RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.
Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

REFERENCE	I0278_WG_0910_02
STATUS	FOR DISCUSSION

I0278 – ESTABLISHING THE SAFE ISOLATION PROVIDER (SIP) AS A STANDALONE REC PARTY

BY FRANCINE PEYROUX-SISSOKO, DAVE WRIGHT, GLENN SHEERN AND JEMMA JOHNSON FOR DISCUSSION

1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to provide industry Parties with a short background on REC Issue I0278 – Establishing the Safe Isolation Provider (SIP) as a Standalone REC Party and questions which will be discussed during the Working Group (WG) to help frame its solution development, i.e. the way SIPs should report and document their work, agree on safe practices, sealing methodology and approach with regards to interference, damage and tampers.

2 BACKGROUND

REC Issue I0278 – Establishing the Safe Isolation Provider (SIP) as a Standalone REC Party has been raised to formally recognise the SIP as a standalone REC Party to align with Ofgem's Strategic Direction Statement, enabling easier access to certified SIPs, meeting market demand and ensuring safety standards. High safety standards through a robust training, vigorous qualifications and a strong audit process will be implemented within this new framework.

3 QUESTIONS FOR THE WG

In advance of the Working Group session on 10 September 2026, Working Group attendees are invited to think about the following questions:

3.1 REPORTING & DOCUMENTATION

Currently, for any Safe Isolation Work, the following information is being transmitted:

- Fault resolution Report or Request for Decision on Further Action
- Asset Condition Report
- Report to Supplier of Possible Irregularity
- Confirmation or Rejection of Energisation Status Change
- SIP Event Complete
- Asset Condition Report Response / Clearance

1. Do you believe that the information currently covered is the right data that needs to be transmitted?

2. Do you believe that there is any data currently missing that would need to be transmitted?

3. Do you believe that there is any information currently covered that is not in fact needed?

4. Do you believe that there is any data missing that would need to be collected by SIPs? At the last WG, Members agreed that the following information should be collected by SIPs as a standard (Date and time of visit; Property address; MPAN).

5. What are challenges that you foresee with the current information transmission method?

6. Is there a preferred alternative to transmit information?

Please think about both situations where everything goes according to plan, and situations where there are issues.

3.2 INTERFERENCE, TAMPERS & DAMAGE

1. Taking into consideration the points below do you agree with our assumptions on responsibility and with reference to communication what would be the preferred method of contact:

    a) If the cutout is damaged, we believe SIPs should report it to DNOs. Do you agree? How should they report to DNOs?

    b) If damage has been done to the Supplier's equipment, we believe SIPs should report it to the supplier. Do you agree? How should they report to the Supplier?

    c) If damage has been done to the Consumer equipment, we believe there should be a contractual discussion between the Consumer and the operative. Do you agree? How should they report to the Consumer?

2. Are there any other points, or any other types of damage that need clarification on?

3. Should standalone SIPs be shown the standard type of set up they should work on or should they be shown specific types of tampers?

3.3 SAFETY & SEALING

1. What should a standalone SIP do to remain safe on site when they identify an issue?

2. What risks do you foresee depending on the form of sealing methodology chosen?

    a) Existing system

    b) Separate system for standalone SIPs