No.	Question	Context	RECCo Response
1	When will we see the more detailed document that sits behind this?	Raised during discussion on the Phase 1a testing approach and assurance materials, seeking visibility of the detailed test approach document.	An update on testing will be shared for review at the 30 April IWG
2	Time of Use Tariffs present a higher risk to grid stability if the supplier isn't signing this as the source of data. will there be cryptogrpahic signing, and will there be a mechanism to report back to suppliers if there are issues spotted with their implementations?	Raised during testing and assurance discussion, focusing on cyber-security, data integrity, and incident feedback mechanisms for supplier implementations.	Cryptographic signing has not been included in the current design. The solution does not relies on each Supplier providing tariff data via its own API endpoint, rather than tariff data being held in a central data store, which reduces the overall risk profile. The approach has been reviewed by DESNZ and RECCo security specialists, and data security will continue to be kept under review. Mechanisms for identifying and raising implementation issues will form part of the wider assurance and testing approach.
3	What happens if incorrect or malicious tariff data is published (e.g. system compromise)?	Raised during detailed rate payload review, focusing on cyber security and data integrity	This concern is noted and aligns with earlier discussions on data integrity (see Q2). While cryptographic signing is not currently included, suppliers are responsible for ensuring the accuracy and security of their data. The wider assurance, testing, and monitoring framework will continue to consider risks relating to incorrect or compromised data.
4	Should ‘last_modified’ apply to all fields apart from MPID?	Raised during review of the Supplier Endpoint Register payload, seeking clarification on the scope and definition of the last_modified field.	This point is agreed in principle. Guidance will be updated where necessary to clarify the intended use of the last_modified field.

5	Does last_modified refer to the URL or the data?	Raised during supplier register payload	Last modified is the date that anything within the Tariff Details Response payload has been updated This will be clarified in guidance to ensure consistent interpretation of the last_modified field.
6	RECCo could surface register data through JSON in the background	Comment made during discussion on the Supplier Register payload design and how data on the Supplier linked to an MPID is exposed to TI users.	This has been partially addressed. The company_legal_name field has now been included in the Get Supplier Endpoints response payload, populated by RECCo using the Party Register. This is reflected in the latest API Technical Specification.
7	Should different tariff versions have different Tariff IDs, i.e. “Super Saver Tariff April 2026” and “Super Saver Tariff Oct 2026” as two unique tariff IDs?	Raised during discussion on tariff identification, naming conventions, and the relationship between tariff name, tariff ID, and versioning.	Yes. Where there are differences in tariff name or associated tariff pricing data, these must be treated as separate tariffs and assigned distinct Tariff IDs.
8	Is there a defined list of tariff_type values or is this free text?	Raised during tariff payload review.	Tariff Type is defined as either Static or Dynamic. Where additional differentiation is required (e.g. EV tariffs), this will be supported through a separate free-text “type of use” field.
9	Should meter_type be an array?	Raised during tariff payload review, focusing on data modelling for meter compatibility.	Yes, this has been agreed and implemented. This is a conditional data item in the MMXXXX5 - Get Tariffs Response and MMXXXX7 - Get Tariff Details Response. It will only be populated where a specific tariff is restricted to certain Meter Types - with all relevant Meter Types listed against the same Tariff ID.
10	Is it worth specifying that the name field is unique within the MPID organisation?	Raised during tariff payload discussion.	A supplier must make sure that it uses unique tariff IDs. Each Supplier has a unique MPID(s) - when combined together this uniquely identifies the tariff for TI Users.

11	Should VAT fields be included (vat_applicable / vat_rate)?	Raised during rates and pricing payload discussion, with a focus on clarity and extensibility of price representation.	The current position is that all prices will be presented exclusive of VAT, as previously agreed with the TIWG. This simplifies implementation, and no strong use case has been identified for including VAT fields in the MVP at this stage.
12	Should unit_price and standing charge by floats instead of strings? Direction should be "I" or "E" for import or export tariffs	Raised during detailed rate payload review, focusing on data typing and standardisation.	We have followed existing EMDS conventions for representing formats e.g. for unit price and standing charges. The enumerations for the meteringPointEnergyFlow are 'I' - Energy FLow is Import and 'E' - Energy Flow is Export. This is an existing Data Item in the Energy Market Data Specification.
13	How will gas vs electricity identifiers be handled (MPID differences)?	Raised during supplier register payload	A single endpoint can support multiple MPIDs (both gas and electricity). The MPID format itself will indicate whether the supply relates to gas or electricity. Electricity MPIDs are 4 characters in length whereas Gas MPIDs have 3 characters.
14	How are gas and electricity tariffs differentiated in the payload?	Raised during supplier register payload	The payload includes a fuel type attribute, which identifies whether the tariff relates to electricity or gas.
15	Is Phase 1 delivery focused on electricity tariffs only?	Testing approach phase 1a - test harness	Yes. Phase 1A is focused on electricity tariffs. Gas tariffs may be included optionally by suppliers, but are not required. Gas will be considered more fully in a later phase.
16	When will timelines for alignment with the Consumer Consent Solution (CCS) be confirmed?	CCS and TI Overview	Timelines for alignment with CCS are to be confirmed and will be communicated through the TIWG/IWG once further clarity is available.
17	Can you share the link to the pre-Christmas webinar?	ToR Overview	Tariff Interoperability Consultation Webinar: Key takeaways and next steps - The Retail Energy Code Company

18	Could a shared test harness or simulator be provided for testing?	Testing approach phase 1a - Test harness	This aligns with current thinking. The proposed testing approach includes the use of sandbox environments and simulators to support testing of both supplier and user implementations. Feedback on the potential use of downloadable or shared testing tools (e.g. test harnesses) is welcomed and will be considered as part of the ongoing development of the Test Approach and Plan.
19	Will code (e.g. GitHub/open source) be provided to support development and testing?	Testing approach phase 1a - Test harness	The current plan is to provide YAML files and an OpenAPI specification to support technical development and validation. Provision of open-source code (e.g. via GitHub) is not confirmed at this stage but will be considered as part of the overall testing and development support approach.
20	Could example implementations (e.g. Python reference API) be provided?	Testing approach phase 1a - Test harness	YAML definitions for the API and payloads will be provided to support validation and development. The broader testing approach, including how materials may be shared (e.g. via GitHub), is currently being developed and will be shared at a future IWG.
21	How will optional participation (non-mandated suppliers) be handled, particularly in relation to attestation?	Testing approach phase 1a - Test harness	This is currently under consideration. The working assumption is that suppliers who voluntarily participate will still be expected to meet the same standards (including testing and attestation) to ensure consistency and avoid negative consumer impacts. Further detail will be developed and confirmed at IWG

22	Is there any indication in the payload as to whether this is the same payload that's being pushed to the meter? Because some agile tariffs aren't pushed to the metre or the metre may be out of date.	Payload Review	This is not a feature of the Tariff Interoperability design. The arrangements focus on tariff data publication rather than device-level communication or meter synchronisation.
23	Why is LDZ region an array?	Payload Review	This has been updated. The LDZ field is no longer an array and has been changed to a string, with separate Tariff IDs used or each LDZ region.
24	How are simple (flat rate) tariffs represented in the schema?	Payload Review	Relevant data fields (e.g. time bands, days of week) are optional. For simple tariffs, only the required fields (e.g. unit price) need to be populated. This provides flexibility for suppliers to represent different tariff types appropriately.
25	How are more complex tariff scenarios (e.g. varying time periods, minimum/maximum usage rules) represented?	Payload Review	Where no time-of-use elements apply, the value “all” should be used to indicate full coverage. For more complex scenarios, stakeholders are encouraged to provide example payloads, which will be reviewed to determine how best to incorporate them into the schema.