

## EREC G94 Initial Discussions

### MINUTES

Meeting – Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> May 2024, 10:30 – 15:30

ENA Office, MS Teams Meeting

ATTENDEES	INITIAL	COMPANY
Nataliia Myrhorodska	NM	ENA
Seth Treasure	ST	NGED
Alan Creighton	AC	NPg
Paul Dynes	PD	SPEN
Peter Twomey	PT	ENWL
John Mason	JM	UKPN
Stephen Tucker	STu	UKPN
Joseph Nolan	JN	GTC

### APOLOGIES

Michael Burgan	MB	SPEN
Steve Mockford	SM	GTC

Registered office Energy Networks Association Limited, 4 More London Riverside, London SE1 2AU  
t. +44 (0)20 7706 5100 e. [info@energynetworks.org](mailto:info@energynetworks.org) [energynetworks.org](https://energynetworks.org)

## MEETING NOTES AND ACTIONS

## LEAD

MEETING NOTES AND ACTIONS		LEAD
<b>Item 1</b>	<b>Welcomes and acceptance of agenda</b>	<b>NM</b>
Members were welcomed to the meeting and the agenda was agreed.		
<b>Actions</b>	None	
<b>Item 2</b>	<b>Review of action from previous meetings</b>	<b>NM</b>
Previous completed actions were agreed and closed.		
<b>Actions</b>	None	
<b>Item 3</b>	<b>ToR Clarity</b>	<b>NM</b>
<p>3.1 Clarification of the use of the term “Network Operators (NOs)”</p> <p>The WG agreed on the following wording of the first paragraph of the clause Background:</p> <p>For a number of years there has been a call from industry towards the Network Operators (NOs) to provide a platform for clear and consistent guidance on the assessment criteria when providing multiple points of supply to a premises.</p> <p>3.2 Clarification of the use of the term “site”</p> <p>The WG discussed the use of the term “site” in the document. It was agreed to replace the term “site” with the term “premises”.</p>		
<b>Actions 3.1</b>	To change the term “site” to the term “premises” <b>01/07/24</b>	<b>NM</b>
<b>Item 4</b>	<b>Update on IET / APEA call</b>	<b>ST</b>
<p>ST provided the WG with update on IET / APEA call. The Association for Petroleum and Explosives Administration (APEA) and the Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET) is working on producing a guidance that can overlap with the future EREC G94 document. In order to reduce risks when providing multiple points of supply to a premises, including a fuel filling stations, it was agreed to organize a meeting with representatives of APEA to discuss a common approaches.</p> <p>The WG agreed that EREC G94 should become a guidance not only for DNO/IDNO experts, but also for customers when they are looking for connection requirements.</p>		
<b>Action 4.1</b>	To arrange a meeting with APEA representatives <b>10/06/24</b>	<b>ST</b>
<b>Item 5</b>	<b>Producing a draft flow chart for domestic premises</b>	<b>ALL</b>
It was developed a second version of the flowchart for domestic premises. Further development to the flowchart will depend on the scenario documents. It will be worked out at future meetings.		

During the discussion of the flowchart, the WG came to the conclusion that it is necessary to have a clear definition of the term “premises”, as each customer can interpret this term in different ways. Therefore, there should be a definition of the term “premises” in the terms and definitions clause.

The definition of the term “premises” is set out in the the Electricity Act (Act). The definition of premises in the Act includes a range of scenarios and the inclusion of owner or occupier in section 16 (1) (a) (i) means that a party who rents part of a piece of land or part of a building can also request a connection to a distribution network.

AC offered to capture the obligations on a DNO under the Act are the provision of a connection to a premises and the risks associated with providing such a connection. According to the Act DNO is under a duty to make a connection between a distribution system of his and any premises under certain conditions (see Electricity Act section 16). However, section 17 of the Act lists exceptions from duty to connect. The provision of a connection a connection to a premises that is embedded within another premises or adjacent to an existing premises may give rise to risks.

A risks may be manageable and hence a connection should be offered, whilst in others the risks may be considered to be unmanageable; in such instances it would be reasonable for a DNO not to provide a connection.

The WG developed a list of the main risks associated with the “unmanageable” connection. AC developed the tables where it is sets out the key risks associated with providing such a connection and the potential mitigations (see tables below).

<i><b>Risk</b></i>	<i><b>Potential mitigation</b></i>	<i><b>Implications</b></i>
1. <i>Inadequate emergency isolation arrangements</i>	<p>a) <i>Ensuring points of supply are adjacent, eg located in the same room</i></p> <p>b) <i>Common emergency disconnection facilities eg a single pushbutton tripping facility accessible to the customer / emergency services</i></p> <p>Or</p> <p>c) <i>Ensuring physical separation between parts of each premises eg via distance or a material physical barrier.</i></p> <p>d) <i>Signage at all points of supply</i></p>	<p><i>Multiple points of supply may be feasible.</i></p> <p><i>G88 requires that supplies to the same building shall be from the same DNO.</i></p> <p><i>Points of supply that are physically separate may be from different DNOs.</i></p>
2. <i>Interconnection / paralleling of points of supply</i>	<p>a) <i>Ensuring physical separation between parts of each premises eg via distance or a material physical barrier.</i></p> <p>b) <i>Establishing a documented management procedure with all relevant parties eg an agreement between the DNO and competent Customer who has the relevant knowledge and expertise to understand and manage the risks.</i></p>	<i>Points of supply that are physically separate may be from different DNOs.</i>
3. <i>Unmanaged diversion of earth fault currents</i>	<p>a) <i>Ensuring that there is a single earthing system design for the relevant premises prepared in conjunction with the relevant owners / occupiers and the relevant network operator(s).</i></p> <p>b) <i>Ensuring that there is an enduring system in place to ensure the earthing system remains unchanged from the original design other than where agreed by all relevant parties.</i></p>	<i>Management most likely to be practical where there is one DNO.</i>
4. <i>Excessive touch potential</i>	a) <i>Ensuring that there is a single earthing system design for the relevant premises prepared in conjunction with the relevant owners / occupiers and the relevant network operator(s).</i>	<i>Management most likely to be practical where there is one DNO.</i>

	<p>b) Ensuring that there is an enduring system in place to ensure the earthing system remains unchanged from the original design other than where agreed by all relevant parties.</p> <p>c) Ensuring that the design of the relevant earthing systems is such that the minimum of 2.5m between earthed metalwork is maintained above ground. This is to manage touch potential.</p> <p>d) Ensuring that the design of the relevant earthing systems is such that the minimum of 10m between earthed metalwork is maintained belowground. The 10m may be reduced following a bespoke voltage touch potential assessment.</p> <p>e) Ensuring that the design of the relevant earthing systems is such that the separation between HV and LV earths is in accordance with ENATC 41-24.</p>	Points of supply that are physically separate from an earthing perspective may be from different DNOs.
5. Excessive earth voltage rise arising from damaged neutral conductors	<p>a) Ensuring that there the customer has a suitable bonding between the DNOs neutral and metallic services is in accordance with EREC G12.</p> <p>b) The DNO not providing an earthing terminal where it would be inappropriate to do so as permitted in the ESQCR.</p>	

In summary, the WG agreed that the existing flowchart is sufficient, but needs to be updated according to the agreed scenarios and may be refined to a more specific one. If adequate separation from existing supply cannot be achieved, reference for alternatives should be provided in flowchart.

<b>Action 5.1</b>	To finalize the flowchart for domestic premises <b>15/07/24</b>	JM
<b>Item 6</b>	<b>Discussion of the scenarios document</b>	<b>CMc</b>
<p>ST presented revised schedules for consideration to the WG.</p> <p>GTC and UKPN provided comments for each scenario which were discussed by the WG.</p> <p>In general the drawings are sufficient and do not require significant changes only minor additions are required. However, notes for scenarios should be supplemented. To do this, the group had a productive and lively discussion of each scenarios and related notes. The group reached a common consensus on filling out the scenarios notes. The scenarios document needs to be finalize in accordance with the discussion.</p>		
<b>Actions 6.1</b>	To finalize the scenarios document based on the discussions <b>15/07/24</b>	ST
<b>Item 7</b>	<b>Discussion legislation about 10 m separation value</b>	<b>CMc</b>
Not discussed.		
<b>Actions 7.1</b>	Members to provide research on legislation about 10 m separation value <b>Next meeting</b>	ALL
<b>Item 8</b>	<b>Next steps</b>	<b>NM</b>

Next steps were not discussed in detail due to lack of time. After finalizing the accompanying documents (flowchart for domestic premises and scenarios document), all this needs to be implemented in the document. According to the WG, the discussions of EREC G94 have reached the point when it is necessary to start active work on writing a draft version of the document. Before the next meeting, the WG have to think on the next steps on the way to producing EREC G94.

**Post meeting notes.**

ENA agreed on the further development of EREC G94. ENA aims to involve Threepwood in the development of a final draft version of the document. The WG has made significant progress in developing the content of the document. A version of the draft document was also developed. All of the above should be reflected in the draft version. NM will make appropriate additions to the existing draft document and distribute it to the WG members for comments and proposal of filling the document. After that, ENA think it is appropriate to involve Threepwood in the discussions of the EREC G94 document. Meantime, NM will liaise with Threepwood and resolve all organizational issues related to further development of a final draft version EREC G94.

<b>Actions 8.1</b>	To make additions to the existing draft EREC G94 according to the achieved results and circulated among WG members <b>24.06.2024</b>	NM
<b>Actions 8.2</b>	To provide comments and proposal of filling the document on the draft EREC G94 <b>15.07.2024</b>	ALL
<b>Actions 8.3</b>	To liaise with Threepwood <b>15.07.2024</b>	NM
<b>Item 9</b>	<b>AOB</b>	<b>CMc</b>
None were raised.		
<b>Actions</b>	None	
<b>Item 10</b>	<b>Next Meeting</b>	<b>CMc</b>
The next meeting will be arranged according to the achievements, approximately mid-July.		
<b>Actions 10.1</b>	Review timing and arrange the next meeting <b>01.07.2024</b>	NM

## ACTIONS LIST

<b>3.1</b>	To change the term “site” to the term “premises” <b>01/07/24</b>	NM
<b>4.1</b>	To arrange a meeting with APEA representatives <b>10/06/24</b>	ST
<b>5.1</b>	To finalize the flowchart for domestic premises <b>15/07/24</b>	JM
<b>6.1</b>	To finalize the scenarios document based on the discussions <b>15/07/24</b>	ST
<b>7.1</b>	Members to provide research on legislation about 10 m separation value <b>Next meeting</b>	ALL
<b>8.1</b>	To make additions to the existing draft EREC G94 according to the achieved results and circulated among WG members <b>24.06.2024</b>	NM
<b>8.2</b>	To provide comments and proposal of filling the document on the draft EREC G94 <b>15.07.2024</b>	ALL
<b>8.3</b>	To liaise with Threepwood <b>15.07.2024</b>	NM
<b>10.1</b>	Review timing and arrange the next meeting <b>01.07.2024</b>	NM