RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSES FOR REVENUE PROTECTION AGENTS (RPA).

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 RPAs 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**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	We have always felt that the establishment of a SIP would not stop the unauthorised de-energisation of supplies. Making the SIP a standalone party will not impact this if the qualification requirements are too rigorous, whilst if they are too easily obtained the potential safety issues will remain.	Thank you for your response. The establishment of a standalone Party will not weaken the qualification requirements of this standalone Party. 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 to help reduce the unauthorised de-energisation of suppliers.

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**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	As the meter is the responsibility of the supplier, the SIP, which is not appointed by the supplier should not carry out any work which could affect liability. SIP work should be limited to de-energising supply on behalf of the customer and any safety issues should be raised through the established practice.	Thank you for your response. Current SIPs can already work without the appointment of the Energy Supplier.

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**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Sorry, we are not able to answer this.	Thank you for your response.

Question 4:	**Do you think there are requirements currently missing that should be covered for a SIP accession?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	N/A	Thank you for your response.

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**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Having different types of SIPs carrying out different parts of a job could lead to communication issues which will affect the transfer of information. Different SIP roles will add complexities to what was initially a simple process.	Thank you for your response.

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**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	The existing process of sending energisation status through the DTN is a tried and trusted process that, though not trouble free has largely worked. Having agents that are recording the energisation status of the site and not having access to the DTN will create issues with determining the energisation status with a knock affect to theft. Smart Meter alerts and settlement issues.	Thank you for your response.

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**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Accredited SIPs should be provided with sealing pliers that identify them as the responsible party and indicate when unauthorised parties have de-energised the supply.	Thank you for your response.

Question 8:	**If a meter interference has been identified by standalone SIPs, who should be notified and how?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	As the supplier and the MOP may not be known by the SIP, we would expect the SIP to call Crimestoppers which will see the issue routed to the correct party.	Thank you for your response.

Question 9:	**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**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	Yes, we do think there should be an accredited training program established by the DNO and MOp parties. As mentioned in question 1, this should not be prohibitively expensive or onerous as to put off parties taking up the qualification.	Thank you for your response. The Code Manager have reached out to the Party for clarity.

Question 10:	**What other impacts and/or benefits do you believe SIPs as a standalone Party could have in relation to RP?**	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
SSE Energy Supply Limited (Energy Supplier)	SIP de-energisation work on behalf of RP would be more than a temporary measure for non-domestic premises. This would be a change to the original SIP scope, as opposed to the original scope of a de-energisation for site work to be carried out.	Thank you for your response. SIPs would not conduct any RP work, unless they are qualified to do so in a different capacity. The Code Manager will address the risk of a potential cross-over during the Working Group sessions.