

# Isolations for Safe Working (ISW) Working Group Draft Minutes

Meeting 03

25 November 2019 at 10:30

Bloomsbury Building, 10 Bloomsbury Way, London, WC1A 2SL

Attendee	Representing
Boz Laird-Clowes [BL]	BEIS
David Brown [DB]	E.ON
Frank Bertie [FB]	NAPIT
Geoff Huckerby [GHu]	AMO
Ian Crawley [IC]	SSEN
Jane Eccleston [JE]	ENWL
Jonathan Elliott [JE]	Electrical Safety First
Paul Abreu [PA]	Energy Networks Association
Richard Brady [RB]	Western Power
Richard Hill [RH]	British Gas
Simon Wilson [SW]	EDF Energy
<b>Secretariat</b>	
Darta Valtere [DV] Chair	ElectraLink
Graham Hall [GH] Secretariat	ElectraLink
Tim Hipperson [TH]	ElectraLink

## 1. Welcomes and Apologies

---

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the 3<sup>rd</sup> DCUSA Isolations for Safe Working, working group meeting, noting the apologies received from Peter Waymont, Dave Wright, Gillian Groundwater, Warren Lacey and Kevin Little.
- 1.2 The Working Group agreed to act in accordance with the terms set out in the DCUSA “Competition Law Guidance”.

## 2. Outstanding Actions

---

- 2.1 The Group approved the minutes of the last meeting on 21 October 2019 as an accurate record.

## 3. Outstanding Actions

---

- 3.1 The outstanding actions are included as Attachment 2.

## 4. RFI - Planned Supply Isolations for Safe Working on Customers’ Electrical Installations in Domestic Premises

---

### Review of Responses

- 4.1 The Chair noted that the Request for Information had been sent out following the previous meeting with a deadline for responses of Friday 22 November. As a result, the responses had not been circulated to the group.
- 4.2 The Chair noted that nine responses had been received to the five questions below (from 3 suppliers, 3 DNOs, 2 iDNOs and 1 other respondent), which are included (anonymised) as Attachment 3.
  - What is your current process for authorising/providing de-energisation of the customer’s installation for electrical works to proceed?
  - Is the provision of de-energisation a chargeable job to the consumer?
  - Does your company offer a service for installing a double-pole isolator switch? If so, is this a chargeable job to the consumer?
  - Can you provide some examples of any improvements that might be made to the current isolations process in order to offer a better level of service to consumers and encourage safer working by their electricians?
  - Do you foresee any barriers to developing a self-funded access Scheme for authorised electricians (MOCOPA like arrangements for isolations with registered individuals)?

## Principles and Solutions

4.3 The Group agreed that any potential solution would need to adhere to the following five principles;

1. It must allow parties to meet their obligations
2. It has to be safe
3. There must be clear responsibilities and accountabilities
4. There must be a clearly defined and communicated process
5. It must comply with industry codes and regulations

## Solutions

4.4 The Group agreed that the following five potential solutions should be assessed and reviewed in order to either rule them out or take forward;

1. Switch on the meter
2. Isolation Switch
3. Attended Isolations
4. A Scheme for Electricians
5. Do Nothing

4.5 The Group reviewed the pros and cons of all five potential solutions, as highlighted in the following table;

4.6

### **1. SWITCH ON THE METER**

#### Pros

- All the principles are covered and met
- Eliminates the need for the process

#### Cons

- Timescales (w. smart meter programme in motion)
- Cost
- Manufacturing of new meters

### **2. ISOLATION SWITCH**

#### Pros

- One-off visit
- All the principles are covered and met
- Positive customer experience

#### Cons

- Not always practical
- Additional point of possible failure

- Opportunity to inspect assets and install smart meter

### 3. ATTENDED ISOLATION

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All the principles are covered and met</li> <li>• Opportunity to inspect assets and install smart meter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would require 2 or more visits</li> <li>• Poor customer experience</li> <li>• Logistically complex</li> <li>• Not a permanent solution</li> </ul>

### 4. SCHEME FOR ELECTRICIANS

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourages safe working</li> <li>• Good customer service</li> <li>• Provides an auditable trail</li> <li>• All the principles are covered and met</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance difficulties</li> <li>• Electricians not obligated to sign-in</li> <li>• Still need stand-alone options (2 or 3)</li> <li>• Cost of liability insurance may be barrier to some, however it could be that 100% buy-in is needed</li> </ul>

### 5. DO NOTHING

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several principles are not met</li> <li>• Could discourage safe working</li> <li>• Increased outage alert noise to Suppliers &amp; DNOs</li> </ul>

4.7 The Group agreed that Options 1 and 5 could be ruled out.

4.8 The Group agreed that Options 2, 3 and 4 could be taken forward, with a review of how they may interact with each other at the next meeting alongside a more detailed look at next steps and potential changes or requirements associated with each option.

4.9 The Chair also noted that at the next meeting a review of the outstanding regulation and legislations questions would be on the agenda.

## 5. AOB

5.1 The Chair queried whether members had any other business to raise. No items were raised.

## 6. Next Meeting

---

- 6.1 The Chair confirmed that the next ISW working group meeting will be held on 13 January 2020 at ElectraLink's offices, Northumberland House, 303-306 High Holborn, London, WC1A 7JZ.