



Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Meeting Summary

State of Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority Office of Education, Outreach & Enforcement

March 24, 2026 **subgroup** meeting summary: Revisions to the IX WG
Governance Framework

Introduction

On March 24th, GPI held a one-hour IX WG subgroup meeting to continue discussing revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework. Potential revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework were discussed in detail during the February 10, 2026, IX WG meeting. As documented in the summary for that meeting ([available here on the IX WG webpage](#)), many draft revisions discussed during that meeting were either supported or not opposed by IX WG members.¹ However, the following three topics warranted further discussion in a more focused subgroup setting.

- Topic A: Storage Representation among Developer Voting Members
- Topic B: Establishing New Voting Members
- Topic C: Inclusion of DEEP BETP as a Voting Member

In advance of this subgroup meeting, GPI distributed a version of the proposed revisions to Governance Framework document that incorporated the revisions that parties in attendance at the February 10th IX WG meeting either supported or did not oppose (see footnote and the February 10th IX WG meeting summary for more detail). However, this version of the document retained (in redline) the proposed changes related to these three outstanding topics for easy identification and to help facilitate discussion during the subgroup meeting.

The following pages provide an overview of the proposed changes as discussed during the subgroup meeting, and of subgroup meeting discussion. Following the subgroup meeting, GPI and EOE developed a revised version of the IX WG Governance Framework, which is included as an appendix to this meeting summary for review.

Overview of Proposed Changes and Discussion

¹ The February 10, 2026, IX WG meeting did not include a formal vote on any matters related to the IX WG Governance Framework. The overview captured in this introduction intends to provide an overall representation of participants' reactions to the proposed revisions on that date. When asked if participants took any issue with these proposed revisions, parties did not express concerns that warranted changes or updates to the proposed revisions.

Prior to discussing potential revisions related to the three topics listed above, Aileen Cole (GPI) provided a brief reminder overview of the items left unchanged when revising the IX WG Governance Framework, items that would be considered “minor” revisions, and some of the more substantive revisions. As in the February 10th IX WG meeting, subgroup participants had no questions or concerns regarding these revisions that warranted revisiting them for further discussion.

Next, Aileen Cole (GPI) provided an overview of the three topics that would be the focus of discussion throughout this subgroup meeting. Below, we offer a contextual summary of these proposed revisions and GPI and EOE’s rationale for proposing them, as well as an overview of participant discussion on these items.

Topic A: Storage Representation among Developer Voting Members

Context

The original 2021 version of the IX WG Governance Framework establishes two voting members (plus alternatives) to represent the DG Industry/Developers. Energy storage has been an increasing topic in Connecticut, including in the interconnection context. Recent storage-related PURA orders to the IX WG have included orders pertaining to bidirectional EVs, energy storage benchmarking, and the EDCs’ flexible interconnection proposal.

Seeking to align with observed trends in Connecticut—including increasing storage-related IX WG directives from PURA—GPI and EOE proposed formally establishing in the updated Governance Framework document that the two developer voting members should be required to represent both the solar and storage industries in some manner. GPI and EOE also noted that this was not inconsistent with the IX WG mission statement.

Summary of Participant Feedback

- Noel Lafayette noted that Massachusetts just ruled on “storage as a right,” indicating that storage is likely to indeed become a more widespread topic of discussion in Connecticut. Noel also noted that there are some entities in Connecticut that are not standalone storage companies, or that are microgrid companies (e.g., Scale Microgrids), which do have a storage component.
- Aileen Cole (GPI) clarified that this revision is not intended to stipulate that the storage representative must be a standalone storage developer—storage developer representation in the form of a microgrid developer, a developer that also does solar, or a representative from an industry association would also be consistent with this revision.
- Emma Marshall-Torres (Scale Microgrids) expressed support for ensuring that storage is represented as a voting member of the IX WG. Noel Lafayette noted that he felt that Scale Microgrids could be a good voting member, as they bring a lot of technical expertise in this area, as well as knowledge from other jurisdictions.
- Val Stori (GPI) asked whether participants had thoughts or questions regarding how many voting members there should be, and regarding a membership balance between developers and EDCs. Several parties felt that maintaining some form of balance between developer and EDC voting membership was important.
- Mike Trahan (ConnSSA) reminded participants of the origins of the IX WG and the original governance framework, which was to create a venue in which developers could

Speak directly to utilities. Mike wanted to ensure that revisions do not lead to the IX WG straying too far from that original vision.

- Carl Nowiszewski (Eversource) suggested that one potential means of clarification would be updating the “Developers” label in the list of voting members in the IX WG framework to “DER developers,” which is inclusive of a range of technologies.

Conclusion

Subgroup attendees did not express opposition to the inclusion of the language specifying that storage developers should have some form of representation among IX WG voting members, and in many ways expressed support for this update. GPI and EOE will incorporate IX WG Governance Framework revisions accordingly.

Topic B: Establishing New Voting Members

Context

The original 2021 Governance Framework is silent regarding how new entities can become voting members, but also does not preclude the addition of new voting members. The IX WG facilitator has the authority to add new IX WG voting members. GPI and EOE proposed language stating that parties wishing to become new IX WG voting members must indicate so at an IX WG meeting and stating that the addition of new IX WG voting members is at the discretion of the facilitator.

Summary of Participant Feedback

- Aileen Cole (GPI) asked participants whether they had perspectives regarding parameters that should be followed when considering whether to accept new IX WG voting members (e.g., number of voting members, whether the party brings a novel perspective to the list of voting members, that party’s alignment with the voting member roles and responsibilities as outlined in the Governance Framework, etc.)
- Joe Marranca (UI) emphasized the importance of striving for consensus, and noted that the more voting members there are, the harder it is to achieve consensus. Aileen Cole (GPI) asked if he felt there should be an absolute cap, or whether the concern was more oriented around reasonableness. Joe Marranca (UI) specified that maintaining an overall reasonable number of voting members was his primary concern.
- Mike Farrell (Trinity Solar) noted that anyone is able to participate in the IX WG. Any participant can use their voice to share their perspective. If what they present is compelling, it should be considered by the voting members. For this reason, Mike Farrell (Trinity Solar) favors keeping the list of voting members as-is.
- Carl Nowiszewski (Eversource) also emphasized the importance of maintaining an IX WG voting membership approach that aligns with the goal of consensus. He also noted that the addition of new voting members who specifically bring new perspectives not yet include on the current list of voting members is a valuable endeavor, and noted that highly technical representation among voting members has been lacking, and he would welcome that form of representation. Finally, Carl noted that originally, the IX WG was much more informal, and did not tend to respond to PURA orders in the manner that has occurred over recent years.

- GPI and EOE reminded participants that revisions to the IX WG framework are being discussed with the goal of aligning the framework with current IX WG practices, which are reflective of directives from PURA.
- Noel Lafayette noted that sometimes, the IX WG gets stuck on trying to achieve consensus on items that they are unlikely to achieve consensus on, and that sometimes it would be more productive to simply acknowledge where there isn't consensus. Aileen Cole (GPI) noted that there is existing Governance Framework language regarding noting where consensus is unlikely to be achieved, and the IX WG can lean more on that authority when and where needed.
- Mike Trahan (ConnSSA) expressed that he felt that the addition of new voting members should be left up to IX WG members, not the facilitator. EOE reminded participants that revisions to the Governance Framework are at the discretion of EOE. Ultimately, EOE has the authority to make these revisions, but wished to hear group feedback and perspectives in the process.

Conclusion

GPI and EOE will incorporate the draft language as presented in the proposed revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework. During the February 10, 2026 IX WG meeting, Connecticut Green Bank requested to be added to the list of voting members. The Facilitators feel that the Connecticut Green Bank brings a valuable perspective not yet represented among the list of voting members. They will therefore be added to the list of IX WG voting members.

Starting in 2026, GPI and EOE will review voting membership on an annual basis.

Topic C: Inclusion of DEEP BETP as a Voting Member

Context

DEEP BETP was not listed as a voting member in the 2021 Governance Framework document, though PURA included them as a voting member in the 2024 100-Day Sprint Process. However, DEEP waived their voting rights during the 100-Day Sprint Process. GPI and EOE proposed adding them to the list of IX WG voting members for consistency with PURA's most recent directive pertaining to IX WG voting membership.

Summary of Participant Feedback

- Throughout the subgroup meeting (and the February 10th IX WG meeting), several participants expressed that because DEEP has not been actively participating in the IX WG, they should not be added to the list of voting members outlined in the governance framework.
- James Talbert-Slagle (OCC) expressed that DEEP BETP brings a unique perspective and more of a technical perspective than OCC. However, they would need to be a more active participant in the IX WG (consistent with the voting member roles and responsibilities) to be a voting member.
- Cornelius Stevenson (UI) and Amanda Trinsey (CIEC) noted that they do not object to the inclusion of DEEP but felt that their formal inclusion likely warranted further discussion.
- Amanda Trinsey (CIEC), Mike Farrell (Trinity Solar), and Noel Lafayette sought further clarification on the potential addition of DEEP as a voting member. Mike Farrell asked

why they are being proposed as a voting member if they would likely abstain from voting, and Noel Lafayette asked who requested that DEEP be included as a voting member.

- GPI and EOE clarified that they are neutral regarding the inclusion of DEEP as a voting member. Their proposed inclusion was simply for alignment with a recent action from PURA and is a matter of open discussion.

Conclusion

GPI and EOE will not add DEEP BETP to the list of IX WG voting members in the Governance Framework document. If any party (including but not limited to DEEP BETP) in the future wishes to be considered for addition to the list of voting members, they must identify this preference at an IX WG meeting, as indicated in the language adopted for alignment with Topic B. When the facilitators conduct their annual review of voting members, they will consider any party's request to become a voting member.

Conclusion

The items below offer a high-level summary of revisions made and not made to the IX WG Governance Framework based on the discussion from this subgroup meeting and the February 10, 2026, IX WG meeting. An updated version of the IX WG Governance Framework is included as an appendix to this summary for review purposes.

- Items that did not warrant further revision based on discussions at the February 10th IX WG meeting (items left unchanged, minor revisions, and some more substantive revisions, as outlined in the February 10th IX WG meeting summary)
- GPI will update the "Developers" title in the list of voting representatives to instead state "DER Developers." Both the solar and storage industries must be represented in some form between the two DER Developer voting members.
- Parties seeking to become voting members must identify this preference at an IX WG meeting. Final decisions regarding changes to the list of voting representatives are up to the Facilitator. The Facilitator will review the list of voting members on an annual basis.
- Connecticut Green Bank will be added to the list of voting members. CT Green Bank raised the desire to become a voting member during the February 10th IX WG meeting. CT Green Bank participates extensively in IX WG meetings and brings a perspective not yet represented among the list of current voting members.
- DEEP BETP will not be added to this list of voting members at this time. DEEP BETP is free to request to become an IX WG voting member.

Appendix: IX WG Governance Framework—2026 Revisions

The updated 2026 IX WG Governance Framework is provided on the following pages for review.

Connecticut Distributed Generation Interconnection Working Group Governance Framework

Revised April 2026

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 Distributed Generation Interconnection Working Group (IXWG) will consist of representatives from, at a minimum, 1) state agencies, 2) electric distribution companies (EDCs), 3) DG industry / developers, and 4) groups representing customers. Additional parties are free to participate in the IXWG if interested. A member or members of the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority's (Authority) staff assigned to the Office of Education, Outreach, and Enforcement (EOE) shall serve as the Facilitator, and may be assisted by a consultant selected by EOE through a competitive RFP process. EOE and the selected consultant, if any, are referred to herein as the Facilitator. EOE shall notify the IXWG 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) and consultant, if any, assigned to serve as the Facilitator. The number of voting representatives from each of the stakeholder groups is as follows:

Voting Representative	Number of Votes
1. EDCs	2 (1 from each of Eversource and United Illuminating)
2. DER Developers	2 (1 representing solar developers and 1 representing storage developers; groups that represent both solar and storage developers are permitted to meet these requirements)
3. CIEC	1
4. OCC	1
5. Connecticut Green Bank	1

Additions and/or subtractions to the list of voting representatives shall be discussed at an IXWG meeting, although final decisions regarding changes to the list of voting representatives is left up to the Facilitator.

Each primary member can designate an alternate (secondary) to represent itself or its organization, but only the primary or selected secondary representative shall be eligible to vote. All attendees can participate in the group discussion; however, only the primary or secondary representative can participate in the final decision-making process.

The IXWG may also engage one or more third-party technical consultants/experts² to assist it with various matters. The technical expert will not be a voting member of the IXWG and shall report directly to the Facilitator(s). Any member may suggest a specific technical expert. However, any disagreements as to which expert(s) to engage shall be resolved by the Facilitator(s) in the Facilitator's sole discretion.

Any fees incurred by the IXWG for engagement with third-party technical consultants/experts must be deemed necessary and reasonable by both the Facilitator(s) and the Authority. Any budget for third-party technical consultants/experts must follow Section 16-18a of the General Statutes of Connecticut and be approved by the Facilitator(s) and the Authority.

Meeting Schedule and Process

The IXWG shall generally meet on a monthly basis. In no case shall the IXWG meet less often than once per quarter.

Notice of a regularly scheduled meeting shall be distributed to the IXWG members at least 10 business days in advance of the meeting. The agenda for the meeting shall be distributed to the IXWG members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

Meeting notes shall be taken by the Facilitator at each IXWG meeting and shall include the date, meeting location, topics discussed and a descriptive account of all differences in opinion offered or positions taken regarding the topic at issue.

Meeting notes shall be made available on a publicly accessible website. Reports, documentation, presentations and other information referenced in the relevant notes shall also be made available to IXWG members.

Any proposals and the results of any votes on those proposals during an IXWG meeting shall be clearly identified in the meeting summaries. This includes identification of which voting representatives supported or opposed a proposal subject to vote, whether a voting representative abstained from voting, and whether voting representatives did or did not achieve consensus on the proposal.

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

Roles and Responsibilities

IXWG 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

² E.g. EPRI, RAP, etc.

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 stakeholders) and will actively seek agreement wherever possible.

It is the responsibility of the IXWG voting representatives and alternates to keep their organizations and stakeholders informed of developments in the Working Group process.

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

Choosing Topics

In line with the IXWG mission statement, the IXWG shall prioritize topics where there is a possibility to reach consensus among the members, as well as topics associated with the Authority’s Orders to the IXWG. IXWG members are free to inform the Facilitator of additional topics of interest they would like to discuss with the IXWG, so long as those topics are relevant to the group’s interconnection focus. Absent direction from the Authority, decisions regarding which topics will be addressed by the IXWG will be determined by the Facilitator.

Decision-making

The goals of the IXWG voting process will be to

1. Achieve consensus on interconnection-related issues where possible;
2. Make substantive decisions by consensus of the IXWG members, when consensus is possible; and
3. Document non-consensus determinations, including which parties did and did not support certain items.

“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.

EOE may file a quarterly letter to the Authority to document the proposals the IXWG voted on during meetings in that quarter, and the results of those votes (consensus or non-consensus, including documentation of support from each voting representative). In this filing, EOE may include the topics the IXWG discussed as well as a list of topics—if any—on which the Facilitators believe further discussion will not be productive. For all issues and proposals, the Authority will make the final determinations and decisions.