



Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Meeting Summary

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

Summary of the February 10, 2026 CT IX WG Meeting

NOTE: On Thursday, February 19th, GPI sent IX WG members a draft version of the February 10th IX WG meeting summary for review. IX WG members who attended the February 10th 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. 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 Thursday, February 26th. GPI and EOE reviewed all suggested revisions to determine whether incorporating them into the revised meeting summary would be appropriate.

IX WG member-suggested revisions that GPI and EOE felt were appropriate to incorporate into the final meeting summary have been incorporated into this revised meeting summary. Substantive revisions are reflected 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.

Table of Contents

- Table of Contents**..... 1
- Introduction**..... 2
- Meeting Summary** 2
 - Presentation and Discussion: Draft Revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework** ... 2
 - Items left unchanged (overview and participant discussion) 3
 - Minor revisions (overview and participant discussion) 4
 - Substantive revisions (overview and participant discussion)..... 5
 - General Feedback on Proposed Revisions to the Governance Framework..... 7
 - Action Items: IX WG Governance Framework Revisions 7
 - Discussion: Dispatch limiting schedules for ESS projects enrolled in the Connected Solutions program** 8
 - Action Items: Dispatch Limiting Schedules 8
 - Presentation and Discussion: EDC Overview of Draft Flex IX Proposal** 9
 - EDC Presentation..... 9
 - Participant Q&A/Discussion..... 10
 - Action Items: Flex IX Proposal..... 11
 - Other Items** 11
 - Bidirectional EV Charging Workgroup 11
 - Motion No. 17 (Docket No. 25-01-27), pertaining to Proposals 2 and 3 11
 - Next Steps and Action Items** 11
- Attachment A: Draft Proposed Revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework** .. 13

Introduction

Since Fall 2023, The Great Plains Institute (GPI)—in collaboration with Jamie Spannhake and Becca Adams, the EOE Staff assigned to work with GPI—has facilitated PURA’s Interconnection Working Group (IX WG). The February 10, 2026 IX WG meeting included discussion on the following items.

- GPI and EOE’s **draft** revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework
- Dispatch limiting schedules for ESS projects enrolled in the Connected Solutions program
- Flex IX Working Group Update and Proposal Overview
- Other items
 - Annual Energy Storage Solutions Program review, Docket No. 25-08-05. PURA directs Program Admins to convene a Bidirectional EV Working Group and to file, "on behalf of the DER IX WG" a recommended process for interconnecting BEVs.
 - Dan Crisp requested that an additional item be added to the agenda based on a recent PURA ruling on Motion No. 17 in Docket No. 25-01-27,¹ pertaining to Sprint Proposals 2 & 3. The UI-proposed timeline, which PURA directed the EDCs to follow in its order, indicated that this item could be discussed at the February 10, 2026 IX WG meeting in advance of a March 10, 2026 filing deadline.²

Meeting Summary

Presentation and Discussion: Draft Revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework

The IX WG created the [Governance Framework](#) in January 2021. The framework can be updated so long as it remains consistent with PURA’s [November 25, 2020 Order](#) in Docket 17-12-03-RE06, which directed that the IX WG establish bylaws.

The Governance Framework contains several IX WG processes and procedures, some of which have not been in practice since before GPI began facilitating the IX WG in Fall 2023. During the December 9, 2025 IX WG meeting, GPI proposed that GPI and EOE could develop a draft revised/redlined Governance Framework document (for IX WG review), with revisions intended to more closely align with actual IX WG operations. No developers, EDCs, or other IX WG members expressed opposition to revisiting the Governance Framework, or to GPI and EOE developing and distributing draft revisions to the Governance Framework for IX WG review.

¹ Link to Motion No. 17:

[https://www.dpuc.state.ct.us/dockcurr.nsf/4b3c728dd1c0d642852586db0069aa70/a168b08d639ca90f85258d9400536e7e/\\$FILE/25-01-27%20Motion%20No.%2017%20Ruling.pdf](https://www.dpuc.state.ct.us/dockcurr.nsf/4b3c728dd1c0d642852586db0069aa70/a168b08d639ca90f85258d9400536e7e/$FILE/25-01-27%20Motion%20No.%2017%20Ruling.pdf)

² Note that this motion was issued on Wednesday, February 4, 2026, the same day that GPI sent participants the agenda for the Tuesday, February 10, 2026, IX WG meeting. For this reason, it was not able to be included on the meeting agenda, which already contained several items requiring detailed discussion.

GPI distributed draft redline revisions to IX WG participants on February 4, 2026. During the February 10, 2026 meeting, GPI provided an overview of the draft revisions for IX WG review and discussion. This presentation was divided into the following three components:

- Items left unchanged
- Minor revisions
- Substantive revisions

Following presentation of each of three components, GPI paused for participant comment and discussion related to each item. Presentation and discussion is summarized below. **A copy of the draft redlined revisions discussed at the February 10, 2026 IX WG meeting is included as Attachment A to this summary for reference purposes.** These draft redlined revisions are not intended to be interpreted as formal, finalized revisions to the Governance Framework.

Items left unchanged (overview and participant discussion)

First, GPI provided an overview of the following items from the Governance Framework, which were not revised. GPI and EOE felt that many of these items remained core to the purpose and operation of the IX WG and the responsibilities of IX WG members and thus did not feel that they required update or revision.

- Goal/Mission Statement
- Definition of “consensus”
- Ability for IXWG to engage third-party technical consultants and to establish subcommittees
- Meeting frequency (generally monthly, minimum quarterly)
- Voting member roles and responsibilities
 - Attempt to attend all IXWG meetings
 - Review relevant materials in advance of the meetings
 - Act in good faith during IXWG discussions
 - Keep the organizations they represent informed of IXWG work and developments
- Ability for voting members to designate alternates

No IX WG participants expressed concern with these items remaining unchanged.

Meeting summary continues on following page.

Minor revisions (overview and participant discussion)

Next, GPI provided an overview of the following minor revisions made to the Governance Framework. These were items that GPI/EOE updated, but the updates would not result in substantive changes to IX WG operations.

Minor Revision	IX WG Participant Feedback
Updated references to ITWG/IPWG to IXWG	None
Moved/relocated some parts of the framework	None
Minor language clarifications	None
<p>Updated meeting noticing approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formerly: IXWG meeting notice and agendas, “shall... be posted on a publicly accessible website and in Docket No. 17-12-03RE06, or another docket of the Authority’s choosing.” • Update: Agenda to be distributed to IXWG members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting 	<p>Matt Shortsleeve (Solect) suggested that the facilitators seek to update the distribution timeline from 48 hours to one week in advance.</p> <p>GPI indicated that they believe they can provide meeting agendas to IX WG members more than 48 hours in advance.</p>
<p>Updated meeting notes approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formerly: IXWG facilitator had to develop a schedule and that schedule would “assign” different meeting participants to notetaking roles for meetings. Notes to be posted on publicly available website and filed in Docket No. 17-12-03RE06. • Update: Facilitator takes notes, notes posted on website 	
<p>IXWG topic prioritization approach updated to include topics associated with PURA orders, and clarified that IXWG members may express additional topics of interest for discussion</p>	<p>Matt Shortsleeve (Solect) did not suggest a change to this approach but did seek a better understanding of what other workgroups might already exist at PURA that are focused on technical issues.</p> <p>GPI informed the workgroup that one aspect of the Governance Framework they did not change was their ability to bring in technical experts on an as-needed basis, or to establish technical subgroup meetings or subcommittees focused on certain technical topics, such as this one. GPI is open to developing a technical subgroup focused on this topic if there is sufficient interest among IX WG participants. EOE also acknowledged that there are many workgroups within PURA, but EOE is not involved with all of them.</p>

Substantive revisions (overview and participant discussion)

Next, GPI provided an overview of five substantive draft revisions to the governance framework. All such revisions were to parts of the Governance Framework pertaining to voting representatives, the voting process, and documentation of votes. A summary of these five draft revisions, as well as participant comments in response to these proposed revisions, is provided below.

Overview of Substantive Revision	IX WG Participant Feedback
<p>Addition of DEEP BETP to the list of voting members</p> <p>GPI and EOE proposed adding DEEP BETP to the list of voting members because PURA listed them as a voting member in their order directing the 100-Day Sprint Process. The intention behind this proposed revision was to create alignment with this more recent PURA directive pertaining to voting members.</p>	<p>Mike Trahan (ConnSSA) and Noel Lafayette expressed opposition to inclusion of DEEP BETP as a voting member, as they have not participated in or been significantly involved with the IX WG. They also inquired about their involvement in the Sprint Process. GPI clarified that DEEP BETP filed a letter waiving their voting rights during the 100-Day Sprint.</p> <p>No other IX WG members provided further commentary regarding the expressed support for or opposition to inclusion of DEEP BETP as a voting member in the revised Governance Framework.</p>
<p>Storage representation among developer voting members</p> <p>GPI and EOE proposed clarifying that the two developer voting representatives may consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 solar developer + 1 storage developer • 1 solar and/or storage developer + 1 representative from a solar and/or storage developer industry group • 2 representatives from solar and/or storage developer industry groups <p>This proposed revision seeks to establish that both solar and storage developers are in some form represented among by the two votes given to developers in the Governance Framework</p>	<p>Participant perspectives were mixed regarding formally establishing that storage developers must be represented among the developer voting members. Perspectives are summarized below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noel Lafayette expressed that he does not believe it is necessary to establish required storage representation among voting members due to the limited presence of standalone storage in CT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GPI clarified that the intention is not for this to be a requirement for standalone storage, specifically, to be represented. Rather, it is simply a requirement that storage developers (of any form) have voter representation. • Noel Lafayette recommended that storage developers could have a subgroup where their issues could be discussed, rather than having representation as a voting member. Through this model, storage developers could convey their concerns to the broader IX WG. • Emma Marshall-Torres and Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids) expressed that they work in storage in the CT market, and many storage assets exist. They feel that storage-related topics are worth discussing with the full IX WG. • Mike Trahan (ConnSSA) stated that while all perspectives are welcome, this is an IX WG, not an industry group. For this reason, he feels that voting rights should go to those representing the types of issues that arise the most.

Overview of Substantive Revision	IX WG Participant Feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GPI clarified that during the December IX WG meeting, participants expressed an interest in using the voting procedures more. The rationale for this proposed addition is that there has been an increase in storage-related orders from PURA over the past few years, so it may be worth considering whether storage should have IX WG voter representation given the likelihood that storage-related issues may come to a vote.
<p>Clarified process for being added as a new voting member</p> <p>GPI and EOE clarified that stakeholders that wish to be added as a new voting member shall identify themselves during an IX WG meeting. Participants may discuss these requests during the meeting. However, final decisions regarding changes to the list of voting representatives is at the discretion of the Facilitator.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike Trahan (ConnSSA) expressed that decisions regarding adding new voting members should be up to active IX WG participants, not facilitators. GPI asked if any parties in attendance were interested in becoming voting members but clarified that a formal decision regarding whether such parties would become a voting member would not be made during the meeting. Sara Pyne (CT Green Brank) expressed verbally that the Green Bank would like to be considered as a new voting member. No parties provided further commentary regarding expressed support for or opposition to the addition of the Green Bank as a new voting member. No official decisions were made regarding potential new voting members.
<p>Expanded upon IX WG voting process/decision-making goal</p> <p>GPI and EOE proposed the following revisions to the original goal of the decision-making process as expressed in the 2021 Governance Framework language. New proposed language is indicated in <u>underline</u>.</p> <p>The goals of the <u>IXWG voting</u> process will be to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Achieve consensus on interconnection-related issues where possible;</u> <u>Make substantive decisions by consensus of the IT-WG IX WG members, when consensus is possible; and</u> <u>Document non-consensus determinations, including which parties did and did not support certain items.</u> 	None
<p>Updated process for documenting consensus votes and IXWG discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formerly: IXWG facilitator to file annual report documenting topics discussed during IX WG meetings in past 12 months. 	<p>Matt Shortsleeve (Solect) suggested that the group may want to consider more frequent reporting/filings documenting votes.</p> <p>GPI clarified that the intent behind these proposed revisions is that the group has never followed the reporting requirements as listed in the original 2021 Governance Framework, even before GPI began facilitating the IX WG in Fall</p>

Overview of Substantive Revision	IX WG Participant Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual report must include summaries of all consensus/non-consensus items. ○ IXWG to also file a report to PURA when it's reached consensus or majority agreement on an issue. ● Updated: Facilitators may file a quarterly letter documenting proposals the IXWG voted on during that time frame, the results of those votes, other topics discussed, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should reflect/mirror IXWG summaries 	<p>2023. For this reason, optional quarterly filing presents an opportunity to document IX WG votes, without establishing a granular filing schedule requirement. There may be a way to adjust the proposed language to accommodate filings at different time intervals to document IX WG votes on substantive items. Ultimately, such filings should largely be reflective of the content to be included in meeting summaries.</p>

General Feedback on Proposed Revisions to the Governance Framework

In addition to the participant feedback documented above, participants provided some high-level comments pertaining to the draft revisions to the 2021 Governance Framework.

- Noel Lafayette emphasized that the original IX WG participants spent an extended period of time developing the Governance Framework. The Sprint followed a different process that should be considered the exception, not the rule. He believes the IX WG should return to adhering to the original 2021 Governance Framework.
 - Jamie Spannhake (EOE) reminded participants that the proposed revisions to the Governance Framework are not based on the Sprint Process, but rather on the fact that that the IX WG has not followed the 2021 Governance Framework for a very long time, including before the time that GPI began facilitating in 2023 (pre-Sprint). The revised framework is based on the original 2021 Governance Framework.
- Mike Trahan (ConnSSA) asked whether IX WG voting member term limits could be considered.
 - EOE clarified that these could be considered. Other items, such as a different approach for determining developer voting members, could also be considered.
- Aileen Cole (GPI) suggested that further discussions pertaining to revisions to the Governance Framework would occur via a subgroup for interested parties.

Action Items: IX WG Governance Framework Revisions

GPI and EOE to hold subgroup meeting for continued discussion of the draft Governance Framework.



Discussion: Dispatch limiting schedules for ESS projects enrolled in the Connected Solutions program

Next, IX WG members from Scale Microgrids discussed issues they've been having pertaining to dispatch limiting schedules for ESS projects enrolled in the Connected Solutions program. The discussion is summarized below.

- Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids): We have many battery projects and we are receiving limiting dispatch schedules. We spoke with Eversource and it does not seem like we can modify those time blocks. We have seen some documentation that those time blocks can be flexible depending on the developer. We seeking clarity on whether those time blocks are flexible/can be modified to make sure we have sufficient time to charge the batteries and participate in the Connected Solutions program.
- Joe Debs (Eversource): Eversource generally prefers fixed schedules because it simplifies the analysis/calculations and keeps impact study timelines shorter. More varied schedules makes for more difficult and time-consuming studies (e.g., 5-6 months), which would impact all projects.
 - Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids): If we keep the same number of time windows, would that still affect study timelines?
 - Joe Debs (Eversource): We want to keep the times consistent across the board to the extent possible. In the long term, varied schedules on a project-by-project basis would impact study timelines overall.
 - Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids) noted that Exhibit B in Eversource's Guidelines for Generator Interconnection states the contrary. Exhibit B contains language stating that dispatch limiting schedules should be flexible.
 - Joe Debs (Eversource) acknowledged this and explained that the language was developed with good intentions but will need to be changed.
- Aileen Cole and Val Stori (GPI) asked if any other storage developers on the call who have encountered this issue and asked what about the time blocks causes issues.
 - Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids): If there is any point in a particular season where the thermal limits are violated, then there is 0% charging for that entire season, though this could be changed based on substation loading.
- Sara Pyne (CT Green Bank): Is this due to the passive or active dispatch requirements? Active dispatch happens two times a year, with a summer season and a winter season. The event duration can last 1-3 hours between noon-9pm. Passive dispatch occurs during June, July, and August and has a 3 hour time window (5-8pm).
 - Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids): We cannot get up to 100% charged during the overnight charging window without setting a new customer demand peak or increasing their utility bill. Essentially, we need to do low power charging overnight, even though there is more power available overnight. This is due to the dispatch schedule tariff in the IA.

Action Items: Dispatch Limiting Schedules

Joe Debs (Eversource) and Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids) to discuss how much longer studies would take if time blocks were flexible.

Presentation and Discussion: EDC Overview of Draft Flex IX Proposal

On January 28, 2026, Eversource sent Flex IX Workgroup members a draft version of the EDCs' Flex IX proposal for review, which is run by the EDCs. On February 4, 2026, GPI distributed this draft proposal to the IX WG for review in accordance with Order Point 4 in PURA's [August 20, 2025, Decision](#) in Docket No. 25-01-27.³ In Order Point 4, PURA directed that, "the EDCs should seek input from stakeholders through written or oral feedback and present the proposal to the broader Interconnection Working Group for additional review" and that, "the EDCs shall make a good-faith effort to develop consensus language for the proposal to the fullest extent possible."

In IX WG discussions in Spring 2025, the EDCs expressed a desire to run and facilitate the Flex IX Workgroup themselves, which was allowed in accordance with PURA's Decisional language.

First, GPI provided an overview of the regulatory history directing that the EDCs develop a Flex IX proposal, and provided an overview of Order Point 4. Then, Joe Debs (Eversource) shared high-level aspects of their draft proposal, as summarized below.

EDC Presentation

Joe Debs (Eversource) explained that the first step was considering what other states are doing in this area for benchmarking purposes. MA and NY have highly technical WGs and Eversource was interested in working with those groups and aligning with them to the extent feasible, because even though CT does not have Flex IX in CT, CT utilities are exploring it in other states. The end of the draft proposal contains a review of the other states explored.

The EDCs also shared the following high-level points:

- Eversource currently uses "scheduled interconnections." Live flexible interconnection is much more complex.
- Eversource and UI have different systems, which will require different hardware and software deployments to enable Flex IX.
 - Because UI already has telemetry available at all distribution substations, its rollout would be mostly a software deployment (plus integration of software into existing systems). UI also has a smaller system (~20 substations to Eversource's ~200 substations).
 - Eversource has a larger system and does not currently have telemetry at all its distribution substations—Eversource would need to deploy ADMS and DERMS systems to enable Flex IX.
 - For these reasons, UI's rollout may be less expensive and more compact than Eversource's roll-out
- PURA is in the midst of its formal Integrated Distribution System Planning (IDSP) docket—there are many items relevant to Flex IX that Eversource does not feel can realistically be determined until PURA makes a decision in that docket.
- Eversource generally favors unified Flex IX requirements for all three of its operating companies (MA, CT, NH). While some states are ahead in some areas, it has not been

³ The August 20th Order is a slightly updated version of Order Point 8 from PURA's [March 26, 2025, Interim Decision](#).

comprehensively addressed. Timelines also vary between states—MA has no timeline/deadline, but the MA workgroup started two years before CT's.

- In particular, EDCs seeking feedback on its curtailment analysis approach (e.g., What are developers' expectations when it comes curtailment? How many MW?)

While EDCs have hosted several Flex IX Workgroup meetings, workgroup attendance and participation has been limited. The EDCs received written feedback on the draft Flex IX proposal from one party. Eversource also clarified that the draft Flex IX proposal was developed by Eversource and UI. Eversource then sent out the draft Flex IX proposal those on the Flex IX Workgroup distribution list for review and comment.

Eversource informed participants that there will be another Flex IX Workgroup meeting tomorrow (2/11). GPI informed participants that the EDCs invite IX WG members to submit additional written feedback and comments on the Flex IX proposal by no later than 2/17/26 (one week following the IX WG meeting).

Participant Q&A/Discussion

- James Schwartz (Independence Solar): Other states are further ahead and we are doing a good effort with the resources we have. My suggestion would be to table this and see what other states do and use their ideas. Besides the technical aspects, the biggest piece is commercial management—who is taking on the curtailment risk?
 - Joe Debs (Eversource): We like this idea, but there's still a 3/15 deadline for CT.
 - Rob Sazanowicz (UI): Per PURA's order, we need to a proposal by 3/15. However, given the amount of investment and work that would be necessary to enable Flex IX, there will still be a lot of time to revise, adjust and flesh out details, especially those pertaining to the IA, which remains an open question (e.g., Do we treat it as last in first out? Or curtail everyone 1%)?
 - UI's sister companies in NY are a few steps ahead, and UI is working directly with them. We are proposing basically the same process that they are doing.
 - UI is looking for a process that enables them to bring a project online that wouldn't otherwise be able to come online, or to come online while avoiding an expensive upgrade (e.g., considering curtailment as an option in lieu of an expensive upgrade).
- Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids): Regarding curtailment risk, we provided comments indicating that we will be looking for a worst case curtailment schedule to better understand that risk. We would like to see that as a deliverable. Regarding future system impact studies and how they would account for Flex IX, would they follow a schedule that you produce? Or would they not be there because of the curtailment possibility?
 - Joe Debs (Eversource): While still being decided, it will likely be a time series analysis.
- Luke Hanson (Scale Microgrids): Are there any improvements for the schedules or is it a carry over?
 - Joe Debs (Eversource): We are able to allow larger units so long as they curtail for certain parts of the year. That's why the curtailment conversation is so important. However, the EDCs cannot answer that question, only developers can decide when a project is no longer economically feasible. The improvement would be that when

we implement the process it may give us more granularity. We can't do time series analysis yet, but we will be able to do this.

- Rob Sazanowicz (UI): Having more capacity available will open up the lines a bit. We will have real systems information based on what the system is doing day to day, while we are currently projecting and modeling. Maybe we can automate time series analysis and open up those schedules.

Action Items: Flex IX Proposal

- EDC-hosted Flex IX Workgroup meeting tomorrow (2/11/2026)
- IX WG participants may submit written comments on the EDCs' draft Flex IX proposal by no later 2/17/2026
- **EDCs to present final Flex IX proposal at the IX WG meeting on 3/10/2026**
- EDCs' Flex IX proposal is due 3/15/2026

Other Items

Bidirectional EV Charging Workgroup

Sara Pyne (CT Green Bank) informed the IX WG of a new workgroup (the Bidirectional EV Workgroup), established via Order 20 in PURA's 2025 RRES Decision (Docket No. 25-08-05). Sara Pyne noted that the Energy Storage Systems program administrators (the EDCs and CT Green Bank) will be establishing the working group, which will begin meeting soon. She will be available to provide additional information during the March IX WG meeting.

IX WG participants that are interested in participating in the new Bidirectional EV Workgroup should reach out to Sara Pyne (sara.pyne@ctgreenbank.com).

Motion No. 17 (Docket No. 25-01-27), pertaining to Proposals 2 and 3

Dan Crisp (Eversource) explained that PURA had recently issued a Ruling on a Motion pertaining to the EDC's' compliance filing covering Proposals 2 and 3 from the Sprint process. In its Motion, PURA had approved an approach proposed by UI, which involved the EDCs developing a new draft framework solution for Proposals 2 and 3, presenting that draft framework to the IX WG during the February 10th IX WG meeting, and iterating upon that proposal before formally voting on it during the March 10th IX WG meeting, in advance of an April 10th filing deadline (assuming consensus support for the proposed solution).

Because there was little time remaining in the meeting, GPI and EOE expressed that it would not be realistic to seek to re-orient IX WG participants to Proposals 2 and 3, which the group discussed in detail throughout Summer 2025.

Accordingly, Eversource proposed that the EDCs and ConnSSA—who was substantially involved in prior discussions pertaining to Proposals 2 and 3—meet in advance of the March 10th IX WG meeting to develop and refine a solution, to be presented by during the March 10th IX WG meeting.

Next Steps and Action Items

- **Topics tabled for future meetings**
 - EDC update on their non-binding report on distribution study timelines/costs
 - EDC update on how their updates to the IX guidelines align with the Sprint straw proposal developed last Summer/Fall

- Note: This item has some overlap with the Proposals 2/3 topic
- **March 10, 2026 IX WG meeting topics**
 - Overview of draft/proposed changes to Governance Framework
 - EDC presentation of revised Flex IX proposal
 - EDC presentation of framework solution for Proposals 2 and 3
 - Other items
 - EDC update on their non-binding report on distribution study timelines/costs
 - EDC update on how their IX guidelines updates align with the Sprint straw proposal developed last Summer/Fall

Action Item Summary Table

Responsible Party	Action Item(s)
IX WG members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide feedback on Flex IX Proposal to Joe Debs (joseph.debs@eversource.com) by February 17, 2026 • Reach out to Sara Pyne (sara.pyne@ctgreenbank.com) if you are interested in participating in the Bidirectional EV Workgroup
EDCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue revising and iterating upon Flex IX proposal in accordance with feedback received • Present revised/updated Flex IX proposal to IX WG during March 10th IX WG meeting
EDCs/ConnSSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet to develop and refine a proposed solution to address Proposals 2 & 3 • Present proposed solution to IX WG during March 10th IX WG meeting
EDCs/Scale Microgrids	Joe Debs and Luke Hanson to discuss how much longer studies would take if time blocks were flexible
GPI/EOE	Schedule an IX WG subgroup meeting to continue discussing proposed draft revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework

Attachment A: Draft Proposed Revisions to the IX WG Governance Framework

As described in the summary above, GPI and EOE proposed a series of draft revisions to the IX WG framework, which had not been updated since 2021. The proposed draft revisions are included on the following pages for reference purposes only. These should not be considered final adopted revisions to the Governance Framework.

Connecticut Distributed Generation ~~Technical~~ Interconnection Working Group (Government and Framework)

February 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 ~~Technical~~ Working Group (IXWG~~ITWG~~) will consist of representatives from, at a minimum, 1) ~~S~~state ~~A~~gencies, 2) ~~E~~lectric ~~D~~istribution ~~C~~ompanies (EDCs), 3) ~~DG~~ ~~i~~ndustry / ~~d~~evelopers, and 4) groups representing ~~C~~ustomers. Additional parties are free to participate in the IX-WG 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), ~~or a consultant selected by EOE through a competitive RFP process,~~ 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 IX~~P~~WG 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/or consultant, if any,~~ assigned to serve as the Facilitator. The number of voting representatives from each of the stakeholder ~~clusters~~ groups is as follows:

<u>Voting Representative</u>	<u>Number of Votes</u>
1. EDCs	2 (1 from each of Eversource and United Illuminating)
2. Developers	2 (<u>1 representing solar developers and 1 representing storage developers; groups that represent both solar and storage developers are permitted to meet these requirements</u>)
3. CIEC	1
4. OCC	1
5. <u>DEEP BETP</u>	<u>1</u>

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~~ at the discretion of ~~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 ~~IX~~ITWG may also engage one or more third-party technical consultants/experts⁴ to assist it with various matters. The technical expert will not be a voting member of the ~~IT~~ITWG 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 ~~IT~~ITWG 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.

~~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.~~

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

~~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 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. Additions and/or subtractions to the ITWG members list shall be discussed at the meeting, although final decision is left up to the Facilitator.~~

Meeting Schedule and Process

The ~~ITWG-IXWG~~ITWG shall generally meet on a monthly basis. ~~Upon unanimous agreement of all stakeholders and the Facilitator, the ITWG may meet less frequently, but i~~In no case shall the ~~ITWG-IXWG~~ITWG meet less often than once per quarter.

Notice of a regularly scheduled meeting ~~and the agenda for the meeting~~ shall be distributed to the ~~ITWG-IXWG~~ITWG 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. 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 ~~IX-WG~~ITWG 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 ITWG meeting, the designated ITWG 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 ITWG member may elect to take the meeting notes while participating in the meeting. Each ITWG member shall review the meeting notes to ensure accuracy.~~

⁴ E.g. EPRI, RAP, etc.

~~The reviewed Meeting 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 made available to IX-WG members, on the publicly accessible website and in Docket No. 17-12-03RE06, or another docket of the Authority's choosing.

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

~~At the request of the Authority, the Facilitator(s) or his/her designee from the IXFWG will be required to report annually to the PURA Authority Chairperson and his/her designees on topics undertaken in the prior twelve months.~~ Annual meeting reports, if requested, shall include summaries ~~on 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 ~~The~~ meetings ~~shall will~~ be publicly noticed and shall take place prior to December 1 each year, unless otherwise directed by the Authority.

Roles and Responsibilities

~~IX~~WG 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 stakeholders ~~cluster~~); and will actively seek agreement wherever possible.

It is the responsibility of the ~~IX-WG~~ IXWG voting representatives and alternates to keep their organizations and ~~other organizations in their clusters~~ stakeholders informed of developments in the Working Group process.

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

Choosing Topics

In line with the ~~IX-WG~~ IXWG's mission statement, the ~~IX-WG~~ IXWG shall prioritize topics where there is a possibility to reach consensus among the members, as well as topics associated with PURA the Authority's Orders to the IX-WG. IX-WG members are free to inform the Facilitator of additional topics of interest that they would like to discuss with the IX-WG, so long as those topics are relevant to the group's interconnection focus. ~~Any disputes over the topics to~~

~~be addressed will be resolved by the Facilitator(s), in the Facilitator's sole discretion. Absent direction from the Authority, decisions regarding which topics will be addressed by the IXWG will be determined by the Facilitator.~~

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

- ~~• Conduct review of interconnection guidelines and technical criteria/screens;~~
- ~~• Monitor IEEE 1547 and identify areas that need investigation;~~
- ~~• Continue to evaluate ways to improve hosting capacity maps;~~
- ~~• Identify ways to establish a formal technical regional working group;~~
- ~~• Begin to consider specific cybersecurity requirements.~~

Decision-making

The goals of the IX-WG voting process will be to

1. Achieve consensus on interconnection-related issues where possible;
2. Make substantive decisions by consensus of the IX WG/ITWG 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.~~

~~The ITWG/EOE shall may file a report/quarterly letter to PURA/the Authority when to documenting the items that proposals the IX-WG voted on during meetings in that timeframe/quarter, and the results of those votes (consensus or non-consensus, including documentation of support from each voting representative). In this filing, EOE shall also may document/include the range of item/topics the IX-WG discussed in that timeframe, as well as a list of topics—if any—for withon which EOE and the IX WG/the Facilitator 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/not 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 ITWG during its discussion of the matter. In the case of non-consensus issues/For all issues and proposals, ultimately the Authority will have/make the final determinations and final say on decisions. In many cases, the technical consultant 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 technical consultant will be used in the final decision-making process by the Facilitator(s) and the Authority.~~