

## Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

### DCRP/21/04/PC: Engineering Recommendation (EREC) G12 Issue 4 Amendment 2

#### *Requirements for the Application of Protective Multiple Earthing to Low Voltage Networks*

---

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 7 May 2021** to [dcode@energynetworks.org](mailto:dcode@energynetworks.org) and please title your email:

**‘Consultation Response DCRP/21/04/PC EREC G12 Issue 4 Amendment 2’.**

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 5100, or to [dcode@energynetworks.org](mailto:dcode@energynetworks.org)

<b>Respondent</b>	<i>Nick Ebsworth</i>
<b>Company Name</b>	Siemens Mobility (Soon to be re-named “Yunex”)
<b>No. of DCode Stakeholders Represented</b>	1
<b>Stakeholders represented</b>	<i>Nick Ebsworth</i>
<b>Role of Respondent</b>	<i>EVSE supplier, installer, maintainer</i>
<b>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]</b>	Yes

## Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

	Question	Response
Q1	Do you agree that the proposed amendments to EREC G12 Issue 4 achieve the Distribution Code Objectives?	Yes
Q2	Do you agree with the proposed text contained in EREC G12 Issue 4, or do you have any alternatives to propose?	No

Please provide comments relating to the specific technical content of the EREC<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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
32	6.2.16.1		General	<p>The comment “...separation between the TT earth and underground metallic services is not considered necessary” is, if I understand it correctly, a seismic change from the position that we currently have, where, depending on what you read, a separation of between 2,5m and 10m is required underground between the TT earth rod and any metallic service that could conceivably be connected to a PME supply earth. As this is such a significant change, the text here needs to be extremely clear and unambiguous.</p> <p>Also, to imply that zero separation is required just feels plain wrong. Would 1mm separation be ok? I doubt it. It would be far more sensible to suggest a practical minimum separation (such as 0.5m) that allows TT earths to be easily installed but without risking direct metallic contact between the two earth domains.</p>	<p>“.....separation between the EVSE TT earth rod or mat and underground metallic services which may conceivably be connected to a PME supply earth may be reduced to 0.5m”</p>	