



Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Subgroup Meeting Summary

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

May 1, 2026 Bidirectional EV Interconnection Subgroup Meeting Summary

NOTE: On Monday, May 11th, GPI sent IX WG members a draft version of the May 1 BEV IX Subgroup meeting summary for review. IX WG members who attended the subgroup 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. This 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 than Monday, May 18th. No revisions were received by GPI and EOE.

Introduction and Context

The May 1, 2026 IX WG subgroup meeting focused on the EDCs' initial straw proposal for interconnecting bidirectional EVs in accordance with Orders 20 and 25 in PURA's its [2025 ESS Decision](#) in Docket No. 25-08-05.

- **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.²

The May 1st IX WG subgroup meeting was a continuation of the discussion on the straw proposal during the April 7, 2026 full IX WG meeting, during which the EDCs' presented their

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

² 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.

initial straw proposal for interconnecting BEVs (provided below for reference purposes).³

Bidirectional EV Interconnection Process [EDCs' initial proposal from 4/7 IX WG meeting]

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.

In advance of the subgroup meeting, GPI encouraged BEV parties and other interested stakeholders to coordinate with one another to identify and propose specific revisions to the EDCs' preliminary proposal, informed by the April 7th IX WG discussion on this topic. BEV parties and the EDCs were both encouraged to come to the May 1st subgroup meeting

Discussion: Straw proposal for interconnecting bidirectional EVs

Aileen Cole (GPI) provided an overview of the feedback received during the April 7th IX WG meeting and afterwards via email. A summary of major discussion points is provided below.

- Steve Letendre (VGIC) sought clarification regarding whether there was a procedure for adding BEVs at sites with existing solar.
- Nachum Sadan (Grid Edge Networks) clarified that in the feedback summary listed above, V2X should be considered under V2H and both should include definitions.
 - V2X: Vehicle is connected to a charger and the charger is connected to the grid. The customer does not intend to export to the grid but rather to operate in parallel and UL 1547 is still required. In this case, the EDCs would need to limit export capability—this is being tested at the New Haven pilot project. When this ability to export exists, the UL standard still requires protection to prevent export.
- Zach Woogan (VGIC) noted that the feedback overview was generally accurate, but clarified that for systems not operating in parallel (i.e., they cannot physically nor programmatically discharge to the grid), the manufacturer could unlock that functionality if the customer requests functionality to discharge to the grid.

³ During the May 1st IX WG subgroup meeting, the EDCs confirmed that this remained the most up-to-date version of the straw proposal language.

- There are three layers of capability to discharge to the grid: technical, regulatory/legal, and practical.
 - Different jurisdictions treat “capability” differently. In MD, MI, and CA (and proposed in NV and MA), the capability to export is a legal and regulatory issue (vs a standards issue).
- Joe Debs (Eversource) clarified that if you operate in parallel, but you are not exporting to the grid, but you are generating power, then you need an interconnection agreement.
 - Interconnection agreement required: Parallel export and parallel non-export
 - Interconnection agreement not required: Operating in bidirectional mode only when islanded or never operating in bidirectional mode
- Steve Letendre (VGIC) re-raised the question of whether the second paragraph of the straw proposal is necessary.
 - Joe Debs (Eversource) explained that the intent is to make it clear that a vehicle that can discharge can’t interconnect anywhere there is a charging station.
 - Steve Letendre (VGIC) clarified that once a BEV has permission-to-operate and has received interconnection approval, it cannot charge unless it is plugged into an EVSC. Steve may propose some redline edits to the paragraph but generally, does not oppose Joe’s concerns.
- Carl Nowiszewski (Eversource) inquired about the BEV program compensation structure more broadly (e.g., Could a whole neighborhood plug into one inverter and be compensated? Is the incentive based on discharge during outage or peak events?)
 - Madeline Frierson (Customized Energy Solutions) explained that the ESS program provides incentive and compensation for battery storage. The program is considering how to expand its offerings to BEVs.
 - Sara Pyne (CT Green Bank) added that compensation is based on performance responding to ESS program criteria events, which is tied to a battery at one location. The ESS program currently allows for a non-exporting EV and the BEV Workgroup is discussing how to treat non-exporting systems.
- Sara Pyne (CT Green Bank) asked whether there are any currently BEVs seeking to interconnect.
 - Carl Nowiszewski (Eversource) replied that there is one BEV application in the queue.
 - Jennifer Runyon (Eversource) added that another application is expected from the New Haven pilot. PowerClerk is being adjusted to meet the project’s needs. There appears to be developer confusion when filling out the interconnection application around whether the system is interconnecting via AC (inverter/charger) or DC (battery inside the vehicle) and whether to use the nameplate rating or the AC-side rating.

Aileen Cole (GPI) suggested that BEV parties collaborate to develop redlined revisions to the initial straw proposal language that take into account the items discussed during the April 7th IX WG meeting, feedback received via email, and the items discussed during the May 1st subgroup meeting. Ultimately, parties appeared to be generally aligned regarding much of the proposal and potential revisions to the proposal.

BEV parties agreed to send their redlined edits to the EDCs by no later than May 8th. The EDCs agreed that this would be helpful but noted that the timeline between receiving revisions on May 8th and the IX WG meeting scheduled for May 12th would not be sufficient time to review and incorporate suggested revisions as appropriate. GPI will consider alternative schedule options.⁴

Next Steps and Action Items

Responsible Party	Action Item(s)
Developers	Submit redlined edits and additions on the straw proposal by 5/8
EDCs	EDCs to revise straw proposal and present at the next full IX WG meeting or a subgroup meeting in late May.

⁴ GPI and EOE have rescheduled the May IX WG meeting from 5/12 to 5/26 to accommodate these timeline concerns.