DCRP/17/04: Energy Networks Association Distributed Generation Connection Guides

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 01/09/2017** to [dcode@energynetworks.org](mailto:dcode@energynetworks.org) and please title your email ‘Consultation Response DCRP/17/05 GC0079 ’. Please note that any responses received after the deadline may not receive due consideration.

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 | (i) Do you believe that GC0079 better facilitates the appropriate Distribution Code objectives? If not, why do they fail to do so? |  |
| Q2 | (ii) Do you support the proposal to exclude VS protection technique as loss of main protection for new embedded generators? Please clarify why. |  |
| Q3 | (iii) Do you support the proposed change in RoCoF to setting 1Hzs 1 with a delay of 500ms for distributed generators below 5MW? Please clarify why. |  |
| Q4 | (iv) Do the proposed changes facilitate efficient connection and operation of distributed generators? If not, why do they fail to do so? |  |
|  | (v) Do you agree with the workgroup’s recommended Option 2 of applying the changes to all embedded generators including type tested generating units and why? |  |
|  | (vi) In particular do you agree that manufacturers of type tested generating plant should ensure type tested equipment is compliant with the new requirements by 01/02/2018? |  |
|  | Are there any additional manufacturing costs associated with these requirements? If so what are what are they and what is their proportion to the existing cost? Please provide evidence (in confidence if necessary). |  |
|  | (viii) Do the proposed changes introduce any material risks for distributed generators? What are these risks? And have they been or will they be appropriately mitigated? |  |
|  | (ix) Do the proposed changes impose any additional material risks on the system operator, eg reduced stability margins, reduced reactive capability margins, or difficulty in managing transmission system voltages? If yes, please highlight these risks. |  |
|  | (x) Do the proposed changes impose any additional material risks on distribution network operators, eg stability and security issues safety risks, or any additional investment that might be neither economic nor efficient? If yes, please highlight these risks. |  |
|  | (xi) Do the proposed changes adequately protect the interests of all distribution network users? If not, why do they fail to do so? |  |
|  | (xii) Are there further technical considerations to be taken into account? If yes, please highlight these technical considerations. |  |
|  | (xiii) Is there any evidence that Users will be inappropriately or adversely affected by the changes proposed? If so, please provide details. |  |
|  | (xiv) Do the modifications proposed strike an appropriate balance between the needs of generators, DNOs, transmission licensees, and other interested parties? If not, why do they fail to do so? |  |
|  | (xv) Please provide any other comments you feel are relevant to the proposed change. |  |

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