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_0430**
DATE	**30 April 2026, 14:00**
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
John Aung	Retail Energy Code Company	JA	Committee Member
Samuel Wroe	DESNZ	SW	Committee Member
Daniel Leyfield	Levelise	DL	Committee Member
Andrew Eisenberg	EON	AE	Committee Member
Pardeep Randhawa	npower	PR	Committee Member
Lee Sutton	My Energi	LS	Committee Member
Sam Stanhope	ESG Global	SS	Committee Member
Carolyn Burns	ESG Global	CAB	Committee Member
Komal Brown	Scottish Power	KB	Committee Member
Matt Roderick	SMS Energy	MR	Committee Member
Emma Johnson	Centrica	EJ	Committee Member
Rhiannon Denyer	EDF Energy	RD	Committee Member
David Green	EDF Energy	DG	Committee Member
Tom Oldfield	Mixergy	TO	Committee Member
Michael Snowden	Secure Meters	MS	Committee Member

DRAFT

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Bryan Hale	British Gas	BH	Committee Member
Mike Winter	SSE	MK	Committee Member
Elenore Glendinning	Voltalis	EG	Committee Member
Shannon Grehan	Electralink	SG	Committee Member
Christopher Butcher	Smartest Energy	CHB	Committee Member
Andy Dean	GEO Together	AD	Committee Member
James Harrow	GEO Together	JH	Committee Member
Rik Temmink	GEO Together	RT	Committee Member
Abdul Choudhury	Energy Security	AC	Committee Member
Jaipal Naidu	Perse Energy	JN	Committee Member
Conor Mullaney	Glen Dimplex	CM	Committee Member
Andrew Green	Waters Wye	AG	Committee Member
Pete Noyce	Kraken	PN	Committee Member
Montana Aeberhardt	Ofgem	MA	Committee Member
Emily Davis	Ofgem	ED	Committee Member

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed attendees to the REC Tariff Interoperability Implementation Working Group (IWG) meeting held on 30 April 2026.

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The Chair confirmed the agenda, including a walkthrough of an example payload, an update on testing, an overview of the change log, an introduction to Tariff Interoperability (TI) Phase 1a Performance Assurance and questions from the previous IWG meeting.

The actions and minutes from the previous IWG were reviewed. Of the six outstanding actions, members agreed that all could be closed except two which remained open and would be covered later in the meeting;

- **RECIWG_26_0326_01** – RECCo to provide an update on indicative Phase 1b timelines following publication of the CCS consultation response.
- **RECIWG_26_0326_02** – RECCo to engage with the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) to confirm the appropriate assurance approach for Phase 1a.

3. EXAMPLE PAYLOAD WALKTHROUGH

NH provided a high-level overview of the baselined Tariff Interoperability Application Programme Interface (API) payload, explaining that it is intentionally organised into three components: an envelope containing tariff identity and lifecycle attributes; keys defining eligibility and applicability by fuel; and pricing logic expressed through a standing charge and a rates array. Members were reminded that complexity is designed to sit within the rates array to ensure a stable, consistent envelope across all tariff types. NH described that static tariffs rely on tariff_days and time_from/time_to at the rate level, with lifecycle dates held at the envelope level, while dynamic tariffs use explicit valid_from and valid_to timestamps at the rate level with static-specific fields left null.

NH displayed worked examples to illustrate how the model would support a simple flat tariff, a static time-of-use tariff with EV and non-EV splits, dynamic half-hourly tariffs (including negative pricing), and block tariffs using consumption bands. Members were reminded that complexity is designed to sit within the rates array to ensure a stable, consistent envelope across all tariff types.

Recurring themes showcased by NH highlighted design patterns that appear across every example, a particular focus was drawn on rates[] does the heavy lifting as it represents a variety of types of uses or the same type of use broken out over different time periods to fit different tariff optionality. NH noted the sellable to at envelope level should be returned even if there is not a sellable to date, but it can be nulled out if a sellable to has not been agreed to or has not been applied yet to a specific tariff. At the rates array there are optional fields an example presented was if they are null to reduce the size of the payload.

Members raised several technical considerations. MR highlighted concerns around polymorphism within the rates array driven by tarrif_type, noting potential validation challenges and the difficulty of representing mixed scenarios such as dynamic EV pricing alongside flat household rates. It was agreed that this feedback would be recorded through the change log acknowledging it may be more appropriate for future phases. AD also noted inconsistencies in example time boundaries, observing differences in whether time_to was treated as inclusive or exclusive. Members agreed that a consistent approach aligned with existing industry practice should be adopted and clearly documented.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

4. UPDATE ON TESTING

JA outlined the proposed end-to-end testing approach through to go-live. A high-level plan was presented showcasing RECCo internal testing of tooling and validation services running in parallel with pilot testing involving selected suppliers and TI Users, followed by wider market testing using relative onboarding windows rather than fixed dates. The approach was described as balancing delivery certainty with flexibility for participants' internal change cycles.

Expectations were set out for each party. Suppliers are expected to undertake internal build activity or provide stub endpoints capable of returning valid payloads, execute mandatory

test cases using a RECCo-issued workbook, retain evidence internally and allow RECCo and TI Users to test their endpoints. RECCo will provide the draft and final test workbooks, a TI Monitoring Tool, a validation service or simulator, the supplier register and clarification support via the questions log. TI Users are expected to develop against the API specification and test both with RECCo and supplier endpoints. It was emphasised that full production builds are not required for the pilot; lightweight stubs are sufficient.

Testing will focus on three endpoints: GET /tariffs/{mpid}, GET /tariff/{mpid}/{tariff_id}, and the RECCo-hosted GET /suppliers endpoint. A draft workbook comprising 23 mandatory functional and non-functional test cases was described, covering schema validation, filtering, error handling, static versus dynamic behaviour, performance thresholds and a pre-live monitoring tool.

Members sought clarification on dependencies and process. It was confirmed that while government response annexes are expected in May 2026, the API technical specification is already published and not expected to materially change. RECCo confirmed its intention to provide a validation service to simulate counterparties, reducing reliance on live connections. The draft test workbook will be issued with a short review period, after which it will be finalised. For Phase 1a, assurance will be based on self-testing supported by director-level attestation, with no prescribed evidence format beyond internal retention. Members were again encouraged to volunteer for pilot testing, noting the low burden and high value to programme assurance.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

5. CHANGE LOG

NH introduced the Design and Decision Change Log as the central, auditable mechanism for managing amendments to the TI API, Energy Market Data Specification (EMDS) data standards and related baseline documents. It would capture the change itself and the category it sits in as well as the rationale for the specific change and the business driver, who decided it what the decision was and the status of that decision. The log will be maintained by RECCo and shared as a read-only artefact with full transparency for IWG members.

All requests will begin in a pending review state before progressing through discussion and, where agreed, approval. Members may raise changes during IWG sessions, through written submissions, emails or bilaterals; all substantive design changes will be routed through the log. Clarification questions, guidance and future-scope items will instead be directed to dedicated logs or documentation. A suggestion was made to consider supplementary GitHub issue tracking for technical audiences to support clearer comparison of before-and-after states; RECCo agreed to explore this as a potential enhancement. The Chair reaffirmed that once the API and EMDS are formally baselined following the government response, all subsequent changes will be managed strictly through this process.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

DRAFT

6. INTRODUCTION TO TI PHASE 1A PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

AW outlined proposals to assure supplier performance against TI requirements, with the aim of mitigating consumer harm, protecting Net Zero benefits and maintaining confidence in optimisation services. In response to consultation feedback, the preferred approach has moved away from a daily monitoring API towards monthly supplier reporting aligned with existing REC performance assurance processes, supported by updates to the Annual Statement of Compliance and continued operation of the TI Monitoring Tool. A formal change process has been initiated, with consultation and Party Impact Assessment (PIA) planned later in the year.

The proposed reporting framework includes monthly metrics covering tariff update timeliness, API availability and response times, and request volumes and success rates, alongside annual confirmations of tariff coverage and arrangements for handling queries. An ad-hoc report is also proposed to capture information on tariffs not currently within TI scope, to inform future phases. Where possible, reporting will consolidate overlaps with Supplier Licence Condition (SLC) requirements to reduce duplication. The TI Monitoring Tool will poll supplier endpoints at randomised intervals, test both list and detail tariff APIs per MPID, and validate responses against the API schema.

ACTION IWG_01: Suppliers were requested to provide feedback on the detailed Performance Assurance proposals issued with the meeting papers by 08 May 2026.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

7. QUESTIONS FROM PREVIOUS IWG

The Chair confirmed that questions and comments from the previous IWG had been extracted from meeting transcripts, anonymised and published in a structured tracker alongside RECCo responses. This process will be repeated for each IWG to ensure transparency, continuity and clear closure of issues raised by members.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

8. AOB

The Chair requested members to take action by reviewing and providing comments on the spreadsheet with the Performance Assurance proposals by 08 May 2026 and the Example Payloads previously shared via email and the REC Portal.

The Chair encouraged members to volunteer for the pilot group and reminded members that suppliers do not need a full build and that a stub could also work.

The Chair noted that the Testing Workbook would be shared with IWG Members in the following weeks.

During the AOB, CHB raised a question concerning suppliers reaching the 100,000-meter point. This was taken away as an action to confirm a response from DESNZ as it related to policy.

DRAFT

ACTION IWG_02: RECCo to engage with DESNZ concerning the policy related question on raised by CHB.

Next meeting date: TBC

DRAFT