

## IWG Subgroup – Moving Meters Guidance Meeting 01

08 April 2025 at 1:00pm  
Teleconference

Attendees	Company
Alexander Pentecost [AP]	Eclipse Power
Alister Brown [AB]	Scottish Power
Chris Varney [CV]	OVO
Danielle Fisher [DF]	UK Power Networks
David Brown [DB]	Association of Meter Operators
Michael Gorewoda [MG]	EON
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSEN
Andy Coole [AC]	A Coole Electrical Ltd
Dave Roberts [DR]	Scottish Power
Paul Abreu [PA]	Energy Networks Association
Paul Morris [PM]	UK Power Networks
Richard Hill [RH]	Centrica
Warren Lacey [WL]	Northern Powergrid
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Secretariat	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

### Apologies

Attendees	Company
Shuba Khatun [SK]	SSEN

## 1. Administration

---

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the IWG Subgroup, advising that the purpose of the group is to produce guidance regarding moving meters.
- 1.2 The Chair asked members for permission to record the meeting for the purpose of aiding the Technical Secretariat. No members objected.
- 1.3 The Chair reminded members to act in accordance with the terms set out in the DCUSA “Competition Law Guidance” for the duration of the meeting.

## 2. Overview of the Issue

---

- 2.1 The Chair advised that a DNO had raised a matter for discussion at the March IWG meeting. The DNO advised they have been receiving a number of calls from customers asking to move their meters, however on investigation, a service alteration is not necessary. The DNO advised that the customers had been told by their Supplier to contact the DNO.
- 2.2 The IWG discussed this and agreed for a subgroup to be formed to discuss this further and to develop guidance in this area if needed.
- 2.3 The Chair invited DF, who had raised this initially, to provide a further update.
- 2.4 DF explained that they have been receiving call from customers who have contacted their Supplier asking to move their meter (usually more than one to three meters away from the cut out) and have been advised that they need to contact the DNO for their cut out to be moved too.
- 2.5 DF noted that they believe some Suppliers have guidance advising that if the customer wants to move the meter more than one or three metres, this should be referred to the DNO. DF advised that these customers are under the impression that they must have their main incoming cut out moved in order to be able to move their meter somewhere more accessible.
- 2.6 DF advised that from their organisation’s point of view, they see no reason why the customer has to move their cut out and why the meter cannot be located wherever the customer wants in their property providing adequate protections are put in place. DF noted that they wanted to seek input from Suppliers to see if there are any blockers in being able to do this so that they can guide customers more effectively.

## 3. Development of Guidance

---

- 3.1 The Chair opened this up for discussion.
- 3.2 CV raised that BS 7671 stipulates that the cables connecting the meter to the consumer unit should not exceed 3 meters in length. Therefore if the move is within 3 meters they would move the meter, put an isolator in and let the customer do the rest. However if the move is outside of the 3 meters they would refer the customer to the DNO. CV added that if a customer wants a new service

position, it is usually from inside to outside which would require the DNO to put a new service in outside anyway.

- 3.3 DF noted that in the London area, they see a lot of requests for internal moves. DF noted that there are added complexities around multi-occupancy buildings, for example houses that have been converted into flats. DF noted that sometimes the cut out is located in the basement which belongs to one of the flats, and therefore the occupiers of the other flats want the meters moved.
- 3.4 DF noted that after intervention from the DNO, the Supplier normally allows the electrician to run cables from point A to point B and then connect it up over three metres. DF noted that they were not aware that the standard suggested it had to be the cut out. DF noted that they understood there has to be extra points of protection but not that there has to be the cut out. DF noted that they get a lot of pushback from the customer when they have to pay a large cost to move a service that they do not want to.
- 3.5 CV advised that in examples such as this they would refer the customer to the Building Network Operator (BNO).
- 3.6 MG highlighted that multi-occupancy buildings would follow the G87 guidance, but that they are unsure if any guidance is in place for single occupancy buildings.
- 3.7 RB noted that they do not believe there is anything stated in the BS 7671 regarding a limit of 3 meters between the meter and the cutout, just requirements around protection. RB suggested that this message needs to be circulated to teams in the field.
- 3.8 RH agreed and highlighted that their organisation's policy is to keep the meter on the meter board unless the customer is vulnerable, and it is located at height. RH agreed that this is a communication piece and that it needs to be addressed within Supplier, DNO and Meter Operator call centres.
- 3.9 MG agreed that their organisation would install the meter as close to the service position as possible, unless a vulnerable customer needed it lowering. MG noted that multi-occupancy buildings are slightly different and would fall under the G87.
- 3.10 The group agreed that guidance and a fixed set of Frequently Asked Questions would be useful to ensure customers are being advised correctly and come away with clear next steps of who they should contact. The group agreed that guidance on what a customer can or cannot do should also be clearly backed up by the relevant policies. The group agreed that it will be key that the outputs of this group are circulated to all organisations to ensure the message is consistent.
- 3.11 To aid in the development of this guidance, the group considered common scenarios and scenarios that would not be included in the scope.
- 3.12 RH raised two scenarios they believed are out of scope. Firstly, moving a cut out and meter from inside to outside as the DNO will need to be involved in moving the cut out. Secondly bringing a meter down from height for a vulnerable customer.

- 3.13 DF noted that the first scenario is not common in their experience. DF asked whether, if a customer had a single phase meter in the cabinet outside and they want to put a new service in, they would have to have this outside. RH agreed that their organisation would not put the meter anywhere else.
- 3.14 DF outlined the below common scenarios.
- The meter being in an inconvenient location (such as a basement) and the customer therefore wanting it to be moved up to another room.
  - In houses that have been converted into flats, sometimes the cut out is located within one of the flats, and the occupiers of the other flats want the meters moved into their own flats.
  - During renovations the meter (but not the cut out) may be in the way of work the customer wants to do and therefore they want it moved.
- 3.15 Members considered that to prevent some of these situations occurring in the future, guidance should also be given at the stage of MPAN creation when buildings are being divided into flats.
- 3.16 CV asked whether DNOs have any guidelines on how far they would deem acceptable for the metre tails to run, if a customer wanted to move the meter and have the cut out remain in place. CV advised that in their organisation they would not expect their metering engineers to run long lengths of cables through rooms and would want the customer's electrician to be involved. CV asked who would make the connection to the existing cut out, as a lot of electricians would not be able to cut the seals.
- 3.17 DF noted that their team advise customers that if the distance exceeds what the Supplier is comfortable with, they can get their electrician to put the cable in between point A and point B to the specification the Supplier advises with the points of isolation the Supplier advises and leave it ready for the Supplier to connect to the cut out and to the metre.
- 3.18 CV noted that it would then be the metering engineer who would need to make the connection of the existing cable that the electrician has put in. CV noted that most metering engineers would not do testing on the cable that is running through rooms to confirm it is not damaged. CV raised concerns about this. PA noted that it could be possible for a certificate to be left by the electrician to confirm they have tested it and that it is safe to connect.
- 3.19 CV questioned who is currently connecting to the initial cut out. DF advised that it is the Supplier. CV advised that their business does not do this. DF noted that they refer the customer back to the Supplier. CV noted that in high rise apartment blocks, the redhead is there and energised when they arrive and questioned who is connecting this. DF clarified that they deal with domestic and small commercial and therefore there are different processes in place.
- 3.20 DF reiterated that this is why guidance in the area is needed. DF suggested looking at the current guidance for multi-occupancy buildings to see if this can be replicated for single occupancy buildings. DF suggested that the guidance could link back to these policies.

- 3.21 RB advised that G87 is currently undergoing a review by the ENA. RB noted that it may not be possible to expand the scope as it relates only to multi-occupancy buildings.
- 3.22 RH suggested that the G87 should be amended to prevent developers from putting all meters in a communal meter room as it is not good for smart. RH agreed to email RB with more detail to raise at the G87 review working group. The group agreed this was not in scope of the current meeting.
- 3.23 The group discussed the possibility of amending the G87 to include guidance on single-occupancy buildings as well as multiple-occupancy. The group suggested that if the scope could not be expanded, it could be used as a template to create an additional document that covers single-occupancy buildings.
- 3.24 The group agreed that firstly, they need to work on drafting some current guidance/FAQs to be circulated to call centres to ensure customers are correctly advised. Secondly, a separate piece of work can be completed to review and update existing policies and guidance.
- 3.25 The Chair agreed to work with DF and PM offline to produce a first draft of a guidance document and to circulate this to the group for feedback.

Action 01/01 - The Chair to work with DF and PM offline to produce a first draft of a guidance document and to circulate this to the group for feedback.

## 4. Any Other Business

---

- 4.1 The Chair asked whether there was any other business, to which nothing was raised.

## 5. Next Meeting

---

- 5.1 A Doodle Poll will be circulated shortly to determine a date for the next meeting.

# DCUSA

## New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
<b>01/01</b>	The Chair to work with DF and PM offline to produce a first draft of a guidance document and to circulate this to the group for feedback.	The Chair	New Action.

# DCUSA

## Closed Actions

Action Ref.			Update