RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

I0278 WORKING GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**I0278 Working Group Meeting 2**
DATE	**29 June 2026: 14:00 – 15:30**
LOCATION	**On Teams**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Francine Peyroux-Sissoko	REC Code Manager	FP	Lead Analyst
Dave Wright	REC Code Manager	DW	Chair
Rebecca Griffiths	Retail Energy Code Company	RG	Proposer

Full attendee list available upon request.

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Lead Analyst welcomed attendees to the second I0278 Working Group (WG) meeting and invited any additional items of business for consideration during the meeting. The representative from Electrical Safety First mentioned they had sent out a survey to their electricians' database in the previous week. The survey focuses on understanding how often the service cutout fuse is being pulled without permission. They will share the results with the Code Manager.

I0278WG_0629_A01: The Code Manager to share the final survey results from Electrical Safety First with members once it has been completed.

2 REVIEW OF MINUTES AND ACTIONS OF PREVIOUS MEETING

No comments were received on the minutes of the first WG meeting held on Monday 11 May 2026 and the minutes were approved as a true and accurate record. The Lead Analyst reminded attendees of housekeeping rules before starting the meeting and displayed the competition law compliance slide. The Chair told members to be mindful of their conduct in relation to competition law. Members should raise any concerns immediately. The Lead Analyst provided an updated of ongoing actions that can be found on the actions log.

3 I0278 BACKGROUND & WORKING GROUP AIMS

DW provided an overview of REC Issue I0278, reminding members that Ofgem's Strategic Direction Statement explicitly calls for the establishment of the SIP as a standalone Party role, providing a robust system without reducing the safety requirements to conduct this role. This new framework should also help reduce the safety issues that the current one poses (electrocutions, electric shocks, broken seals, etc.) and help move away from an inequal system and from a low competitive market with net zero being an important driver in that direction. DW summarised the activities to date (discussions with Industry bodies, an information request opened for six weeks and the first working group session).

A representative from Electrical Safety First wanted to capture that local generation and storage should be considered as a risk. Compared to G98/ G99/G100 compliant devices, the advent of "plug-in PV" and "plug-in battery storage systems" means there may be several non-compliant devices deployed in Consumer's homes. Therefore, some additional checks may be needed where some of these are not easily identifiable. A solution could be to additionally ensure that all circuit-breakers are switched to the "off" position, in addition to opening the main switch.

I0278WG_0629_A02: The Code Manager to check whether the advent of non-compliant devices and the risks they create should be raised as a REC Issue or whether an awareness piece should be conducted for Metering Equipment Managers (MEMs).

DW provided an overview of the different areas members of this working group should focused on across the working group sessions, and some members added some thoughts to the list. The updated and agreed list can be found below:

- Scope (current WG session)
- Equipment
- Sealing
- Unmetered supply
- Testing
- Safety
- Damage
- Interference
- Reporting
- Data flows
- Training
- Auditing
- Accession

4 SCOPE DISCUSSION

Following on from the first working group, DW opened the discussion on the scope of SIPs, asking members to go through a few questions listed below. Slido was used anonymously to encourage discussion and has been included in the post-meeting papers.

4.1 WHAT CHALLENGES DO YOU FORESEE WITH SIPS BEING ABLE TO UPGRADE TAILS BETWEEN CUTOUT AND METER, WHEN AN ISSUE HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED?

Members mentioned a few challenges:

- Correct sizing cross-sectional area (CSA). DW agreed that SIPs should be changing the tails if the CSA does not match, in an old housing stock with a reduced cross-section area of 10 mil for instance, whilst the upgrade would need 25 mil). Members agreed that SIPs should be able to change these tails and should ensure they use the correct size for the capacity when doing so. Correct sizing CSA should be made clear in the governance and should be covered in the SIP training. A member added that electricians currently working in 7671 would consider the CSA of the cable back to the cutout, however a few old cutouts where it is not possible to put anything greater than 16 mil have been seen. DW reminded members of the Service Termination Issue Reporting Guidance (STIRG) document which would have information on how to notify the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) when data flows are not used. The same

standards should be kept for standalone SIPs, even if the communication strategy might differ slightly.

- Incident investigation. Obligation towards the Energy Supplier to identify who was last on the site in case of an incident to be able to escalate given the number of different Parties involved (DNOs, IDNOs, BNOs, etc.). DW agreed that it is important to know how to record the work that has been done on site and ensure the right Parties can access to these records.

I0278WG_0629_A03: The Code Manager to consider adding an investigation procedure in the SIP's policy detailing the process, and the responsible Parties for the investigation.

- Gas fly leads at the point of the tails. The consideration is on the meter health, ensuring that any interaction with the metering system is communicating correctly.

- Damages screws in cutout or meter, i.e. B04, with old cut outs unable to receive greater than 16mm tails. This would be mentioned in the STIRG document. This should be made clear in the governance and should be covered in the SIP training.

- When an issue is identified with the tails, SIPs should upgrade them and make a record of the change. This should not present a challenge as this will be part of the SIP's role.

- Anti tamper devices. This will depend on each organisation.

I0278WG_0629_A04: The Code Manager to investigate whether there are any stipulations that make it mandatory for MEMs to use a certain security device on Energy Supplier's meters.

- Condition of the cut out such as asbestos. The Cut Out Glossary, available on the REC Portal, details which process to follow. The Code Manager will ensure this document which is currently under review will be made available to Parties and will be included in the training for SIPs.

- Standardising cable identification and labelling. There is a standardisation in the Consolidated Code of Practice (CoMCoP), however that standardisation does not stipulate what the Live and Neutral conductors must look like, as long as it is possible to identify them. It will not be possible to change the entirety of the CoMCoP. However, it could be possible to add information on what that would be for standalone SIPs, only if it does not confuse other Parties.

- Pyro or older rising mains style tails. Most cases would be on the Building Network Operators (BNO) network. A procedure should be made clear for SIPs to report these to the BNO.

I0278WG_0629_A05: The Code Manager to draft a list of scenarios where SIPs need to report issues they identify (i.e. faulty equipment, signs of interference, poor installations), who they need to report the issue to, and what the escalation route is for each scenario.

4.2 WHAT CHALLENGES DO YOU FORESEE WITH SIPS BEING ABLE TO UPGRADE TAILS FROM THE METER TO THE ISOLATOR, WHEN AN ISSUE HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED?

This is considering the outgoing side of the meter, i.e. the other side of the first question, in case there are further challenges.

Members mentioned they believed that if a SIP were to fit an isolator, to install solar panels or EV charging for instance, of EV charging, they should be able to put an isolator on both the restricted side and on the 24-hour supply. A member added that it was needed, especially in areas in Scotland with THTC set ups. With off-peak or more complex wiring set ups, there needs to be some understanding of maintaining the isolation. The WG agreed that if it is off peak or there is a split of supplies, it should have its own form of isolation. DW added that the diagram that will be amended by the Code Manager would add some alternatives, considering cases with A5 terminal meters.

The loss of communication is always going to be an issue, so a reporting methodology is needed. Damaged screws at the meter were also mentioned. DW asked members for their thoughts where it is not possible to take the tails out: should the SIP stops their work or should they be allowed to continue their work, i.e. cut the tails, fit their isolator and report to the supplier that the meter is damaged. Members believed this was dependent on whether there would be a risk of exposing the conductors, for instance if the tails that would go into the meter were bent. If there was a way of mechanically clamping the tails below the meter, it would be safe to proceed with the work. DW agreed and added that this would need to be documented for standalone SIPs. A member added that there should be some considerations to ensure that the SIP can report and demonstrate that they found the job with damaged screws when going on site before they can continue their work. This is to ensure that they will not be taken responsible for that issue before continuing to work on the meter.

On the old multi way double pole blocks, members shared that they should be removed if they are found in a poor condition. A member highlighted that there is currently a difference between CoMCoP and BS7671 regarding what is acceptable for wiring markings, and for the double pole blocks it may also be slightly different. What an electrician may consider acceptable currently may not be what the view is from a MEM's perspective. As double pole blocks are available to buy in the market and there is nothing in the legislation stating that they cannot be used, it is likely to be difficult to prohibit their use if they are installed correctly. Therefore, a clear expectation of double pole blocks and what needs to be done if they're found in poor conditions need to be made clear. However, if the double pole blocks are feeding multiple connections, SIPs would only be responsible for what they are working on. In that case, as long as the particular block they are working on is safe, they would be required to notify the Consumer as part of their test certificate. DW warned that the lines between BS7671 and CoMCoP should not be blurred. These blocks would come under BS7671. All operatives, either MEMs or electricians, when working on an exposed conductive would have a duty of care to make it safe, irrespective of whether there is a cost associated with it or not. The WG therefore agreed that there is no issue with multi-way double pole blocks as long as they are fit for purpose and are not damaged. As a priority, the standalone SIPs should have to identify whether they are fit for purpose, and if they are not, they have an obligation to replace and make them safe.

4.3 WHAT CHALLENGES DO YOU FORESEE WITH SIPS BEING ABLE TO CHECK TIGHTNESS OF CUTOUT TERMINALS?

DW asked members whether they believed that SIPs should be expected to check tightness of cutout terminals as part of their training. Members agreed it should be adequately covered in the training and assessment.

A few challenges were mentioned:

- Torque settings. One member mentioned they use torque screwdrivers but not at the cutout. Using them at the meter gives the advantage of knowing which meter and which manufacturer is being used. Depending on the manufacturer, the torque screwdrivers are being recalibrated, or it is not possible to know if it was torqued up at the same setting the operative would have first used it. A NAPIT representative mentioned that most operatives in the electrical industry are aware of torque settings nowadays. This awareness should help to avoid over tightening cutout terminals. One of the challenges would be that most of the tools would be too old, and operatives from MEMs to DNOs, would over tighten cutout terminals as they previously learnt. DW highlighted that there should be a clear understanding in the training what tightening should look like, without over tightening the cutout.

- Metal clad cutout awareness. Members reflected on what standalone SIPs could work on, considerations should be given to rewireable fuses, fuse neutrals, J-type fuses, porcelain fuse carriers and metal cutout with asbestos. This should be covered in the training. The cutout glossary being currently under review, more cutout types will be added to reflect the current environment operatives work in. CoMCoP currently states how DNOs notify Energy Suppliers and MEMs of such change. Considerations should be made on how a standalone SIP could be part of the repository currently used by DNOs to be notified when a new cutout is being introduced.

I0278WG_0630_A06: The Code Manager to investigate how an electrician is currently being notified that a new cutout has been introduced when the DNO would have changed it.

- Access to terminations – shared neutrals. Top side, bottom side loops and shared supplies should be covered in the training and is already something that MEMs are learning about.

A member asked whether there would be some centralised technical support for standalone SIPs. Although this is not something that is within the scope of this REC Issue, it may be something training organisations such as NAPIT, NICEIC and the Institute of Electrical Technology consider should they see a gap once standalone SIPs are operational.

4.4 ARE THERE ANY SCENARIOS WHERE SIPS COULD HAVE ISSUES ACCESSING THE METER AND/OR CUTOUT?

Members mentioned that there were a lot of scenarios where SIPs could have issues accessing the meter and/or cutout.

- Shared/looped supplies. The biggest challenge is that MEMs have access to more information than electricians. They may know who the Energy Suppliers are next door, and Consumers would be more likely to have more confidence in them than in a standalone Party, if a MEM were to come to their property because of a shared or looped supply. A member mentioned that DNO should inform the operative when they found a looped supply given they may prevent the upgrade going ahead until it is resolved as it will put more load or demand onto their network. This should help standalone Parties to gain Consumers' trust, although it would not always be the case.

- CT cabinets should not be an issue as SIPs will not be dealing with CT supplies, only with the whole current. However, a member mentioned that whole current meters mounted onto CT cabinets with the cutout located behind the doors are being found more than before,

especially with buildings that have been converted. This seemed to be a similar issue mentioned in the first WG session, where a three-phased cutout with 200 amps could be found on a CT panel. In those cases, DW advised that the key is to identify the cutout, and if the meter sits on a CT panel, standalone SIPs will need to abort the job and let a specialist work on it. This should also be covered in the training.

- Access issues with Consumer away from the site, or not keeping the appointment, or key issues are likely to always be a problem, and not something that will be possible to resolve as part of I0278.

- Gas meter or other utilities blocking or if a Consumer unit is built over the meter. This is the same issue as what MEMs are currently experiencing, having trouble getting in touch with the relevant organisations to unblock the access, and finding the Party who will pay for this service. It is unlikely that I0278 will be able to resolve these challenges. However, with the EAS document coming into place from October 2026, it will be required to conduct a pre-work site survey before installing an isolator for an EV charger for instance. Therefore, standalone SIPs should also have to conduct such surveys which should help with identifying potential blockers. It should be made clear in the governance and covered in the training with some checklist of what operatives should be looking for.

4.5 WHAT CHALLENGES DO YOU FORESEE WITH SHARED SERVICES WITH OTHER PARTIES?

Members shared the following challenges:

- Having all Parties involved and in agreement. DW suggested the standalone SIP should be the lead as they are the ones who will be conducting the work. Identifying all Parties involved throughout different parts of the process might prove a challenge.

- Blaming each other for issues. This goes back to discussions on damaged screws and damaged equipment.

- Re-energisation issues. This was mentioned at the last WG. The main point is to not re-energise another organisation's work.

- Shared neutral/dropped neutrals. This will always be an issue. Testing and training are key to reduce it.

- Supply dependency – medical equipment. This should be identified within the pre-work survey.

- Supply demand (where applicable). This will be a DNO challenge.

The Electrical Contractors' Association (ECA) pointed out that the EAS pre-work survey is not as clear as thought given the use of the verb "shall" which could be interpreted as "must" or "should". The NAPIT representative questioned whether the WG could mandate standalone SIPs to conduct a pre-work survey. The WG cannot mandate such survey, however it can be made clear in the training and governance of the advantages for SIPs to conduct such a survey.

5 NEXT STEPS, DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The Lead Analyst confirmed that the next meeting will take place on Tuesday 21 July 2026 from 10:00-11:30.

Members asked about expected timescales for the establishment of a standalone SIP. The Lead Analyst mentioned that this would partly depend on the progress of these WG given there is still a lot to cover before the solution requirements can be agreed on. The legal texts and CoMCoP will then be updated, before we can consult on with the wider industry. It is more likely that 2027 will be when this Issue is being implemented. This is to ensure that we have the most robust solution and framework in place, rather than going too fast, not engaging with the right Parties, missing important points and having to reconsider an important piece of this work. Information about this REC Issue can be found on the REC Portal here. An Update to Plan will be presented at the Change Panel at the end of July 2026, which will provide new timelines for the solution development of this Issue. This will be shared on the REC Portal and with WG members, who can inform Parties they know are interested in the SIP role.

6 AOB

The Lead Analyst invited attendees to provide AOB. None other were raised. The Chair invited attendees to share any further thoughts and input they may have after talking to their organisation to the REC Change mailbox: change.management@recmanager.co.uk, before closing the meeting.

ACTIONS LOG

Action ref.	Action	Owner	Status
I0278WG_0511_A01	The Code Manager to amend the diagram with some explanatory notes, and to expand the responsibilities of SIPs in different scenarios with some supporting documentation.	Code Manager	In progress
I0278WG_0511_A02	The Code Manager to share with members statistics provided by the HSE.	Code Manager	Completed
I0278WG_0511_A03	The Code Manager to share the ENA EREC about fuse upgrades with members when it is made available.	Code Manager	In progress
I0278WG_0629_A01	The Code Manager to share the final survey results from Electrical Safety First with members once it has been completed.	Code Manager	New
I0278WG_0629_A02	The Code Manager to check whether the advent of non-compliant devices and the risks they create should be raised as a REC Issue or whether an awareness piece should be conducted for Metering Equipment Managers (MEMs).	Code Manager	New
I0278WG_0629_A03	The Code Manager to consider adding an investigation procedure in the SIP's policy	Code Manager	New

	detailing the process, and the responsible Parties for the investigation.		
I0278WG_0629_A04	The Code Manager to investigate whether there are any stipulations that make it mandatory for MEMs to use a certain security device on Energy Supplier's meters.	Code Manager	New
I0278WG_0629_A05	The Code Manager to draft a list of scenarios where SIPs need to report issues they identify (i.e. faulty equipment, signs of interference, poor installations), who they need to report the issue to, and what the escalation route is for each scenario.	Code Manager	New
I0278WG_0629_A06	The Code Manager to investigate how an electrician is currently being notified that a new cutout has been introduced when the DNO would have changed it.	Code Manager	New

DECISIONS LOG

Decision ref.	Action	Owner	Status
I0278WG_0511_D01	The working group agreed to keep SIPs' activities to a whole current and ensure it will be explicitly stated.	Working Group	In progress
I0278WG_0511_D02	The Working Group agreed that it should be made explicitly clear that SIPs (as individual or organisation) can only re-energise supply they would have de-energise as part of the same job. This should also be made clear in the training and handover process.	Working Group	In progress