DCRP/20/06/PC: Distribution Code Storage Modification

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 February 2021** to [dcode@energynetworks.org](mailto:dcode@energynetworks.org) and please title your email ‘Consultation Response DCRP/20/06/PC DCode Storage Modification. 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](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 general intent of the proposed modification? If not, please explain your views. |  |
| Q2 | Do you agree that the proposed modifications satisfy the applicable Distribution Code objectives? If not, please explain your concerns. |  |
| Q3 | Do you agree with the approach to a timed future implementation and do you agree with the suggested date? |  |
| Q4 | Do you agree with the inclusion of mandatory cessation of active power import, and change to generating mode, on falling frequency and do you agree with the thresholds suggested? If you disagree, please explain why. |  |
| Q5 | Do you agree with the general approach taken to V2G requirements? If not, please state what you think is incorrect and inappropriate and please suggest any alternative approaches. |  |
| Q6 | Do you foresee that V2G will be needed for EVs of under 3.6kW registered generating capacity? If so, this would require appropriate drafting to be included in G98. |  |
| Q7 | Do you agree that DNOs should insist on formal Equipment Certificates for vehicle manufacturers to demonstrate compliance of V2G capabilities? If you disagree, please explain why. |  |
| Q8 | Do you have any comments on the proposed EVCP, Heat Pumps, V2G application form (Appendix 3) or the proposed connection process flowchart (Appendix 2) for all domestic customers? |  |
| Q9 | What do you think of the proposed digitalisation plan outlined in the introduction and do you have any feedback or suggestions on the minimum functional requirements the app should have? |  |
| Q10 | Do you agree that the data requirements relating to storage technologies etc should be left to the DCRP working group [Data Exchange Working Group] on data exchange provisions to resolve? |  |
| Q11 | Do you have any comments on the proposed legal text drafting? |  |

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

| 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 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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)