DIF 72 Subgroup - Meeting 03

29 October 2025 at 10:00 - Web-Conference

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSE
Don Mackenzie [DM]	EON
Chris Verney [CV]	OVO
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Richard Hill [RH]	Centrica
Michael Turrington [MT]	EDF
Danielle Fisher [DF]	UKPN
Code Administrator	
Richard Colwill [RC]	Chair
Craig Booth [CB]	Secretariat

1. Administration

Recording

1.1 The Chair asked members if they were comfortable for this Working Group to be recorded. No members objected to this request. The purpose of this recording is to aid the Technical Secretariat in producing an accurate report of the meeting.

Apologies

1.2 No apologies were received.

Competition Law Guidance and Terms of Reference

1.3 The Working Group reviewed the "Competition Law Guidance" and "Terms of Reference". All Working Group members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting and agreed to the Terms of Reference.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

2.1 The Chair provided the following background information included in Section 2 of the ToR.

Customers may request their meters to be moved by a Supplier for a variety of reasons, including for building works, renovation, accessibility, for cosmetic reasons and due to vulnerability.

DIF 72 was raised by a DNO Party due to conflicting views and policies between Parties as to the scenarios where a meter move can be performed by the Supplier (or their appointed agents) or where a service alteration (changing the location of the incoming supply cable and cutout) is required, particularly in instances where a cable length may need to exceed 3 meters and require an isolator or other safety mechanism to be fitted.

The Party identified several issues relating to this:

- *that it can cause unnecessary works and disruption to customers' homes;*
- *that it can result in unnecessary costs for customers to bear;*
- *that it takes longer to arrange the service alteration and requires the coordination of multiple parties to achieve it; and*
- *that customers get passed around when there is disagreement as to whether a meter move can be performed by the Supplier.*

During initial discussions, several resources were identified which Parties may be relying upon and which the subgroup should consider in its analysis:

- *BS7671 Institute of Engineering and Technology ("IET") Wiring Regulations;*
- *Energy Networks Association ("ENA") G87 Engineering Recommendations; and*
- *ENA G104 Engineering Recommendations.*

2.2 The Chair outlined that the purpose of the subgroup is to discuss the policies and procedures surrounding meter moves and service alterations and to agree a consistent approach for Suppliers, DNOs and IDNOs when assessing whether a meter can be moved or a service alteration is required.

2.3 The Chair noted that in the absence of a commonly agreed approach, the objective would be to:

- Document parties' policies so that these can be used in determining whether a meter move will go ahead or a service alteration will be required; and
- To improve the accuracy of communications (scripts, letters, etc.) to make it clear why a service alteration is required instead of a meter move being possible (e.g., whether this is due to a Supplier, DNO or IDNO policy, for health and safety reasons, etc.)

2.4 The Chair advised that two meetings of the subgroup had been held in 2024 and that an RFI had been issued, responses to which had been attached to the meeting invite. The Chair advised that the group may wish to review these responses later in the meeting or in a future meeting.

2.5 The Chair reminded members that this subgroup does not have any formal decision-making powers and cannot compel a Party to follow any guidance which it develops.

3. Discuss the Issue and Agree Next Steps

3.1 RH suggested that there are two common scenarios. The first being a customer wanting their meter moved a very short distance (within the parameters of the meter board or to an adjacent meter board), which would be the Suppliers responsibility. And the second scenario being the customer wanting the meter moved a greater distance, which would need to be a joint venture between the Supplier and DNO.

3.2 DF highlighted a scenario in which a customer wanted their meter moved a longer distance but not the cut out and main incoming cable, and questioned why they could not just move the meter as it is more cost effective. DF gave the following examples.

- In a single occupancy property, the cut out and meter are somewhere less accessible such as a basement, and the customer wants to move the meter somewhere more accessible. The cut out can be left in the basement but the meter needs to be moved more than 3 metres.

- In houses that have been converted into flats, 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.

3.3 RH advised that the customer would need to involve an electrician as BS7671 states that if the distance between the metre and the fuse board is greater than 3 metres, it must have circuit protection (a switch fused isolator adjacent to the meter). RH noted that this would involve three parties, the Supplier/Meter Operator, the DNO and the customer's electrician.

3.4 DF agreed that the customer would need to liaise with the Supplier and their electrician to ensure adequate protections were put in place, however questioned why the DNO needs to be involved. DF noted that the DNO moving the cut out is expensive for the customer and may not always be necessary.

3.5 RH highlighted that their organisation's policy is to keep the meter as close to the cut out as possible, with the exception of vulnerable customers who are treated on a case by case basis.

3.6 DF reiterated that moving the cut out as well is a significant cost for the customer, and asked why there is a reluctance to move the meter away from the cut out, if they are following the standards and putting in the right levels of protection.

3.7 MT asked DF what they are getting pushback on, whether it is that Suppliers are misadvising customers or whether they are not getting involved in the process.

3.8 DF explained that they have been receiving calls from customers who have contacted their Supplier asking to move their meter (usually more than one to three metres away from the cut out) and have been advised that they need to contact the DNO for their cut out to be moved too. DF noted that often the customer only needs to move the meter.

3.9 Members discussed and agreed that this is related to education/training, especially for call centre staff. DF agreed that they are seeking clarity to ensure customers are getting the same information from the DNO as the Supplier. Members suggested they look at call scripts and provide a suggested script or flow chart that is consistent.

3.10 MT asked if other DNOs are experiencing the same issues. RB agreed they also have this issue and that they refer the customer back to the Supplier and this back and forth can lead to customer dissatisfaction and complaints.

3.11 DM advised they often find there to be a lack of understanding of the demarcation zones. DM noted that as a Supplier, irrespective of where the metre is positioned in the property, all they ask is that there is a separate point of isolation at the meter point so they can safely isolate the equipment and work on it. DM stated that anything else would be the DNO or BNO responsibility.

3.12 CV noted that if the customer wants their cut out moved but it is not possible due to cost or location, they would contact the Building Network Operator (BNO) to install another cut out. CV noted that the BNO and DNO would then need an agreement to connect their cables into DNO equipment. CV noted that the Supplier would then install their meter to the BNO equipment. CV advised they would not run a cable a long distance from the existing cut out to the new meter due to BS7671 requiring current protection. CV noted that this would need to be completed by the BNO, and customers should be advised of this.

3.13 DF questioned whether they, as the DNO, need to be involved in this as when they push back on the customers behalf, the work is always completed. DF advised that in these cases, they believe an electrician runs the cable from the existing cut out to the new meter location with appropriate overcurrent protection. When the Supplier arrives they connect the tails in either end.

3.14 DF asked Suppliers whether, if the electrician could provide relevant paperwork confirming the work they had completed was adequate and provided the right protections, they would have any issue connecting into the cut out and into the metre. DF acknowledged that the ownership of the cable would need to be discussed.

3.15 CV advised that their organisation would not allow this as their engineers would not have been able to complete their testing. They would not want to take responsibility for connecting a cable at either end that the electrician had fed in.

3.16 CV noted that the only way they could see it working would be the DNO giving authorisation to the electrician to connect into their cut out (which some DNOs do in certain scenarios currently). A new cut out would need to be installed at the new meter location, and then the Supplier would need to come and do their testing of the cut out which is energised and install the new meter to the new cut out. CV added that they would be concerned about who takes responsibility for the cable in between the cut out and the new cut out.

3.17 DF stated that they do not believe their organisation has any electricians with permission to terminate into their cut out. DF suggested that clear guidance is needed on who is responsible for what, for example that it is the customer in a single occupancy premise or the BNO in a multi occupancy premise who is responsible for the cables between point A and point B. If Suppliers were then happy to do the connection at the meter end, they could tell the customer they needed an extra cut out or an isolator if that is sufficient.

3.18 Members suggested the possibility of increasing the role of a SIP to include these types of jobs. RB noted that currently the SIP role is very specific. The Chair took an action to pull out the responsibilities of a SIP and to explore whether those responsibilities can be expanded upon.

> 03/01 – The Chair to provide a list of the activities SIPs are permitted to perform and to explore whether those responsibilities can be expanded upon.

3.19 MT noted that there is also already a flow in place for completion of SIP work so this would provide an auditable trail, as opposed to an electrician doing the work. DF noted that if SIPs were to be used, they would need to make it clear to the customer why they specifically need a SIP rather than an electrician of their choice.

3.20 DF noted that these circumstances also commonly arise in multioccupancy buildings (often converted houses rather than large blocks of flats) and asked whether the BNO should be responsible for running those cables and if so, would Suppliers be happy just to attend and connect both ends.

3.21 CV advised that if they make that connection, they would be taking responsibility for that cable and as they would not have done any testing on it, they would not be comfortable doing this. CV noted that if it was already connected when they arrived they could install their meter, but that connecting the cable is where their concern lies.

3.22 DF asked whether it could be an option to ask the customer or BNO, to sign a document to confirm that the wiring was done by a qualified electrician and is done to BS7671 standards.

3.23 CV suggested that this type of change to the industry would need to be documented through the correct channels, possible in the Consolidated Metering Code of Practice (CoMCoP). DM highlighted that if this change were to be made, there would be a large number of historical installations that would not be compliant and suggested that this would need to be considered. DM noted that it could lead to A or B codes being raised in order to rectify past work.

3.24 RH raised a scenario in G87, in which a DNO puts in a heavy duty 400 amp cut out and the BNO fits their Multi Service Distribution Board (MSDB) going to each floor. RH asked who currently makes the connection between the MSDB and the cut out as this is the same scenario but on a simpler level.

3.25 DF agreed that what is being done in that scenario should be what is done here. RB advised that their organisation installs this equipment and that it is down to the customer and their Supplier to agree connection from that point onwards. RB noted that the BNO has to install some sort of isolation.

3.26 DF suggested that what needs to be done in single or multi occupancy buildings would be the same in terms of the points of isolation, type of cables etc., however the ownership of the cables needs to

be considered. DF noted that this could be more complicated for single occupancy buildings as there is no BNO to take responsibility.

3.27 Members discussed and the Chair produced the following diagram.

3.28 DF suggested issuing a Request For Information (RFI) to DNOs asking if there would be any issue with there not being a point of isolation. DF noted that the remining question is then who connects the cable into the cut out.

3.29 RH noted that the existing meter is being removed form its original position. If, hypothetically it is the DNOs responsibility to put those cables into the cut out, there is a meter there that the DNO does not want to be involved with. RH suggested this complexity needs to be considered.

3.30 DF noted that they would probably just remove the meter tails and put tails into nothing rather than connecting up the meter. DF highlighted that if it has to be the DNO, this adds a layer of complexity, whereas finding a solution where Suppliers are comfortable connecting at both ends would be a cleaner solution.

3.31 RB advised that from National Grid's point of view, the DNO cut out (left on the illustration) is their boundary and they would not work beyond that. RB advised that if the customer just wanted their meter moved from the left of the illustration to the right with no cut out move, they would not want to get involved. RB noted that BS7671 is open to interpretation regarding distance, mentioning protection but not the three metre rule.

3.32 DF asked Suppliers whether it is a cut out specifically that needs to be within three meters of the meter and if so, where is this identified. DF questioned whether this can just be a point of isolation.

3.33 DM advised that the guidance states any point of isolation. DM added that having something between the DNOs cut out and a meter is frowned upon so they would not want to put anything between unless BS7671 applies, which he felt did not.

3.34 RH noted that there is a clause in BS7671 stating that you do not have to have a fuse isolator if the DNO accepts their fuse will protect your cable. RH added that they do not promote this to customers as they are aware some DNOs would not be comfortable with this. RH advised that this is why they stipulate the three metre rule for needing a fused isolator.

3.35 RH noted the difficulty in trying to apply G87 which applies to multi occupancy new builds, to an existing single occupancy premise.

3.36 Members discussed what could be classed as additional protection. RH suggested that a red link may be ruled out as there is no protection. Members agreed it should be fused protection.

3.37 DF asked whether it is written into a policy that a customer cannot move their meter further than three metres away from the cut out. DF noted that they have BNOs where meters are more than three metres away from the cut out so they assume it is possible. DF added that some Suppliers have a rule of one metre and some have a rule of three metres, and asked where this comes from.

3.38 RH advised that within their organisation, if a customer asks for their meter to be moved, they will agree to move it onto a meter board at the side if this will help. RH suggested this may be where one metre comes from. Regarding the three metre rule, RH advised they will move a meter up to three metres if the customer is vulnerable. RH noted that this can be done without additional fuse protection.

3.39 CV advised that within the BS7671, section 433.2.2 on over current protection specifically mentions three metres.

3.40 Regarding the isolation, DF asked whether it would be possible to leave it down to the electrician to make sure it is suitable for the setup. Therefore, it would be the customer's or BNO's responsibility.

3.41 DF asked if it would be possible to find a solution which allows Suppliers to connect the DNO cut out to the new fuse protection, or whether they would need to look into the possibility of the DNO doing this. DF noted that DNOs may have the same concerns as Suppliers have raised. DF added that DNOs may not want to do this as it is not in their usual remit.

3.42 DM raised that as a Supplier there are considerations surrounding the meter position and whether it will affect WAN/HAN connections. JH agreed and suggested that if the Supplier is moving the meter, they can handle this. DM noted that if they were going to involve SIPs, the SIP would need to factor this in with conversations they have with the customer.

3.43 DF suggested that they would need to ask DNOs whether they would be happy with SIPs wiring into the cut out (subject to their scope of work being updated).

3.44 DF asked if the following scenario would be acceptable - the SIP could run the long cable between the cut out and meter and put a fused isolator on the cut out end and a point of isolation on the meter end. The Supplier could then arrive when there is no fuse in the fused isolator. The Supplier would then connect a short meter tail from the cut out to the fused isolator and then connect short meter tails between local isolation point and meter. It is then left de energised ready for the SIP to put the fuse back in.

3.45 CV noted that this would not be possible as the local isolation point at the meter position would not be energised. Therefore they would not be able to do their testing or know whether their meter was working as they would not be able to power it up. CV noted that they would not put the fuse in and power up the KMF because they would not have tested that cable.

3.46 DF suggested that, after putting the normal meter tails from the DNO cut out into the new fuse protection, the SIP puts it in making it live. The Supplier could then do what they need to. DF noted

that this would negate the need for them to change the SIP scope as it would be the Supplier connecting into the DNO cut out.

3.47 Members questioned whether this would need to be a SIP or whether it could be any electrician. Members noted that there are not a large number of SIPs and customers may find it difficult to find one able to do the work. CV noted that they would rather it was included in the SIP scope of work.

3.48 CV and RH agreed to raise this matter at the next AMO meeting and provide feedback at the next subgroup meeting.

> 03/02 – RH and CV to present potential solutions discussed by the DIF 72 subgroup at the next AMO meeting. Feedback to be provided at the next DIF 72 subgroup meeting.

3.49 The Chair agreed to draft an email to all Parties, outlining the subgroup's discussions and consideration of using SIPs or electricians. The Chair agreed to note that the group are leaning towards using SIPs, and ask Parties for their opinions/concerns. The Chair agreed to circulate a draft to members before issuing. Members agreed to discuss responses at the next meeting.

> 03/03 - The Chair to draft an email to all Parties; outlining the subgroup's discussions, outlining their consideration of using SIPs or electricians (leaning towards SIPs), and asking Parties for their feedback.

3.50 The Chair summarised the following key points to discuss further at future meetings.

- Review and discuss call centre scripts,
- If progressing the electrician route, what accreditation or training would they need and what processes would be needed.
- If progressing the SIP route, how long would it take to update the scope of work and what is the process for doing this.
- Policies and how to make it clear who owns what point.
- Feedback received from the email sent to all Parties.

3.51 The group agreed to meet again on Wednesday 10 December at 2:30pm.

4. Any Other Business

4.1 The Chair asked the group whether there were any other items of business to discuss. There were no other items raised.

New and Open Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
03/01	The Chair to provide a list of the activities SIPs are permitted to perform and to explore whether those responsibilities can be expanded upon.	The Chair	New Action.
03/02	RH and CV to present potential solutions discussed by the DIF 72 subgroup at the next AMO meeting. Feedback to be provided at the next DIF 72 subgroup meeting.	RH and CV	New Action.
03/03	The Chair to draft an email to all Parties; outlining the subgroup's discussions, outlining their consideration of using SIPs or electricians (leaning towards SIPs), and asking Parties for their feedback.	The Chair	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update