

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

DCRP/18/03/PC: 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 2nd February 2018** to dcode@energynetworks.org and please title your email 'Consultation Response DCRP/18/03/PC EREC P2'. 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>Tom Chevalier</i>
Company Name	Power Data Associates Ltd
No. of DCode Stakeholders Represented	None
Stakeholders represented	<i>N/A</i>
Role of Respondent	<i>Party Agent</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]	Yes

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

	Question	Response
Q1	Do you agree that the proposed amendments achieve the Distribution Code Objectives?	<p>Yes</p> <p>The removal of the differentiation between Interruptible and Non-Interruptible distributed generation has caused many debates. The DCUSA cross refers to P2/6 and these definitions as the basis of different charges. These differences are arbitrary and no longer relevant as highlighted in the proposed changes. The various forms of generation have developed over the last 10+ years and historic definitions are no longer relevant. The use of these definitions in DCUSA has led some stakeholders to interpret these definitions to their financial advantage. Removal of the distinction will remove this opportunity.</p>
Q2	Do you agree with the proposed text contained in the draft EREC P2, or do you have any alternatives to propose or indeed any comments relating to the specific technical content of the EREC?	No

Please provide comments relating to the specific technical content of the EREC¹

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

¹ Add more rows if required

Distribution Code Consultation Response Proforma

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