Connecticut Green Bank
Docket No. 26-08-02
Response to Interrogatory CAE-31
Date of Submission: August 17th, 2026
Witness: Connecticut Green Bank - Sergio Carrillo

Question:

CGB Comments, May 28, 2026, p. 5. For each potential solution listed for DC-coupled solar and storage, provide an estimate of the cost to participants.

Response:

The Connecticut Green Bank ("Green Bank") understands that this request is looking for an estimate of *participant* costs associated with the potential solutions identified for obtaining separate data for DC-coupled solar and storage systems. Based on that understanding, Green Bank does not anticipate that participants would incur incremental costs for these potential solutions where the applicable monitoring equipment and data platform are already installed and operating. In those circumstances, the participant cost is expected to be $0.00, unless there is a subscription fee, which depends on the data monitoring provider.

The information needed to distinguish solar production from storage system activity may already be captured through the participant's existing solar and storage monitoring platform, or through the platform used by the relevant third-party owner, installer, or original equipment manufacturer (OEMs). If the data monitoring system is not installed, the estimated cost to the participant may be in the $400-$1,000 range depending on the system and the installation labor but could vary across providers and installers. If the data monitoring is already installed, the cost would not be to the participant but rather the cost that may need to be considered would potentially be between the data provider and United Illuminating ("UI").

For example, certain monitoring providers may be able to separately identify solar production data and storage system activity, and this information is typically accessible to the participant. The question UI may consider is how to obtain that information at an agreed-upon cadence and in a mutual data sharing format. To the extent UI determines that this data is necessary and does not agree with Eversource's determination[1] on the minimal impact of parasitic load and round-trip efficiency losses to the participant, or has concerns regarding direct consumption of system output for purposes other than parasitic load, then UI may consider coordinating directly with the applicable monitoring providers for data to compare to the UI production meter data. UI may consider discussing with Tesla, SolarEdge, or any other relevant providers, in order to confirm the

[1] https://www.dpuc.state.ct.us/dockcurr.nsf/8e6fc37a54110e3e852576190052b64d/7716e1476a34f23585258e05004ea5c3/$FILE/26-08-02%20ES%20Written%20Comments%205.28.26.pdf

Connecticut Green Bank
Docket No. 26-08-02
Response to Interrogatory CAE-31
Date of Submission: August 17th, 2026
Witness: Connecticut Green Bank - Sergio Carrillo

availability of the necessary data fields, establish the frequency and format for data transfers, and determine whether any additional data or processing may be needed.

Another potential consideration may be to work with the Energy Storage Solutions ("ESS") Distributed Energy Resource Management System ("DERMS") provider to access this data. In ESS, the Green Bank has noted there is a field for solar data across most of the residential BESS OEMs along with battery energy storage system data. UI may want to discuss with the DERMS provider ways to streamline access to this data which would support the growth of DC coupled solar and storage systems in both RRES and ESS Programs in UI territory. This data would likely only be available for customers in Energy Storage Solutions, and the Green Bank is unsure of which particular 160 customers that UI referenced[2] and if they overlap with any Energy Storage Solutions customers.

The Green Bank does not anticipate a direct participant cost for either a monitoring-platform data-access approach unless noted above or a DERMS-based aggregation approach, provided the necessary equipment and monitoring platform are already in place. Any additional costs associated with implementing such a solution would likely be incurred by UI rather than by the participant.

[2] https://www.dpuc.state.ct.us/dockcurr.nsf/8e6fc37a54110e3e852576190052b64d/213db67062d6ff9785258dee00428383/$FILE/2026-05-05%20UI%20Motion%20for%20Clarification%20%2325-08-02.pdf