

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

DCRP/19/02/PC: Engineering Report 130

Guidance on the application of Engineering Recommendation P2, Security of Supply

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 7th March 2018** to dcode@energynetworks.org and please title your email 'Consultation Response DCRP/19/02/PC EREP 130'. 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 5124, or to dcode@energynetworks.org

Respondent	<i>Hui Yi Heng</i>
Company Name	Scottish & Southern Electricity Network
No. of DCode Stakeholders Represented	1
Stakeholders represented	<i>Scottish & Southern Electricity Network</i>
Role of Respondent	<i>Distributor</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 EREP 130 achieve the Distribution Code Objectives?	Yes
Q2	Do you agree with the proposed text contained in the draft EREP 130 Issue 3, or do you have any alternatives to propose or indeed any comments relating to the specific technical content of the EREP?	Agree in general with the technical content of the EREP. See further comments in table below.

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
9 / 51	1	Para 4	Technical	It is stated here that CBA is to be used to establish the justification or otherwise, <u>for providing additional security</u> to meet the requirements of EREC P2/7 Table 1, whereas the rest of the document mentioned CBA as a mean to justify providing <u>less</u> security.	The EREP also provides guidance on the use of cost benefit analysis (CBA) to establish the justification or otherwise, for providing security differing from the requirements of EREC P2/7 Table 1.	Accepted. Wording amended.
17 / 283	5	Para 4	Editorial	Reference to Figure 2 should be Figure 3	... (see Figure 3)	Accepted.
19 / 332	5	Figure 3	Editorial	Several typos in the Figure	"Latest Demand" to "Latent Demand" Latent Demand (if # calculated for Non-Contracted and Contracted)	Accepted.
22 / 428	7.1	Para 1 -	General	Most of Section 7.1 are general statements for non-network capacity and are relevant to both contracted and non-contracted.	Create a new section before existing Section 7 "Contribution to System Security from Contracted DG, DSR Schemes, and ES" for these general statements.	Accepted. New Clause 7 created to separate the general requirements from those specific to Contracted and Non-Contracted.
23 / 488	7.2		Editorial	The <u>Contracted</u> DG security...	Change to "Contracted"	Accepted.

¹ Add more rows if required

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

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
43 / 1082	Annex D	Table D.2.2	Technical	The F factor for onshore wind (winter) 3-hour persistence is higher than that of 2-hour persistence	Change the F factor of Tm = 3-hour to 15 %	Accepted. Comment added to table in Annex G.3.
44 / 1089	Annex D	D.3	Editorial	Typo in the heading Approach 2 – Using <u>capability</u> factors	Approach 2 – Using capacity factors	Accepted.