



**GREAT PLAINS
INSTITUTE**

Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Meeting Summary

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

September 3, 2026 Subgroup Meeting: Chess Clock Functionality

NOTE: On Wednesday, September 9th, GPI sent IX WG members a draft version of the September 3rd IX WG Subgroup meeting summary for review. IX WG members who attended the September 3rd IX WG 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. 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 Wednesday, September 16th. 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.

Overview

This meeting discussed if and how the "chess clock" functionality has been implemented in PowerClerk by the EDCs and how that aligns with Sprint Orders 10 and 15.

GPI framed the conversation noting that Sprint Proposal 5 requested the addition of a chess clock functionality to PowerClerk so that for the duration of the IX application, PowerClerk tracks whether it is the EDCs' or the developers' turn to provide a deliverable to be able to progress the application to the next step. PURA, in its August 20, 2025, decision, ordered the EDCs to adopt Proposal 5 and file compliance with PURA upon completion. IX WG members have raised concerns about the chess clock functionality's implementation, noting that the implemented functionality does not capture the intent behind Sprint Proposal 5. Through discussions with developers, it has become clear that developers were looking for the implementation of two key features:

- The "clock" where the time it takes for a step to be completed is tracked, and
- A "bounce" feature where it shows that the ball is in the EDC's court or the developer's court.

Presentation

Maritza Estremera Jimenez (UI) provided a walkthrough in PowerClerk on how to locate the chess clock and its functions:

- Test project
- All projects tab
- How to find the chess clock
 - View/Edit
 - Form that has the clock is called Activity, Progress, and Responsibility display.
 - Select continue and wait for it to load
 - Customer information at the top
 - At the bottom, different dates of when the application was received and any additional milestones in the IX process
 - Tallies up the number of days it has taken for the IX process, residential renewable team review, technical review
- Meter install and energize date will populate at the bottom when available.

Discussion

During the discussion, several developers echoed that the implemented chess clock functionality does not resemble the requirements of Sprint Proposal 5 and furthermore, that both EDCs have failed to meet PURA Orders 10 and 15 from its 8/20 decision in Docket 25-01-27.

Developers have experienced that the status update feature (the “back and forth” notification system) is not without glitches; in addition, multiple developers expressed a desire for the chess clock to show long each stage of the study is taking and how long it should take.

- Mike Trahan, ConSSA: Asks about PowerClerk’s functions as a chess clock. How does it go back and forth with who is responsible, whose court the ball is in?
 - Maritza: Our interpretation of the chess clock was more about dates and how long the project has been in each phase. UI can check with EEA to determine whether such a status update is possible within PowerClerk. There is currently a component built into "status" updates in PowerClerk, but notification is via email.
- Chris Lobdell, PurePoint Energy: The intent behind the chess clock proposal was to help demonstrate and show the amount of time it's taking for each section of the review. Some reviews can have a 15-day turnaround time, but sometimes things take 8-9 months before getting to contingent approval. The chess clock feature is

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

important so that developers can see the current step and how long each step is taking. There is a lot of downtime between updates, and developers are experiencing that the single POC cannot provide an update. An application can sit in technical review for a long time and even when a developer makes an update, the status remains in technical review. There are in-between stages in technical review that PowerClerk is not capturing and developers are not sure how long it should take for another update. The expectation on timing is missing. Knowing timelines can help developers forecast projects.

- Toni Berlandy, Eversource: Eversource has not implemented the chess clock functionality into PowerClerk yet. Toni reflects that it sounds like technical review becomes a bit of a black hole in part do to all the review steps and multiple departments involved. It may be possible to add more statuses in PowerClerk, for example, to say which group the technical review is with (e.g., engineering). When a status changes, an email would go out to the developer. There may be limitations on what can be done within PowerClerk.
- Marty Timperio, PurePoint: Inquires whether UI gets pinged by PowerClerk once the developer makes an update. How does this actually work on the utility side of things? Developers have experienced at their regular meetings with their POC that the POC hasn't seen an update come in. Would like to ensure that utilities are being alerted ASAP once developer has completed its update.
 - Maritza will check on whether update "pings" are automated
 - Toni: Once a developer submits an update, the status does change. When a correction is submitted in, it goes into an ES review status. For Level 1 projects, if the EDC fails to respond to the prompt that an update has been made, then the POC receives an email reminder.
- Katie Morales, Earthlight: Has experienced some "incorrect" notifications. For example, sometimes "to do" action items are being put into the developer's status but it's something developers don't have ownership over. Single POC does not have ability to change the status, so it is important that status updates are made correctly.
- Joe Debs, Eversource: Clarifies that the 15 business days Eversource has in its guidelines does not include a site visit. The supplemental review addresses the site visit. A developer can choose to select supplemental review and a field visit will be coordinated with the developer to visit transformer. If a developer does not choose a supplemental review, one could still be determined by the EDCs to be needed later in the study process.

- Allison Perruccio, Trinity Solar: The biggest benefit of the chess clock for is the transparency and accountability for the study timeline. Currently, developers do not know how long a project should be in a particular status. If there were expectations around the timeline, this would allow developers to provide an update to their customers. The chess clock should say who has possession of the project, how long they should have it in each stage, when we should see each stage go through the portal.
- Kayte asks for clarification on the supplemental review.
 - Joe: Details are in the revised guideline since 2003. Supplemental allows a developer to choose a study process that delivers a more precise cost of the upgrades upfront. Supplemental review used to avoid an impact study.
 - Kayte : Sometimes we are being required to have often multiple site visits for all our projects.
- Sara Pyne, Green Bank: Clarifies whether the supplemental review is optional and if there is a fee? And, if the developer chooses the supplemental review, is that a faster process than the EDC determining at a later date that a supplemental review is needed?
 - Toni, Supplemental review can be done at the developer's request or if the EDC determines that one is needed. Yes, the fee is less \$2,500.
 - Joe, When a developer requests it, it's because they want to firm up the cost of the service upgrade earlier in the study process. When the EDC initiates a supplemental review, it's because the project failed an initial screen. The supplemental review will determine whether an impact study is needed.
 - Val Stori, GPI: To tie this supplemental review discussion back to the chess clock discussion, would folks want to see supplemental review timelines within PowerClerk?
 - Joe: Unsure if this is possible. Will check the guideline to see if there are any timelines assigned to the supplemental review. It involves coordinating a number of people for a meeting in the field and can take weeks to set up.
- James: The chess clock came out of the Sprint process, which was focused on making IX more efficient and lower cost. A key cost of DG development is the long timelines between an application or approval. The chess clock should leave a trail that shows where the time is being spent. Is it on customer-side or EDC-side activities? Are the reviews taking longer than prescribed? If we had data around the actual time it takes to move through the different study stages, we could use it to improve over time.

- Val: Another important feature not mentioned in the Order but that I think was understood as a critical component of the chess clock is the timing--not only how long is each step taking but also transparency into how long steps *should* take vs how long they actually take.
- Luke Hanson, Scale Microgrids: Recently had projects that went through the impact study and ISO study, and at the very end of the study process, the metering team and engineering team got out to the site and realized service wasn't adequate. Would like to see site visits as part of the system impact study so that issues could be identified earlier.
 - Joe : yes, this could be added to the scope.
- Mike: Summarizes discussion around the chess clock functionality and implementation. The [March 26, 2025 Interim Decision](#) on the chess clock was to feature a tracking method to indicate whether it is the EDC's or customer's turn to act. Is either utility in compliance? UI and ES have to comply with chess clock requirements in other states or face penalties. This has gone on for two years.
 - UI and Eversource agree that neither is in compliance, but are working to be in compliance that is aligned with the expectation.
- Val: Asks to identify next steps; what would it take to bring everyone into compliance from a time and effort standpoint?
 - Maritza: UI thought it was in compliance. Maritza will take back the concerns that have been raised and meet with its vendor to find out if these features can be implemented, how much it will cost, and how long it will take.
 - Toni: Similarly unsure about a turnaround time. Eversource would also need to discuss with EEA (vendor) and then can give an update.

Next Steps:

- EDCs to discuss options around cost and timelines to implement with their vendor.
- The working group will check in on the status of these conversations with EEA at its October WG meeting