RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSES FOR METERING EQUIPMENT MANAGERS (MEMS), METER OPERATOR AGENTS (MOAS), ELECTRICITY METERING OPERATIVES (EMOS), SAFE ISOLATION PROVIDERS (SIPS)

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

On 13 February 2026 the Code Manager issued an information request to industry to seek feedback from MEMs, MOAs, EMOs and SIPs on the Issue I0278.

The purpose of this document is to consolidate the responses and for the Code Manager to answer any questions raised within those responses.

DOCUMENT VERSION	V1.0
RESPONSE TYPE	Non-Confidential
DATE ISSUED	13 February 2026
RESPONSIBLE COMMITTEE	Change Panel
LEAD ANALYST	Francine Peyroux-Sissoko

DATE INFORMATION REQUEST ISSUED	13 February 2026
RESPONSE DEADLINE	27 March 2026

Question 1:	Can you share your views on the establishment of the SIP as a standalone REC Party?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	We believe that establishing the SIP as a standalone party would be problematic. There would be an inherent lack of knowledge and experience of metering types, systems and wiring methods. There would also be a lack of understanding of DNO equipment and the reporting of defects. We believe this lack of knowledge and understanding would lead to potential safety issues. From our own experience, we were made to demonstrate a track record in metering to ensure we had relevant experience prior to our approval as a meter operator and subsequently a SIP. We feel that this has been diluted of late and would worsen if the change proposal goes ahead. Convenience should not proceed compliance and electrical safety.	Thank you for your response. The establishment of a standalone Party will not mean a reduction in training, qualification nor safety standards. On the contrary, the Code Manager is looking to develop a clear governance structure with high safety standards and a streamlined Accreditation with a strong qualification process for SIPs.
Anonymous (MEM)	We are broadly supportive of the establishment of the Safe Isolation Provider (SIP) as a standalone REC Metering Party. The current structure, where SIP capability is linked to Metering Equipment Manager (MEM) accreditation, creates barriers for organisations with the technical capability to safely undertake isolation work but who do not operate as MEMs. This can limit the availability of qualified practitioners and introduce delays in the deployment of low-carbon technologies such as EV chargers and heat pumps. Establishing SIP as a standalone REC Party would: • increase market capacity for isolation work	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager is indeed looking to develop a robust governance structure with high safety standards, a streamlined Accreditation including a strong qualification, audit and training process. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 1:	Can you share your views on the establishment of the SIP as a standalone REC Party?	
	• enable appropriately qualified electrical contractors to operate within a regulated framework • reduce reliance on supplier-led or MEM-only models • support faster deployment of low carbon technologies However, we believe this change must be accompanied by robust governance, training, audit and reporting frameworks to ensure consumer safety and maintain the integrity of supply. A standalone SIP should be required to demonstrate the same level of safety management and data integrity as current MEM-led SIPs.	
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	In principle, I support the establishment of the SIP as a standalone REC Party. The current framework appears too prohibitive in practice because access to SIP activity is tied too closely to existing MEM structures. That may suit established metering businesses, but it does not reflect the wider pool of competent electrical contractors already operating in the market, many of whom hold recognised competence through electrical CPS registration and have stronger underpinning electrotechnical knowledge than some parties presently able to undertake this work through energy-sector pathways. A standalone SIP role should therefore be used as an opportunity not simply to create another route for existing metering parties, but to create a proportionate and accessible route for competent electrical contractors to become accredited to undertake safe isolation, de-energisation and re-energisation work. In my view, the present position unintentionally favours energy suppliers and affiliated parties who are already permitted to provide these	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 1:	Can you share your views on the establishment of the SIP as a standalone REC Party?	
	services within their own operating models, often at no additional cost to the wider job. That creates a competitive distortion. Independent electrical contractors can lose work, not because they are technically incapable of carrying out the task safely, but because they cannot access the same permissions without involving a third party. This is not a level playing field. There is also a practical safety point. Where the legitimate route is too slow, too expensive or too uncertain, it can create a commercial incentive for individuals to cut seals or remove fuses outside the formal process. That is clearly undesirable. A better solution is not to preserve an overly restrictive model, but to create a regulated, proportionate route that allows more competent parties to undertake the activity lawfully and safely. This would also align with the broader policy intent of reducing delays to electrification and low-carbon technology deployment by increasing the number of parties able to isolate supply safely. Ofgem's Strategic Direction Statement expressly points to reforms that make it easier to become accredited as a SIP so that more third parties can provide these services and reduce delays for customers adopting electric heating and transport.	

Question 2:	**What would you suggest should be within the scope of a SIP when working on metering equipment, e.g. access to meter to tighten termination?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	Access to all relevant meter and DNO terminals to allow for upgrading of tails and to verify terminal tightness. Reporting of DNO defects. Reporting of tampering/energy theft. Reporting of meter issues/damage/blank screens etc. Working knowledge of complex metering systems.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (MEM)	The scope of a SIP should focus specifically on safe isolation and restoration of supply, rather than broader metering activities. Suggested scope includes: **Permitted activities** • Isolation of supply at the service head or cut-out • De-energisation and re-energisation • Fuse removal and replacement • Verification of safe isolation • Safety checks before and after work • Recording condition of equipment and seals • Supporting access to metering equipment for other authorised parties • Market messaging responsibilities **Conditional activities** • Access to meter terminals for safety verification • Tightening of terminations where required for safety	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 2:	**What would you suggest should be within the scope of a SIP when working on metering equipment, e.g. access to meter to tighten termination?**	
	• Recording equipment condition where safety issues are identified **Excluded activities** • Meter installation or exchange • Meter configuration • Communications hub work This separation maintains clear boundaries between safety isolation functions and metering responsibilities, reducing operational risk.	
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	The scope should be clearly defined and proportionate to the task of safe isolation. At a minimum, a standalone SIP should be permitted to: • de-energise and re-energise supply safely; • Fit isolation devices (DP switches, overcurrent protective devices), say up to 100 A; • remove and replace service cut-out fuses where authorised within the framework; • remove and replace seals using an approved method; • gain access to the meter and associated equipment for the purpose of isolation and reinstatement; • carry out visual inspection of metering tails, cut-out condition, accessible terminations and obvious signs of damage, overheating or deterioration; • tighten accessible terminations only where this is explicitly permitted, the equipment falls within defined scope, and the party is trained and authorised to do so;	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 2:	**What would you suggest should be within the scope of a SIP when working on metering equipment, e.g. access to meter to tighten termination?**	
	• identify and record defects, damage, signs of interference, inadequate enclosures, poor terminations, overheating, or other unsafe conditions; and • stop work and escalate where conditions fall outside the authorised scope. I would be cautious about allowing broader metering works under the SIP banner unless the role is specifically expanded and the competency requirements reflect that. The core function should remain safe isolation and associated limited works necessary to enable electrical works to proceed safely. In short, the scope should be wide enough to make the role useful in practice, but not so wide that it becomes a backdoor route into broader metering activity without the appropriate governance.	

Question 3:	**Which MEM accession requirements do you think are necessary for SIPs and which are not given the scope of this Issue?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	All current MEM accession requirements should be maintained. Shortcuts and watering down of requirements, due to pressure from external market influences should not replace the need for a robust safety regime nor stand in the way of electrical safety.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager is considering making the requirements fit for purpose for a SIP role only without compromising safety or high standards.
Anonymous (MEM)	We believe some MEM accession requirements should apply to SIPs. Requirements likely necessary: • Competency framework and qualifications • Safety management systems • Insurance requirements • Operational governance procedures • Incident reporting processes • Audit and compliance processes • Record keeping and traceability • Market messaging The focus should be on electrical safety competence rather than full metering operational capability.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	Some accession requirements are clearly necessary, but the full MEM framework should not simply be imported wholesale. Requirements that are likely to remain necessary include: • registration with a UKAS accredited Competent Person Scheme i.e. NICEIC;	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 3:	**Which MEM accession requirements do you think are necessary for SIPs and which are not given the scope of this Issue?**	
	• clear competency requirements for operatives; • defined procedures for de-energisation, re-energisation and reinstatement; • safety management systems; • incident reporting and escalation arrangements; • audit, assurance and complaints handling processes; • identity, traceability and records management; • arrangements for secure handling of seals or alternative approved devices; and • appropriate insurance and governance. Requirements that may be unnecessary or disproportionate for a standalone SIP include: • full MEM/MOA operational structures where the party is not undertaking broader metering services; • accession requirements linked to activities outside safe isolation; • systems, interfaces or market participation obligations designed for full metering service providers rather than isolation specialists; and • administrative or technical obligations that do not materially improve safety, consumer protection or traceability for the limited scope of SIP work. The framework should be proportionate to the activity. If the role is safe isolation, the accession model should test whether the party can carry out safe isolation competently, safely, consistently and accountably. It should not require them to become, in effect, a full metering business by another name.	

Question 4:	**Do you think there are requirements currently missing that should be covered for a SIP accession?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	The current requirements should be kept.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (MEM)	The following requirements should be considered for SIP accession: **Digital job records** Every isolation event should have a digital record including: • time and location • responsible operative • isolation method • photographic evidence **Managed Regulatory Infrastructure** Standalone SIPs should be encouraged to utilise an 'Accredited Enabler' or managed platform to ensure market messages are sent accurately and safety audits are logged; rather than processing messages manually. **Mandatory isolation verification** Evidence capture to demonstrate safe isolation procedures were followed. **Audit capability** Ability for suppliers, MEMs or regulators to audit isolation activity. Incident reporting framework Structured reporting for:	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager have reached out to the Party for more precision and will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 4:	**Do you think there are requirements currently missing that should be covered for a SIP accession?**	
	• unsafe equipment • meter interference • potential theft • safety incidents **Seal management controls** Traceable seal usage to prevent tampering or misuse.	
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	Yes – please also refer to answer no.3. I believe the framework should explicitly address: • minimum electrical competency standards for individuals, not just organisations; • recognition of electrical contractors with CPS registration as eligible applicants, subject to meeting the defined SIP-specific requirements; • defined practical training and assessment in relation to cut-outs, metering interfaces, safe isolation, sealing, reinstatement and escalation; • requirements for reporting unsafe equipment and suspected theft/interference; • minimum record-keeping standards, including before-and-after evidence where appropriate; • rules on what is and is not within scope, with mandatory escalation points; • audit and enforcement arrangements that are proportionate but credible; and • arrangements that work for SMEs, not only larger energy-sector entities.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager have reached out to the Party for more precision and will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 4:	**Do you think there are requirements currently missing that should be covered for a SIP accession?**	
	A key missing element at present is a route that acknowledges the competence base of mainstream electrical contractors. Any new regime should avoid assuming that only parties already embedded in the energy metering sector can meet the necessary safety standards.	

Question 5:	**What challenges do you foresee with having different types of SIPs, i.e. physical SIPs, flow-only SIPs and combined SIPs, rather than having only one type (combined SIPs)?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	Physical SIPs would have to rely on a third party to ensure accurate data is transferred in a timely manner. There is the potential here for incorrect and/or missing data due to the fact that additional parties are involved.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (MEM)	Introducing multiple SIP types may create operational complexity. Key risks include: **Accountability confusion** It may become unclear which party is responsible for safety validation or reporting. **Operational coordination** Where flow-only SIPs exist, a second party may still need to attend site. **Data fragmentation** Different parties may hold different parts of the safety record.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	Multiple categories could work, but there are risks. The main challenges would be: • confusion in the market about which type of SIP can do which task; • increased risk of work being allocated incorrectly; • more complexity in training, assurance and auditing; • greater potential for disputes over scope boundaries; • customer and contractor frustration where one SIP can attend but cannot complete the full required task; and	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 5:	**What challenges do you foresee with having different types of SIPs, i.e. physical SIPs, flow-only SIPs and combined SIPs, rather than having only one type (combined SIPs)?**	
	• inefficiency where multiple parties may need to be involved in what should be one visit. If different SIP types are introduced, the boundaries must be unambiguous and easy for customers, contractors and duty holders to understand. Otherwise, the regime risks replacing one bottleneck with a more complicated one. My general view is that a combined model is preferable where possible, provided the competency and authorisation requirements are proportionate and accessible. A fragmented model may create unnecessary operational friction.	

Question 6:	**Are there any challenges you foresee with how standalone SIPs may record and report issues (if no access to the DTN for instance)?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	The challenge would be that issues would not be reported and the potential for unsafe situations and energy theft would increase and worsen over time. The DNO and/or supplier would not have visibility of the isolation having taken place.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager does not mean that this should not be reported, but which methods of reporting should be in place and how reporting should happen, i.e. via data flows, etc.
Anonymous (MEM)	If standalone SIPs do not have DTN access, there must be a structured reporting pathway. Possible solutions include: • automated reporting via approved industry platforms and managed service gateways • standardised digital job records - reporting through the responsible MEM or supplier • use of central reporting portals - though this lacks the validation of an integrated solution Without a structured reporting method, issues such as: • damaged equipment • unsafe installations • meter interference may not be communicated effectively.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 6:	**Are there any challenges you foresee with how standalone SIPs may record and report issues (if no access to the DTN for instance)?**	
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	Yes, this is a practical issue that will need resolving. If standalone SIPs do not have access to the DTN or an equivalent reporting route, there is a risk of: • inconsistent reporting standards; • delays in communicating defects or unsafe conditions; • weak audit trails; • disputes about whether issues were identified and notified; and • fragmented information across suppliers, MEMs, contractors and network parties. There needs to be a simple, standardised and accessible reporting mechanism for standalone SIPs. That does not necessarily mean every SIP needs full DTN access, but there must be a formal route that is recognised, auditable and accepted across the market. The reporting mechanism should allow the SIP to record: • the work undertaken; • time and date of isolation and reinstatement; • equipment condition; • defects found (broken out into potential dangers and recommended improvements); • seals removed and replaced; • suspected interference or theft flags; and • any escalation made to the relevant party. Without this, accountability and consistency will suffer.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 7:	**In relation to security and integrity of supply, do you think standalone SIPs should be issued with sealing pliers or should an alternative method of sealing be agreed?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	With increasing supply costs and general costs of living increases, energy theft is becoming more of an issue than before. Anyone working on DNO and metering equipment must be issued with proper sealing pliers in order to safely and securely seal equipment to avoid third party tampering.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (MEM)	The use of sealing pliers should be carefully controlled. **Controlled issuance** Provide sealing pliers only to accredited SIP organisations with strict tracking and auditing. **Hybrid model** Allow sealing pliers but require seal usage to be digitally recorded and auditable. Traceability of seals is essential to protect against fraud and interference.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	There should be an agreed, controlled and auditable method of resealing, but I do not think the answer necessarily has to be limited to traditional sealing pliers only. The key principle is that whichever method is adopted must preserve security, traceability and integrity of supply. If sealing pliers are used, there must be strong controls over issue, use, tracking and audit. If an alternative sealing solution is adopted, it should provide at least an equivalent level of security and traceability.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 7:	**In relation to security and integrity of supply, do you think standalone SIPs should be issued with sealing pliers or should an alternative method of sealing be agreed?**	
	My view is that the framework should remain open to either approach, provided the method: • is standardised; • is difficult to misuse; • is traceable to the operative or business; • supports audit and investigation; and • is accepted across the relevant parties. The focus should be on control and traceability, rather than preserving a specific legacy method for its own sake.	

Question 8:	**Do you believe an accredited training programme for standalone SIPs should be developed and which Parties should be involved in its development?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	Absolutely. We believe that current training requirements (EUSR) are severely lacking as they are. As a business we have 30 plus years' experience in metering and general electrical contracting. Working in a SIP/EMO role for the past 12 years we have experienced first-hand the issues that arise from a lack of experience and training of individuals. Training should be provided by entities with direct experience in metering, safe isolation and DNO infrastructure. Without proper training and auditing, we believe the quality and safety of SIP installations will fall. Notwithstanding the potential safety issues, we believe a lack of understanding of metering and tariffs will lead to billing issues for customers and/or loss of revenue to suppliers particularly with regards to complex metering systems. i.e. Comfort Plus Control etc.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will follow up on which training requirements from the EUSR may be lacking during the I0278 Working Group sessions.
Anonymous (MEM)	Yes, an accredited training programme should be developed. Training should cover: • safe isolation procedures • electrical safety • REC governance • seal management • identifying meter interference • reporting safety issues • customer safety and premises risk assessment	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 8:	**Do you believe an accredited training programme for standalone SIPs should be developed and which Parties should be involved in its development?**	
	Industry training centres and accredited CPD programmes could support this development. The training should include a practical assessment, not just classroom theory.	
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	Yes, absolutely. An accredited training programme should be developed so that there is a consistent minimum standard for standalone SIPs. However, it must be designed in a way that recognises prior electrotechnical competence and does not unnecessarily duplicate knowledge already held by qualified electrical contractors. The programme should be developed with input from: • RECCo / the REC Code Manager; • DNOs / network parties; • MEMs and relevant metering bodies; • Electrical industry competence bodies and CPS operators i.e. NICEIC; • Electrical safety consumer orientated charities i.e. Electrical Safety First; • DESNZ and Ofgem as relevant policy and regulatory stakeholders; and Pparties with practical field experience of isolation, metering interfaces and supply reinstatement. The training should cover both technical and governance elements, including scope boundaries, consumer safety, equipment recognition, safe isolation procedure, cut-out and metering interface risks, reporting, sealing, escalation, and identification of interference or theft.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 9:	**The REC Code Manager's current view is that standalone SIPs should be able to identify theft/meter interference. Would you be supportive of that approach?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	Yes, we believe that this is paramount to ensure that the SIP engineer is able to risk assess a potentially dangerous installation.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (MEM)	Yes, SIPs should be able to identify potential theft or interference. During isolation work, SIPs are often well positioned to identify: • bypass wiring • tampered seals • damaged equipment • unusual installation configurations However, SIPs should not be expected to investigate theft. Instead they should: • record evidence • secure the installation if safe to do so • report the issue through a defined industry process Digital evidence capture tools would be valuable in supporting this process.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	Yes, I would support that approach. A standalone SIP should be trained and expected to identify obvious signs of theft, interference or tampering and to report them through a defined escalation route. That is both sensible and necessary. However, the expectation should be to identify and report, not to investigate beyond competence or undertake enforcement functions. The boundary needs to be clear. SIPs should know what indicators to	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager will address these considerations during the Working Group sessions.

Question 9:	**The REC Code Manager's current view is that standalone SIPs should be able to identify theft/meter interference. Would you be supportive of that approach?**	
	look for, what evidence to record, and who to notify, but they should not be placed in a position where they are expected to go beyond their authorisation or competency.	

Question 10:	**What other impacts and/or benefits do you believe SIPs as a standalone Party could have on MEMs?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
Rodgers Electrical Services Ltd (RES) (SIP/EMO)	MEMs would be responsible for rectifying any discrepancies in the installations whilst carrying out meter exchanges or following up on complaints, often some sometime after the SIP event has taken place. This may result in potentially unsafe situations or tariff correction issues following on from the original SIP task. There is a reputational risk to the supplier and the DNO when they are not at fault. We do not see any benefit other than relieving the labour pressures put upon the MEM due to the congested nature of the renewable and green technologies industry requirements.	Thank you for your response.
Anonymous (MEM)	Benefits • Increased availability of isolation services • Reduced scheduling bottlenecks • Faster LZCT installation programmes • Reduced reliance on MEM workforce capacity Challenges • Maintaining safety governance across a larger workforce • Ensuring consistent training and standards • Coordinating site activity between multiple parties	Thank you for your response.
Morgan Lambert Ltd (Consultancy specialising in electrical safety, compliance auditing and technical assurance across the housing sector)	Potential benefits include: • reduced bottlenecks; • better market capacity; • improved customer responsiveness; • clearer allocation of roles;	Thank you for your response.

Question 10:	What other impacts and/or benefits do you believe SIPs as a standalone Party could have on MEMs?	
	• fewer delays to associated electrical works and LZCT installations; and • reduced pressure on MEMs to service activities that could safely be undertaken by other competent accredited parties. Potential impacts on MEMs may include: • increased competition in areas of work they currently undertake; • some loss of revenue linked to isolation activity; • the need for clearer interfaces and handoffs between MEMs and SIPs; and • potential changes to operational models where isolation work is currently bundled with other services. That said, I do not consider increased competition to be a negative in itself. If the accreditation model is robust, widening access should improve market efficiency without compromising safety. From my perspective, one of the strongest arguments for reform is that the current position can create unnecessary cost and delay for independent electrical contractors and their clients. In some sectors, that extra step can be the difference between winning and losing a job. In the rented sector, delays can also have legal and compliance consequences. Government guidance now states that where remedial work or further investigation is required, it must be carried out within the period specified by the report and within 28 days, and landlords must then provide the required confirmation and evidence. Where isolation by a third party is needed and timings are variable or unpredictable, that can make statutory compliance materially harder to achieve.	

Question 10:	What other impacts and/or benefits do you believe SIPs as a standalone Party could have on MEMs?	
	For that reason, I consider that a more accessible standalone SIP route for competent electrical contractors would not only improve competition but would also support timely compliance and reduce incentives for unregulated practices. Overall, my view is that reform is necessary and should go further than simply rebadging the existing framework. The new standalone SIP model should create a proportionate, auditable and safety-led route that competent electrical contractors can realistically access. If designed well, this would improve competition, reduce delays, support compliance with other legal duties, and lessen the commercial pressure that can currently drive unsafe or unregulated isolation practices. The key is to widen lawful access without diluting standards.	