Data Standards Body

Technical Working Group

Decision 340 - Maintenance Iteration 18

Contact: Mark Verstege, Hemang Rathod, Nils Berge, Brian Kirkpatrick

Publish Date: 17 April 2024

Decision Approved By Chair: 23 April 2024

Context

This decision relates to the issues consulted on in Maintenance Iteration 18 of the Data Standards. This maintenance iteration incorporates Information Security, CX, Banking, Energy and CDR Register standards. The details for this iteration can be found at: DSB Maintenance Iteration 18 Agenda & Minutes.

Additionally, processes and an overview of the maintenance operating model can be found at: https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance.

Decision To Be Made

Changes related to the standards arising from the issues consulted in the maintenance iteration.

Feedback Provided

Below is a list of the issues addressed in this iteration. Each issue has a link to the issue thread containing the public consultation relating to the issue:

lss.#	Sector	Issue	Decision	Change Type	Obligation Date	Notes
629	All	Maintenance Iteration 18 Holistic Feedback	Change Recommended	Non- Breaking Change	N/A	Detail in following section
557	СХ	Withdrawal of a SUI by an Account Holder leaving an "Empty" Authorisation	Defer	N/A	N/A	CX Guidelines have been developed to cover Joint Account scenarios. Guidelines for Secondary User sharing to progress alongside operational enhancements.
633	СХ	Collection Consents - Authorisation Amendment	Defer	N/A	N/A	Proposed changes to the Authorisation Amendment Standards to be deferred pending further analysis.
543	Security	refresh token ex pires at and sharing expires a t claims listed as MUST be supported	Change Recommended	Non- Breaking Change	N/A	Removal of outdated statements
631	Security	Updates to 'Revoking consent' Standards	Change Recommended	Non- Breaking Change	N/A	Clarification of revocation standards to align to Rules
632	Security	Concurrent consent support and cdr arrangement id	Change Recommended	Non- Breaking Change	N/A	Removal of outdated statements

lss.#	Sector	Issue	Decision	Change Type	Obligation Date	Notes
626	Admin	AuthorisationMet ricsV2 abandonmentsBy Stage property descriptions and CDS Guide	No Change	N/A	N/A	Recommending to not proceed with the proposed change at this time
623	Energy	Add new pricing models to EnergyPlanContra ctV2	No Change	N/A	N/A	Recommending to not proceed with the proposed change at this time
624	Energy	Improved structure for Solar Time Varying Tariffs	Change Recommended	Breaking Change	11 November 2024	Improve Solar Tariff Structure to better cater for time varying tariffs
625	Energy	Additional field to support Step Tariff calculations	Change Recommended	Breaking Change	11 November 2024	Add `period` field in tariff structures to support step rate calculation
627	Energy	EnergyPlanTariffP eriod - Change to daily supply charge	Change Recommended	Breaking Change	11 November 2024	Changes to support banded daily supply charges
634	Telco	Potential error in Telco specification	Change Recommended	Non- Breaking Change	N/A	Error in the Get Account Detail schema.

Decisions For Approval

Issue 629 - Maintenance Iteration 18 Holistic Feedback

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/629

Change Impact

Non-Breaking change

Decision

To make the following minor changes to the Standards to correct defects or clarify intent:

- Correct typo in the Security Endpoints section: 'cdr arragement id'.
- Remove incorrect error response schema and provide clarity for error details in two Register endpoints: Get Data Holder Brands and Get Software Statement Assertion (SSA).
- Correct inconsistent wording from 'Software Package' to 'Software Product'.
- Provide clarity and a link to the unreferenced ClientRegistration schema from the ClientRegistrationRequest schema description.
- Clarify that the 'require_pushed_authorization_requests' parameter should be a Boolean *true* value aligning to the upstream specification, rather than a string.
- Remove the incorrect Non-normative Example: 'Accept-Encoding: charset=UTF-8'

To defer a change proposed on the holistic issue to make changes to two Register endpoint descriptions. The change detail has been transferred to a new issue: #637 - Review Register API descriptions.

Background

This is the regular Maintenance Iteration Holistic Feedback Change Request that is created at the beginning of each maintenance iteration to capture trivial changes to the standards that do not warrant a dedicated Change Request.

Issue 543 - refresh_token_expires_at and sharing_expires_at claims listed as MUST be supported

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/543

Change Impact

Non-Breaking Change

Decision

The decision is to proceed with the proposed change to remove outdated statements, to ensure the current requirements are clear.

Remove the section below from the <u>Scopes and Claims</u> section:

The following additional claims MUST be supported:

- refresh_token_expires_at: indicates the date-time at which the most recently provided refresh token will expire. Its value MUST be a number containing a NumericDate value, as specified in <u>section 2</u> of section 2 [JWT]. If no refresh token has been provided then a zero value should be returned.
- sharing_expires_at: indicates the date-time at which the current sharing arrangement will
 expire. Its value MUST be a number containing a NumericDate value, as specified
 in section 2 of [JWT]. If consent is not complete or a sharing_duration was not requested
 in the authorisation request object then a zero value should be returned.

Replace the following sentence under Requesting Sharing Duration:

The Data Recipient Software Product is able to obtain the expiration of sharing via the sharing_expires_at claim.

With:

The Data Recipient Software Product is able to obtain the expiration of the sharing arrangement by presenting a refresh token to the token introspection endpoint. The expiration value is provided in the exp field in the response.

Remove references to 'refresh_token_expires_at' and 'sharing_expires_at' in the Non-normative Examples.

Background

This issue noted there are currently statements declaring that the 'refresh_token_expires_at' and 'sharing_expires_at' Information Security claims MUST be supported, however previous versions of the Standards had declared these claims MAY be retired from 16 September 2022.

The issue proposed these now-deprecated statements be removed for clarity and certainty.

Consultation through the maintenance iteration included the following points:

- Whether the removal of these statements could be considered a non-breaking change as the detail provided in the current version of the Standards may be adopted and in active use by participants;
- If by removing the statements, it would cause a change in Data Recipient behaviour that may increase load on Data Holders;
- The change may diverge from commonly used InfoSec patterns;
- That by removing the claims, the InfoSec requirements in the Standards are being simplified by removing redundant claims; and
- Concern regarding any transition requirements to allow for participants to adapt to the change.

Further analysis and discussion of these points did not reveal strong reasons not to proceed with the change. It was determined that as a transition away from these claims had already occurred when they were allowed to be retired, the potential for adverse impact is likely to be low.

Issue 631 - Updates to 'Revoking consent' Standards

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/631

Change Impact

Non-Breaking Change

Decision

The decision is to proceed with the proposed change to clarify the requirements for notifying participants of consent and authorisation withdrawal and expiry, to ensure alignment to the Rules.

Replace the current statements:

Revoking consent

Data Recipient Software Products MUST use the Data Holder's CDR Arrangement Revocation End Point with a valid cdr_arrangement_id to notify the Data Holder when consent is **revoked** by the consumer via the Data Recipient Software Product.

Data Holder's MUST use the Data Recipient Software Product's CDR Arrangement Revocation End Point with a valid cdr_arrangement_id to notify the Data Recipient Software Product when consent is **revoked** by the consumer via the Data Holder.

With:

Revoking consent

Data Recipient Software Products **MUST** use the Data Holder's CDR Arrangement Revocation endpoint with a valid cdr_arrangement_id to notify the Data Holder when consent is withdrawn or otherwise expires, except for the following reasons:

- The withdrawal was initiated via the Data Holder,
- The consent expires at its natural expiry time, defined by the Data Recipient in the authorisation request and available in the token introspection endpoint,
- Invalidation of the consent due to a change in the Data Holder or Data Holder Brand status on the Register.

Data Holder's **MUST** use the Data Recipient Software Product's CDR Arrangement Revocation endpoint with a valid cdr_arrangement_id to notify the Data Recipient Software Product when an authorisation is withdrawn or otherwise expires, except for the following reasons:

- The withdrawal was initiated via the Data Recipient,
- The authorisation expires at its natural expiry time, defined by the Data Recipient in the authorisation request and available in the token introspection endpoint,
- Invalidation of the authorisation due to a change in the Data Recipient or Software Product status on the Register.

Background

Current statements require Data Recipients and Data Holders to notify each other when 'consent is revoked' by the consumer.

July 2023 Rules amendments broadened the associated obligations to include notification when a consent or authorisation expires 'for any reason'.

To accommodate these changes, the proposal is to extend the existing statements to require a notification in all cases unless it is technically unnecessary, such as when a Data Holder authorisation naturally expires at the time initially specified by the Data Recipient.

Issue 632 - Concurrent consent support and cdr arrangement id

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/632

Change Impact

Non-Breaking Change

Decision

The decision is to proceed with the proposed change to avoid confusion that may arise from these outdated statements.

Remove the following statements:

A Data Holder **MUST** only return the cdr_arrangement_id in the Token and Token Introspection End Point responses if they also support concurrent consent. This ensures that Data Recipient Software Products have a reliable way to determine whether a given Data Holder supports concurrent consent.

And:

For any existing consents, Data Holders **MUST** retrospectively generate a cdr_arrangement_id such that Data Recipient Software Products can obtain a valid cdr_arrangement_id for all active consents they hold.

Background

These statements were in support of a transition period and past obligation date (November 2020). They are now determined to be obsolete.

The removal of these statements was discussed throughout the maintenance iteration and no concerns were raised.

Issue 626 - AuthorisationMetricsV2 abandonmentsByStage property descriptions and CDS Guide

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/626

Change Impact

No Change

Decision

The decision is to not proceed with the proposed changes to the Standards or guidance at this time.

Background

Requests for clarification of the requirements for Get Metrics v5 abandonment metrics resulted in guidance being developed in early December 2023. This issue requested the Standards to be updated to reflect elements of the guidance, and other updates to make the guidance clearer.

The proposed updated text for the Standards was discussed throughout the Maintenance Iteration, including discussion on whether the intended clarification would result in a change in interpretation, which would cause this proposal to become a breaking change for some data holders. Participants suggested that if the change were to proceed, they would require it to be accompanied by a future obligation date to remain compliant, as their interpretation differed from the guidance which had been published after the Get Metrics changes.

It has been determined that the change proposed may not be warranted at this time as the existing guidance states the general intent and expectation of implementations. Further, implementations delivering contrary to that guidance would not significantly impact the insight the data may provide to the Regulator.

Future changes related to the authorisation journey may prompt a review of reporting requirements and new versions of Get Metrics could be consulted on at that stage.

Issue 634 - Potential error in Telco specification

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/634

Change Impact

Non-Breaking Change

Decision

The decision is to proceed with the proposed change to correct a schema error in the Telco Standards.

Change the following specification, from:

To:

Backaround

Similar to the Banking and Energy Account Detail endpoints, the Candidate Telco Account Detail endpoint combines a base schema from the Account 'list' endpoint with an additional 'detail'

schema providing further fields. In the Telco specification, part of the base schema was repeated in the detail section, causing the appearance of duplicate fields.

The proposal is to resolve the incorrect grouping of the schemas to avoid duplicate fields and ensure the structure is aligned to the intent.

The change is considered to be Non-Breaking as the Telco Standards are not yet Binding. As a result, the endpoint will also not be versioned to accommodate the change.

Issue 623 - Add new pricing models to EnergyPlanContractV2

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/623

Change Impact

No Change

Decision

The decision is to not proceed with these changes.

Background

Currently, pricing models can be specified for a consumers energy contract for different pricing arrangements (e.g. a fixed price or time of use based prices) via the pricingModel field in the standards. This is an ENUM field with a specific list of values indicating various pricing models a contract can have.

This change request was raised by Ergon Energy to introduce new pricing models for new scenarios.

Through participant discussion and feedback in the MI, it was identified that the various scenarios noted in the change request for which new pricing models were requested can be catered for by the existing standards, and no change was required.

A suggestion was made to update the description of the pricingModel element to make it clearer that it is about usage charges which was considered. However, noting that the description of the ENUM values provide the clarity, this change is not recommended.

As a result, no change is being recommended.

Issue 624 - Improved structure for Solar Time Varying Tariffs

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/624

Change Impact

Breaking Change

Decision

The decision is to make the following changes:

- 1. Convert solarFeedInTariff.timeVaringTariffs structure from an object to an array to allow representation of multiple feed in tariff for a given plan
- 2. Add new mandatory displayName field to solarFeedInTariff.timeVaringTariffs giving data holders the flexibility in sharing the tariff names
- 3. Add new ENUM values VARIABLE and CURRENT to solarFeedInTariff.scheme

This change will result in new version of following APIs:

- Get Generic Plan Detail from v2 to v3
- Get Energy Account Detail from v3 to v4
- 11 November 2024 is recommended as the FDO for the change. This is the last obligation date noted in the Obligation Dates Schedule.
- 8 September 2025 is proposed as the retirement date for the deprecated versions of the above APIs.

Background

Time Varying Tariffs for Solar Feed-In Tariffs (FiT) are relatively new and were introduced in the Data Standards as part of EnergyPlanResponseV2. In Victoria, one offer or plan can consist of up to 4 solar feed in tariff types (Source: Essential Services Commission website, https://www.esc.vic.gov.au/electricity-and-gas/prices-tariffs-and-benchmarks/minimum-feed-tariff-review-2023-24).

This change request was raised by DEECA to change the standards to facilitate sharing plans that have multiple Solar FiT policies, with each Solar FiT policies having multiple rates with different time periods.

Two options were discussed during the consultation:

- Option 1: Changes proposed by DEECA in the CR. This involves converting the current solarFeedInTariff.timeVaringTariffs structure into an array for multiple FiT representation and adding new mandatory displayName field to it.
- Option 2: Leverage existing standards to represent plans with multiple Solar FiTs

It was noted that whilst option 2 would work, it would lead to:

- A confusing and incorrect way to represent the tariffs, as they would not be structured appropriately
- Interpretation issues on anyone consuming the CDR offer data
- Potential duplication of implementation costs to develop with this work-around and then to correct it later

Participants indicated strong preference for option 1 and hence is being recommended.

Based on participant feedback, an FDO date of 11 November 2024 is being recommended, which is the last obligation date noted in the Data Standards' Obligation Dates Schedule. This will be aligned with FDO of other Energy changes being proposed as part of this MI.

An example highlighting the detail of the change is below:

```
"solarFeedInTariff": [
    "displayName": "string",
    "description": "string",
    "startDate": "string",
    "endDate": "string",
    "scheme": ["PREMIUM", "VARIABLE", "CURRENT", "OTHER"] // New VARIABLE and CURRENT
ENUM values
    "payerType": "GOVERNMENT",
    "tariffUType": "singleTariff",
    "singleTariff": {
      "rates": [
          "unitPrice": "string",
          "measureUnit": "KWH",
          "volume": 0
       }
      ]
    },
    "timeVaryingTariffs": [ // Converted into array of objects
          "type": ["PEAK", "OFF_PEAK", "SHOULDER"],
          "displayName": "string", // New mandatory field
          "rates": [
              "unitPrice": "string",
              "measureUnit": "KWH",
              "volume": 0
            }
          ],
          "timeVariations": [
              "days": [
                "SUN"
              "startTime": "string",
              "endTime": "string"
            }
          ]
        }
    ]
 }
]
```

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/625

Change Impact

Breaking Change

Decision

The decision is to add a new optional field period field to the following objects:

- EnergyPlanControlledLoad.singleRate
- EnergyPlanControlledLoad.timeOfUseRates
- EnergyPlanSolarFeedInTariffV2.singleRate
- EnergyPlanSolarFeedInTariffV2.timeVaryingTariffs
- EnergyPlanTariffPeriod.timeOfUseRates

Its value would be formatted according to <u>ISO 8601 Durations</u> (excludes recurrence syntax) and will default to P1Y if absent.

This change will result in new version of following APIs:

- Get Generic Plan Detail from v2 to v3.
- Get Energy Account Detail from v3 to v4.
- 11 November 2024 is recommended as the FDO for the change. This is the last obligation date noted in the <u>Obligation Dates Schedule</u>.
- 8 September 2025 is proposed as the retirement date for the deprecated versions of the above APIs.

Background

Energy plans can contain stepped rates, which apply to specific usage levels or steps. When usage surpasses a set amount, the rate for the next tier is applied.

A key component to help calculate step rates is the period over which those rates apply. Currently, a period field is only included in single tariff rates in the Energy Standards.

Specifically, the period field is missing for the following objects, and hence step tariffs for these objects cannot be fully supported:

- tariffPeriod.timeOfUseRates
- solarFeedInTariff
- controlledLoad

This change request was raised by DEECA add the period field in the missing objects noted above addressing the existing gap in the standards so step tariffs to be calculated properly by the consumers of the data.

Whilst participants broadly supported the change, a few questions were raised during consultation.

- The need to know the specific start and end dates of step periods:
 - Analysis on this matter indicated that the step rates are calculated over a billing period and as such the start and end is implied accordingly (e.g.
 - https://www.globirdenergy.com.au/step-rates/)

- The DSB had further discussion on this with retailers, who noted they currently only share the period field with comparison sites like iSelect
- Based on discussions in the MI, there is lack of clear evidence for need to support
 the introduction of specific start and end dates for step calculations. These may be
 revisited in a future CR raised by the community if necessary
- Public vs private API version alignment:
 - The change proposed in this request would impact both PRD and consumer endpoints due to shared common plan structures
 - Given this change was raised for DEECA who are the data holders for public plan information (i.e. PRD), a question was raised about the need for having this change aligned with retailer held consumer data
 - As per the problem description, this issue impacts both PRD and consumer account detail endpoints. As noted in the original <u>comment</u>, the <u>period</u> field is essential in calculating step rates appropriately over a period of time which can be beneficial in plan comparison and for calculating rates for consumer invoices

It is also worth noting this change impacts the same API structures as the other Energy changes being recommended in this Decision Document.

Based on the above, this change is being recommended.

An FDO date of 11 November 2024 is being proposed, which is the last obligation date noted in the Obligation Dates Schedule. This is in alignment with the FDO of other Energy changes being proposed.

Issue 627 – EnergyPlanTariffPeriod – Change to daily supply charge

Link to issue:

https://github.com/ConsumerDataStandardsAustralia/standards-maintenance/issues/627

Change Impact

Breaking Change

Decision

The decision is to amend the EnergyPlanTariffPeriod with the changes to allow representation of banded daily supply charges:

 Add a new dailySupplyChargeType ENUM field to indicate of daily supply charges are single or banded with the following values:

```
"dailySupplyChargeType": ["SINGLE", "BAND"] // New optional ENUM field for daily supply charge type. Default value is SINGLE if field is not provided. Note: it is not a UType as it is an optional field
```

- Change the existing dailySupplyCharge to a conditional field, noting that it is mandatory if dailySupplyChargeType is SINGLE
- Add a new conditional bandedDailySupplyCharges object to allow represent daily supply charges. It is mandatory if dailySupplyChargeType is BAND

This change will result in new version of following APIs:

- Get Generic Plan Detail from v2 to v3
- Get Energy Account Detail from v3 to v4

- 11 November 2024 is recommended as the FDO for the change. This is the last obligation date noted in the Obligation Dates Schedule.
- 8 September 2025 is proposed as the retirement date for the deprecated versions of the above APIs.

Background

This change was raised by Ergon Energy to allow support of banded daily supply charges in the energy plans.

In the MI, two main issues were raised and discussed as part of this CR, which are summarised below:

1. Sharing of plan information with banded daily supply charges in CDR:

This is the primary issue for which this CR has been raised. Retailers can offer plans that can consist of banded daily supply charges. The standards currently do not cater for this and only allow for a single daily supply charge to be provided per plan.

Various options have been presented and discussed for this. Based on the feedback during the MI on the options, the option noted above is being recommended as it does not impact Data Holders that don't support banded daily supply charges whilst maintaining alignment with other common structures.

This would also enable AER/DECCA to start sharing banded daily supply charges once issue 2 noted below is resolved.

An example highlighting the detail of the change is below:

```
{
    "type": "ENVIRONMENTAL"
    "displayName": "string",
"startDate": "string",
    "endDate": "string",
    "dailySupplyChargeType": ["SINGLE", "BAND"], // New optional ENUM field for daily
supply charge type. Default value is SINGLE if field is not provided. Note: it is not a
UType as it is an optional field
    "dailySupplyCharge": "AmountString", // Conditional - Mandatory if
dailySupplyChargeType is SINGLE. NOTE: Field name typo corrected from
 dailySupplyCharges` to `dailySupplyCharge`
    "bandedDailySupplyCharges": [ // Conditional - Mandatory if dailySupplyChargeType
is BAND
       {
         "unitPrice": "string",
"measureUnit": ["KWH", "KVAR", "KVAR", "KWAR", "KW", "DAYS", "METER", "MONTH"],
// Optional. The measurement unit of rate. Assumed to be DAYS if absent
         "volume": 100 // Optional. Volume the charge applies to.
       }
     ],
    "timeZone": "LOCAL",
    "rateBlockUType": "singleRate",
}
```

Recommendation:

Given this is an existing issue DHs need resolved, the above change is being recommended with an

FDO of 11 November 2024, which is the last obligation date noted in the <u>Obligation Dates</u> <u>Schedule</u>. This is in alignment with the FDO of other Energy changes being proposed.

2. Consistent representation banded daily supply charges in CDR-PRD data and EME/AER channels:

During the MI, it was noted that retailers currently provide banded daily supply charges to AER via a workaround. AER noted that they currently do not process and share that information via their comparison sites.

As this issue relates to how the data is shared between retailers and AER/DECCA, it is outside the scope of MI and CDR to resolve. However, it was acknowledged as in important issue to address, specifically to ensure alignment between Energy PRD and account detail information which is vital for plan comparison and switching use cases.

Recommendation:

The recommendation is for this issue be resolved externally with relevant stakeholders, which the DSB can provide appropriate support for.

Feedback from participants supported the recommendations for the two issues.

Documentation and schema changes

The following change requests are for minor changes to correct formatting and spelling issues:

Issue #	Change Type	Change Description
#310 - Review date format conventions	Documentation change	Updated the date format in the 'Obligation Dates Schedule' table in the linked summary page to match the format in the 'Endpoint Version Schedule' tables to simplify cross-referencing. The format is YYYY-MM-DD.
#361 - Typo in sector identifier uri description	Documentation change	Corrected typo in the Description of `sector_identifier_uri`
#362 - Update PPID link	Documentation change	Updated 'Pairwise Pseudonymous Identifier (PPID)' link
#370 - Add 'Consumer Experience Principles' to the Introduction text in the Principles section of the CDS and add CX acronym	Documentation change	Added reference to 'Consumer Experience (CX) Principles' in the introductory sentence and reformatted CX Principle 4 and 5.
#371 - Avoid scrollbars for long lines	Standards publishing	Updated the stylesheet for the Standards pages to avoid horizontal scrollbars in the Version Delta area.
#376 - Custom field types for Response Headers are not displayed	Standards publishing	Updated the template for the Standards pages to output custom 'type' values defined in the schema specification files but not previously rendered in the documentation, and removed the unused 'Format' column for Response Headers.
#388 - Fix typo in Amending Authorisation Standards: Changing Attributes	Documentation change	Corrected a typo in the text: 'How a changed attributed is signified'.

Implementation considerations

When possible, consideration and preference to non-breaking change has been prioritised with community consultation. Where breaking changes have been recommended, future dated obligations have been proposed in consultation with participants during the course of the Maintenance Iteration to ensure sufficient lead time for implementation.

Implementation considerations for each change request have been considered and detailed within each change request summary.