EREC G83/2

Southern Solar – Responses to Draft for Public Comment (Iss 2)

Editorial

- (Page 5) Header bar reads “Issue 1”

Technical / General

- (Pt2/Pr3) We appreciate this clarification. Recommend adding further sentence “This is irrespective of the power rating of the prime mover”
- (Pt2/Pr7, Pt5.1.1/Pr2, Pt5.1.2/Pr1) There are several summaries of this within the document, and they are not completely consistent. We suggest a single definition in Definitions.
    - Furthermore, what constitutes a “Planned programme of work” is not well defined and will be difficult to police. For example, there is, to the current requirements, a potential incentive for housing developers to break an estate up into a large number of small contracts (one per dwelling), which could then be seen as a large number of Stage 1 systems.
    - Conversely, Pt5.1.1 implies that even if the projects are unrelated but in close proximity, Stage 2 method is required.
    - We also recommend some examples to clarify whether a project or group of projects would classify as a “planned programme of works”, which, if in close geographic proximity, would require Stage 2 treatment
        - A new housing estate operated by a single Client on which SSEGs are installed in a number of separate houses due to be sold to individual owners, even if each house was developed under an individual contract: YES
        - Two new houses on the same street, built by individuals, with the SSEG installation under separate contracts, even if sold as a result of a marketing “push”: NO
        - Retrofitted installations of SSEGs within the property of a single housing association: YES, if in close geographical proximity and it is known at the time of commissioning of any site that another installation is planned
        - Two SSEGs connected to the same exit point: NO (see 5.1.1 for whether this is within the scope of EREC G83)
        - Two SSEGs, each with an output less than 8A, to be installed on a single property but connected to separate meter points (for example, farmhouse and barn with separate supplies): YES
- (Pt5.2/Pr1) Please clarify whether this implies a requirement for a single switch to isolate ALL SSEGs on the site. Obviously this is best practice, but may not be practical where, for example, a second SSEG is retrofitted where one has been in place for several years attached to another part of the installation or where equipment is not suitably sized for the extension. This is not a new issue; it applies to the current version of G83

- (Pt5.2/Pr1) What is the definition of “accessible”? A reasonable assumption is to be as accessible to the DNO’s technicians in an emergency as the service cutout, which may raise the question of where to site it where the cutout is in a separate outdoor service cupboard.
- (Pt5.3.1,Pr3) Recommend adding words to the effect of “Likewise, the interface protection should not cause disconnection unless the voltage, frequency and loss-of-mains sensors indicate and excursion, subject to measurement accuracy”. This is implied elsewhere, but we are aware of at least one device that does not do this for G59.
- (Pt6.2/Pr3) “Point of interconnection” is not well defined. We currently interpret this to be the Entry Point (ie the DNO service cutout), but it could also be the point where circuits dedicated to the SSEG connect with the consumer’s installation (ie at the relevant distribution board).
- (AnnexA1.2/Pr2) We wonder if BS EN 50438 (2007) and BE EN 61727 (1996) are of relevance (We are not manufacturers, however, so these standards may have been superseded / withdrawn / become obsolete)