

July 24, 2026

**VIA eFiling**

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**Re:** Potential Regulations for Interconnecting Electric Loads  
Docket No. L-2025 3059032

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Enclosed for e-filing, are the Comments of Constellation Energy Generation, LLC to the Secretarial Letter of June 22, 2026, in connection with the above-captioned docket.

If you have any questions concerning this filing, please contact me via email at [jesse.rodriquez@constellation.com](mailto:jesse.rodriquez@constellation.com) or Cynthia Brady at [Cynthia.brady@constellation.com](mailto:Cynthia.brady@constellation.com).

Best Regards,

*Jesse Rodriguez*

Jesse Rodriguez,  
Director, Regulatory Affairs

Cc: Darren D. Gill, Deputy Director ([dgill@pa.gov](mailto:dgill@pa.gov))  
Cynthia Brady, Assistant General Counsel

BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Potential Regulations for  
Interconnecting Electric Loads

:  
:

Docket No.  
L-2025 3059032

---

**COMMENTS OF  
CONSTELLATION ENERGY GENERATION, LLC**

**Introduction**

On July 4, 2026, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (the “Commission”) published in the PA Bulletin a request for comments on the possibility of promulgating regulations for interconnecting electric loads, including large loads. Specifically, the Commission seeks comments on this list of questions and any other topics that interested parties believe should be included in potential regulations on the interconnection of electric loads.

Constellation supports the Commission’s efforts to gather more information and feedback regarding interconnecting electric loads, including large loads. More directly, Constellation supports the Commission’s efforts in establishing a model tariff for large loads (“Model LL Tariff”) and believe many of the recommendations in that proceeding should be applied to these questions.

Constellation supports the following areas as discussed in the Model LL Tariff: proposed interconnection study timeline, transparency, and accountability provisions. Speed to market is of critical importance to many large load customers, and the Model LL Tariff recognizes this in proposing guidelines that would provide these customers with needed certainty that their projects will be studied in a rapid and transparent manner. Constellation supports the Commission’s proposal to encourage electric distribution companies (“EDCs”) to improve the transparency of their large load customer interconnection processes by providing customers looking to interconnect with periodic updates, average response times, queue position information, and expected timelines. This transparency will allow large load customers to make informed business decisions regarding interconnection requests and proposed projects based on accurate and timely information. In addition, Constellation agrees that six months is a reasonable maximum amount of time for EDCs to complete interconnection studies unless there are exigent circumstances as reflected in the Model LL Tariff.

Implementing these proposed guidelines, along with mechanisms that incentivize EDCs to follow them, will maximize study efficiency and ensure timely integration of large loads, giving the Commonwealth a regional and national advantage in the effort to attract new jobs, expand tax base, and grow the economy.

- 1. What electric load interconnection issues should be addressed via regulation? Please list the specific issues and how a regulation would be beneficial.**

Constellation agrees that there would be benefits to addressing certain electric load interconnection issues through regulation. Establishing clear, uniform rules would promote greater consistency across EDCs, improve transparency for customers and regulators, reduce unnecessary delays, and ultimately support a more predictable and competitive environment for large load development. Right now, EDC interconnection processes and timelines can often be charged at the will of the EDC, with little or no notice to developers.

Specific issues that would benefit from regulation include:

- Defined interconnection study timelines, including a clear deadline for completing studies, such as the six-month timeline reflected in the LL Model Tariff. A defined timeline would provide customers with greater certainty, support more disciplined EDC processing of requests, and reduce the risk that projects are delayed by open-ended study processes.
- Accountability measures for missed timelines, including penalties or other consequences where an EDC fails to meet required deadlines, unless exigent circumstances justify an extension. This would ensure that timelines are meaningful and would create an incentive for timely action while preserving flexibility for legitimate reliability, permitting, or engineering constraints.
- Customer self-build options for interconnection facilities or upgrades, subject to appropriate EDC technical standards and oversight. The EDC should allow large load applicants to have access to clear, and consistent standards for equipment and design. Allowing customers to self-build can help accelerate project completion, reduce bottlenecks, and give customers more control over cost and schedule where the EDC is unable to complete work on a timely basis.
- Transparent interconnection queues and project tracking, including clear visibility into a project's status, required next steps, study milestones, and any causes of delay. This would improve customer planning, allow regulators to monitor EDC performance, and help ensure similarly situated customers are treated consistently.
- Coordination between PJM transmission processes and EDC distribution processes where large load projects may affect both systems. Clear coordination requirements would reduce duplicative studies, improve visibility into cumulative system impacts, and help ensure that reliability, cost responsibility, and timing issues are addressed in an integrated manner.

Overall, targeted regulation in these areas would not need to dictate the outcome of every interconnection request, but it would establish a common framework that improves certainty, transparency, accountability, and fairness for EDCs, customers, and other stakeholders.

## **2. Should regulations concerning load interconnection be formulated and applicable by customer class, interconnection voltage or tariff rate?**

It is good regulatory practice to distinguish between customer classes, generally, and that holds true for load interconnection regulations and tariff provisions, as well. Customers in different customer classes have very different load factors and characteristics, and therefore impose different costs associated with serving those loads. Load interconnection rules that

vary by customer class afford EDCs the opportunity to appropriately identify the needs and costs of serving different types of customers, and to allocate those costs appropriately. Those differences should be reflected in tariffs. To that end, Constellation recommends that the recently adopted Model LL Tariff should establish a new class of very large customers.

In creating interconnection regulations for large loads, it is important to keep in mind the distinction created regarding transmission level interconnection.

State regulated retail tariffs or rate schedules must refrain from dictating the specific rates, terms or conditions of transmission service to avoid jurisdictional conflicts under the Federal Power Act (“FPA”). The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) exercises jurisdiction over agreements and rates that affect the wholesale sale and transmission of electricity in interstate commerce. By contrast, states retain jurisdiction over all matters not regulated by FERC, including over retail sales, distribution facilities and generation facilities. Therefore, under the FPA states cannot regulate within FERC’s jurisdiction, and vice-versa.

Any retail tariff or interconnection rule must ensure conformance with the jurisdiction of the FPA, and the present model rate schedule fails in this respect because the model rate schedule regulates transmission service of the large load customers that fall within FERC’s jurisdiction.

Any transmission-level requirements included in a rule or tariff would intrude upon FERC’s exclusive jurisdiction. Neither the Pennsylvania PUC nor the Pennsylvania assembly can trump the FPA, and would be preempted.

This does not mean that Pennsylvania has no tools to protect its retail customers. It can focus requirements on the effects of large load on retail sales and distribution service. But those measures must avoid regulating the rates, terms and conditions of FERC-jurisdictional transmission service. For example, the retail service contract can contain certain requirements that may include a load ramp and an obligation for the customer to pay all applicable riders and tariffs. This would result in the customer paying the FERC-approved transmission charges for the minimum contract term, but does not dictate what those charges will be – they will be as determined by FERC. Collateral for the retail service or distribution service contract could also be sized to reflect the obligations under that contract.

Proceeding with transmission-related requirements in the model rate schedule would embed a legal infirmity in the rate schedule, subjecting it to ongoing potential legal challenge. This, in turn, would create uncertainty and delay investment in the infrastructure needed to accommodate large loads reliably and in a way that protects retail customers.

- 3. Should load interconnection requests have different review levels based on load size, similar to generation interconnection review levels? If yes, please provide the load size range for each level of review and the rationale for these levels.**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.

**4. If there is generation collocated with the load, should there be an expedited process for the generation to be interconnected at the same time the load is interconnected?**

Yes, if there is generation collocated with the load, there should be an expedited process for the generation to be interconnected at the same time the load is interconnected. When prospective load and generation is paired and proceeding to come online at the same time, the regulations and tariffs should recognize the reduced system impacts resulting from those configurations and allow for differentiated treatment, where appropriate. Substantial benefits can be achieved with all types of co-located generation resources designated to Large Load Project Applicants and Customers, particularly when able to serve all or a substantial part of the projected new large load.

It is widely accepted that co-location of load and generation can result in a quicker, and more efficient interconnection of Large Load Project Applicants and Customers to the grid. Recent studies have explained that co-location of generation and new large loads improves grid efficiency, relative to interconnection of new large loads remote from generation, by minimizing the distance that power must be transmitted to the new load.<sup>[1]</sup> This both reduces the risk of overloading existing transmission lines, potentially avoiding expensive system upgrades, and minimizes transmission line losses. It is in the interest of all customers to preserve existing tools for efficiently interconnecting projected new large load customers, including co-located configurations. Regulatory requirements and EDC rates should acknowledge and reflect the unique benefits of co-location of generation and load, and provide for an expedited process for the generation and the load to be studied and interconnected together.

<sup>[1]</sup> See The Co-Located Load Solution, Michael Kormos, July 2024. <https://nei.org/resources/reports-briefs/data-center-co-location>.

**5. Some electric distribution companies (EDCs) provide online portals for the interconnection of distributed energy resources. Should the same be provided for load-interconnecting applicants to submit all applications and supporting documents? Please list the benefits or drawbacks.**

For large load interconnection requests, EDCs should replicate online resources and processing of interconnection requests similar to what is used for distributed energy resources. The online resources should not be limited to interconnection customers submitting documents through a portal, however. Rather, EDC websites should include a landing page for large load interconnection. Through links or information on the page, EDCs should publish information important to prospective large load customers as well as stakeholders. Information to be provided should include but not be limited to applicable tariff(s), guidelines, processing steps, expected timelines, and anonymized information regarding large load projects that have been or are in the study process. Publishing generally applicable information provides easy access and transparency, which is helpful both for prospective interconnection customers as well as EDCs by proactively addressing potential questions.

Including a link to a portal for submission of an application and relevant documents would be helpful, as well, by providing ready access for interconnection customers, and permit the submission of documents that may be too large to send via email. Additionally, a portal keeps an application and its documents together electronically, allowing for easier management for both the EDC and the interconnection customer.

**6. What are some methods that may be used to discourage applicants from submitting duplicative projects with different EDCs?**

Proper load forecasting should only include new large load that has a meaningful and verifiable commitment to bring the project to commercial operation. There are several ways to discourage applicants from submitting duplicative projects with different EDCs including site control, financial disincentives, and notice.

Perhaps the most obvious way to discourage applicants from submitting duplicative projects with different EDCs is to require that project applicants have site control over the property on which the projected load being studied is to be located. Site control may take the form of ownership in the form of a deed. In addition, eligibility could include a contractual legal claim over the property, such as a signed purchase agreement, or a lease/option with a specified minimum term.

Another way to discourage duplicative projects is a requirement to demonstrate financial commitments or the ability to secure third party energy supply for the project. Examples of financial requirements that discourage duplicative project submittals include the following:

- Credit/collateral support;
- financially significant infrastructure investment;
- energy service agreement; and
- long-term supply commitment with generators.

Additionally, for transparency, applicants could be required to specifically state whether they have submitted a potentially duplicative project within the state and, if so, provide the project number.

Beyond the process of studying potential load that may be duplicative, care should be taken around load forecasting. Load forecasting methodologies should avoid approaches where similar large load projects have widely differing load forecasts resulting from broad discretion of the corresponding EDCs or differing basic assumptions. Inaccurate load forecasts will undermine confidence in capacity market price signals and chill investment in both new generation projects and large load, depriving the state and its citizens of the corresponding economic development benefits.

Load forecasting rules should establish clear, objective criteria for including large loads in the forecast, grounded in verifiable financial commitments and development milestones. Such rules should include written explanations by the EDCs for deviations from load

forecasts and an annual report comparing forecasted versus actual large load additions. Requiring a significant financial commitment in the form of one of the agreements referenced above as a prerequisite to being added to the load forecast will also reduce the risk of duplication of large load demand when a single large load project is exploring multiple sites. If only one project will ultimately be developed, only one project should be reflected in the forecast.

Moreover, Constellation agrees with the Model LL Tariff that the Model LL Tariff that requires EDCs to publish a list of interconnection applications (by zip code, MW amount, and stage) on their public website, but in a way that protects customer identity.

**7. In order to establish a position in the EDC's queue, would requiring a load interconnection applicant to pay a fee, based on the level of review, be effective in minimizing duplicative projects with different EDCs?**

Yes, payment of a fee is one way to discourage duplicative projects across multiple EDCs. For additional ways of discouraging duplicative projects, see the response to 6, above.

Beyond discouraging duplicative projects, there should be a focus on ensuring creditworthy, non-speculative requests, where the study fee is reflective of the potential system impact.

**8. Should projects be able to move ahead of other projects in the queue based on completion of certain milestones? If so, please offer the criteria and conditions that should be considered and any that should not be a determining factor.**

The ability to move ahead of other projects in the queue should primarily be linked to creating incentives for those Large Load Project Applicants and Customers that provide the greatest benefits (or impose the least costs) to the grid and other customers. To the extent that a project has previously been studied by the RTO or by the EDC and shown to impose little or no upgrade costs beyond the point of interconnection, the Load Project should be afforded an expedited path through the utility load interconnection study queue. The concept is very similar to the one employed by PJM in its generator interconnection process, where a project that requires no network upgrades based on an initial system impact study may go directly to the negotiation of the interconnection agreement, bypassing additional studies that require resources and time. while still protecting its other customers. (PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff, Part VIII, Subpart C, section 406(A)(2).)

**9. What if any protocols should be in place for circumstances where an applicant can jump ahead in the queue?**

See the response to question 8, above.

**10. For the load interconnection applications, should the EDCs charge an application fee? If yes, please answer the following:**

**a. Should a fee be required for load sizes above a certain minimum threshold and should such a fee increase based on the size of load? If so, what should that threshold be?**

Yes. EDCs should be permitted to charge application fees for load interconnection requests, provided the fees are differentiated by customer class and project size. Many EDCs already use fee structures that vary based on customer type or the magnitude and complexity of the requested load. That approach is appropriate because the cost, engineering effort, and system planning impacts associated with a residential or small commercial request are materially different from those associated with a large commercial, industrial, data center, or other high-load project.

If a new large-load interconnection model is adopted, the fee requirement should apply primarily to commercial and industrial customers and, in particular, to large-load customers above a defined minimum demand threshold. For large loads, the fee may reasonably increase with the size of the requested load, because larger projects require more detailed engineering review, system impact analysis, planning coordination, and evaluation of potential network upgrades.

A reasonable threshold would be one that excludes residential and small commercial customers and focuses on projects with a meaningful potential to affect distribution planning and cost allocation. For example, the Model LL Tariff applies to customers at or above 50 MW individually or 100 MW in the aggregate, while also preserving flexibility for EDC-specific tariff proposals. That type of threshold is appropriate because it targets the projects most likely to create significant interconnection study costs and ratepayer-protection concerns.

For large-load applications, the fee should be paired with clear study timelines and accountability. The PUC's Model LL Tariff establishes a maximum six-month timeframe for EDCs to complete interconnection studies. If an EDC fails to complete the study within that timeframe, the applicant should be entitled to a refund of 50% of the application fee for each 90-day period beyond the six-month deadline. This refund mechanism appropriately incentivizes timely completion, reduces uncertainty for project developers, and helps ensure that EDCs manage the study process efficiently.

The costs of any such refunds should not be recovered from other ratepayers; the EDC should bear those costs directly.

**b. What payment methods should EDCs accept?**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.



**c. Should EDCs allow for electronic payments without administration fees?**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.

**d. Should an EDC's costs for processing load interconnection requests be aligned with the cost structure for load interconnection application fees?**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.

**e. Should there be more oversight of load interconnection application fees to avoid any potential arbitrary fees?**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.

**11. Once a load interconnection request is submitted, what information should the EDC provide to the applicant, and by what means and frequency? Examples may include queue position, status of load study, anticipated timeline for completion, etc.**

Once a load interconnection request is submitted, the EDC should provide the applicant with timely, transparent, and standardized information sufficient to allow the applicant to understand where its request stands, what additional information may be needed, and when key study milestones are expected to be completed.

At a minimum, the EDC should provide confirmation that the application has been received and deemed complete or identify any deficiencies that must be cured. The EDC should also provide the applicant's queue position, the status of the load study, the anticipated timeline for completion, any major dependencies or outstanding information requests, and notice of any material changes to the study schedule, scope, or assumptions.

This information should be provided through a reliable written process, such as a secure applicant portal, written correspondence, or another standardized tracking mechanism that creates a clear record for both the applicant and the EDC.

Providing this information on a predictable cadence will reduce uncertainty for applicants, improve accountability in the study process, and help ensure that large-load projects and EDC system planning proceed on a coordinated and informed basis.

Some examples include:

*Confirmation of Application Completion:*

Means: Written confirmation

Timing: Upon acceptance of a complete interconnection study application.

Details: The EDC must confirm within a reasonable timeframe (5 business days) when the application is considered complete, which starts the timeline for interconnection studies.

*Interconnection Study Process and Status:*

- Means: Written communication and public website listing.
- Timing: Interconnection studies must be completed within six (6) months from the date the application is accepted as complete; if the study is delayed beyond six months, the EDC must refund 50% of the study fee for each 90-day period past the deadline.
- Details: The EDC should provide updates on the stage of the interconnection study process; the EDC is required to list interconnection applications (by zip code, date accepted, MW amount, and study stage) on its public website, but in a way that protects applicant.

*Emergency Response Requirements:*

- Means: Written communication.
- Frequency: At contract initiation and as needed.
- Details: The EDC must provide the applicant with its emergency response requirements, including actions necessary for responding to PJM emergency load shed events.

*Study Costs and Refunds:*

- Means: Written communication and billing.
- Frequency: At study initiation and upon completion/delay.
- Details: The applicant is responsible for study costs, and the EDC must refund part of the fee if studies are delayed, absent exigent circumstances.

*Public Queue Transparency:*

- Means: Public website / portal.
- Frequency: Ongoing, updated as applications progress.
- Details: The EDC must maintain a public queue of applications, showing zip code, MW amount, date accepted, and study stage, while protecting applicant confidentiality.

*Emergency Procedures and Curtailment:*

- Means: Written communication.
- Frequency: At contract initiation and as procedures change.
- Details: The EDC must provide requirements for emergency curtailment and load shed event.

**12. Should there be prescribed timelines and timeframes for completing the various steps in the load interconnection application review process? If so:**

- a. Please provide a list of steps in the process and a reasonable time to complete each step. Please include various studies that may be required as part of the review process.**

The general steps in the process are as follows:

- Initial stage - Early engagement and preliminary site reviews

- Formal Application - a new large customer formally applies for electric service, provides load ramp, other required info, and pays any applicable engineering deposit
- Transmission Planning Analysis – The EDC studies the applied-for load and identifies system violations and mitigating reinforcements and expansions needed for interconnection and to ensure system reliability.
- EDC analysis – Based on studies, the EDC determines initial scope, cost, and schedule for any necessary infrastructure.
- Study Results - Study results are shared with the customer
- Detailed Engineering for ‘direct connect’ completed as well as engineering for transmission network

**b. What is a reasonable timeframe to complete a load interconnection application review?**

Constellation supports the Commission recommendations in the Model LL Tariff:

After the application has formally been submitted and all required information provided to the EDC, the EDC should be able to complete the required studies within 6 months consistent with the Model LL Tariff, which requires:

“Interconnection Studies will be completed within six (6) months from the date that an application for interconnection study is accepted by the Company as complete. ... If the Company has not completed the interconnection studies within six (6) months ... the Company will refund the applicant 50% of the study fee for each 90-day period beyond the six-month completion deadline. The costs of these interconnection studies and the refunds will not be recovered from other ratepayers.”

Constellation continues to believe that the 6-month timeline is reasonable compared to other states and industry practices and while some states have longer timelines, Constellation believes that a shorter, defined period is necessary to keep Pennsylvania competitive and to avoid unnecessary delays.

The timeline, when coupled with the aforementioned application fees, increases transparency for customers seeking interconnection, allowing them to plan their projects with greater certainty. It also protects ratepayers by ensuring that only serious projects proceed, reducing the risk of stranded costs.

**c. What timeline should exist for EDCs to complete the review of collocated load and generation requests, if any?**

Given co-located load is paired with generation, EDC review of such requests should be able to be completed faster than new large load by itself. If the new load is at the same location as the generation that will be serving it, the impacts on the grid should be less and the study time should be reduced. We recognize that PJM has the lead in reviewing new utility-scale generation interconnection requests, but any EDC review in connection with that process should be expedited. See The Co-Located Load Solution, Michael Kormos, July 2024. <https://nei.org/resources/reports-briefs/data-center-co-location>

**d. If an EDC exceeds its expected review timeline, what actions should the EDC be required to take?**

Constellation supports the Model LL Tariff recommendation that the established timeline provides accountability for EDCs, ensuring they complete studies in a timely manner. If EDCs fail to meet the deadline, the model tariff includes financial penalties (refunds of 50% of the application fee for each 90-day period beyond the deadline), which incentivizes timely completion and reduces uncertainty for project developers.

**13. Should there be separate queues for both generation and load interconnection requests? Why or why not?**

There should be separate queues for both generation and load interconnection requests, especially given the fact that PJM has the lead with respect to utility-scale generation interconnection requests.

If a new load applicant is to be located with a new generation resource, or otherwise having its load served by a specific new generation resource, the load and generation should be studied together. Studying the load and generation together is more efficient, requiring a single, combined study process. In addition to being more efficient, studying the load and generation together allows the PJM and the EDC to properly assess the true impact of the load for transmission planning and cost allocation purposes.

**14. How should the Commission address situations where there are exigent circumstances delaying a project's review or approval to interconnect from proceeding? Examples of these circumstances may include unexpected developments, need for additional studies, changing guidelines, etc.**

Constellation agrees with the examples provided in the question, including unexpected developments, the need for additional studies, changing guidelines, or other circumstances that may reasonably delay a project's review or approval to interconnect. However, the most important considerations in those situations are communication and transparency. If an exigent circumstance occurs or is occurring, it is paramount that the EDC promptly reach out to the customer or applicant, explain the reason for the delay, and identify what the EDC is doing to resolve the issue.

The Commission should require EDCs to provide prompt written notice when a deadline cannot be met due to exigent circumstances. That notice should identify the specific reason for the delay, describe the additional work required, provide an updated schedule for completion, and identify any steps the EDC is taking to mitigate or resolve the issue. In addition, where the customer or applicant is able to assist with addressing the exigent circumstance, the EDC and applicant should work together in good faith to resolve the issue as efficiently as possible.

Any extension should be limited to the time reasonably necessary to address the exigent circumstance and should not operate as an open-ended pause in the interconnection process. The Commission should also require EDCs to update the customer at regular intervals, continue work on portions of the review that are not affected by the delay, and maintain documentation sufficient for the Commission to evaluate whether the delay was justified.

There should also be consequences where an EDC fails to provide adequate transparency or timely communication. If an EDC does not clearly identify the exigent circumstance, explain the basis for the delay, provide an updated schedule, or keep the customer informed, the Commission should have the ability to deny or limit the requested extension, require additional reporting, direct corrective action, and, where appropriate, impose penalties or other accountability measures. This would help ensure that exigent circumstances are not used as a broad exception to established timelines or as a substitute for proactive project management.

This approach would give EDCs appropriate flexibility to address legitimate reliability, technical, or regulatory issues while preserving transparency, accountability, and certainty for customers seeking to interconnect.

**15. Should EDCs be required to provide hosting capacity maps?**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.

- a. If yes, what are the benefits, if any, of requiring EDCs to develop hosting capacity maps containing EDC feeder data and locations for substations, distribution transformers, line voltage, and related distribution assets?**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.

- b. What are the concerns regarding this requirement, if any?**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.

- c. What aspects should be considered for these hosting capacity maps? Examples may include the frequency of updates, transparency, filtering and toggling mechanisms, size and number of applications for a certain location, identified system constraints, complaint process, etc.**

At this time, Constellation is not taking a position on or responding to this question.

**16. Should EDCs be required to publish a public list of projects in an EDC's load interconnection queue?**

See responses to questions 8 and 11, above for question 16 and subparts a-c.

- a. What are the benefits, if any, of requiring EDCs to post on its website a list of projects in its load interconnection queue that includes the project's queue position, nameplate capacity, and circuit identifier in a manner that protects the identity of the project owner and the location of the project?**
- b. What are the concerns regarding this requirement, if any?**
- c. What aspects should be considered for these public lists of projects? Examples may include timing for updates, transparency, filtering and toggling mechanisms, complaint process, etc.**