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 5**
DATE	**06 October 2026: 09:30 – 13:00**
LOCATION	**On Teams**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Francine Peyroux-Sissoko	REC Code Manager	FP	Lead Analyst
Dave Wright	REC Code Manager	DW	Chair
Glenn Sheern	REC Code Manager	GS	Subject Matter Expert
Rebecca Griffiths	Retail Energy Code Company	RG	Proposer
James Hardy	Retail Energy Code Company	JH	Guest Presenter

Full attendee list available upon request.

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Lead Analyst welcomed attendees to the fifth I0278 Working Group (WG) meeting and thanked members for their continued engagement, noting that the September session had been postponed and therefore a longer agenda had been scheduled. The agenda was amended to accommodate a presentation from James Hardy on DTC Market Messages for current SIPs before progressing to the wider discussions on reporting and documentation, safety, interference, tamper, damage and sealing with the use of *Slido*. The Lead Analyst reminded attendees of housekeeping rules before starting the meeting. The Chair told members to be mindful of their conduct in relation to competition law. Members should raise any concerns immediately.

2 REVIEW OF MINUTES AND ACTIONS OF PREVIOUS MEETING

No comments were received on the minutes of the WG meeting held on Tuesday 18 August 2026 and the minutes were approved as a true and accurate record.

3 REPORTING & DOCUMENTATION DISCUSSION

3.1 DTC MARKET MESSAGES FOR CURRENT SIPS

JH delivered a presentation covering the current REC obligations relating to SIP market messaging and the use of Data Transfer Catalogue (DTC) messages through the Data Transfer Service (DTS). Key points included:

- SIPs are currently obligated to send and receive a number of DTC market messages under REC requirements.
- DTC message specifications are contained within the Energy Market Data Specification (EMDS).

- Parties wishing to use DTS must:
  - Obtain a Market Participant Identifier (MPID);
  - Accede to the DTS User Agreement; and
  - Demonstrate technical capability to send and receive market messages.
- Existing Meter Operator and MEM organisations already satisfy these requirements. However standalone SIPs would need to meet them independently.
- Several options exist for accessing DTS, including:
  - Building a dedicated interface;
  - Using a third-party provider;
  - Using ElectraLink's web-based tool.

Members were informed of the associated DTS costs, including gateway charges and traffic usage charges. Additional considerations include identification of supplier MPIDs, technical expertise requirements and the potential need for additional guidance for standalone SIPs.

No questions were raised during the presentation, although members were invited to contact JH separately should queries arise later.

3.2 REPORTING AND MARKET MESSAGES

The Working Group reviewed the existing SIP reporting framework and discussed whether current DTC/DTS arrangements remain appropriate for a future standalone SIP model.

3.2.1 REPORTING AND MARKET MESSAGES

Members agreed that reporting remains necessary, particularly for:

- Notification of works;
- Dangerous situations;
- Faults and technical defects;
- Meter tampering and revenue protection concerns; and
- Energisation/de-energisation status updates.

Whilst there was broad support for retaining the information currently exchanged, members questioned whether the existing reporting mechanism was the most efficient means of achieving this.

The discussion then focussed on balancing the need for information sharing against the complexity and cost of market messaging for standalone electricians and smaller SIP organisations. Members observed:

- The current process was designed around existing Meter Operator arrangements rather than independent SIP businesses.
- Simpler reporting mechanisms, including portals or centralised routing solutions, should be explored.

- Any future solution should minimise complexity whilst retaining appropriate audit trails and assurance capability.

The Working Group broadly agreed that the information remains necessary, but the mechanism used to communicate it may require further consideration.

DNO representatives advised that they currently receive some notifications outside standard market messaging arrangements and noted the absence of a dedicated flow advising DNOs that SIP activity is about to commence.

The Group discussed whether future notification thresholds or batch reporting approaches might be appropriate for larger-scale activities.

I0278WG_1006_A01: Richard Brady to seek ENA feedback regarding notification thresholds and information requirements for SIP activities and report back to the Working Group.

The majority of attendees believed that DTN and DTC is the preferred method.

I0278WG_1006_A02: The Code Manager to investigate the difference between Market Messages D0136 and D002, bearing in mind the impact Parties would expect from the tampering code (D0136), and to investigate potential duplicate Market Messages.

3.2.2 RECORD KEEPING & ASSURANCE

Members considered what information should be retained by standalone SIP organisations. Items discussed included:

- Job records;
- Work completion records;
- Seal information;
- Safety notices;
- Competence and training records;
- Authorisation records;
- Fault and tamper reports; and
- Evidence supporting investigations and audits.

There was broad agreement that organisations should retain sufficient evidence to support investigations, assurance activity and dispute resolution, whilst avoiding unnecessary reporting burdens.

Members revisited previous discussions relating to vulnerability and PSR arrangements. The Group agreed this remains an area requiring further consideration, particularly around signposting vulnerable consumers and understanding any future opportunities for information exchange.

I0278WG_1006_A03: Scott McPhillimy to report back on the work Ofgem is conducting regarding PSR and vulnerability.

It was reminded that Market Messages sending PSR instructions relate to licence conditions on Energy suppliers and DNOs. As SIPs won't have a licence, they will not be able to instruct the Party and therefore could flag the vulnerability but not send Market Messages.

The Chair mentioned that the ENA EREC on fuse upgrade is now with the Code Manager. The ENA sent their responses to the Code Manager's feedback, which is currently under review, before the EREC can be published. Should there be an upgrade to the liability cap, the Code Manager should be informed so the Consolidated Code of Practice (CoMCoP) can be aligned.

The Group discussed the possibility of providing standardised guidance or templates to support investigations, incident reporting and evidence gathering. Members felt this could assist organisations unfamiliar with energy-sector investigation processes.

I0278WG_1006_A04: The Code Manager to draft a standardised template to support investigations, incident reporting and evidence gathering for SIPs.

3.2.3 OPERATIONAL REPORTING

Members discussed what information should be recorded for agreed scenarios such as aborted visits, de-energised supplies found on arrival or identified tampering.

- DNO issues, theft, risks of safety issues
- Tampering
- Unsafe network equipment
- Unsafe customer side of the installation, fire/thermal
- Who de-energised and for what reasons > is there a tag on it to tell SIPs this info and Sips should then record that.

Members discussed whether the current process of leaving a safety notice and making safe should be followed or whether a different one should be put in place. They agreed that the documentation could be the same, however the resolution might be different depending on the organisation's level of risks.

I0278WG_1006_A05: Steve Humphreys to share examples of electrical sector Dangerous Situation Reporting forms for consideration by the Working Group.

They also discussed who needs be informed and within what timescales. All agreed that if there is a risk to life such as a risk of electric shock, they should immediately contact the Consumer, Energy Supplier and/or DNO. Contractual obligations for less severe issues should come second from the obligations from the CoMCoP, and the time frame could be between 3 to 5 Working Days. It was confirmed that there is currently no time frame discrepancy between CoMCoP and NAPIT nor ESF.

4 SAFETY, INTERFERENCE, TAMPERS, DAMAGE DISCUSSION

Members discussed how standalone SIPs should respond when evidence of tampering is identified. There was broad agreement that:

- Safety should remain the overriding priority.
- SIPs should avoid interfering with potential evidence where possible.

- Where tampering is discovered, operatives should make the situation safe where necessary, withdraw from the site and report the issue appropriately.

Discussion explored various reporting routes including:

- Existing market flows;
- Supplier or DNO reporting;
- CrimeStoppers and equivalent whistleblowing routes.

Members agreed further consideration is required before prescribing a single reporting methodology. However all agreed that should SIP identify a tampering issue, they should stop all work and report it, unless they are put under extreme pressure to finish the job.

The Group discussed several technical scenarios including:

- Reverse polarity;
- Multiple energy sources;
- Battery storage systems;
- Solar PV generation;
- Neutral and earthing arrangements;
- Asbestos awareness;
- BNO installations;
- Meter cabinet defects;
- Leaking bitumen and equipment deterioration.

Members agreed many of these issues should be addressed within training and competence requirements for future SIPs.

The Group discussed how dangerous conditions should be communicated to consumers and referenced existing dangerous situation reporting processes already used within the electrical sector.

There was support for ensuring a documented notification process exists regardless of whether the issue is ultimately resolved on-site or passed to another responsible party.

5 SEALING DISCUSSION

The Working Group reviewed the merits of continuing with the existing metering seal methodology versus introducing an alternative sealing solution specifically for SIPs.

Benefits identified for using the existing methodology included:

- Well understood and established industry arrangements.
- Consistency with existing CoMCoP requirements.
- Existing controls and assurance frameworks already in place.

Concerns identified for using the existing methodology included:

- Availability of seals and tooling.

- Potential market bottlenecks if standalone SIP numbers increase significantly.
- Existing lead times and supplier capacity considerations.
- Difficulty distinguishing between SIP and MEM activity where identical seals are used.

Members considered alternative seal types and the possibility of a SIP-specific sealing methodology. Benefits discussed included easier identification of SIP-installed seals and potentially improved scalability. No conclusion was reached.

I0278WG_1006_A06: The Code Manager to develop a comparison of potential seal options, including indicative costs, operational impacts and implementation considerations, and to report back to the Working Group.

6 NEXT STEPS, DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The Chair informed attendees that the Code Manager talked to SMOG in October, who supports this REC Issue and will be informed of its progress.

Members discussed the next meeting and agreed it will focus on training and auditing and take place on:

- Monday 9 November from 12:30 to 15:00

Another meeting in December will focus on the theme of accession. A calendar invite will be sent to members following this meeting.

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	Completed
I0278WG_0721_A01	The ENA to check with their colleagues whether there is a standard equipment and clothing list across DNOs.	ENA (Richard Brady)	In progress
I0278WG_0818_A01	Jemma Johnson to share information about data sharing regarding vulnerability and PSR specifications with the Working Group.	Jemma Johnson	Completed
I0278WG_0818_A02	Steve Humphreys and Craig O'Neill to discuss the possibility to work on a joint approach with the National Association of Professional Inspectors and Testers (NAPIT), the National Inspection Council for Electrical Installation Contracting	NAPIT and IET (Steve Humphreys and Craig O'Neill)	In progress

	(NICEIC) and the Institute of Electrical Technology (IET) to share best practice when encountering vulnerability on site.		
I0278WG_1006_A01	Richard Brady to seek ENA feedback regarding notification thresholds and information requirements for SIP activities and report back to the Working Group.	Richard Brady	**New**
I0278WG_1006_A02	The Code Manager to investigate the difference between Market Messages D0136 and D002, bearing in mind the impact Parties would expect from the tampering code (D0136), and to investigate potential duplicate Market Messages.	Code Manager	**New**
I0278WG_1006_A03	Scott McPhillimy to report back on the work Ofgem is conducting regarding PSR and vulnerability.	Scott McPhillimy	**New**
I0278WG_1006_A04	The Code Manager to draft a standardised template to support investigations, incident reporting and evidence gathering for SIPs.	Code Manager	**New**
I0278WG_1006_A05	Steve Humphreys to share examples of electrical sector Dangerous Situation Reporting forms for consideration by the Working Group.	Steve Humphreys	**New**
I0278WG_1006_A06	The Code Manager to develop a comparison of potential seal options, including indicative costs, operational impacts and implementation considerations, and to report back to the Working Group.	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	Agreed
I0278WG_0511_D02	The Working Group agreed that it should be made explicitly clear that SIPs (as individual or organisation) can only re-	Working Group	Agreed

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