India Solar EPC 2026: DC Oversizing, ILR Strategy and Yield-Risk Planning

By Sudarshan Karweer · 27 August 2026 · growthifye.com

A 2026 practitioner guide to DC oversizing, ILR selection, clipping economics, ALMM impacts and lender-ready yield planning in India.

India's solar market in 2026 is no longer pricing risk only on module cost, ALMM availability or evacuation readiness. A quieter but equally material issue is now getting board-level attention: inverter loading ratio, or ILR, and the broader question of DC oversizing.

For Indian utility-scale, group captive and behind-the-meter C&I projects, the old shorthand of "just use 1.3" is increasingly weak. Module watt classes have changed, inverter current limits have tightened design choices, state-specific irradiation patterns matter more in merchant and open-access structures, and curtailment risk is forcing a different view of peak-hour generation. Add BESS into the design conversation and the economics can shift again.

This makes ILR strategy a real EPC, financing and revenue issue, not just an electrical design parameter. In practice, the right DC:AC ratio in 2026 depends on tariff structure, seasonal load curve, module pricing, land constraints, clipping tolerance, evacuation limits, CFA or DCR conditions where relevant, and how lenders underwrite P50/P90 output.

This article sets out a practical framework for Indian stakeholders evaluating DC oversizing in 2026, with numbers, trade-offs and implementation considerations.

Why ILR matters more in India in 2026

ILR is the ratio of installed DC module capacity to inverter AC capacity. A 130 MWp DC plant connected to 100 MWac inverter capacity has an ILR of 1.30. The purpose is straightforward: modules rarely operate at nameplate output due to temperature losses, irradiance variability, mismatch, soiling and degradation. By adding extra DC, the project drives higher inverter utilisation over more hours of the day.

In 2026, several India-specific factors are making ILR optimisation more valuable:

- Module prices have softened versus the 2022-24 stress period, but ALMM-compliant supply still carries timing and bankability implications by manufacturer and technology line.
- High-efficiency n-type TOPCon modules in the 575-650 W class are common in utility procurement, changing string sizing and inverter current matching.
- C&I consumers are more focused on daytime self-consumption and demand-charge management, not just annual kWh output.
- Curtailment and substation backdown in some states reduce the value of noon-time excess generation.
- Land and transmission costs remain elevated enough that extracting more kWh per MWac can improve economics if clipping is controlled.
- Lenders are asking more detailed questions on clipping loss assumptions, DC degradation, and the gap between modelled and achievable net export.

For many projects, ILR decisions can move annual generation by 2% to 6%, but project IRR by much more depending on tariff structure and peak-value alignment.

Typical ILR ranges and when they work

There is no universal “correct” ILR, but current Indian market practice in 2026 generally falls into these bands:

- 1.15-1.22: conservative range, often used where land is constrained, module supply is uncertain, or grid export limits are strict
- 1.23-1.30: common range for utility and open-access plants with stable evacuation and standard revenue structures
- 1.31-1.40: aggressive range, typically justified where modules are relatively cheap, land is available, and morning/afternoon shoulder generation is valuable
- Above 1.40: niche use case, generally requiring careful clipping analysis, strong inverter compatibility and often a co-located storage or constrained interconnection rationale

In many Indian climates, moving from an ILR of 1.20 to 1.30 can raise annual AC energy by roughly 3% to 4.5%, depending on temperature profile, GHI/DNI mix, orientation, inverter behaviour and losses. Moving from 1.30 to 1.40 often yields a smaller incremental benefit, sometimes only 1% to 2.5%, while clipping losses rise faster.

That diminishing return is where poor designs get exposed. If the project is already facing noon curtailment, or if the buyer’s load falls in peak solar hours due to operational shifts, extra DC can become under-monetised capacity.

As a screening rule in 2026:

- Group captive/open access with fixed tariff and healthy evacuation: ILR 1.25-1.35 is often bankable
- Utility tender with known backdown risk: ILR should be tested against curtailment-adjusted dispatch, not unconstrained generation
- Behind-the-meter C&I with strong daytime load: ILR 1.20-1.30 can work well if export is limited and self-consumption remains high
- Solar plus storage: ILR can sometimes be pushed higher if clipped energy is captured or shifted, but round-trip losses and storage cycling economics must be included

The economics: module CAPEX versus clipping and tariff value

The core ILR decision is simple in principle: does the value of extra AC energy justify the cost of additional DC capacity and associated BOS impacts?

For a 2026 Indian ground-mount project, adding DC capacity is not only a module purchase decision. It may also affect:

- Module mounting structure tonnage
- DC cable quantities and combiner architecture
- string sizing and current compliance with inverter MPPTs
- SCB/JB counts depending on design approach
- pile count and table layout
- land-use intensity and row spacing constraints
- transformer loading margins in some configurations

Indicatively, if the marginal all-in cost of extra DC capacity is around Rs 14-20 lakh per MWp added, and that additional MWp generates 1.4-1.8 million kWh over the plant life in net AC terms after clipping and degradation, the decision can look attractive under tariffs of Rs 2.6-3.5/kWh. But the economics weaken sharply if:

- clipping exceeds modelled values by 1-2 percentage points
- ALMM supplier substitution changes module IV characteristics or dimensions late in procurement
- evacuation caps force energy spill
- high-temperature performance is poorer than assumed
- C&I offtaker load coincidence is lower than expected

A practical way to judge ILR is to compare levelised cost of the incremental kWh from added DC against the realised tariff or avoided power purchase cost.

For example:

- Base project: 100 MWac with 125 MWp DC at ILR 1.25
- Option B: 100 MWac with 132 MWp DC at ILR 1.32
- Incremental DC added: 7 MWp
- Marginal added EPC cost: say Rs 1.2-1.4 crore per MWp depending on technology and BOS implications
- Annual incremental net AC yield: maybe 1.8-2.8% on total plant output, depending on site and clipping

At 100 MWac scale, that may mean an extra 4-6 million kWh per year. At Rs 3.0/kWh realisation, that is Rs 1.2-1.8 crore annual gross revenue. Even after degradation and financing impact, the uplift can be compelling. But if curtailment strips out 25-35% of that incremental noon-heavy energy, the case changes materially.

This is why lenders increasingly want project-specific clipping and dispatch modelling rather than generic design assumptions.

Technology constraints shaping ILR decisions

In 2026, ILR is also constrained by hardware realities, especially module current and inverter input capability.

Key issues include:

- High-current modules can exceed inverter string input current windows if string design is copied without checking operating current at site temperatures.
- Bifacial gain assumptions can accidentally increase effective DC loading beyond design intent.
- East-west layouts can tolerate higher ILR with lower peak clipping than due-south layouts because generation is spread wider across the day.
- Tracker projects often need more refined clipping analysis than fixed-tilt because of higher noon concentration unless backtracking and control logic are optimised.
- Reactive power obligations and high-temperature derating can influence usable AC export, especially in weak-grid conditions.

This is where disciplined [Procurement & vendor management](/coreservices/epc/procurementandvendormanagement) becomes important. A paper ILR strategy can fail in execution if module dimensions shift after contracting, or if inverter firmware and DC-side compatibility assumptions are not locked before procurement release.

Design teams should verify at minimum:

- MPPT voltage window against seasonal temperatures
- max string voltage at minimum ambient conditions
- current compatibility at module Isc and operating current levels
- clipping profile by month, not just annual aggregate
- AC cable and transformer loading during high-generation windows
- parasitic load impact on shoulder-hour gain
- mismatch risk if multiple module bins or substitute suppliers are introduced

For projects with single-axis trackers, the interaction of ILR and tracker stow strategy should also be reviewed. In some curtailment-prone locations, a slightly lower ILR with better dispatch discipline can outperform an aggressively oversized design that cannot monetise its noon peak.

ILR strategy for C&I, utility and solar-plus-storage projects

Different business models value the same kWh differently. That means ILR should be selected around revenue shape, not just annual yield.

C&I open access and captive

For C&I consumers, the most important question is hourly alignment with consumption and grid import tariff. If the customer pays blended daytime power costs of Rs 6-9/kWh and can absorb solar internally, extra shoulder-hour generation has strong value. But if contract demand, weekend operations or seasonal shutdowns reduce daytime offtake, oversized DC may simply push more low-value export.

Good practice is to model at least:

- 15-minute customer load data for 12 months
- seasonal operating schedules
- holiday/weekend variation
- banking rules and settlement assumptions by state
- DSM or scheduling implications where relevant

In these cases, ILR of 1.20-1.30 is often sensible, but a plant serving a stable industrial day load may justify 1.32 or slightly above if export restrictions are manageable.

Utility-scale ISTS and intrastate projects

For utility projects, the tariff is usually fixed and the challenge is minimising LCOE while protecting net delivered energy. Here, ILR should be stress-tested against:

- state or nodal curtailment history
- pooling substation loading pattern
- seasonal cloud behaviour
- declared capacity and scheduling regime
- P90 debt case assumptions

A project selling at tariffs near Rs 2.5-2.8/kWh cannot afford optimistic clipping assumptions that later erode DSCR. Developers should model not just annual clipping percentage but monthly and hourly clipping concentration, especially if high generation coincides with recurring grid constraints.

Solar with BESS

Storage changes the ILR discussion because clipped or low-value noon energy can sometimes be shifted into evening peaks. But this is not automatic.

The value depends on:

- BESS duration and usable capacity
- PCS sizing relative to PV export limit
- round-trip efficiency, typically 85-90% AC-to-AC depending on system design
- cycling regime and warranty throughput constraints
- evening tariff premium or peak demand savings

In some cases, a PV plant at ILR 1.35 with a 2-hour BESS can outperform a 1.25 design without storage. In others, the battery remains underused because charging windows are short, clipped energy is insufficiently frequent, or the tariff spread is too narrow.

This is why [BESS system integration](/coreservices/epc/besssystemintegration) should be assessed together with PV oversizing, not as an afterthought. The right answer often lies in co-optimising inverter rating, battery PCS, point of interconnection limits and dispatch logic.

What lenders and investors now expect in 2026

Bankability around yield assumptions has become tighter. Debt providers are no longer comfortable with generic consultant templates that assume standard clipping and uniform weather-year behaviour.

A lender-ready ILR assessment should include:

- site-specific generation simulation using credible long-term weather data
- separate P50 and P90 clipping estimates
- temperature-adjusted module performance assumptions
- degradation curve by technology type, especially for n-type lines
- curtailment sensitivity cases
- equipment substitution risk if named ALMM vendors are changed
- monthly net export profile and revenue mapping
- downside case for inverter outages or thermal derating

For financed projects, even a 1-1.5% overstatement in net deliverable energy can materially affect minimum DSCR in early years. That is why prudent developers are increasingly choosing designs that are not just yield-maximising, but model-defensible.

From an EPC standpoint, this also requires strong QA/QC & HSE enforcement during construction, because string mismatch, poor terminations, connector heating, tracker misalignment and commissioning defects can erase the expected benefit of higher DC loading.

A practical decision framework for developers and buyers

Before freezing ILR, Indian project sponsors in 2026 should ask six practical questions:

- What is the actual value of incremental kWh by time block, not just annually?
- How much clipping occurs monthly, and is that energy monetisable?
- Are module and inverter selections electrically compatible at the intended DC loading?
- Will evacuation, curtailment or export limits cap AC delivery?
- Does the land, structure and cable design support the extra DC at acceptable cost?
- Will the design remain bankable if one approved supplier is replaced during procurement?

A disciplined pre-FC or pre-award study should compare at least three ILR cases, such as 1.20, 1.28 and 1.35, under base, downside and curtailment scenarios. For most projects, the best answer is not the highest-yield case on paper, but the one with the best risk-adjusted delivered energy per rupee invested.

For sponsors executing at scale, this is exactly where experienced [Solar & hybrid plant EPC](/coreservices/epc/solarandhybridplantepc) support adds value. Design choices on ILR influence procurement sequencing, BoS design, commissioning profile, revenue certainty and lender confidence from the start of the project cycle.

In 2026, DC oversizing in India is no longer a generic design tweak. It is a commercial strategy embedded in EPC design, grid reality and financing discipline. Projects that treat ILR analytically will generally produce tighter CAPEX allocation, more defensible generation estimates and fewer post-commissioning surprises.

If you are evaluating solar plant design, revamp sizing, or a solar-plus-storage business case, contact Growthifye’s advisory desk for project-specific support on design optimisation, EPC strategy and bankable yield-risk assessment.

Explore Growthifye's related capabilities

This analysis connects directly to our advisory practice: [Solar & hybrid plant EPC](/coreservices/epc/solarandhybridplantepc) · [BESS system integration](/coreservices/epc/besssystemintegration) · [Balance of system & civil works](/coreservices/epc/balanceofsystemandcivilworks) · [Procurement & vendor management](/coreservices/epc/procurementandvendormanagement).

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