

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

DCRP/21/02/PC: Distribution Code EREC G100 Issue 2: Technical Requirements for Customers' Export and Import Limitation Schemes

Stakeholders are invited to respond to this consultation, expressing their views or providing any further evidence on any of the matters contained within the consultation document. Stakeholders are invited to supply the rationale for their responses to the set questions.

Please send your responses and comments by **17:00, 3rd December 2021** to dcode@energynetworks.org and please title your email 'Consultation Response DCRP/21/02/PC – EREC G100 Issue 2. Please note that any responses received after the deadline may not receive due consideration by the Working Group.

Any queries on the content of the consultation pro-forma should be addressed to DCode Administrator on 020 7706 5105, or to dcode@energynetworks.org

Respondent	<i>Name</i>
Company Name	
No. of DCode Stakeholders Represented	
Stakeholders represented	<i>Please list all Stakeholder names responding on behalf of (including the respondent company if relevant).</i>
Role of Respondent	<i>Eg Distributor/Supplier/Generator/ Consolidator / Exemptible Generator / BSC Agent / Party Agent / Distributor / other – please state ¹⁾</i>
We intend to publish the consultation responses on the DCode website. Do you agree to this response being published on the DCode website? [Y/N]	

¹ Delete as appropriate – please do not use strikethrough, this is to make it easier to analyse the responses

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

	Question	Response
Q1	Do you agree with the general intent of the proposed modification? If not, please explain your views.	
Q2	Do you agree that the revised EREC G100 should be included in the Distribution Code (as a new requirement by reference in DPC6), be listed in Annex 1 and included under Distribution Code governance in the future?	
Q3	Do you agree that the proposed modifications satisfy the applicable Distribution Code objectives? If not, please explain your concerns.	
Q4	Do you support the formal description of the states of operation and the migration between them?	
Q5	Do you agree with the fail safe approach, and with the excessive state 2 operation criteria? If not, would you propose different criteria?	
Q6	Do you agree with the proposed approach to resetting the limitation scheme and recovering from state 3? In particular do you agree that it is appropriate to distinguish the capability to reset the CLS between domestic and commercial/industrial installations? An alternative would be to make a distinction between fully type tested CLSs and those which are not fully type tested; the WG would be interested in views on this.	

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

	Question	Response
Q7	Do you agree with the revised design limits? Do you support the thresholds now proposed?	
Q8	Do you support the approach to communication media? Do you agree with the suggested approach to cyber security?	
Q9	Do you have any comments on the requirement to monitor the integrity of the secondary circuit of the current transformers used?	
Q10	Do you support the approach proposed for multiple limitation devices installed in a single premise?	
Q11	Do you have any comments on the proposals for domestic installations?	
Q12	Do you have any comments on the proposed type testing regime?	
Q13	Is there the right balance of principle and detail in Section 5 on testing? Do you have any detailed comments on how testing should be prescribed?	
Q14	Do you agree that the addition Figure 0-1 in the Introduction of EREC G100 aids understanding of the relationship between EREC G100 and flexibility services that the customer might be providing? If not, can you suggest any improvements?	
Q15	Do you agree with requirement in EREC G100 to only provide a schematic diagram, with any	

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

	Question	Response
	operational diagram for generation remaining to be as specified in EREC G99 (or G98, 59 or 83)?	
Q16	Do you agree that the 5s period before an excursion into state 2 is registered is appropriate? If not, please state what you think might be an appropriate approach.	
Q17	Do you agree that is appropriate to allow remote resetting of state 3?	
Q18	Do you agree that fully type tested CLSs should be tested at three current settings, viz maximum, minimum and one intermediate point? If not please suggest.	
Q19	If you have any detailed comments on the proposed drafting, please provide those comments in the proforma provided, or by marking up the consultation draft of G100.	

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

Please provide comments relating to the specific technical content of the proposed modifications²

Page / line No	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
						See comments above.

² Add more rows if required