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG)

Tor Justad, Highlands Against Nuclear

Richard Outram - NFLA

Ian Ralls - Friends of the Earth

1. SMR Updates & Questions Michael Jones

Michael Jones (MJ) introduced the GBE-Nuclear Policy and Sponsorship team as the Department interface with GBE-Nuclear, the Government's expert nuclear delivery body.

In June, following a robust two-year procurement, GBE-N announced that Rolls Royce SMR was selected as the preferred bidder to develop the UK's first SMRs, subject to final government approvals and contract signature.

The Government SMR programme will deliver up to 1.5 GW of electricity in the mid 2030s, underpinned by £2.5 billion allocated across the Spending Review period. Further spending decisions will made be made at subsequent Spending Reviews.

Ian FOE – how many companies involved in procurement process have built nuclear reactor already? What about unproven designs?

MJ: Generally, there are no commercially operating SMRs. Importantly, a GBE-N project would be subject to all usual regulatory processes and permitting, and the usual business case process. Rolls Royce SMR's design is based on proven pressurised water reactor technology.

Following bid evaluation, GBE-N deemed Rolls Royce SMR the best overall technological solution for the UK.

Alison Downes: Were delivery dates part of criteria? How will it be funded?

MJ: It is expected that SMRs delivered by GBE-N will be operational in the mid-2030s.

Decisions on funding mechanisms will be subject to future policy decisions and business case approval. Government will fund the development phase of the GBE-N programme.

Tor Justad: Asked about using Dounreay experience and also the size of SMRs.

MJ: Unable to comment on RR Plc submarine business.

Forum members then asked about timescales and how the announced £2.5bn will be allocated and the need for a clear message.

MJ: The £2.5bn is for the overall SMR programme across the Spending Review period. There will be further clarity at the point of contract signature, expected later this year.

Forum members expressed concerns at the possibility of US companies using specific technology in the UK linked to data centres and speculation.

Chris Heffer: Confirmed that the Government was not bypassing any regulatory stages in response to US pressure.

2. <u>General Questions</u>

Media reports suggest Cottam in Nottinghamshire (former coal power station) and London Gateway Port are being considered for SMRs or AMRs (as well as some sites in EN6 such as Hartlepool, Oldbury, Wylfa and Trawsfynydd), but EN7 is not yet enacted. Furthermore that Kent County Council is interested in SMRS at Dungeness, but this site has been all but ruled out for development.

Please confirm status of EN7 [Mike Taylor, TASC]

Sam White: Any such proposals would be a commercial matter for the parties involved.

The government is in the process of designating a new National Policy Statement for nuclear energy generation, EN-7, which will empower developers to identify suitable sites for new nuclear projects using a robust set of siting criteria.

We aim to designate EN-7 before the end of the year, subject to ongoing parliamentary scrutiny, but EN6 remains in place to provide guidance for developers.

When do you expect EDF to publish its next update on Hinkley Point's cost and schedule? Can officials confirm that the government still does not intend to make any financial contribution to the completion of HPC? [Alison Downes, Stop Sizewell C]

EDF periodically update shareholders on its existing fleet and projects under construction. It will be for EDF to decide when to update on cost and schedule.

No Government investment in HPC is planned.

Why, earlier this year, was the Dounreay Stakeholder Group informed that the interim end state of the Dounreay site was to change from 2036 to the 2070s at a projected cost of £8.7 billion. What are the reasons for this huge increase in timescale and cost to the taxpayer? [Tor Justad, Highlands Against Nuclear]

Dounreay has a new lifetime plan to reflect how long it will realistically take and how much it will cost to bring the site to its interim end point.

Tom Papworth: The updated plan takes into account what has been learnt over the last ten years decommissioning the site, including work done at Dounreay and other sites across the country, technological advances and also reflecting the strategy of prioritising the highest hazard work. It will give Dounreay a credible and reliable programme of work that will be delivered through a rolling ten-year strategy creating a stable platform upon which they will continue to reduce the hazards and continuously seek new and better ways to deliver value for the taxpayer.

This new plan will enable priority investment in their current workforce and the site's infrastructure, whilst also guaranteeing employment and investment in the Caithness and north Sutherland area for many more decades to come.

Lifetime plans for NDA sites are not funded plans. They provide a long-term roadmap for work, based on latest expectations and assumptions, and any associated estimated costs help to inform the Nuclear Provision. The Nuclear Provision is the best estimate of how much it will cost to clean up the UK's nuclear sites over a programme lasting over 100 years. It is a single point estimate, within a range, for all potential future costs, based on latest plans.

Actual funding for delivering near term work at Dounreay and at the NDA's other sites is agreed periodically with UK Government through the spending review process. This is the process by which Government sets out detailed plans for public spending for all government departments.

Please can the Minister explain how HMG can reconcile its support for imposing secondary sanctions upon countries trading in energy commodities with Russia whilst failing to impose secondary sanctions upon itself and the UK for continuing to do so when importing Russian sourced and manufactured uranium fuel products used in Britain's civil nuclear industry? Surely this is hypocrisy. When will HMG finally end such imports? [Richard Outram, NFLA]

Maiti Lahiff: Under HMG policy the procurement of nuclear fuel is a matter for the operator. The Government continues to work with reactor operators to accelerate the removal of Russian-origin fuel from the UK supply chain.

With the cooperation of industry partners, we have been able to bring forward our commitment to ban Russian uranium from 2030, to 2028. This was announced under the Technology Prosperity Deal agreed with the United States, reinforcing our shared commitment to eliminate any remaining dependencies.

We do not currently directly import Russian uranium. We have one reactor that uses indirectly sourced Russian uranium, and the reactor operator has confirmed that no Russian uranium will be present in its supply chain following the implementation of our 2028 ban.

We continue to engage with EDF and Sizewell B to understand the feasibility of removing Russian uranium before 2028, but UK energy security must be of highest priority when taking these decisions. Our actions must give time for industry and supply chains to adjust, and we must have confidence that alternative supply is available to support the UK's energy needs. Any UK operator must comply with UK laws and international obligations.

Andy Blowers raised the effectiveness of the justification process which the Chair noted.

Has the Labour Government decided on a target for nuclear generation (Conservatives' 24GW?) If so, what impact will this have on the Nuclear Roadmap? [Alison Downes, Stop Sizewell C]

That is a question for the Minister, who plans to attend in the future, but Officials can advise that no GW target for nuclear has been set by this Government.

3. GDF Update

Jess Parsons: The process to site a GDF is ongoing. No site has yet been chosen.

As you'll be aware, Theddlethorpe withdrew from the process earlier in the year. This leaves two communities involved in the siting process (both in Cumberland).

Nuclear Waste Services (NWS) is continuing work to assess suitability in these areas, and in parallel is continuing to work with the local communities to ensure they can make an informed decision about whether to host a GDF in their locality.

NWS is working towards making a recommendation to ministers next year on whether (and if so which) community or communities to take through to the next phase of the programme. The next phase will involve the drilling of deep investigatory boreholes.

Timings to deliver a GDF are influenced by the complexity and time taken to conduct the geological investigations necessary to demonstrate feasibility and safety, and are therefore subject to change.

NISTA report.

NISTA published its annual report earlier in Aug the year, this downgraded the GDF programme from an amber to a red rating, citing it as unaffordable.

It is not uncommon for projects to receive a red rating at specific points in their lifecycle. A red rating is not a reflection of overall delivery performance, but rather it shows a project's likelihood of successful delivery at a particular moment in time, and if challenges or issues are not addressed. Projects and programmes on the Government Major Projects Portfolio include some of the most innovative undertaken by government. It is therefore not uncommon for some of them to have a red rating early in their development.

The downgrading was largely driven by the outcome of the Spending Review.

It was a challenging Spending Review for the NDA and, as a result, the NDA is looking across all of its programmes and undertaking some replanning to mitigate risks and support ongoing progress. This includes the GDF.

As part of this, NWS are updating the programme business case.

With regard to the specific question about whether DESNZ was aware of NISTA's assessment before the SZC FID was made, we were not. We only became aware of it when it was published in August.

With regards to the recent media reports that DESNZ is considering policy change, ministers remain committed to the consent based policy. No changes are planned to this process.

As has been the case since 2008, the Government continues to reserve the right to explore other approaches in the event that, at some point in the future, such an approach does not look likely to work.

Forum members noted there has been very little media coverage on the subject and speculated whether this was an indication of how much of a priority a GDF is this for the Government.

Were DESNZ aware of Nista's January 2025 assessment that opined the Geological Disposal Facility project was 'unachievable' and 'unaffordable' before the SZC FID was made? [Chris Wilson, TASC]

Point of information: The NDA Annual Report says "*Management has identified a risk that the construction and opening of the GDF may be delayed beyond 2050*." [page 180] . At the last NWS Exchange NGOs were told NWS intends to review the GDF Business Case in the hope of achieving an Amber rating for the project in the next Nista Assessment. The GDF is not on the same growth trajectory following the recent spending review, so when the business case is reviewed there is a strong possibility that the completion date will move again.

Can officials please confirm whether recent media reports that the Department is considering abandoning a commitment to carry out a Test of Public Support in the Potential Host Community prior to taking forward any proposal for a Geological Disposal Facility are true? And could you confirm that the Relevant Principal Local Authority will continue to retain its Right to Withdraw under any revised guidance? [Richard Outram, NFLA]

With regards to the recent media reports that DESNZ is considering policy change, ministers remain committed to the consent-based policy. No changes are planned to this process.

As has been the case since 2008, the Government continues to reserve the right to explore other approaches in the event that, at some point in the future, such an approach does not look likely to work.

The forum asked whether the Department had considered the impact on SZC if future a GDF is delayed as a result of future SR decisions. The Department responded by saying there were sufficient funds in the current SR period for NWS to continue.

4. <u>DESNZ Response to Regulatory Review</u>

Statement read out from NGOs regarding DESNZ's response to the Nuclear Regulatory Taskforce:

In summary, the NGO statement expressed concern about the political rhetoric accompanying the review, including the Prime Minister's promise to "rip up the rules", which NGOs believe will undermine public confidence in the nuclear safety regime and alienate potential new host communities. NGOs were also concerned that the independence of the UK's nuclear regulators could be compromised.

In responding to the Taskforce's expected final report, NGOs called for personal assurances from Ministers that safety standards will not be reduced, alongside concrete measures that demonstrate how this will be achieved, and for the importance of regulators' independence to be emphasised. Any "regulatory steer" must place maintaining the safety of nuclear operations and dealing with hazardous legacies as the top priorities and should allow regulators to make their own technical judgement on further priorities.

NGOs also highlighted that nuclear projects face far more challenging obstacles than regulatory hurdles, including project complexity, poor planning, investment difficulties, and slow decision-making by industry and government, and urged more transparency about the contribution these causes make to project delays.

DESNZ Officials involved in its response to the Regulatory Taskforce heard and noted the NGO Forums views from the statement.

Have you had any steers on the findings of the review? Alison Downes

Those who will be responsible for writing the Government response to the review are here, and the chair has acknowledged your comments, strength of feeling and tone.

5. **Sizewell C Technical Brief**

   NGo Forum 8 Oct - SZC Technical Qs.docx (officials in document clearing)

Questions for Sizewell C Technical Brief

1. When will the contracts be signed? What is the reason for this delay/why were they not signed when negotiations were concluded?

The final investment decision reflected commercial agreement between HMG, EDF and the new investors on the project. Following this agreement it is necessary to conclude detailed financial agreements and satisfy conditions precedent before the project reaches the point of revenue commencement. We are aiming to reach this milestone this Autumn.

2. How often will construction and cost progress reports be published?

A Strategy and Delivery Plan will be laid to Parliament in the coming months; this will reflect the content of the Full Business Case. Parliament will be kept updated throughout SZC's construction via periodic written submissions. The company will also publish annual accounts and reports via Companies House.

Decisions regarding the timing and scope of the Strategy and Delivery plan, and the nature of Parliamentary reporting, are currently being considered.

3. What completion date will be used for evaluation of progress reports? (Confirm LRT as end 2039/Jan 2040 and HRT as end 2043/Jan 2044, and is this for reactor 1 or for both?) [How can public evaluate progress if no target date known]

As confirmed by Sizewell C, the project is due to begin operating from the mid-late 2030s. The LRT and HRT thresholds govern incentives on the project and its investors – they are not the company's own schedule estimates.

The exact schedule estimate owned by SZC Ltd is considered commercially sensitive. This is to ensure sufficient commercial tension with the supply chain to incentivises efficient delivery. This is in the interests of consumers and taxpayers and ensures Sizewell C actively embeds lessons learnt from other projects.

4. Is there an outturn completion date beyond which the length of contract is reduced year for year, as for Hinkley Point C? If so, when would this be triggered?

The Initial Regulatory period runs to 60 years after Scheduled Commercial Operations Date. The Electricity Generation Licence will not automatically be extended if there is a delay in COD.

5. Is there a long-stop date for construction, as for Hinkley Point C, beyond which government can cancel the contract? If so, when is this?

If the Commercial Operations Date is not achieved by Scheduled COD, delay adjustments will be made to the Yield Cap and WACC according to how long the delay endures, as set out in the licence.

In addition, Ofgem has statutory enforcement powers which can be used where businesses fail to meet relevant obligations, including where they demonstrate poor behaviours or conduct.

The Secretary of State has the right to discontinue the project in the occurrence of an HRT Predicted Overrun. This helps early identification and mitigation of risk.

6. Confirm that LRT cost is £40.5bn and HRT is £47.7bn [2024] What is the significance of the £38bn [2024] made public?

SZC Ltd has set out that the capital cost for Sizewell C will be around £38bn, in 2024 prices. Any infrastructure project of this scale will face risks and potentially disruptive events outside of its control as well as opportunities to reduce costs. Sizewell C's supply chain is strongly incentivised to keep costs down and investors will lose potential revenue if there are overruns.

The LRT and HRT are not cost estimates, but thresholds within the RAB financing structure and represent trigger points from a cost perspective for the imposition of penalties on equity shareholders should costs overrun.

7. Confirm that if the project is cheaper, 50% of capex savings between the actual cost and LRT are added to RAB? Is this 50% of total capex?

If the project is delivered below the LRT, 50% of <u>the difference</u> between the final cost and the LRT will be added to the RAB.

8. Please explain why the cost estimate of autumn 2020 of £19.5bn [2015] NOT including risk and inflation was not acknowledged to PINS in the project's January 2021 update.

The department's assessment of the Sizewell C DCO application and the decision to grant development consent was entirely separate from the department's decisions on the financing of the Sizewell C project, which included analysis of the project's cost and value for money.

Strict barriers were in place between officials in our team and those working on the DCO to maintain propriety requirements. We cannot comment further.

9. What is the total estimated cost of the project including all financing costs? How does this relate to the model reported by the FT that this could total £100bn? https://www.ft.com/content/5f54592e-50ba-4a1e-8219-7a4eb01f74ed

Sizewell C has provided the capital cost estimate of around £38bn for the project – it is not common to disclose the cost of financing when describing the total project *cost. It would not be appropriate to comment on the disclosure of information from the equity raise process*

10. What percentage of the (£38bn) cost is going to a) overseas companies and b) UK subsidiaries of overseas companies

The project plans to award 70% of the value of construction to UK companies. Detailed contractual information for the project is commercially sensitive.

11. Are the terms essentially the same for all private investors? Ie they all get the same rate of return?

During construction, regulatory allowed return is dependent on both the cost of equity component in the Initial Weight Average Cost of Capital (IWACC), and by how the project is delivered in terms of cost and schedule. At the Price Control Review the IWACC will be replaced by the Regulatory WACC (RWACC), which is set by Ofgem and reviewed at set intervals during operations.

These factors are shared by all investors, including the UK government. Internal rates of return will vary slightly between investors as this is also dependent on the timing and duration of investment, which varies between investors.

12. Will the UK government investment receive the same returns from the project as the private investors before any “recycling” (asked in Qs 20)

Correct – please see the answer above.

13. If Centrica's investment is capped at £1.3bn, please can you tell us how will the difference between the £1.3bn Centrica invests and the £3bn it will have grown to be paid for??

10.8% is the real Ke, 6% is the nominal yield cap during construction. The yield cap provides a limit to the yield that investors can receive during the project’s construction. It is calculated as 6% per annum of the opening nominal equity balance each year. This limit will be lowered according to the delay adjustment if the project is not delivered by Scheduled COD.

A significant part of the Allowed Revenue during construction will be the Return on Capital building block, which is calculated as IWACC x RAB. The IWACC at 6.73% (real) was calculated using the 10.8% (real) Ke. To the extent Allowed Revenue during construction exceeds the amount that can be distributed under the Yield Cap *(as described above), it is retained in the company to fund company needs, which will in turn lead to growth of the RAB.*

14. Is 10% real equity return even at HRT not overly generous?

The return for shareholders in SZC was set through a competitive process. Sizewell C is a mega infrastructure project and very different to regulated transmission; this figure is broadly comparable to returns on similar sort of assets.

15. How is there no exposure for investors to changes in interest rates? How will this be compensated for?

During construction, the cost of equity element of the IWACC is a factor that determines the return for investors. Other factors include how the project is delivered against budget and schedule.

The cost of equity is given in real terms, CPIH linked, and therefore provides some inflation protection. However, investors are not protected against real interest rate risk.

16. At what date is there a reduction in earnings, with only 50% of capex being added to RAB? Is it capex for that period or total capex?

Under the Capex Incentive Building Block (Special Condition 28 of Sizewell C's Licence), <u>only 50%</u> of any Actual Allowable Capital Spend above the LRT (up to the HRT) (i.e. between the LRT and HRT) will be logged to the Regulated Asset Base. This is not dependent on schedule, so there is no pre-defined date at which this incentive will kick-in.

17. The 65% debt is described by Centrica as a 'target'. Are there any consequences if the actual falls short or exceeds this target? Will the National Wealth Fund fund an investor beyond 65% debt? Will the rate of return be adjusted down if the equity contribution is less than the target?

The key debt metric is the 'net debt to RAB' ratio, which is set at 65% (i.e., debt being 65% of RAB). There are very negative consequences for shareholders if net debt to RAB exceeds 65%, so shareholders are strongly incentivised not to exceed this metric, i.e., not to 'over lever' the company. The primary disincentive is that dividends are 'locked up' if the 65% figure is exceeded. It can also lead to the GSP protections for shareholders becoming unavailable if leverage is exceeded. It is also *mechanically unlikely that the metric will be exceeded given the 'equity first' nature of the funding and the fact that SZC is fully financed up to the HRT from Day 1.*

Exactly what 'net debt to RAB' ratio the company runs at, i.e., 65%, or slightly lower, is a matter for the SZC Treasury function.

The NWF loan is only drawable by SZC if SZC is meeting its debt covenants, one of which is not exceeding the 65% net debt to RAB ratio.

18. If the National Wealth Fund interest rate is higher than the forecast 4.5% real, the investors will be recompensed the extra cost. If it falls below this level, will investors be required to pay back the additional income?

The cost of debt is 'passed through' to consumers. Changes in underlying interest rates (up or down) are reflected in those costs that are passed through. The profit margin on the NWF debt would be 'recycled' to consumers. NWF debt is c.88% of the total debt raised by SZC. (The remainder being commercial bank debt).

19. What requirements are there for investors to report their finance costs/cost of borrowing?

At the company (ie SZC) level, SZC is already fully financed up to the HRT, so SZC does not need to raise new debt, beyond its existing debt facilities, to finance the construction phase.

Whether equity investors borrow outside the structure to fund their own equity investments does not change the rate of return investors receive in the construction phase.

20. Is the length of the power purchase agreement 60 years?

As per the answer to question 4, the Initial Regulatory period runs to 60 years after Scheduled Commercial Operations Date.

21. How in practical terms will the 'recycling' of the government's profits to consumers be done? What would the charge to consumers be without this recycling? Confirm that £1 [2025] is index linked.

The mechanism for recycling is subject to ongoing policy development; it will be used to recycle profits made by HMG (via our debt & equity returns from the SZC Project) in order to lower supplier levies (with the policy intent being to lessen the impact of suppliers passing costs onto consumers).

HMG's returns will be received from SZC as part of their Allowed Revenue entitlement (which is funded by supplier levies during the construction phase of the project).

Not accounting for recycling, the average bill impact across the construction period would be higher, but still around £1 a month. The £1 a month figure is given in real (2025) terms.

22. What indications have Ofgem given about returns during operation? Julia Pyke has speculated to investment media that these will be "double digit" and Centrica has expressed confidence returns will be high because of risk, (eg they said *"Specifically, there's recognition in the agreement that a single planned nuclear power station carries more risk than a dispersed network, and therefore the expectation issues carry higher return"*….. And *"we derive a degree of comfort and place weight on the fact that we see returns that will reflect the higher risk and the unique characteristics of a nuclear asset over the lifetime."* Given we have been assured of the safety of this reactor and that the technical problems encountered elsewhere will have been ironed out, what is the risk when the plant is operational? And risk is not on the owners anyway as consumers will contribute to the Allowed Revenue if necessary, so why should there be high rates of return?

As noted above, at the PCR the IWACC will be replaced by the Regulatory WACC (RWACC), which will be set by Ofgem and reviewed at set intervals during operations. These factors are shared by all investors, including the UK government. Rates of return will also be impacted by the timing and duration of investment, which varies between some investors.

23. The government's figure in the Subsidies Database for the FID Scheme of £54.589bn to cover the difference payments and the value of the Government Support Package is a discounted figure and a split between the components is not given. What are the separate undiscounted values of the difference payments subsidy and the GSP? **What is the discount rate?** When will payments under this subsidy begin? Is there any actual payment for the GSP or is it just a notional figure? Are there any other components in this subsidy? https://searchforuksubsidies.beis.gov.uk/scheme/?scheme=SC11357

The subsidy figure has been calculated in accordance with The Subsidy Control (Gross Cash Amount and Gross Cash Equivalent) Regulations 2022. In line with those regulations it has been discounted at a rate of 5.3%. It includes the difference payments plus, where relevant, the value of protections under the GSP. As the GSP is designed to protect against low probability but high impact events, no payments under the GSP are currently envisaged.

The subsidy would be awarded at Revenue Commencement, which is when RAB payments begin.

24. Is the FT's article that the SZC RAB could add £200,000/year to bills for large businesses accurate? If not, what is your estimate? https://www.ft.com/content/30d3fb6c-e350-42e2-b8fd-1756993c56fa

We cannot comment on Cornwall Insight's analysis. An equivalent figure to our estimate of average bill impacts on households has not been calculated for businesses. This is because the variation in energy consumption across non-domestic users is so significant that an average user is not a useful measure for analysis. The impact on non-domestic users has been considered as part of the broader approval process.

25. What is the assumed price of power from Sizewell C (in today's money and 2012 money)? We note that Julia Pyke said £60-£70 MWh to the Telegraph. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2025/08/21/sizewell-c-nuclear-power-uk-energy-security-baseload/

SZC's figure is the average annual revenue paid by to consumers per unit of electricity generated in £2012 money during SZC's operating phase under a range of construction scenarios

26. Centrica has said there is an "Agreement in principle for initial 20-year offtake agreement for our share of Sizewell C's production, and for Centrica to provide Sizewell C with route to market services for additional volumes' https://www.centrica.com/media-centre/news/2025/investment-in-sizewell-c/. Is this 'share' based on their retail market share or their investment share? Does Centrica have additional rights to the output of Sizewell C compared to other electricity retailers? If so, is this additional electricity bought through LCCC and is it priced in the same way as the other sales of Sizewell C power? If Centrica has additional rights to power, has EDF negotiated a similar agreement to buy additional power?

The offtake agreement is subject to final negotiations.

The share is related to Centrica's shareholding percentage. The arrangement is time limited.

Electricity is not purchased from LCCC. Centrica will pay market price for their share of the power, set in line with the Baseload Market Reference Price. The remaining portion will be traded in the market.

The offtake agreement is in the interests of consumers, as well as supporting the company. It avoids the costs and risks associated with SZC setting up its own trading function, whilst guaranteeing the Reference Price is achieved for a portion of the project's power.

Centrica is the only shareholder with an agreement in-principle in respect of the offtake of electricity from SZC.

The company will be obliged to tender for another market trader in the future, with the terms included in the agreement with Centrica benchmarked to the results of this tender to ensure they are market standard.