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_0623**
DATE	**23 June 2026, 10:30**
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
Andrew Wallace	Retail Energy Code Company	AW	Committee Member
John Aung	Retail Energy Code Company	JA	Committee Member
Rebecca Griffiths	Retail Energy Code Company	RG	Committee Member
Julia Ledden	Retail Energy Code Company	JL	Committee Member
Samuel Wroe	DESNZ	SW	Committee Member
Richard Slack	Levelise	RS	Committee Member
Luke Pratt	EON	LP	Committee Member
Sam Stanhope	ESG Global	SS	Committee Member
Claire Louise Roberts	Scottish Power	CLR	Committee Member
Emma Johnson	Centrica	EJ	Committee Member
Rhiannon Denyer	EDF Energy	RD	Committee Member
Mike Winter	SSE	MK	Committee Member
Shannon Grehan	Electralink	SG	Committee Member
Nicola Butcher	Smartest Energy	NB	Committee Member
Julian Moore	Smartest Energy	JM	Committee Member
Dinyar Baria	Neso Energy	DB	Committee Member
Christopher Butcher	Smartest Energy	CB	Committee Member

DRAFT

Attendee	Representing	Initials	Role
Andy Dean	GEO Together	AD	Committee Member
James Harrow	GEO Together	JH	Committee Member
Rik Temmink	GEO Together	RT	Committee Member
Montisha Ransome	Octopus Energy	MR	Committee Member
Peter Morgan	Energy Security	PM	Committee Member
Graeme Collyer	Electrorad	GC	Committee Member
John Hinsley	Glen Dimplex	JOH	Committee Member
Gareth Evans	Waters Wye	GE	Committee Member
Lori Wilson	Kraken	LW	Committee Member
Rose Galloway Green	Ofgem	RGG	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 23 June 2026. The Chair also introduced JL as the new Test-Manager.

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The Chair confirmed the agenda, including a walkthrough of the Testing Approach and Plan, an update on the Tariff Interoperability (TI) Change Log and an overview of the TI Query Tracker.

The actions and minutes from the previous IWG were reviewed. Of the three outstanding actions, members agreed that all could be closed except one 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.

3. TESTING APPROACH AND PLAN

JA provided an overview of the Testing Approach and Plan, outlining the objective to validate end-to-end testing and ensuring supplier readiness ahead of the planned go-live by February 2027. JA confirmed the primary objective was to ensure that suppliers can successfully operate within the Tariff Interoperability arrangements, supported by RECCo-provided

systems, including the TI Supplier Register, TI Validation Tool and TI Monitoring Tool. The approach aimed to enable both suppliers and TI users to undertake pre-go-live testing activities using the tools.

JA explained that the testing strategy would follow a phased delivery model to reduce implementation risk. The initial RECCo internal testing (Stage 0) would validate the core platforms and infrastructure. Followed by a pilot phase (Stage 1), during which a selected group would test the design, API specification and test workbook. The pilot phase is intended to provide confidence that the design is robust before wider rollout. Subsequent self-directed supplier testing (Stage 3) which focuses on assurance, whereby suppliers must provide formal sign-off confirming completion of testing.

JA highlighted that in terms of design principles, the model is industry-led and supported by centralised tooling. The TI Supplier Register would act as the repository of supplier endpoints, enabling TI users to retrieve connection details. The TI Validation Tool would function as a simulation environment, allowing both suppliers and TI users to test request and response scenarios. The TI Monitoring Tool would be used by RECCo to monitor supplier endpoints both pre- and post-go-live, validating responses and supporting ongoing assurance.

The assurance model places responsibility on suppliers, requiring director-level sign-off and retention of testing evidence within a standard workbook. Each stage mandates no outstanding Severity 1 or 2 defects, supported by endpoint validation, central defect management, and governance oversight by RECCo and DESNZ.

Risk is mitigated through a pilot phase to refine the design and specifications ahead of wider rollout, supported by a standardised test workbook to ensure consistency. RECCo is also considering a similar workbook for TI users, with a decision to follow the pilot.

The overall outcome is intended to deliver a scalable, low-bottleneck testing model with clear go/no-go confidence for go-live, underpinned by formal assurance and validated evidence. AW raised a question to Members surrounding a consultation about the technical specifications for Phase 1a and whether the documents scheduled to be published on 09 October 2026 would be substantial to support the REC release on 06 November 2026. No initial thoughts were raised. An action was taken to provide responses to the Tariff Interoperability mailbox by 03 July 2026.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

ACTION RECIWG_26_0623_01: Code Manager to post questions into a post-meeting email. RECIWG Members to provide feedback by 03 July 2026.

4. TARIFF INTEROPERABILITY CHANGE LOG

NH updated Members on the Tariff Interoperability Change Log and sought initial industry views on several technical design areas, noting that further feedback would be accepted post-meeting.

The discussion on API versioning confirmed the current preference for header-based versioning, as this supports efficient routing at gateway level and minimises supplier implementation complexity. Alternative approaches, including URL/path-based and payload-

based versioning, were raised by industry. Members highlighted potential benefits of these alternatives, particularly for downstream processing and traceability of stored data. It was agreed that further industry feedback is required, and an action was taken for RECCo to publish a version of its internal design decision log to support more informed responses.

NH then discussed LDZ Region vs GSP Group for gas tariffs, where concerns were raised that some suppliers may use GSP for gas in practice. Members queried whether this reflects standard industry practice or isolated cases and highlighted the potential impact on interoperability if inconsistent geographic bases are used. It was noted that further evidence is required from suppliers to understand how common this approach is and whether it introduces complexity in tariff comparison. RECCo agreed to undertake further industry engagement and analysis before confirming the appropriate design approach.

NH explained polymorphism within the API payload highlighted that the current design dynamically adjusts returned fields based on tariff and fuel type to reduce payload size. While this approach was generally understood, members raised considerations around implementation clarity, data quality assurance, and schema validation. Suggestions included strengthening schema definitions to support automated validation and reduce ambiguity. RECCo confirmed that feedback would be reviewed, including potential enhancements to improve clarity and consistency for implementers.

NH confirmed that RECCo did not intend to utilise regex validation, on the basis that validation approaches should remain the responsibility of individual suppliers. This position was noted with no challenge from Members.

Economy 7 and time-of-use tariffs was also discussed, where current feedback suggests that the existing payload structure may not clearly support these tariff types. Members questioned the necessity of introducing a specific identifier (e.g. a dedicated Economy 7 flag) and highlighted the lack of a clear industry definition or use case. It was suggested that existing time-segment structures may already be sufficient. RECCo confirmed it will seek further clarification from those who raised the issue and gather additional industry input before determining whether any changes are required.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

ACTION RECIWG_26_0623_02: RECCo to consider publishing a public-facing version of the API design decision log to support industry review.

ACTION RECIWG_26_0623_03: RECCo to engage with suppliers with a possible request for information to assess the prevalence and implications of using GSP for gas tariffs.

ACTION RECIWG_26_0623_04: RECCo to gather further evidence and use cases on Economy 7 requirements and provide additional clarification.

5. TARIFF INTEROPERABILITY QUERY TRACKER

The Chair provided an update on the TI Query Tracker, confirming that queries raised through previous Tariff Interoperability Implementation Working Group meetings and the project mailbox are being logged, tracked and responded to. Most queries have been closed, with more complex or open items captured in the tracker alongside responses or next steps.

The tracker would be published on the REC Portal to ensure visibility, acting as a central log of queries and actions. Key themes from the meetings included technical artefacts, testing and assurance, tariff updates, future tariff publication and non-domestic obligations. It was noted that RECCo is preparing a guidance note to clarify non-domestic and bespoke tariffs.

Members were encouraged to review the tracker. Queries raised in the current session would also be added, with more complex items potentially revisited in dedicated discussions.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

6. AOB

The Chair highlighted that a post-meeting email will be issued on the questions asked during the meeting with responses requested by 03 July 2026 to support review ahead of future meetings. Members were also reminded to review and respond to the PAB consultation within the published timeline.

It was noted that an upcoming RECCo webinar on Phase 1A implementation timelines and the Government response will take place, with members encouraged to attend or send representatives. The session is expected to be recorded and shared.

Members were advised that any additional queries requiring formal tracking should be submitted via the Tariff Interoperability mailbox to ensure inclusion in the Query Tracker. Clarification was also provided that testing timelines discussed for Phase 1A do not currently include Consumer Consent flows.

RECIWG Members noted the update.

ACTION RECIWG_26_0623_05: RECCo to circulate webinar details and include links in post-meeting communications.

Next meeting date: TBC

DRAFT