DCRP/PC/18/01: Engineering Recommendation P28

Voltage fluctuations and the connection of disturbing equipment to transmission systems and distribution networks in the United Kingdom.

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 Wednesday** **31 January 2018** to [dcode@energynetworks.org](mailto:dcode@energynetworks.org) and please title your email ‘Consultation Response DCRP/PC/18/01 EREC P28 ’. 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](mailto:dcode@energynetworks.org)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent** | *Name* |
| **Company Name** |  |
| **No. of DCode Stakeholders Represented** |  |
| **Stakeholders represented** | *Please list all Stakeholder names responding on behalf of (including the respondent company if relevant).* |
| **Role of Respondent** | *Eg Distributor/Supplier/Generator/ Consolidator / Exemptible Generator / BSC Agent / Party Agent / Distributor / other – please state* [[1]](#footnote-1)*)* |
| **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]** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Question | Response |
| Q1 | Do you agree with the proposed requirements and planning levels for RVCs in EREC P28 Issue 2 (as provided in Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7 and Table 4 of EREC P28 Issue 2)? |  |
| Q2 | Do you agree with the proposal for providing improved clarity of what constitutes ‘worst case normal operating conditions’ for the assessment of voltage fluctuations under EREC P28? |  |
| Q3 | Do you agree with the proposals for an intermediate planning level to assist with co-ordination of the transfer of flicker severity from higher voltage to lower voltage supply systems? |  |
| Q4 | Do you have any objections to the proposed amendments in EREC P28 Issue 2 as they currently stand? If so, please describe your concerns and if possible propose any alternatives. |  |
| Q5 | Do you agree that the proposed modification proposal better facilitates the Distribution Code objectives? |  |
| Q6 | Recognising that any consequential changes to the Grid Code will need to be progressed via the Grid Code governance process, the Working Group would welcome any concerns you have at this stage if the EREC P28 Issue 2 proposal was to be considered for adoption in the Grid Code? |  |
| Q7 | Do you have any other comments to make on the proposed changes? |  |

Please provide comments relating to the specific technical content of the EREC[[2]](#footnote-2)

| Page No | Line No | Clause/ Subclause | Paragraph Figure/ Table | Type  of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial) | COMMENTS | Proposed change | OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT  on each comment submitted |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Delete as appropriate – please do not use strikeout, this is to make it easier to analyse the responses [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Add more rows if required [↑](#footnote-ref-2)