RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**.
Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

REC TARIFF INTEROPERABILITY IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP
MEETING MINUTES

MEETING	**RECIWG_26_0326**
DATE	**26 March 2026, 13:30**
LOCATION	**By teleconference**

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Chris Stock	Retail Energy Code Company	CS	Chair
Edma Hyskaj	Code Manager	EH	Code Manager
Paul Crorken	Retail Energy Code Company	PC	Committee Member
Nizar Hamood	Retail Energy Code Company	NH	Committee Member
Sarah Jones	Retail Energy Code Company	SJ	Committee Member
Andrew Wallace	Retail Energy Code Company	AW	Committee Member
Samuel Wroe	DESNZ	SW	Committee Member
Daniel Leyfield	Levelise	DL	Committee Member
Richard Slack	Levelise	RS	Committee Member
Ivan Castro	Levelise	IC	Committee Member
Gareth Evans	Waters Wye	GE	Committee Member
Andrew Eisenberg	EON	AE	Committee Member
Pardeep Randhawa	npower	PR	Committee Member
Sam Stanhope	ESG Global	SS	Committee Member
Matthew Winstanley	ESG Global	MW	Committee Member
Carolyn Burns	ESG Global	CB	Committee Member
Komal Brown	Scottish Power	KB	Committee Member
Claire-Louise Roberts	Scottish Power	CIR	Committee Member
Matt Roderick	SMS Energy	MR	Committee Member
Emma Johnson	Centrica	EJ	Committee Member
Daniel Hollingworth	Ohme	DH	Committee Member

DRAFT

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Lori Wilson	KrakenTech	LW	Committee Member
Kevin Hammond	Octopus Energy	KH	Committee Member
Rhiannon Denyer	EDF Energy	RD	Committee Member
Chris Howe	Mixergy	CH	Committee Member
Christine Harris	Mixergy	CHa	Committee Member
Michael Snowden	Secure Meters	MS	Committee Member
Lama Al Fakhri	EU Panasonic	LAF	Committee Member
Bryan Hale	British Gas	BH	Committee Member
Robert Read	British Gas	RR	Committee Member
Mike Winter	SSE	MK	Committee Member
Caroline Nocton	Power Vault	CN	Committee Member
Andrew E.Jones	Total Energies	AJ	Committee Member
Fareed Ahmad	Maxen Power	FA	Committee Member
Andy Dean	GEO Together	AD	Committee Member
James Harrow	GEO Together	JH	Committee Member
Jaipal Naidu	Perse Energy	JN	Committee Member
Emma Johnson	Centrica	EJ	Committee Member
Conor Mullaney	Glen Dimplex	CM	Committee Member
Andrew Deeming	Glen Dimplex	AD	Committee Member

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the first REC Tariff Interoperability Implementation Working Group (IWG) meeting held on 26 March 2026 and outlined the purpose of the session, noting that the meeting was intended to be interactive and discussion-led.

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The Chair confirmed the agenda, including an overview of the IWG Terms of Reference (ToR), Consumer Consent Solution (CCS) and Tariff Interoperability (TI) Phase 1a & b, reviewing the testing approach for Phase 1 and payload review.

3. IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Chair provided an overview of the IWG Terms of Reference, highlighting the group's advisory role, scope of activities, and its focus on implementation assurance rather than policy decision-making.

Members were invited to provide feedback on the ToR.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

4. CONSUMER CONSENT SOLUTION & TARIFF INTEROPERABILITY OVERVIEW – PHASE 1A & B

The Chair provided an update on the phased delivery approach for TI, confirming that Phase 1a will deliver the Public Tariff Pricing Data API with a target for February 2027. Including that Phase 1b (Customer Specific Tariff Information) will be aligned to the CCS post-Minimum Marketable Product and that no standalone TI consent mechanism will be developed.

SJ also requested that any members that were interested in becoming early adopters and help shape and implement the Consumer Consent Solution (CCS) Minimum Marketable Product email: consumerconsent@retailenergycode.co.uk .

Members discussed expected timelines and dependencies with CCS, noting that further clarity is expected following the CCS consultation response.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

ACTION IWG_01: RECCo to provide an update on indicative Phase 1b timelines following publication of the CCS consultation response

5. TESTING APPROACH PHASE 1A

SJ presented an overview of the proposed testing approach for Phase 1a noting that this phase is limited to public tariff pricing data and excludes customer-specific data and consent-related functionality, which will be addressed in Phase 1b. SJ highlighted the use of a pilot group for early validation, the provision of sandbox environments and simulators. As well as the reliance on supplier self-testing supported by management attestation, rather than mandatory witnessed testing and the consideration of how the Monitoring Tool could support pre-go-live assurance.

AW continued confirming that the attestation approach will allow for supplier engagement which will support the communication ahead of the go-live due to questioning surrounding mandatory testing. The monitoring tool is suggested to mimic a TI user and would send messages to suppliers to understand if it is up and the kind of operational APIs that are working.

Members discussed simulating the monitoring tool as it could accelerate the acceptance of the tool amongst users. AW appreciated the feedback as it provided valuable insight into how parties could manage any risks internally.

Members also questioned how the testing and assurance would apply to new entrants and late opt-in suppliers as well as the relationship between testing, qualification and existing REC assurance processes.

NH outlined a five-stage testing model which can be found on slide 10 of the meeting slides. Members requested a provisional timeline for each stage. The Chair stated that the test approach and plan was being reviewed by the test manager to confirm the assumptions on the timeline are correct. If approved a timeline could be presented for the next IWG meeting.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

ACTION IWG_02: RECCo to engage with the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) to confirm the appropriate assurance approach for Phase 1a.

ACTION IWG_03: RECCo to circulate a draft Test Approach and Plan, including indicative timelines and proposed test scenarios, ahead of the next IWG meeting.

6. PAYLOAD REVIEW

NH provided a review on the draft API payload structures, including the Supplier Endpoint Register payloads, Tariff and tariff details payloads and Rates and time-of-use structures. Members wanted clarification that the last modified date was of the URL and not the last date that the tariffs were updated and that it related to all fields apart from Market Participant ID (MPID). The Chair confirmed that the definition would be made clearer to ensure no future confusion.

Some members wished for further identification of the MPID due to the use of MPIDs for Gas and Electricity. Other members established that a single endpoint can be utilised for multiple MPIDs regardless of whether they are gas or electricity. SJ clarified that further into the payload there is a fuel type attribute that will inform suppliers whether it is a gas or electricity tariff. It was also confirmed that MPIDs are the codes for each individual supplier, but they are listed in the party register. The Chair regarded that a digital services platform was digitising supplier registration and MPIDs as a part of a separate programme which would finalise in September 2026.

Members requested clearer examples to illustrate complex tariff structures which NH and SJ confirmed would be possible as the updated version has all the corrected types of data. Questions were also raised concerning cyber-security considerations in relation to public tariff data integrity and cryptographically signing tariffs by the energy retailer to prevent attacks on the power grid.

Due to time constraints, not all questions were resolved during the meeting.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

ACTION IWG_04: The Code Manager to compile and respond to payload-related questions raised during the meeting at the next IWG meeting.

ACTION IWG_05: RECCo to provide example payloads illustrating common tariff scenarios ahead of the next IWG meeting.

ACTION IWG_06: RECCo to consider and assess the cyber-security risk raised regarding public tariff data integrity and provide a response at a future IWG.

7. Q&A

Additional questions were not addressed as time did not allow. Members were encouraged to submit further detailed queries via email to enable structured responses outside the meeting.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

8. AOB

No additional items were raised. The Chair thanked members for their engagement and confirmed that questions not addressed would be captured and responded to ahead of the next meeting.

Next meeting date: TBC

DRAFT