

# **Annex 6 – Non-Minimum Viable Product (MVP) Final Recommendations**

All of the Non-MVP aspects of our final recommendations can be considered as semi-flexible i.e. so long as the intent behind the final recommendation (as per this report) remains in place, the means of change and the exact changes to be made can be agreed when the changes are further developed at the appropriate time.

Reform Component	Final Recommendations
Target Model Add-on (TMA) D5 and TMA D6	To standardise and simplify the terms and conditions in the connection offer (TMA D5); limited to agreeing a common structure rather than agreeing a standard agreement across all Transmission Owners. To introduce a requirement to accept a standard form contract as part of the connection application process (TMA D6), with non-standard terms offered to developers leading up to Gate 1. However, such changes are not necessarily part of the MVP.
TMA E1 to TMA E3	To make a recommendation to the Connections Delivery Board in Q1 2024 on whether to make further changes to TMA E1 to TMA E3, in line with the recommendation in the Connections Action Plan. In order to do this we will further explore the cost benefit case of further changes to TMA E1 to TMA E3. Therefore, such potential changes are not necessarily part of the MVP.
Offshore Considerations	The Target Model Option (TMO) 4 process deviations related to Leasing Round Capacity Requests / Reservations and Letter of Authority Equivalent for offshore projects are to be explored in parallel to the MVP (but are not part of the MVP).
TMA I and TMA N	The criteria to reject a new application needs to be drafted in such a way that it is fair and transparent, with input from Government and/or Ofgem, and to be in line with relevant policy directives. Also, guidance for what aspect of an existing application can be modified must also be created. To future proof TMO4 we should (in limited circumstances) have the ability under licence to reject a properly submitted application. However, this is not necessarily part of the MVP.
TMA K2, TMA K3, TMA K4 and TMA K6	Although we propose to continue to progress with the improvements proposed under TMA K2, TMA K3, TMA K4 and TMA K6 (all related to capacity products) they are not essential in TMO4. We therefore do not propose that these should form part of the MVP for the reformed connections process.
TMA C	An optional optioneering route should remain an option for developers within the reformed connections process. However, we do not believe this should be part of the MVP and as such we propose to develop this as part of our work on secondary processes (as considered in TMA O).
TMA O	We will review and clarify exactly what is considered to be a secondary process and exactly what is considered to require the primary process (i.e. TMO4), including in respect of significant Modification Applications. This will be undertaken in detailed process design and implementation as part of Phase 3. Whilst clarification of what is to be within the primary process is considered to be MVP, the subsequent development of changes to existing secondary processes is not necessarily part of the MVP, but it could be beneficial to develop some or all such changes in similar timescales.