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January 2021

**Goal / Mission Statement**

*To accelerate safe, reliable and economical interconnections of distributed energy resources in Connecticut, through a transparent and informal public forum where technical and policy stakeholders openly share their experience, knowledge and challenges, on common ground, where solutions and recommendations to policy makers strive for consensus, so that renewable energy in Connecticut can flourish, while leading the nation through an example of mutual respect and collaboration*.

**Voting Members**

The Interconnection Policy Working Group (IPWG) will consist of representatives from 1) State Agencies, 2) Electric Distribution Companies (EDCs), 3) DG Industry / Developers, and 4) Customers. A member or members(s) of the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority’s (Authority) staff assigned to the Office of Education, Outreach, and Enforcement (EOE) shall serve as the Facilitator. EOE shall notify the IPWG members and post on a publicly accessible website and/or in Docket No. 17-12-03RE06, or in another docket of the Authority’s choosing, the current staff member(s) assigned to serve as the Facilitator. The number of representatives from each of the stakeholder clusters is as follows:

1. EDCs 2 (1 from each of Eversource and United Illuminating)
2. Developers 2
3. CIEC 1
4. OCC 1
5. CT BETP 1

Each stakeholder shall designate its primary member prior to the first meeting of the IPWG.

Each primary member can designate an alternate (secondary) to represent itself or its organization, but only the primary or selected secondary representative shall have a seat at the main table. All attendees can participate in the group discussion; however, only the primary or secondary representative can participate in the final decision-making process. Additions and/or subtractions to the IPWG members list shall be discussed at meeting, although the final decision is left up to the Facilitator(s).

**Meeting Schedule and Process**

The IPWG shall meet on a monthly basis. Upon unanimous agreement of all stakeholders and the Facilitator, the IPWG may meet less frequently, but in no case shall the IPWG meet less often than once per quarter.

Notice of a regularly scheduled meeting and the agenda for the meeting shall be distributed to the IPWG members at least 10 business days in advance of the meeting. The notice and agenda shall also be posted on a publicly accessible website and in Docket No. 17-12-03RE06, or another docket of the Authority’s choosing.

Meeting notes shall be taken at each IPWG meeting and shall include the date, meeting location, members present, topics discussed and a descriptive account of all differences in opinion offered or positions taken regarding the topic at issue. The Facilitator(s) shall develop a schedule wherein, for each IPWG meeting, the designated IPWG member shall ensure the participation of an individual associated with his/her organization for the sole purpose of recording meeting notes. In the alternative, the designated IPWG member may elect to take the meeting’s notes while participating in the meeting. Each IPWG member shall review the meeting notes to ensure accuracy.

The reviewed notes shall be made available on a publicly accessible website and in Docket No. 17-12-03RE06, or another docket of the Authority’s choosing. Reports, documentation, presentations and other information referenced in the relevant notes shall also be available on the publicly accessible website and in Docket No. 17-12-03RE06, or another docket of the Authority’s choosing.

The Facilitator(s) or his/her designee from the IPWG will be required to report annually to the PURA Chairperson and his/her designees on topics undertaken in the prior twelve months. Annual meeting reports shall include summaries on all completed consensus and non-consensus items, outstanding topics, planned topics, and any other matters deemed relevant by the Facilitator(s). The meetings shall be publicly noticed and shall take place prior to December 1 each year, unless otherwise directed by the Authority.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

IPWG representatives and alternates will make every attempt to attend all Working Group meetings, to be on-time, and to review all documents disseminated prior to the meeting. If a representative or their alternate cannot attend a meeting, the representative should let the Facilitator(s) know prior to the meeting (by telephone or e-mail).

All representatives and alternates agree to act in good faith in the discussions. “Good faith” means that they will be forthright and communicative about the interests and preferences of their organization (and where appropriate, their stakeholder cluster), and will actively seek agreement wherever possible.

It is the responsibility of the IPWG representatives and alternates to keep their organizations and other organizations in their clusters informed of developments in the Working Group process.

The IPWG may designate subcommittees on specific topics. These subcommittees will be charged with bringing suggestions, ideas, and perhaps draft products back to the IPWG for discussion. Such subcommittees will work under the direction of the IPWG, and will not act or make decisions on its behalf.

When a particular topic implicates a technical standard or requires a technical solution, the Facilitator(s) shall consult with the facilitator(s) of the Interconnection Technical Working Group (“ITWG”) and may refer topics to the ITWG as needed.

**Choosing Topics**

In line with the IPWG’s mission statement, the IPWG shall prioritize topics where there is a possibility to reach consensus among the members. Any disputes over the topics to be addressed will be resolved by the Facilitator(s), in the Facilitator’s sole discretion.

As further detailed in the 100-day Sprint Working Group Final Report in Docket No. 17-12-03RE06, dated September 4, 2020, the IPWG shall begin by addressing the following topics:

* Review Interconnection Guidelines and Application Forms;
* Improve Transparency in Interconnection Process, such as:
	+ Public distribution system interconnection queues;
	+ Identify best uses of hosting capacity maps;
	+ Establish and make public reporting requirements;
	+ Investigate cost allocation methodologies;
	+ Review of LREC/ZREC program solicitations on interconnection process.

**Decision-making**

The goal of the process will be to make substantive decisions by consensus of the IPWG members, where consensus shall mean that all the representatives (or their alternates in the representative’s absence) are at least willing to live with a decision and choose not to dissent. If unable to consent, a representative will be expected to explain the reason for dissenting and to try and offer a positive alternative. Representatives are responsible for voicing their objections and concerns, and silence (or absence) will be considered consent.

The IPWG shall file a report to PURA when it has reached consensus on an issue or when a majority of representatives are in agreement and/or the Facilitator(s) believes that further discussion will no longer be productive. Such report will identify all areas of consensus for fast-track approval by the Authority. Such report will provide a detailed description of the alternative approaches preferred by Working Group representatives if and where consensus is not reached. For all areas of non-consensus, such report will provide all supporting documentation used by the IPWG during its discussion of the matter. In the case of non-consensus issues, ultimately the Authority will have final say on decisions.

In many cases, the ITWG and/or its technical expert will be asked to provide and demonstrate its recommendation or position on specific technical subjects where differences of opinions are present between groups. The technical expert shall elaborate on national best practices and experience, along with what makes the most sense for Connecticut. This information and recommendation by the ITWG/technical consultant will be used in the final decision-making process by the Facilitator(s) and the Authority.