Data Centre Grid Connectivity in India 2026: STU/CTU, GNA, BESS and PUE

By Sudarshan Karweer · 25 August 2026 · growthifye.com

A 2026 guide to data centre grid connectivity in India: STU/CTU access, GNA, approvals, BESS sizing, EMS and PUE-linked power strategy.

India's data-centre market is scaling fast, but in 2026 the biggest execution bottleneck is no longer only renewable-power sourcing. It is grid connectivity. For large campuses in Mumbai Metropolitan Region, Chennai, Hyderabad, Pune, Noida, Navi Mumbai and emerging AI-cluster locations in Gujarat, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu and Telangana, project timelines are increasingly governed by substation capacity, transmission access, right-of-way for dedicated lines, upstream fault levels, reactive-power compliance, and the ability to integrate on-site battery energy storage systems with the utility interconnection.

This is a different problem from simply procuring open-access solar, wind-solar hybrid or round-the-clock power. A data centre may sign a competitive renewable-supply contract, but if the utility connection is constrained, if CTU/STU approvals lag, or if the electrical design does not account for N+1 power architecture, harmonic distortion, short-circuit contribution and black-start requirements, the campus can face costly underutilisation. For hyperscale and colocation operators, every month of delay can mean deferred rack revenue, idle capex and higher temporary diesel dependence.

For Indian C&I buyers, developers, lenders and policymakers, the key 2026 question is practical: how should a data centre structure its grid-access strategy so that utility power, captive or open-access supply, on-site BESS, EMS and PUE optimisation work as one bankable energy system?

Why grid connectivity is now the gating item for data-centre energy

Power demand per campus is rising faster than the local distribution system was originally designed to absorb. A 25 MW IT load can translate into roughly 32-38 MW facility demand depending on cooling topology, redundancy and PUE. At a PUE of 1.30, a 25 MW IT load implies about 32.5 MW total facility power. At a PUE of 1.50, the same IT load requires 37.5 MW. On a 100 MW IT campus, that difference becomes 20 MW of additional infrastructure burden. This is why energy strategy and facility design can no longer be separated.

In 2026, the market is seeing four recurring grid-side constraints:

- Limited spare transformation capacity at urban receiving substations
- Long lead times for 220 kV and 400 kV bay allocation and line construction
- Mismatch between contracted demand and actual ramp profile of phased data-hall commissioning
- Stricter technical scrutiny on harmonics, power factor, dynamic voltage support and protection coordination

For many campuses above 20-30 MW, the choice between distribution-level supply, STU connectivity or CTU-linked architecture affects not just tariff, but schedule certainty. The cheapest tariff on paper is irrelevant if energisation slips by 9-12 months.

STU vs CTU vs DISCOM supply: how to choose in 2026

The optimal interconnection pathway depends on load size, location, redundancy design and whether the operator intends to use open access, captive generation, third-party renewable procurement or a portfolio of all three.

At a high level:

- DISCOM supply is often practical for smaller or phased loads where local high-tension infrastructure already exists and augmentation is feasible within project timelines.
- STU connectivity becomes more relevant once the project requires higher voltage evacuation, dedicated feeders, stronger redundancy and better alignment with interstate or intrastate power procurement.
- CTU-linked access matters where the campus, directly or indirectly, relies on interstate supply architecture, high-capacity transmission access, or large portfolio aggregation across states.

For large campuses, the real decision should be based on a total delivered-power model, not only energy charges. That model should include:

- Connection capex: bay, substation augmentation, dedicated line and terminal equipment
- Time to energisation: utility approvals, right-of-way, forest clearances where relevant, and OEM lead times for transformers and GIS/AIS equipment
- Fixed charges: demand charges, wheeling, transmission, scheduling and SLDC/RLDC-related costs depending on structure
- Reliability architecture: dual-source supply, bus sectionalisation, concurrent maintainability and backup-duration assumptions
- Future expansion optionality: ability to move from 20 MW to 60 MW to 120 MW without redesigning the upstream power concept

A common mistake is to accept a nominal sanction from a utility without stress-testing the upstream network. The letter may indicate available load, but the practical availability can still depend on transformer replacement, line reconductoring, protection upgrades or substation expansion. Developers and lenders should insist on a connectivity diligence memo before financial closure.

GNA, transmission planning and what data-centre developers should watch

General Network Access has changed how large users think about transmission access, even if many data-centre operators are not direct participants in the same way generators and bulk transmission users are. In practical terms, 2026 project teams must understand that transmission planning is becoming more structured, and access to the network is increasingly linked to formal planning assumptions rather than informal expectations of spare capacity.

For data centres, this has three implications.

First, long-term load visibility matters. If a campus will scale from 15 MW to 80 MW over four years, that trajectory should be reflected early in utility and transmission discussions. Under-declaring demand to simplify initial approvals can backfire later when augmentation queues lengthen.

Second, location selection should consider not only land and fibre but also network topology. Two sites within the same metro can have very different energisation risk depending on nearby EHV substations, fault levels, congestion and land availability for line corridors. A site that appears cheaper on lease rentals can become more expensive once dedicated interconnection capex and time delays are included.

Third, renewable procurement strategy should be mapped to the connectivity structure. If the energy portfolio includes interstate wind-solar hybrid, intrastate solar under open access, and a campus BESS used for peak management and contingency support, the legal and metering architecture must be designed carefully. In many cases, the commercial meter arrangement, energy accounting logic, contract-demand profile and backup dispatch strategy are the real determinants of savings.

For lenders, a useful test is simple: can the sponsor clearly explain which approvals are needed from the DISCOM, STU, CTU where applicable, electrical inspectorate, and local authorities, along with realistic durations and dependencies? If not, the schedule risk is not yet under control.

Designing on-site BESS for grid support, not just backup optics

On-site battery energy storage is now central to data-centre power design, but in India it is still often discussed too vaguely. A campus BESS should not be justified only as a sustainability asset. It needs a clear electrical and commercial role.

The most bankable use cases in 2026 are:

- Peak shaving to manage maximum demand and avoid expensive capacity oversizing
- Bridging support between utility disturbance and diesel-generator synchronisation
- Power-quality support through fast response to voltage and frequency events
- Limited energy shifting where time-of-day tariffs or contracted supply structures make it economic
- Support for renewable-firming at campus level where contractual or operational logic allows

Battery sizing should be linked to the actual problem statement. For example, if the primary purpose is demand management on a 40 MW campus facing a 6-8 MW evening spike for 1.5 to 2 hours, a 10 MW / 20 MWh system may materially reduce demand charges and defer upstream augmentation. If the use case is ride-through and black-start support, the duration requirement could be lower but the integration with UPS and DG controls becomes more critical.

Indicative 2026 economics for front-of-meter-equivalent lithium-ion systems in India have improved, but behind-the-meter project cost still varies sharply based on fire safety, import content, PCS configuration, thermal management, duty cycle and integration complexity. Fully installed campus BESS can still range widely, and developers should not benchmark only on a per-MWh container price. The relevant metric is delivered value per avoided MW of grid capacity, per avoided litre of diesel, and per percentage-point improvement in uptime resilience.

In many data-centre projects, the hidden value of BESS is schedule de-risking. If a battery allows a phased energisation strategy while the second utility source is completed, the commercial benefit can exceed pure electricity-bill savings.

EMS and digital controls: the missing layer between contract and physics

Many power strategies fail because the commercial contracts and the real-time operating system are disconnected. A data centre with utility supply, rooftop solar, open-access renewable contracts, diesel backup, UPS systems and campus BESS cannot rely on manual operating logic.

An advanced energy management system should be configured to optimise across five layers:

- Source selection based on tariff, reliability and emissions targets
- Demand forecasting at 15-minute block level aligned with Indian scheduling realities

- Battery dispatch for peak management, contingency reserve and renewable smoothing
- Power-quality monitoring including harmonics, power factor and feeder loading
- PUE-linked control signals, especially for cooling and auxiliary systems

This matters because 1 MW saved in cooling or auxiliary load is often cheaper than procuring an additional 1 MW of firm supply. If the campus can improve annualised PUE from 1.42 to 1.32, a 50 MW IT load reduces total facility demand by about 5 MW. At industrial delivered electricity costs of, say, Rs 7.0-9.5 per kWh depending on state, voltage level and sourcing structure, that efficiency gain translates into large annual savings before even considering avoided capacity additions.

For AI-oriented facilities with high rack densities, dynamic thermal loads make the EMS even more important. Chiller optimisation, liquid-cooling integration, variable-frequency drives, economiser logic where climate permits, and demand-response coordination with battery dispatch can significantly reduce the shape and volatility of grid draw.

PUE optimisation as a grid-capacity strategy, not just an ESG metric

In boardrooms, PUE is often discussed as an efficiency KPI. In reality, in India 2026 it should be treated as a grid-capacity strategy.

Every 0.1 improvement in PUE has direct implications for:

- Sanctioned load requirement
- Transformer and switchgear sizing
- DG and UPS architecture
- Cooling-system parasitic load
- Battery duration economics
- Open-access procurement volumes

Consider a 75 MW IT campus:

- At PUE 1.45, total facility load is 108.75 MW
- At PUE 1.30, total facility load is 97.5 MW

That 11.25 MW difference is not academic. It can influence whether one substation arrangement is adequate or whether a second large augmentation is required. It affects connection capex, land use for electrical yards, recurring fixed charges and the scale of backup infrastructure.

In practical terms, data-centre operators should evaluate PUE interventions in the same investment committee as grid and battery decisions. High-impact actions include:

- Containment optimisation and airflow balancing in air-cooled halls
- Chilled-water system optimisation, including delta-T improvement
- Higher-efficiency UPS and transformer selections at design stage
- Real-time cooling control integrated with rack utilisation and ambient conditions
- Water-energy trade-off analysis for cooling technology by city and season

The cost of poor PUE in India is amplified by network constraints. A campus that operates inefficiently is not only paying more per kWh; it may also be consuming scarce grid capacity that is expensive and slow to secure.

State-level execution realities: what sponsors and lenders should diligence

Policy headlines are useful, but execution is state-specific. A project in Maharashtra may face a different mix of demand charges, evacuation practicalities and utility responsiveness than one in Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Uttar Pradesh or Gujarat. The same is true for banking assumptions around open access, standby power, cross-subsidy-related charges where applicable, and treatment of storage-linked operating models.

A serious diligence checklist for 2026 should include:

- Source of primary and secondary utility feeds, including upstream substation loading
- Voltage level and dedicated-line requirement
- Required approvals from DISCOM, STU and electrical inspectorate
- Realistic procurement lead times for transformers, GIS panels, relays and battery systems
- Contract-demand phasing tied to actual hall commissioning plan
- Harmonic study, reactive power study and short-circuit study
- Fire safety design for BESS, including local authority expectations
- Metering and accounting structure for utility, captive, open-access and storage assets
- Cybersecurity and SCADA/EMS integration requirements
- Curtailment, outage and maintenance coordination protocols with the utility

Lenders should also ask whether the project's power architecture remains viable under less favourable scenarios: delayed second feeder, lower-than-expected renewable availability, higher summer ambient temperatures, or slower PUE improvement than promised. The best projects are robust under these stress cases, not only under base-case assumptions.

A bankable roadmap for data-centre power in India

For 2026, the most resilient strategy is usually not a single-source answer. It is a sequenced power roadmap.

A practical roadmap often looks like this:

- Secure grid-connectivity diligence before final site commitment
- Align sanctioned load and interconnection voltage with full build-out, not only phase 1
- Structure utility, STU/CTU and contract architecture to preserve procurement flexibility
- Design BESS around specific value pools: demand reduction, reliability and phased energisation
- Deploy an EMS that can optimise tariffs, battery dispatch and PUE-linked loads in real time
- Treat PUE improvement as avoided-grid-capacity investment
- Build lender-ready documentation around approvals, timelines, contingencies and operating logic

As India's digital infrastructure grows, reliable power will remain the sector's hardest constraint and biggest opportunity. Operators that get grid connectivity, battery integration, EMS and PUE strategy right will not just lower energy cost. They will commission faster, use less diesel, improve uptime resilience and create a more financeable platform for future expansion.

If your team is evaluating a new campus, a load expansion, a grid-connection strategy or an on-site BESS and EMS business case, contact Growthifye's advisory desk for project-specific support on connectivity, power procurement, technical due diligence and lender-ready energy structuring.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sudarshan Karweer — Chief Executive Officer, Growthifye

Over 23 years in management consulting — concept to scale — building and scaling new-age digital and energy businesses. An EY alumnus, Sudarshan leads Growthifye's renewable energy & storage advisory, EPC, transmission engineering and green-financing practices for developers, utilities and C&I consumers across India.

Contact: info@growthifye.com · +91 99676 45323 · growthifye.com