



Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Meeting Summary

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

June 2, 2026 Meeting Summary

NOTE: On Friday, June 12th, GPI sent IX WG members a draft version of the June 2nd IX WG meeting summary for review. IX WG members who attended the June 2nd IX WG meeting were permitted to suggest revisions to the summary for GPI and EOE consideration. Suggested revisions must pertain to whether the summary accurately reflects meeting facts. The summary review period is not an opportunity for participants to add new items or details to the points discussed during the meeting. Suggested revisions were due no later Friday, June 19th. GPI reviewed all suggested revisions to determine whether incorporating them into the revised meeting summary would be appropriate.

Substantive suggested revisions found to be appropriate for incorporation are reflected in this final version in red for clarity and transparency purposes. Minor revisions such as grammar and punctuation corrections are not indicated in red text but have been incorporated to improve clarity.

Introduction

The June 2, 2026 IX WG meeting focused on the following items:

- EDC presentation on straw proposal for interconnecting bidirectional EVs
- EDC presentation Hosting Capacity Map updates
- Flex IX WG updates
- Other items, including ISO-NE resources

The following pages provide an overview of IX WG discussion on these items.

EDCs' straw proposal for interconnecting bidirectional EVs

Context

On December 17, 2025, PURA released its [2025 ESS Decision](#) in Docket No. 25-08-05. The Decision contained two orders pertaining to bidirectional EVs.

- **Order 20** directs the ESS program administrators (the EDCs and the Connecticut Green Bank) to establish a Bidirectional EV Working Group. The Order highlights a number of requirements for the Bidirectional EV Working Group and establishes that the program administrators must submit a Bidirectional EV Report by August 1, 2026 that addresses these requirements. The Bidirectional EV Working Group started meeting in March.¹
- **Order 25** specifically directs that by no later than July 1, 2026, the EDCs must file a recommended process for interconnecting bidirectional EVs. This filing must include proposed redlined and clean revisions to the interconnection guidelines and a description of necessary updates to PowerClerk to enable this process. The order requires IX WG involvement with the development of this process.

GPI clarified that to enable compliance with the EDCs' July 1, 2026 filing timeline for Order 25, the IX WG is targeting completion of this item by mid-June.

EDCs' Initial Straw Proposal

The EDCs' initial straw proposal is presented below. GPI provided this language to IX WG participants in advance of the April 7th IX WG meeting, and the EDCs briefly presented their approach during the meeting.

Bidirectional EV Interconnection Process

It is the position of the EDCs that electric vehicles with bidirectional capabilities, commonly referred to as V2X, V2G, V2H, and any other terminology referring to export of power from a vehicle to a grid connected load and operated in parallel with a power source provided by the utility, will be treated as any other inverter-based battery interconnections as defined in those guidelines within this document with the exception that the equipment shall be UL1741 Supplement SC at such time this standard is released, and UL9741 Standard for Safety of Electric Vehicle Power Export Equipment (EVPE). This requirement is in addition to compliance with Supplements SA and SB otherwise required in these Guidelines for ESS.

Special Note: If the bidirectional charger is integral to the vehicle itself, the vehicle will not be permitted to export to the grid, or offset a load connected in parallel with a grid source of power at any location other than the point of interconnection with Municipal approval, a meter change when required, and the Permission to Operate documentation. Any material modifications to, or replacement of, bi-directional charging equipment will be subject to the requirements as otherwise referenced within these Guidelines.

¹ For more information about the Bidirectional EV Working Group, please refer to that workgroup's webpage, available here: <https://energystoragect.com/bevwg/>

In presenting their straw proposal, the EDCs noted that they largely view an EV battery the same way they view any bidirectional battery, so a standard process for interconnecting a bidirectional battery should apply in many instances. However, they noted that the most important part of interconnection is ensuring that the point of interconnection is associated with a specific location, meaning a car with a bidirectional battery cannot necessarily interconnect anywhere. The EDCs also noted that large setups (e.g., bus station charging) may require additional study.

The EDCs overall stated that this was an initial proposal and they are open to further iteration and discussion, as this is an emerging area.

Subgroup meeting on bidirectional EV interconnection

As a result of the initial discussion, the IX WG opted to hold a subgroup meeting on the topic of bidirectional EV interconnection, which occurred on May 1. A summary of the subgroup meeting can be found here: [May 1, 2026 \(Bidirectional EV Interconnection subgroup\)](#)

EDCs' Redlined Straw Proposal

The EDCs presented a redlined straw proposal to the IX WG on June 2. GPI provided this language to IX WG participants in advance of the June 2nd IX WG meeting, and the EDCs discussed the proposed changes during the IX WG meeting. These redlines are based on discussion at the subgroup meeting as well as information provided by developers to the EDCs.

Joe Debs, Eversource, provided the initial walk-through of the proposal noting that the EDCs:

- Removed reference to V2X, V2G, V2H as these do not have standard definitions
- Added differentiation between AC and DC bidirectional charging systems
- Need to clarify which Certified Requirement Decision (CRD) should be referred to.
 - o Zach Woogen, Vehicle Grid Integration Council (VGIC), commented that the CRD is for DER systems. Tesla will share the document with the EDCs.

Bidirectional EV Interconnection Process (VGIC suggested edits, May 2026)

It is the position of the EDCs that electric vehicle charging systems ~~operating in with bidirectional capabilities mode, commonly referred to as V2X, V2G, V2H, and any other terminology referring to export of power from a vehicle to a~~ while grid-connected ~~load~~ and operated in parallel with a power source provided by the utility will be treated as any other inverter-based battery interconnections as defined in those guidelines within this document, ~~except for the following provisions:~~

- *~~Bidirectional charging systems with an inverter external to the vehicle, referred to as DC Bidirectional Charging Systems, and subject to the guidelines for inverter-based battery interconnection within this document with the exception that the equipment shall be certified to UL1741 Supplement SB at such time this standard is released, and UL9741 Standard for Safety of Electric Vehicle Power Export Equipment (EVPE).~~*

- *Bidirectional charging systems with on-board inverter functions in the electric vehicle, referred to as AC Bidirectional Charging Systems, and subject to the guidelines for inverter-based battery interconnection within this document, must either:*
 - (a) Be certified as a DER System through the relevant UL 1741 SB Certification Requirement Decision (CRD), or;*
 - (b) Use an EV charging station ~~through~~certified to UL 1741 SC. ~~These requirements are in addition to compliance with Supplements SA and SB otherwise required in these Guidelines for ESS.~~*

All grid tied bidirectional equipment will be required to submit an interconnection application.

Special Note: If the bidirectional charger is integral to the vehicle itself, the vehicle will not be permitted to export to the grid, or offset a load connected in parallel with a grid source of power at any location other than the point of interconnection with Municipal approval, a meter change when required, and the Permission to Operate documentation. Any material modifications to, or replacement of, bi-directional charging equipment will be subject to the requirements as otherwise referenced within these Guidelines.

Discussion

Discussion began around the topic of which bidirectional equipment must be interconnected.

Zach Woogen, VGIC, commented that the intent was to clarify that there is charging equipment that can be configured in different modes. The sentence “all grid-tied BEV equipment will be required to submit an IX application” may create confusion because it seems to indicate that anything grid-tied must be interconnected.

Joe Debs, Everource, sought to clarify who controls the bidirectionality and how. With multiple modes available, is it possible for a customer, for example, to change the bidirectionality without EDC approval? Joe expressed concern over this possibility.

Zach Woogen, VGIC, clarified that such functionality does not exist today. This functionality has to be enabled by the manufacturer or an authorized third party, such as a certified installer.

Dominic Gatti, Tesla, confirmed that this information is correct: the settings are determined in the commissioning phase, and then an installer configures the settings upon installing the equipment.

Rob Sazanowicz (UI) and Joe Debs (Eversource) expressed satisfaction with this answer and add that it is important for the industry to follow the rules and understand that there are consequences for the utility and the customer if bidirectionality is turned on without an IX agreement. The permission-to-operate letter identifies whether a customer is authorized to interconnect in bidirectional mode. Joe suggested the straw proposal be revised, and developers would like to be able to discuss and review the final language.

In addition, due to some confusion around whether Tesla’s website provides instruction on how customers can enable their inverters. By mid-June, Tesla will provide the EDCs with an overview and demonstration of what is technically possible for customers to do. The website instructions are for certified personnel, who are the only people that have the ability to configure the equipment.

Zach Woogen, VGIC, will send additional documents from an EPRI-commissioned report with similar findings.

Next steps: EDCs and interested developers to meet by mid-June to further revise straw proposal. GPI will then host a subgroup meeting the week of June 22nd to discuss the final version.

Val Stori, GPI, then sought clarification on which operational modes require an IX application.

Rob Sazanowicz, UI, responded that the EDCs are taking the position that all of them (V2X, V2G, V2H) need an interconnection application. This would be for scenarios where the bidirectional ability is not on and not able to be turned on.

Dominic Gatti, Tesla, V2H is non-parallel and therefore doesn't require an IX application. Would a Power Wall, for example, in backup-only, non-grid operation, need IX application?

Rob Sazanowicz, UI, replied that it would; it's not enough for the inverter to simply be set to don't export.

Dominic Gatti, Tesla, added that the straw proposal should seek to ensure that it does not create confusion for these specific scenarios like backup-only.

Conversation then transitioned to potential incompatibility with current tariff/netting rules. Val Stori, GPI, added that this concern was raised initially, but it was determined that it does not apply directly to the PURA order to the IX WG on a BEV interconnection proposal. Jenn Runyon, Eversource, added that this netting issue was raised in the ESS V2G working group but that it also acknowledged that the V2G WG won't be able to solve it as a group and that it wasn't part of the directive from PURA to the V2G WG.

Rob Sazanowicz, UI, raised that the utility sees an inherent incompatibility with the current netting rules. It has filed a motion or request for guidance with PURA. The utility has had to put some projects on hold due to issues in which clean energy RECs were affected.

Joe Debs, Eversource, added that the guidelines simply say you need to comply with the metering requirements. Agreed that it is an important issue that needs to be discussed.

Zach Woogen, VGIC, asked what options are being considered as alternatives for batteries so they would not violate requirements?

Rob Sazanowicz, UI, replied that UI's suggestion was to modify the netting going forward, to not need a production meter. UI doesn't want to see a situation in which customers can only use battery with solar. Hope to find a way to simplify netting, but don't know if that will happen. They are discussion estimation of RECs based on system sizes. Billing would still be done with the utility meter, but the production meter is what we want to find a different method for. We could eliminate that equipment all together. We have given ourselves an internal deadline of June 30 to hear from PURA.

EDC presentation on new Hosting Capacity Maps

Context

- John Kreso, Eversource, presented a demonstration of Eversource's new hosting capacity maps. This is the first major revision since the last update. The new hosting

capacity maps have increased interactivity and take a foundational approach to potentially enable real-time data updates in the future.

An overview of the changes made to Massachusetts' HCMs can be viewed here: [Link to MA YouTube Overview](#)

Discussion

Note: Grid edge areas are defined as the top ten percent of circuits with the highest number of outages per customer during major storms since July 1, 2012, and the top ten percent of circuits with the longest outages due to major storms since July 1, 2012. Eversource generates a new list for Grid Edge areas annually.

The following Q&A took place between IX WG members and Eversource.

Luke Hanson, Scale Microgrids: Regarding feeder hosting capacity headroom—is that just based on the cable, not based on voltage meters? Does the power flow consider violations?

- A: Power flow considers reverse power flow as well as voltage and amperage.

Luke Hanson, Scale Microgrids: If a parcel is served by a primary meter, is the hosting capacity defined by what is run from the street or at the street level?

- A: Eversource is looking at the closest serving service and that may not appear for new services. Eversource IX team weighs in on exact POCC; Eversource is seeking to automate this information upload.

Sara Pyne, CT Green Bank, inquires if there is an available SOP or report that can be shared on the Eversource website for developers? And if any discrepancies are found, to whom should IX WG members reach out?

- A. You can reach out to me John at john.kreso@eversource.com). John can answer all software questions, and if the question is about capacity, John can route the questions to the right team. John provided the link to the MA recording as the best resource available on how the maps work.

Tom Wemyss, PurePoint Energy, asked how often the maps are updated?

- A. Every two weeks and Eversource is increasing its ability to make the updates weekly.

L Taylor, asked whether the Grid Edge layer / shading or the grid edge field in the parcel details pane should both be reviewed to determine eligibility, or one over the other?

- A. This appears when there are two feeders close to the property and the system is trying to determine whether one feeder is more accurate. The system is using proximity on what appears to be the closest section to that parcel. That logic is not always correct. Eversource has made updates and will continue to rectify.

Tom Wemyss, PurePoint Energy, asked whether the capacity is inclusive of what is in the queue and submitted interconnection requests?

- A. Yes. The power flow includes what is online and what is in the queue (noting that the queue has a 2-week lag)..

Alex Marroquin, Ion Solar Pros, asked whether there is a plan to get to real-time updates in the future?

- A. Yes. Switching to this system is foundational to making those improvements.

Tom Wemyss, PurePoint Energy, asked whether Eversource could help developers understand the “seasons” tab.

- A. Shows the different constraints for each season. Eversource gets historical as well as forward-looking forecasts for load. It is using these forecasts to show how the capacity changes for each season. Right now, the data is displayed at the station-level profiles, but want to move to give feeder-level and then instance-level info. This will improve as AMI rolls out. This information does not replace a study, but it identifies major issues. Developers should take it into consideration before submitting an IX application. If you are proposing something that exceeds the values on the map, you should expect to need upgrades.

L Taylor requested that Eversource reroute the previous Grid Edge link to direct to the new HCMs. Many contractors may have the previous version bookmarked and this will ensure they are aware and accessing the current version.

The old link is here:

<https://eversource.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2f0c365e197f4ce0b9ddf4c988d2ea57> A. Eversource will work on that update.

Luke Hanson, Scale Microgrids, asked Eversource to explain the typical scope of the pre-application process and how it differs from a feasibility study?

- A. CT does not have a pre-application process. A feasibility study will give a ballpark cost to help developers determine whether they want to pursue a project, if it's cost-effective. This study mostly looks at the thermal rating of the devices. Feasibility study delivers a non-binding cost estimate. The impact study is more focused on voltage, flicker, dynamic response, and de-islanding response.

Next Steps

Eversource to update link to the HCMs.

FlexIX Updates

Val Stori, GPI, provided the following overview:

- The next FlexIX WG is scheduled for June 30th at 1:30 ET
- Participants are encouraged to review previous Flex IX materials including
 - PURA Technical Meeting 2, Docket No. 25-01-27 - Interconnection Process Modifications Link to YouTube recording:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wno_NgmvmvmtQ
 - UI and Eversource [March 16, 2026, FlexIX proposal](#)

Discussion

Joe Debs, Eversource, noted that the EDCs have decided that the workgroup should continue to meet; the next meeting should review the scope. Joe expressed that participants should review that scope and that developers should encourage their technical experts to attend.

Noel Lafayette reiterated that the FlexIX WG needs technical people and engineers to participate.

Next Steps

GPI to send the June 30 meeting invitation to the IX WG list and encourage technical leads to attend.

ISO-NE Resources

Val Stori, GPI, reminded the IX WG that the conversation around improved timelines and costs revealed that for projects over 1MW, ISO-NE gets involved. This process is not transparent and the EDCs do not have visibility into the ISO's timelines for transmission studies. GPI proposed that ISO-NE be invited to an IX WG meeting to discuss their study process. Val asked the group for ideas on what we would specifically like ISO-NE to present.

EOE staff shared the following ISO-NE resources which are relevant to IX WG participants:

- [Consumer Liaison Group](#)
- [2025 Capacity, Energy, Loads, and Transmission \(CELT\) report \(excel workbook\)](#)
- Components of the CELT such as the heat pump forecast, EV forecast, battery energy storage system forecast and large loads forecast are available at the [Load Forecast Committee webpage](#).
- [2025 CELT Forecast analysis](#); 2026 update anticipated May 1
- Information on how to download the [ISO To Go mobile app](#)
- [ISO NEWSWIRE news blog](#)
- [ISO-NE Corporate Governance > Budget](#)

Discussion

Joe Debs, Eversource, provided an update that ISO-NE is determining which projects need transmission studies by October. This is good news as some projects will not need studies.

Joe suggested that developers should have representatives attend the ISO's RC Reliability Committee meetings where ISO-NE are making rule changes. The EDCs cannot represent developers in these meetings. Would like to see better coordination between the solar industry and ISO-NE.

ISO-NE Committees: [Committees and Groups](#)

Luke Hanson, Scale Microgrids, noted that there is a disconnect because the developers for the study, and thus expect the study update to come from the EDCs. It would be useful to communicate to ISO-NE that updates should be provided to the EDCs.

Next Steps and Action Items

The table below provides a summary of next steps and action items related to the topics discussed during the June 2, 2026 IX WG meeting.

Responsible Party	Action Item(s)
EDCs	Update existing Grid Edge link to redirect to new Hosting Capacity Maps
Developers	Tesla and other manufacturers to meet with EDCs to discuss equipment capability and customer controls
GPI/EOE	- Schedule a bidirectional EV subgroup meeting before July 1 filing date - Share resources from Hosting Capacity Map demo - Invite IX WG to next Flex IX WG, which will be held on June 30
IX WG	Review FlexIX WG scope and determine if additional items should be added. Members should send technical leads and/or engineers to the Flex IX meeting.