

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

DCRP/21/08/PC: Revision to the Integrated Microgeneration and Storage procedure

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, 12th November 2021** to dcode@energynetworks.org and please title your email 'Consultation Response DCRP/21/08/PC Revision to the Integrated Microgeneration and Storage procedure'. 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

	Question	Response
Q1	Do you agree with the general intent of the proposed modification? If not, please explain your views.	
Q2	If you have any detailed comments on the proposed drafting, please provide those comments in the proforma provided, or by marking up Appendices 1 and 2 as appropriate.	
Q3	Do you agree that 60 A per phase is a sensible upper limit of a fast track scheme? This is 13.8 kW. Would a value representing, say 14 kW (61 A) or 15 kW (65 A) be a better nominal limit?	
Q4	Do you agree with the value of 0.18Ω as an appropriate threshold up to which acceptance of power quality compliance could be automatically accepted?	
Q5	Do you agree that the proposed modifications satisfy the applicable Distribution Code objectives? If not, please explain your concerns.	

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