

EREC G94 Initial Discussions

MINUTES

Meeting – Tuesday 18th February 2025, 10:00 – 12:00

MS Teams Meeting

ATTENDEES	INITIAL	COMPANY
Nataliia Myrhorodska	NM	ENA
Seth Treasure	ST	NGED
Stephen Tucker	STu	UKPN
John Mason	JM	UKPN
Steve Mockford	SM	GTC
Gary Eastwood	GE	TCL
Karan Oommen	KO	TCL
Alan Creighton	AC	NPg
Razzaq Muddasser	RM	NPg
Matthew Brown	MB	NPg
Karan Batra	KB	SPEN

APOLOGIES

Peter Twomey	PT	ENWL
--------------	----	------

MEETING NOTES AND ACTIONS

LEAD

Item 1	Welcomes and acceptance of agenda	NM
Members were welcomed to the meeting and the agenda was agreed.		
Actions	None	

Item 2		Review actions from previous meeting	NM
Previous completed actions were agreed and closed.			
Actions	None		
Item 3		Discuss the final draft of EREC G94	ALL
<p>STu raised a query about the next steps, particularly whether this document should be an Annex 2 of the DCode and sit alongside the EREC G87 - Managing the Risks Associated with the Provision of Multiple Connections in Close Proximity. If it is an Annex 2 of the DCode the document should go out for consultation. STu believes that an external consultation would benefit the document's development.</p> <p>The WG discussed this query noting the pros and cons of both suggested scenarios.</p> <p>AC took an action to find the DCode definitions of Annex 1 and Annex 2 documents to ensure the EREC G94 is eligible to be listed as an Annex 2 DCode standards.</p> <p><u><i>Post meeting note.</i></u></p> <p>After the discussion with AC and MD. The following AC's suggestions will be taking forward:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The workgroup completes the EREC G94 document, seeks sign off by ENFG for the document to be published by ENA. 2. Then, discuss with DCRP whether they want to convene a workgroup to review / revise the document, proceed to public consultation and if approved by DCRP publish the (revised) document as a DCode annex document. <p>The WG discussed AC's feedback and outstanding issues by stepping through each of the following queries.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standard Licence Condition 15A (SLC 15A). <p>AC mentioned that a lot of DNO connections request came through SLC 15A approach rather than the Electricity Act and this should be noted in the document.</p> <p><u><i>Post meeting note.</i></u></p> <p>AC provided a suggested paragraph for Clause 4.1 of the EREC G94 document, including the cross reference to the SLC 15A.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Reference to the EREC G87 - Managing the Risks Associated with the Provision of Multiple Connections in Close Proximity. <p>The WG discussed the potential overlap between the EREC G94 and the EREC G87. It was mentioned that the Figure 1 from the G87 overlaps with the current drawings in the G94. It was agreed to revise the G94 wording and acknowledge that there is an overlap and explain why it is acceptable.</p> <p>NM will update WG on the review of the G87.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Terms and Definitions clause <p>GE pointed out which changes have been provided to the clause Terms and Definitions clause.</p>			

The WG discussed and agreed to refine the term “land” in accordance with AC’s suggestion. So, the definition text for the term “land”, particularly the phrase “could be supporting” should be changed to “might support”.

4. Flowchart

GE provided an overview of the changes implemented in conjunction with AC to the Flowchart. It is now consistent with the Table 1 of this document. No objections to the Flowchart have been received.

The WG asked for a final review of the document after TCL amends the document in accordance with the discussion. This will be discussed with MD.

5. Table 2 – Connection arrangements

No objections have been received on the amendments to the Table 2.

6. 6.2.3 Connection points provided by different DNOs

The concept of an adequate separation was discussed by the WG.

AC stated that separation might be maintained by distance and a barrier and it is necessary to provide clarification in the document.

The WG identified that an additional paragraph should be provided to clarify what constitutes adequate separation in terms of physical separation or an impenetrable barrier.

7. Section 8 Specific considerations

Move Section 8.1 Voltage levels and Section 8.3 PILC cables to the Section 6.2 Assessment considerations. Section 6.2.8 Fuel filling stations move to the Section 8 Specific considerations

8. Drawings

SM raised additional queries regarding the drawings for WG consideration.

It was agreed the following changes should be implemented:

- Change “Connection” to “Connection point”.
- In Table 3 Section 9, or in Section 9 itself, introduce another paragraph that sets out the context of what these drawings are and provides notes associated with each scenario.
- Improve the description of each scenario (colouring and other editorial things).
- Refine the scenarios to ensure that the message we want to deliver is clear identified.

Action 3.1	To circulate the DCode definitions of Annex 1 and Annex 2 documents 18.02.2025 <i>Post meeting notes – closed.</i>	AC
Action 3.2	To address AC’s comments and outcomes from the meeting 17.03.2025	TCL
Action 3.3	Address requirements to the drawings 17.03.2025	TCL
Action 3.4	Update WG on the review of the G87 10.03.2025	NM

Item 4 Query from ECA		ALL
<p>NM raised a query on seeking clarification on the “cut-out cross bond” requested by ECA.</p> <p>GE acknowledge that all references withing this document are cross bonding. To ensure all reference to bond is cross-bond, GE will define the term “cross bond” in the document and include a note stating that the bonding is based on the incoming supply neutral.</p> <p>NM will forward the sentence suggested by the ECA to GE.</p>		
Action 4.1	To provide clarification in the document on cross bond 17.03.2025	TCL
Item 5 AOB		NM
None were raised.		
Actions	None	
Item 6 Next Meeting		NM
NM will determine the day of the next meeting based on the achievements.		
Actions 6.1	Review timing and arrange the next meeting	NM

ACTIONS LIST

<p>3.1</p>	<p>To circulate the DCode definitions of Annex 1 and Annex 2 documents 18.02.2025 <i>Post meeting notes – closed.</i></p>	<p>AC</p>
<p>3.2</p>	<p>To address AC’s comments and outcomes from the meeting 17.03.2025</p>	<p>TCL</p>
<p>3.3</p>	<p>Address requirements to the drawings 17.03.2025</p>	<p>TCL</p>
<p>3.4</p>	<p>Update WG on the review of the G87 10.03.2025</p>	<p>NM</p>
<p>4.2</p>	<p>To provide clarification in the document on cross bond 17.03.2025</p>	<p>TCL</p>
<p>6.1</p>	<p>Review timing and arrange the next meeting</p>	<p>NM</p>