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 3**
DATE	**21 July 2026: 10:00 – 11:30**
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 third I0278 Working Group (WG) meeting and invited any additional items of business for consideration during the meeting.

2 REVIEW OF MINUTES AND ACTIONS OF PREVIOUS MEETING

No comments were received on the minutes of the first WG meeting held on Monday 29 June 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 update of ongoing actions that can be found on the actions log. Both HSE statistics and the Electrical Safety First survey results were shared with members. The ENA draft EREC concerning fuse upgrades has recently been shared with the Code Manager. The Code Manager will come back to the ENA before it can feedback to the working group. DW thanked HSE, Electrical Safety First and the ENA for the work conducted. Members agreed that the data received would help support evidence gathering and future recommendations.

3 I0278 BACKGROUND & WORKING GROUP AIMS

Members were informed that, following discussions with the Metering Expert Panel (MEP), the title of this Issue has been amended to remove the term “metering”. The new title is “Establishing the Safe Isolation Provider (SIP) as a Standalone REC Party”. This is to avoid confusion as Parties in the REC do not necessarily have to be a metering Party to conduct metering activities. Members were reassured that this amendment would not change the aim nor the strategy of this REC Issue I0278, which is still to align with Ofgem’s Strategic Direction Statement (SDS), supporting decarbonisation activities, reducing safety issues that the current framework poses, and assessing safe and compliant routes for standalone SIPs. DW provided an overview of the topics of discussions for the coming working group sessions and suggested dates that members will agree on at the end of this session.

No	Theme
1	Introduction and Framework
2	Scope
3	Equipment and testing
4	Safety, interference, tampers, damage & sealing
5	Reporting and documentation
6	Auditing and training
7	Accession

DW then opened the discussion, starting with the remaining questions about the scope of SIPs, before going on the equipment and testing topic. Slido was used anonymously to encourage discussion and has been included in the post-meeting papers.

4 SCOPE DISCUSSION

4.1 WHAT CHALLENGES DO YOU FORESEE WITH 5 TERMINAL METERS AND TIME SWITCHES?

At the previous WG, members agreed that if there is a 5 terminal meter, SIPs have to put two isolators as a minimum, so there are isolators for both services. Members added that it would be a challenge if SIPs do not have the right knowledge or understanding of an inadvertent disconnection. If there is a lack of knowledge on the configuration of the installation, SIPs should abort the work and seek advice. Information about different installation configurations should however be covered in the training, via diagrams to show what a 5 terminal meter looks like, what a time switch looks like and so forth. There might also be some complex set-ups, off-peak installations and systems that have not yet been created. How this is communicated to the industry should be considered, even though it may be outside the scope of this REC Issue currently. Organisations should be made aware that should they develop new tariffs or equipment, they should communicate it well to the industry so the training and documentation for SIPs and other industry Parties can be updated.

4.2 HOW MANY ISOLATORS WOULD BE REQUIRED?

DW reminded members that there are two forms of safe isolation: SIPs could pull the fuse, de-energise and re-energise within a certain time scale; or SIPs could be on site to fit an isolator.

Members discussed whether a minimum number of isolators should be required, and most responded that this number depends on the configuration of the installation. For instance, if there is off-peak there should be a separate isolator; if there is a multi-rate, the isolation should be made simultaneously; if there was a separate time switching, the isolation should take place after the time switch to prevent the time delay to be isolated. Installing isolation switches could reduce the amount of time an operative would pull the fuse, however this is dependent on each organisation given the costs associated with it. Members agreed that guidance should remain flexible enough to cater for different supply arrangements.

4.3 WHAT CHALLENGES DO YOU FORESEE WITH THE MARKING OF CABLES?

This question was raised as electricians are not used to the marking of cables in a metering context. The Consolidated Code of Practice (CoMCoP) currently states that cables should be

marked for entering and outgoing cables. However, it does not stipulate how they should be marked. This can cause confusion as there are various cable identification markers in use (manufactured markers, marker pens, etc.). There are also different interpretations and expectations between the CoMCoP and BS7671. A member added that BS7671 has always presented a grey area. Members agreed that considering these differences, an education piece is needed for operatives. The process and methodology in CoMCoP currently provide the baseline requirements and should stay as is. However, some work with IET to ensure the process is understood by all operatives. Some additional guidance may therefore be needed to improve consistency.

4.4 ARE THERE ANY OTHER POINTS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN MENTIONED ABOUT SIPS' ACTIVITIES YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD?

Members raised the issue of the reinstatement of smart communications post work being conducted. It was agreed that this should be included in the training. DW also mentioned the reporting of any issues relating to this will be discussed during the reporting WG session.

A member mentioned the isolator minimum standards, referring to the functionality of the isolator itself whether it can be a terminal screw concept or even two points of contact, rather than the cage or clamp style isolator which historically has caused loose terminations. DW added that a lot of organisations banned cage clamps because of the risks they presented, even though they are still acceptable under British standards. Members believed it would be useful to make a recommendation to organisations. However, it would not be possible to determine specific types of equipment that must be used as it would become anti-competitive.

Earth loop impedance was also mentioned. DW highlighted that there is an ongoing debate on this matter as currently earth loop impedance is a responsibility shared between the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) and the electrician or the consumer. This should form part of the testing WG discussion. A member added that it is common to see earth arrangements being changed to improve the earth loop impedance, where the earths are being terminated into neutral blocks. DW added that with the low carbon installations such as EV chargers, there might be earthing arrangements that would have been changed on purpose, converting the whole house of what was originally Protective Multiple Earthing (PME) supply to a TT Earthing System for instance. There might be a wider issue regarding earthing. If electricians are used to conduct earth loop impedance tests, it is not currently stipulated in CoMCoP.

The training and SIP documentation should highlight the possibility of finding different earthing arrangements on site, and when this is the case, SIPs should identify when it is safe to proceed, and if it is not the case, or they believe they do not have the knowledge of this specific issue, they should stop their work and seek advice.

5 EQUIPMENT AND TESTING

5.1 WHAT EQUIPMENT DO YOU CONSIDER THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENT FOR A STANDALONE SIP TO OPERATE AND WHAT SHOULD BE PART OF AN APPROVED EQUIPMENT LIST?

Members agreed that SIPs should hold as a minimum the same requirements and approved equipment list as EMOs hold, i.e. full-face visor, flash resistant clothing, class zero gloves, arc flash Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), etc. as they conduct the same type of work. As

CoMCoP only states that appropriate PPE must be worn, it was not clear whether it aligns with DNOs' standard list.

I0278WG_0721_A01: The ENA (Richard Brady) to check with their colleagues whether there is a standard equipment and clothing list across DNOs.

One difference would concern phase rotation on multi-phase, and whether an earth fault loop impedance test is needed as it is not currently an obligation, not even on new supply. This should be declared by the DNO and confirmed by the electrician when they do the final connection. Members were asked whether they thought there was an advantage in doing an earth fault loop impedance test.

I0278WG_0721_D01: The Working Group agreed that earth fault loop impedance should not be part of the SIP role. The earth loop impedance remains part of electricians' activities during the install. The SIP role is restricted to the fitting of the isolator or de-energization and re-energization activity.

5.2 WHAT EVIDENCE SHOULD A SIP RETAIN TO DEMONSTRATE EQUIPMENT SUITABILITY?

Members agreed that the same rules that currently apply to Electricity Metering Operatives (EMOs) should apply to SIPs, i.e. standards certification, calibration certification, periodical maintenance log and checks, declaration of conformity, PPE and equipment audits.

I0278WG_0721_D02: The Working Group agreed that SIPs should follow the same protocols as EMOs to prove their equipment is fit for purpose.

A member provided the table from the Code of Practice for Electrical Energy Storage Systems for the selection of PPE based on calculated incident energy. It was agreed that it was not appropriate based on the fact that it looks at Direct Current values only.

5.3 WHAT TESTING ACTIVITIES SHOULD A SIP BE EXPECTED TO PERFORM BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER ISOLATION?

DW asked members whether SIPs should conduct new tests when coming back to a property to re-energise after different jobs would have taken place (new wires and new fuse boards for instance). A member believed that testing at the cutout through the meter up to a point of isolation would be the correct way forward, rather than directly re-energise. It will then be safe for an operative to connect on the customer side. Another member added that the same tests should be conducted on a re-energisation. The key is to check whether the outcome of these tests differs. The working group agreed that the SIP documentation should provide specific scenarios to cover eventualities and anomalies. A member added that when SIPs re-energise a property, they should only go to the first isolation point, and if they are unsure of the situation, they should install an isolation switch. The Code Manager will add "safety notice" as an item of discussion in the Reporting and Documentation WG.

A member reopened the previous conversation on risks associated with re-energising supplies where the original reason for disconnection is unknown and could have been conducted for theft or debt reasons. DW suggested adding in the SIP training and documentation that SIPs should not fit an isolator and re-energise if the supply is off on arrival, but abort their work, unless their own organisation would have previously de-energised this property. A pre-check

could potentially be done, however that might imply this new role to have access to the Electricity Enquiry Service (EES) and be added to the Data Access Matrix (DAM).

I0278WG_0721_D03: The Working Group agreed that a SIP should only be allowed to re-energise a supply they or their company have de-energised, and this should be documented.

5.4 WHAT ARE THE STANDARDISED TEST PROCEDURES A SIP SHOULD FOLLOW?

Members mentioned the below as standardised test procedures to follow: polarity, supply, voltage indication/ surface voltage at the cutout, phase rotation, prove not live/prove live, socket check, extraneous metalwork, standard socket tests.

I0278WG_0721_D04: The Working Group agreed that SIPs should follow the same standardised test procedures as EMOs.

Members also reiterated that the scope of SIP activities should be made very clear, to ensure each Party is aware of their responsibilities throughout the process. DW added that neutral current diversion is probably one of the points electricians are not currently aware of, as it is quite unique to metering. Members agreed that any Party who is the last on site and would identify something wrong would have a duty of care to rectify the situation if it is within their scope. If it is outside their scope, they would have to report it to the responsible organisation.

6 NEXT STEPS, DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The Lead Analyst confirmed that the next meetings will take place on:

- Tuesday 18 August 2026 from 10:00 to 11:30
- Thursday 10 September from 15:00 to 16:30
- Tuesday 6 October from 10:00 to 11:30
- Monday 9 November from 14:00 to 15:30

7 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	Completed
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	In progress
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.	Code Manager	In progress
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	In progress
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	In progress
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	In progress
I0278WG_0721_A01	The ENA to check with their colleagues whether there is a standard equipment and clothing list across DNOs.	ENA (Richard Brady)	**New**

RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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
I0278WG_0721_D01	The Working Group agreed that earth fault loop impedance should not be part of the SIP role. The earth loop impedance remains part of electricians' activities during the install. The SIP role is restricted to the fitting of the isolator or de-energization and re-energization activity.	Working Group	**New**
I0278WG_0721_D02	The Working Group agreed that SIPs should follow the same protocols as EMOs to prove their equipment is fit for purpose.	Working Group	**New**
I0278WG_0721_D03	The Working Group agreed that a SIP should only be allowed to re-energise a supply they or their company have de-energised, and this should be documented.	Working Group	**New**
I0278WG_0721_D04	The Working Group agreed that SIPs should follow the same standardised test procedures as EMOs.	Working Group	**New**