Fault Ride-Through for RE Evacuation in India 2026: ISTS Design, Grid Codes, Costs

By Sudarshan Karweer · 18 September 2026 · growthifye.com

A 2026 guide to fault ride-through for RE evacuation in India: ISTS connectivity, grid-code compliance, studies, costs and lender risks.

India's renewable build-out is no longer constrained only by module prices, turbine supply or land. In 2026, one of the most practical transmission-side risks sits inside the grid-code compliance pack: fault ride-through, or FRT. For solar, wind, hybrid and BESS-linked evacuation systems, the ability of the plant to stay connected, support voltage and recover correctly during grid disturbances can decide whether a project gets connectivity approval on time, clears commissioning tests smoothly, and avoids future backing-down disputes.

For developers, FRT is often treated too late, as an OEM settings issue. For lenders, it is sometimes buried inside generic independent engineer checklists. For utilities and transmission planners, however, FRT is now directly tied to stability margins, fault recovery, inverter behaviour in weak grids, and the aggregate performance of renewable energy clusters connected through pooling substations, state networks, green energy corridors and ISTS nodes.

This article explains how FRT matters for Indian RE evacuation in 2026, what grid participants should check, where costs usually emerge, and how project teams can avoid repeated study iterations.

Why FRT has become a transmission engineering issue in 2026

Historically, conventional synchronous generation contributed large fault current, mechanical inertia and predictable post-fault recovery characteristics. High inverter-based resource penetration changes that behaviour. In many RE-rich pockets of Rajasthan, [redacted], Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh and parts of Maharashtra, the share of inverter-based generation around the point of interconnection has risen sharply. That means a transmission fault is no longer only about breaker clearing time and relay selectivity. It is also about how hundreds of MW of converters behave in the first 100 milliseconds to several seconds after voltage depression.

In practice, Indian evacuation planners in 2026 are seeing four recurring triggers for FRT scrutiny:

- Large solar or wind clusters connecting to a common 220 kV, 400 kV or 765 kV evacuation node
- Hybrid projects with shared POI and central plant controller logic
- BESS integrated with RE where dispatch modes change converter operating points
- Weak-grid conditions with lower short-circuit ratio at the interconnection bus

If a plant trips too early during a temporary fault, the system can lose a large block of generation exactly when the grid needs support. If the plant remains connected but injects poorly coordinated reactive current, voltage recovery can worsen. If active power ramps back too aggressively after fault clearance, oscillatory or control-interaction issues may appear. As a result, FRT performance now sits at the intersection of connectivity, protection, control and system stability.

What Indian project teams should read as the compliance baseline

The exact technical requirements for a project depend on the interconnection voltage level, whether the connection is to ISTS or state transmission/distribution systems, the applicable CEA technical standards, the Indian Electricity Grid Code framework as in force in 2026, CTUIL/Central Transmission Utility connectivity procedures, and the relevant STU or SLDC implementation documents. Developers must also align with OEM model validation requirements and utility-specific test protocols.

At a practical level, project teams should expect the utility, consultant or independent engineer to ask for evidence on the following:

- Low-voltage ride-through capability under specified voltage-time profiles
- In some cases, high-voltage ride-through behaviour as applicable
- Reactive current injection and voltage support logic during faults
- Post-fault active power recovery profile
- Stability under nearby and remote faults
- No adverse interaction with plant-level controllers, STATCOM/SVC if installed, and other nearby inverter-based plants
- Model fidelity for RMS and EMT studies where required

The key point is simple: compliance is not only documentary. It has to be demonstrated in studies and then reflected in controller settings, protection coordination and commissioning tests.

Typical FRT study scope for ISTS and state-grid evacuation

For a utility-scale project, FRT assessment usually starts well before synchronisation. In 2026, a robust workstream typically includes both planning-stage and pre-commissioning-stage analysis.

A good minimum scope includes:

- Load flow and reactive power balance at different dispatch conditions
- Short-circuit assessment to understand grid strength at the POI
- RMS transient stability simulations for three-phase and unbalanced faults
- Voltage recovery checks for faults cleared by primary and backup protection timings
- Sensitivity cases for minimum short-circuit level, high RE dispatch and low-demand periods
- Review of inverter, PPC and central controller parameter sets
- Verification of coordination with line, transformer and bus protection schemes

For weaker grids or high-density renewable zones, EMT studies are increasingly relevant. This is especially true where multiple inverter OEMs are present, where plant controllers coordinate with external dynamic reactive devices, or where prior field events indicate control interaction. EMT work is more expensive and data-intensive than RMS studies, but in 2026 it is often the difference between first-time acceptance and months of model clarification.

This is where capabilities such as [Power system studies](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/powersystemstudies) and [Protection, control & SCADA](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/protectioncontrolandscada) become commercially important rather than merely technical. Many project delays arise not from major hardware defects, but from gaps between study assumptions, controller settings actually loaded at site, and what the utility expects during disturbance performance testing.

Where developers lose time and money on FRT

Most FRT-related overruns do not come from one headline cost. They come from accumulated rework across studies, vendor coordination and commissioning.

Common causes include:

- OEM generic models that do not represent site-specific controls
- Late disclosure of POI short-circuit levels or network configuration changes
- Inconsistent fault-clearing times assumed by different consultants
- Mismatch between PPC logic and inverter local controls
- Reactive power equipment sized for steady-state compliance, not dynamic support
- Protection settings that cause unnecessary plant disconnection during recoverable disturbances
- Hybrid projects where BESS and RE controls are not coordinated for fault response

In financial terms, the impact can be material. For a 250 MW to 500 MW solar or hybrid project, one additional round of model validation, utility comments and revised studies can add Rs 15 lakh to Rs 60 lakh in engineering and specialist consultancy costs, depending on complexity and whether EMT studies are needed. If the issue pushes back synchronisation by one to two months, IDC, liquidated damages exposure, generation loss and PPA milestone risk can become much larger than the pure engineering bill.

For very large projects feeding into 400 kV or 765 kV nodes, dynamic grid-support measures may also affect capex. Additional dynamic var support, upgraded plant controllers, communication improvements and testing support can move budgets by several crores. Even if the final hardware addition is modest, the lender concern is whether the project’s interconnection behaviour is bankable and robust under a changing network.

Practical design and contracting decisions that improve FRT outcomes

A strong FRT outcome is usually created at design and contracting stage, not only during final testing. Indian RE developers in 2026 should focus on five practical decisions.

First, define the compliance envelope in vendor contracts. Inverter, wind turbine converter, PPC and BESS PCS suppliers should have explicit obligations for Indian grid-code ride-through and reactive current behaviour. Avoid vague wording such as “grid compliant as applicable.” Specify performance at the actual POI conditions and utility acceptance requirements.

Second, insist on model quality and update discipline. It is no longer enough to receive a black-box model once. Contracts should define:

- Model type to be supplied for RMS and, where required, EMT
- Turnaround time for parameter updates
- Support during utility review meetings
- Accountability if field settings differ from approved models

Third, treat weak-grid conditions as a base case, not an exception. A project may energise into a network stronger or weaker than the original planning case depending on nearby lines, generation additions and outages. Plants designed only for ideal short-circuit conditions may face surprises after connectivity is granted.

Fourth, coordinate FRT with protection philosophy. Ride-through means the plant should survive transient voltage depressions that are within code limits, but genuine internal faults must still isolate quickly.

Developers should align inverter blocking logic, feeder protections, transformer protections and busbar schemes so that external transmission faults do not cascade into avoidable collector-system trips.

Fifth, integrate dynamic performance into the evacuation design review. Teams often separate plant package design from substation and line engineering. In reality, collector voltage control, transformer tap philosophy, shunt compensation, switchyard arrangement and communication latency all influence disturbance behaviour. This is why combining FRT review with [HV/EHV substation design](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/hvehvsubstationdesign) decisions improves commissioning outcomes.

2026 cost benchmarks and procurement implications

No single national tariff exists for FRT compliance services, but market practice in India during 2026 shows some broad ranges.

For utility-scale projects, developers can expect approximate costs such as:

- Basic RMS-based grid compliance and FRT study package for a straightforward project: Rs 8 lakh to Rs 25 lakh
- Detailed multi-scenario study package with utility interaction and settings review: Rs 20 lakh to Rs 50 lakh
- EMT modelling and interaction studies for complex or weak-grid cases: Rs 35 lakh to Rs 1.2 crore or more
- On-site disturbance performance testing support and model reconciliation: Rs 5 lakh to Rs 20 lakh

Capex impacts, if hardware or controls need strengthening, vary widely:

- PPC or controller upgrades: a few lakhs to low crores depending on scale and redundancy
- Additional dynamic reactive support or control integration changes: from tens of lakhs to several crores
- Communication and SCADA changes for coordinated response: project-specific, but often underestimated

For lenders and investors, these numbers are manageable if identified early. They become problematic only when they surface after financial closure or near scheduled commissioning. That is why due diligence in 2026 should explicitly ask whether the project has passed a credible FRT assessment at the actual interconnection assumptions, not merely whether OEM brochures mention low-voltage ride-through.

What utilities, C&I buyers and policymakers should care about

FRT is not only a generator-side concern. It affects wider market confidence in renewable integration.

For utilities and CTU/STUs, stronger FRT performance reduces the risk that a transmission fault triggers disproportionate renewable loss. That supports better system resilience, especially in high-RE hours.

For open-access and C&I buyers, poor grid-compliance behaviour at the generator end can translate into delayed COD, reduced availability, curtailment disputes or unstable injection patterns affecting contracted supply economics. In a market where delivered power cost matters more than nameplate capacity, disturbance performance is commercially relevant.

For policymakers, the 2026 challenge is implementation consistency. India has advanced materially on technical standards, but developers still face variation in modelling expectations, data sharing, utility review speed and disturbance testing protocols. Faster standardisation of model formats, acceptance criteria and coordination between CTUIL, STUs, RLDCs and SLDCs would reduce avoidable delays while maintaining system security.

Another issue is renewable cluster planning. When multiple projects connect around one evacuation corridor, aggregate dynamic behaviour matters more than standalone compliance. Future planning should increasingly require plant-level and area-level assessments so that one project's control strategy does not create instability for its neighbours.

A practical checklist before you apply for synchronisation

Before final utility submission, project teams should verify the following:

- POI network data and fault level assumptions are current
- The approved study model matches actual inverter, PPC and BESS firmware versions
- FRT parameters are frozen, documented and cross-checked with OEM declarations
- Reactive current injection logic is aligned with applicable requirements
- Protection settings do not create unintended trips for external cleared faults
- Post-fault recovery ramp rates are validated for both high and low generation conditions
- Any STATCOM, SVC or capacitor/reactor controls are coordinated with plant controls
- Site test procedures, disturbance recording and reporting formats are agreed in advance

If even two or three of these items are left unresolved, commissioning can become a negotiation rather than a test.

For developers and lenders, the lesson is straightforward. FRT should be handled as a core transmission-readiness item alongside evacuation capacity, bay readiness, metering and open-access approvals. It affects schedule certainty, compliance risk and long-term dispatch performance.

Growthifye supports project teams across transmission-side readiness, including Power system studies, Protection, control & SCADA, and broader connectivity engineering for renewable evacuation. If you are evaluating a new ISTS or state-grid interconnection, contact Growthifye's advisory desk for a focused review of your compliance pathway, study scope and commissioning risk.

Explore Growthifye's related capabilities

This analysis connects directly to our advisory practice: [Power system studies](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/powersystemstudies) · [HV/EHV substation design](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/hvehvsubstationdesign) · [Transmission line engineering](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/transmissionlineengineering) · [Protection, control & SCADA](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/protectioncontrolandscada).

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 84510 99371 · growthifye.com

This article is for general information only and does not constitute engineering, financial or legal advice. © Growthifye. Sharing with attribution is welcome.