RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.

Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

REC TARIFF INTEROPERABILITY SOLUTION WORKING GROUP – TECHNICAL APPROACH AND FINALISED DESIGN & INITIAL PUBLIC TARIFF PRICING DATA STANDARD

MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECTISWG_25_0703**
DATE	**03 July 2025, 13:00**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Kevin Redmond	Retail Energy Code Company	KR	Stand-in Chair
Theo Burnard	Code Manager	TB	Secretariat
Nathan Gould	Retail Energy Code Company	NG	Committee Member
Sarah Jones	Retail Energy Code Company	SJ	Committee Member
Peter Morgan	DESNZ	PM	Committee Member
Tamara Dimova	DESNZ	TD	Committee Member
Samuel Wroe	DESNZ	SW	Committee Member
Bryan Hale	Centrica	BH	Committee Member
Tom Johnston	Centrica	TJ	Committee Member
Robert Read	Centrica	RR	Committee Member
Pete Noyce	Kraken	PN	Committee Member
Daniel Leyfeild	Levelise	DL	Committee Member
Richard Slack	Levelise	RS	Committee Member
Carolyn Burns	ESG Global	CB	Committee Member
Sam Stanhope	ESG Global	SS	Committee Member
Matthew Winstanley	ESG Global	MWi	Committee Member
Daniel Hollingworth	Ohme	DH	Committee Member
Mike Winter	SSE	MW	Committee Member

Sarah Bennett	SSE	SB	Committee Member
Alan DeBell	EDF Energy	ADB	Committee Member
David Green	EDF Energy	DG	Committee Member
Pardeep Randhawa	npower	PR	Committee Member

APOLOGIES

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Chris Stock	Retail Energy Code Company	CS	Chair

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Stand-in Chair opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees to the REC Tariff Interoperability Solution Working Group (TISWG) – Technical Approach and Finalised Design & Initial Public Tariff Pricing Data Standard session.

2. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

The Stand-in Chair outlined the meeting agenda, which included discussing solution design, data standards for route one, and non-functional requirements from both the Supplier and Optimiser sides.

3. REVIEW OF ACTIONS LOG

The Code Manager reviewed the Propose to Close actions and invited comments from TISWG members. No comments were received, and the TISWG agreed to close six actions.

4. FINALISED ASSUMPTIONS

SJ presented an overview of the seventeen Finalised Assumptions that were developed across TISWG sessions, principally Design Assumption One and Two, and amended after taking into consideration feedback from TISWG Members. These assumptions have informed the Proof of Concept (PoC) and overall solution design.

TISWG Members engaged in detailed discussions over the Finalised Assumptions and provided RECCo with useful feedback that was not expressed in previous TISWG discussions.

TISWG Members expressed concerns about Suppliers sharing private tariff data, which could potentially lead to a loss of commercial advantage. SJ clarified that the terms and conditions would define the permitted use of tariff data, ensuring that consumer consent is central to data access.

TISWG discussed the provision of endpoint information by Suppliers, with suggestions for a common standard and central register to support compliance monitoring. RECCo agreed to consider this further.

5. ASSUMPTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION

SJ presented the three remaining assumptions that required further input from TISWG Members and discussed additional feedback that shaped these assumptions. SJ also invited all TISWG Members to provide any additional feedback.

TISWG discussed using webhooks for managing notifications to Users, noting that previous concerns have been raised about the difficulty of implementing webhooks for on-premises Optimisers due to firewall issues. RECCo acknowledged these concerns but noted that webhooks are considered a lower-cost and less complex solution compared to the alternatives, which was better suited to the Minimum Viable Product (MVP) approach and timeline demands.

TISWG Members considered an alternative approach that would require Optimisers to poll the API at a certain time to access changes to tariff data, rather than event driven notifications. RECCo noted that the solution was defined on the assumption that customers would not change tariff frequently, therefore, event notifications would minimise the volume of traffic. The Stand-in Chair noted that RECCo is open to discussing this consideration, however, it would require relevant quantitative analysis on systems impact to justify a move away from webhooks.

TISWG discussed scenarios where Users have multiple Meter Point Numbers (MPXN) and addressed the inclusion of MPXN data in notifications, considering the privacy risk and the complexity of managing additional tokens. The proposed approach was that MPXN data would be included in notifications to identify metering points, with the privacy risk considered low due to encryption and lack of additional consumer context. No concerns were raised with this approach.

SJ presented an overview of consent mechanisms, noting previous discussions have focused on the length of which consent will be granted, whether it should be one-off, or enduring without an expiry date. SJ noted that Consumers can revoke consent at any time by contacting either the Supplier or the registered User. The proposed solution was to allow a one-off consent enabling the User to identify the Consumer's tariff and a separate enduring consent for the purposes of supporting User notifications aligned to the use cases, subject to revocation by the Consumer. No concerns were raised with this approach.

6. PUBLIC TARIFF PRICING DATA - DATA STANDARD

The group discussed a number of points to support the definition of the data standard:

- Identification of Tariffs - SJ explained that tariffs would be identified by name and version, with suggestions for using machine-compatible identifiers for better clarity. TISWG agreed that the display name would be used for customer-facing interactions, while the identifier would be used for communication between systems.

- Location - TISWG considered filtering tariffs by location, such as Distribution Network Area (DNO) or postcode, to minimise data volume and provide relevant information to Suppliers and Optimisers. TISWG Members agreed that tariff prices can be linked to DNO regions, enabling customers to receive pricing information specific to their location and ensuring the standing charge and unit rate accurately reflect regional costs.

- Commodity vs Non-Commodity - TISWG discussed the inclusion of commodity and non-commodity charges in tariff data, agreeing that transparency and granularity are essential when presenting tariff data. TISWG considered how non-commodity elements could be

distinguished from commodity pricing to ensure clarity for end Users. TISWG agreed this area would need further consideration as the solution design is finalised.

- Tariff Status - SJ defined tariff status and discussed how live tariffs are open to new customers and dead tariffs are closed to new customers, noting this terminology aligns with existing licence definitions. SJ explained that this distinction is most important for price comparison platforms, who need to filter out unavailable tariffs and noted it may not be required by Optimisers.

SJ presented the proposed breakdown of tariff pricing information, including standard tariffs with uniform pricing across all periods, and time-of-use tariffs that may vary by monthly, daily, or hourly intervals. A TISWG Member requested that actual dates should be included in the data standard, rather than just defined days of the week.

TISWG Members were requested to review the information in the presentation slides and provide any feedback to RECCo via committees@recmanager.co.uk.

7. NON-FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

The Stand-in Chair presented the non-functional requirements for Suppliers and Optimisers, drawing on TISWG Members survey feedback and industry precedents. The Stand-in Chair discussed availability, performance, scalability, data freshness, and error rates.

TISWG Members discussed the importance of service availability, noting that 98% availability still equates to approximately 30 minutes per day of downtime, which could undermine consumer confidence. TISWG Members advocated for availability targets as high as 99.9%, noting this would reduce potential failure windows to less than two minutes daily, minimising the risk of operational errors. A TISWG Member acknowledged these benefits but noted that higher availability does result in higher costs.

The Stand-in Chair discussed rate compliance, concurrent connections, caching responses, and logging error responses, and requested feedback from TISWG Members. It was requested by members to provide a breakdown of the non-functional requirements aligned to the Public and Private routes, along with further indication of timeframes. RECCo recorded an action to revise the non-functional requirements and reissue these to TISWG Members for review and input.

8. Q&A

No Q&A was raised.

9. AOB

TISWG Members raised the following points for RECCo to consider within the User requirements and requested that these are brought back to future TISWG meetings for discussion:

- Which policies could be implemented to regulate access of ‘bots’ for API Public Access.
- Whether there would be defined security standards that users would be required to comply with.
- What rate limits would be applicable for public and private APIs.

Next meeting date: 17 July 2025