

## Interventions Working Group - Meeting 85

14 January 2026 at 10:00am

Teleconference

Attendees	Company
Angela Copeland [AC]	SPEN
Chris Varney [CV]	OVO
David Brown [DB]	AMO
Jordan Hills [JH]	SSEN
Kim-Marie Mortimer [KM]	OVO
Matt Baker [MB]	ENA
Michael Gorewoda [MG]	EON
Michael Turrington [MT]	EDF
Paul Morris [PM]	UKPN
Rebecca Griffiths [RG]	RECCo
Richard Brady [RB]	National Grid
Richard Hill [RH]	Centrica
Shuba Khatun [SK]	SSEN
Warren Lacey [WL]	NPg
Secretariat	
Richard Colwill [RC] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Hannah Proffitt [HP] (Secretariat)	ElectraLink

### 1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the 85<sup>th</sup> IWG meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair advised the meeting would be recorded for the purpose of aiding the Technical Secretariat in producing the minutes. 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. IWG 84 – Draft Minutes

---

- 2.1 The group agreed the minutes to be an accurate reflection of the discussions held. These are included as **Attachment 1**.

## 3. Outstanding Actions

---

- 3.1 The IWG reviewed the outstanding actions, and an updated version of the actions log can be found in **Attachment 2**.

## 4. Phenolic Cut-outs Update

---

- 4.1 The Chair asked members whether there have been any updates since the last meeting.
- 4.2 MB advised that the Energy Networks Association (ENA) are currently completing analysis and that by the end of February/start of March a report should be ready.

## 5. Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues

---

### MSDB with Open Fuseways



- 5.1 CV presented the above picture to the group, noting that several of the fuse carriers are missing. CV advised that their engineers can shroud the empty fuseways to ensure it is safe to complete the job but asked whether there is a way to report these to the DNO.
- 5.2 CV acknowledged it is not a Category B code as it does not prevent the engineer from replacing the meter, however as there are fuses missing, questioned whether this should be reported to the DNO.
- 5.3 RB noted that the DNOs should be informed as parts of the equipment are missing, however that there is not currently a way to do this.
- 5.4 PM noted that as there is a plastic cover there are no live terminals exposed, however there are inside. PM suggested this is raised at the Service Termination Issues Group (STIG) as it would be beneficial to ensure advice is available for similar situations.

- 5.5 Members agreed to raise this at the STIG and provide feedback at the next meeting.

Action 85/01 – Members to raise the ‘MSDB with Open Fuseways’ issue at the STIG and feed back to IWG members at the next meeting.

Testing procedure for reporting an A19 - Surface voltage found on plastic cut-out

- 5.6 RH highlighted a scenario at a site in which the meter and cut out were in an outside cabinet which had been exposed to moisture. RH advised there was a short circuit event between terminals three and four of the meter and the DNO replaced the cut out on the meter board.
- 5.7 RH advised that voltage was indicated on the plastic cut out using a single pole direct contact tester, however no voltage was indicated when a two pole tester or multi-meter were used.
- 5.8 RH highlighted that the service terminations document states to revert to a two pole tester and/or a multi meter when a single pole tester indicates voltage.
- 5.9 RH theorised that as the cut out had water across it, everything had the same potential. If there is the same potential on the neutral block as on the outgoing of the live or on the cut out plastic, it would not show anything on the lamps or multi-meter because of the potential dividers.
- 5.10 RH questioned whether, in similar scenarios where there are clear signs of moisture/damp on the meter board, DNOs would allow these to be reported as an A19 based on the indication of voltage from the first test only.
- 5.11 RH advised that they would be referring this to the AMO electricity meter forum later in the month, but that it may also need to be referred to the EOMF. RH asked members for any feedback.
- 5.12 AC agreed to refer this to colleagues and to provide feedback at the next meeting.
- 5.13 MG suggested that you could also go to true earth and test it from there. RH clarified that the situation in question is a PME.
- 5.14 CV agreed that this is an issue that needs further consideration. CV asked whether, when they tested between live and neutral in the bottom of the cut out, there was voltage. RH clarified that it was not checked along the bottom because they used the proving unit and the shroud was in. Therefore, the proving unit was proving that the tester was working.
- 5.15 PM suggested that it could be ghost voltage linked to the dampness. RH noted that they are completing research into the two pole tester they currently use and whether there are any better options.
- 5.16 PM suggested an earth loop impedance test could be required. CV advised that their engineers currently do not have the facility to carry out that test so this would be a big process change.
- 5.17 RB asked where on the cut out was tested. RH advised that they tested on the outgoing side of the cut out across all aspects where the single pole was tested. RH noted that it was a 50390 cut out and the screws on these can sometimes light up if there is problem with the cut out. This was ruled out however and the issue was relating to the dampness.

- 5.18 RB asked if the DNO was notified and the cut out was recovered. JH advised they were the DNO and the cut out was destroyed. RB noted that the issue was with the conditions rather than with the cut out.
- 5.19 CV asked whether the DNO had confirmed there was voltage on the surface. JH noted that their engineer could not confirm any voltage but did exchange it because the board was wet and could not be screwed into.
- 5.20 CV asked whether a change in process is needed or whether current guidance should be followed in similar situations. RH suggested that A19 is reviewed to consider whether anything can added to enhance safety.
- 5.21 JH asked that RH brings these slides to their bilateral call so it can be discussed further.
- SIPs replacing substandard cut out to meter tails
- 5.22 RH advised they had received an enquiry from a third-party working behalf of British Gas as a Supplier on an Electric Vehicle install. RH noted that the party is an accredited SIP.
- 5.23 The party advised that they ordinarily fit 25mm cables and would like to swap out the tails between the cut out and meter, to match. RH advised that DCUSA and REC currently do not allow this.
- 5.24 RH noted that they are currently permitted to go into the meter to check the tightness of connections, and swap out cables in terminals three and four and seal back up, however are not allowed to swap the cables between the cut out and meter.
- 5.25 RB asked what size fuse is in the cut out, as if it is an 80 or 100amp, the Meter Operation Code of Practice Agreement (MOCOPA) document states 16mm tails are okay. RH agreed they had advised the party of this, however the party stated they would like to do it for their own comfort to match the cable size of the 25mm.
- 5.26 Members acknowledged it is positive that parties are questioning this rather than going ahead and doing it anyway.
- 5.27 WL stated they could not think of any unintended consequences of them swapping the tails, and suggested that a DCUSA change would need to be raised to amend the scope.
- 5.28 MG presented the REC SIP FAQ document to the group and highlighted section 3 below, noting MG noted that this suggests they would be permitted to swap the tails.

### 3 PERMITTED WORKS FOR THE SIP

#### WHAT CAN A SIP DO?

The role of the SIP is defined separately from that of the REC MEM, and they should not be conflated. They have a **very narrow scope of activities** that they can undertake:

- (a) **De-energise** that Metering Point.
- (b) (if reasonably necessary) **adjust the terminals of the meter and associated equipment and re-make the connection to them to make safe and remedy any disturbance of the connection that may have occurred.**
- (c) **If required, terminate replacement customer tails into the Suppliers Meter, customer tails having been presented and tested by the electrical contractor as part of their works**
- (d) **Re-energise that Metering Point.**

- 5.29 RH clarified that this is referring to the customer tails, not those from cut out to the meter.
- 5.30 RH thanked members and agreed to go back to the party to provide the feedback discussed and advise them that they can raise a DCUSA and REC change if they feel it is necessary.

## 6. 2025 Yearly Review

- 6.1 The Chair advised that this paper has been provided for information and summarises the activities of the IWG in 2025.

## 7. 2026 Work Plan

- 7.1 The Chair asked members for items to include on the 2026 Work Plan.
- 7.2 Members agreed that several of the 2025 items should remain, and that 'Reporting BNO Issues' should be added.
- 7.3 Members agreed to consider this further and finalise items for the 2026 Work Plan at the next meeting.

Action 85/02 - Members to finalise items for the 2026 Work Plan.

#### Improving Customer Journey via Online Forms

- 7.4 Regarding this item from the 2025 Work Plan, PM advised that the first DCP 467 'Online reporting tools for Category A and B defects' Working Group had been held on 12 January and suggested that members discuss.
- 7.5 MT advised they are broadly supportive of the change but noted feedback that the CP needs to be updated to clarify that the proposal does not speak on behalf of all DNOs. PM agreed that clarity on this will be added to the consultation.
- 7.6 PM clarified that the proposal seeks to mandate that parties utilise online reporting tools where DNOs have made them available for the purpose of reporting Category A and B situations.

- 7.7 MG advised that their organisation use the online tool and see the benefits, however that if multiple DNOs introduce tools it could become confusing. PM noted that having one central platform linking all the tools will be crucial.
- 7.8 CV highlighted that their organisation also use the tool and find it beneficial, however agreed that a central page for all DNO tools will be needed for engineers who work across areas.
- 7.9 PM suggested that a discussion is held at the next STIG meeting regarding setting up this central page. MB agreed to add it to the agenda.
- 7.10 MG suggested that a demonstration of the portal and how it is used would be beneficial. PM advised that they have a sandbox and agreed to circulate the link.
- 7.11 CV asked whether, if a report is sent through the online portal, the D0126 and D0368 flows are still sent back by the DNO. PM confirmed they are.
- 7.12 RB advised their organisation is still looking into developing a similar tool. RB added that they had recently received an internal notification regarding SIPs not sending flows and noted that the online tools could be useful to SIPs as they are easily accessible.

## 8. Opportunity for Updates on Related IWG Activities

---

- 8.1 The Chair provided the following updates.

### IWG 'Restricted Access Customer Letters' Subgroup

- 8.2 The Chair noted that the next meeting will be on 19 January, at which members will review feedback provided on the leaflet and address several questions that had been raised.

### DIF 72 'Meter Moves' Subgroup

- 8.3 The Chair noted that the next meeting will also be on 19 January, at which members will review the RFI responses and review a draft guidance document.

## 9. Smart Meter Installs

---

- 9.1 [Smart meter installations for November 2025 can be found at this link.](#)

## 10. REC Metering Hub

---

- 10.1 RG presented a set of slides to the group regarding the Retail Energy Code (REC) Metering Hub Improvements. These are included as **Attachment 4**.
- 10.2 RG asked members for any feedback.
- 10.3 WL suggested that contact information on the REC Portal and Metering Hub could be improved. WL agreed to look at this further and provide more information directly to RG following the meeting. MG agreed but gave positive feedback on the Metering Hub improvements in general.
- 10.4 RG thanked members and asked that they send any further questions or feedback directly to her.



## 11. Any Other Business

---

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

## 12. Next Meeting

---

12.1 The next IWG meeting is scheduled to be held on 04 March 2026. The meeting will start at 10am.

## Attachments

---

- Attachment 1 - IWG 84 Final Minutes v1.0
- Attachment 2 - IWG 85 Actions
- Attachment 3 - Operational, Safety and Reporting Issues & Work Plan
- Attachment 4 - Metering Hub Improvements - December 2025