

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

Requirements for the Application of Protective Multiple Earthing to Low Voltage Networks

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 on 7 May 2021** to dcode@energynetworks.org and please title your email:

‘Consultation Response DCRP/21/04/PC EREC G12 Issue 4 Amendment 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 5100, or to dcode@energynetworks.org

Respondent	Allan Howard
Company Name	WSP
No. of DCode Stakeholders Represented	Sorry do not understand the question
Stakeholders represented	<i>Please list all Stakeholder names responding on behalf of (including the respondent company if relevant).</i>
Role of Respondent	<i>Consultant / designer of highway electrical installations – EV, lighting, media screens etc.</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]	Y

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

	Question	Response
Q1	Do you agree that the proposed amendments to EREC G12 Issue 4 achieve the Distribution Code Objectives?	Yes
Q2	Do you agree with the proposed text contained in EREC G12 Issue 4, or do you have any alternatives to propose?	<p>On the whole but the current issue with supplies is not just limited to EV points but also to other highway electrical street furniture, essentially all aspects such as media screens, advertising, Smart technologies and so forth but not to individual street lighting columns or traffic signage as they predicable loads and under 500W.</p> <p>These are perhaps mentioned within section 6.2.15 but where they are class I could not the proposals in section 6.2.16.2 also be considered i.e. the appropriate electronic disconnection device?</p>

Please provide comments relating to the specific technical content of the EREC¹

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
31	6.2.15		General	Penultimate para to section, could not the device being advised in 6.2.16 also be applied here?	For this para also reference to 6.2.16.2 for the device to change this text to include it as an option where the equipment is class 1.	

¹ Add more rows if required.