ISTS Connectivity & Grid Evacuation in India 2026: Costs, Studies, and Timelines

By Sudarshan Karweer · 25 August 2026 · growthifye.com

A practical 2026 guide to ISTS connectivity, evacuation planning, studies, charges and timelines for Indian RE projects.

India's renewable pipeline is no longer constrained only by land, modules, wind resource or offtake. In 2026, the harder bottleneck for many utility-scale projects is transmission engineering: getting timely connectivity, securing evacuation capacity, passing power system studies, and aligning project design with CEA, CTUIL, STU and grid-code requirements.

For developers, C&I consumers procuring through open access, lenders evaluating schedule risk, and utilities planning new corridors, transmission has become the difference between a bankable project and a stranded one. A well-sited 300 MW solar park can still miss commercial operation if bay allocation slips, a dynamic model is rejected, short-circuit levels exceed equipment ratings, or an upstream pooling station is delayed by right-of-way issues.

This article explains how ISTS connectivity and grid evacuation work in India in 2026, where the real risks sit, what studies and approvals matter, and how serious project sponsors can reduce timeline and cost overruns.

Why transmission engineering is now a front-end project risk

India's generation build-out continues to outpace commissioning of associated transmission in several renewable-rich zones. Solar and wind tenders have become more aggressive, but transmission assets remain exposed to longer approvals, route constraints, forest clearances, land acquisition for substations, and multi-agency coordination. That mismatch shows up as three practical problems.

First, connectivity is no longer a routine administrative step. The quality of the application, single-line diagram, plant control philosophy, reactive compensation concept, and forecast injection profile can materially affect review cycles.

Second, evacuation adequacy must be tested, not assumed. Developers often over-focus on contracted capacity and under-focus on the grid conditions under which power is actually evacuated. A project may have nominal connectivity, yet face curtailment, revised injection conditions, harmonic restrictions, or delayed synchronisation if system studies reveal issues.

Third, financing institutions are now scrutinising transmission dependencies more closely. A lender in 2026 will usually ask not only whether connectivity has been granted, but whether the evacuation path is fully identified, whether terminal bays are available, whether downstream transmission packages are awarded, and whether statutory and technical milestones align with COD assumptions.

For C&I consumers sourcing interstate renewable power, transmission engineering matters because it directly affects delivered tariff, scheduling reliability, and open-access viability. Transmission losses, point-of-connection design, and curtailment exposure can change the economics of supply by tens of paise per kWh over the contract life.

ISTS vs intrastate connectivity: what project sponsors should evaluate

At a basic level, interstate transmission system, or ISTS, connectivity is relevant where generation is injecting into the central transmission network for sale across states or through structures requiring interstate evacuation. Intrastate connectivity typically applies where the state transmission utility, or STU, network is the relevant grid interface. But in practice, the choice is strategic and should be made after considering tariff, network readiness, offtake geography, and implementation timeline.

For an RE developer, ISTS connectivity can offer access to a wider market and stronger evacuation options in some corridors, especially for large-scale projects above 100 MW. It can also align better with central tenders and interstate sale structures. However, that advantage can be offset if the nearest ISTS substation is far away, if the relevant pooling station is oversubscribed, or if the bay or line package is delayed.

Intrastate connectivity may reduce dedicated line length in some cases and offer simpler local integration, but can introduce state-specific scheduling, wheeling, banking and network-augmentation constraints. For C&I structures, intrastate routing may still be economically superior if open-access charges and losses are lower in the target state and if the state network has spare capacity.

A sound comparison in 2026 should cover at least the following:

- Distance from plant switchyard to proposed interconnection point
- Voltage level required: 220 kV, 400 kV, 765 kV or HVDC-linked evacuation context
- Availability of bays at existing substations or need for new pooling stations
- Upstream corridor loading under high renewable injection scenarios
- Applicable transmission charges, losses, wheeling components and scheduling implications
- Likelihood of curtailment during low-demand, high-RE periods
- Construction interface risk between generator scope and transmission scope
- Realistic synchronisation timeline, not only nominal connectivity grant date

In many utility-scale cases, a dedicated evacuation line plus bay extension can cost from about Rs 0.35 crore to Rs 1.2 crore per km depending on voltage level, terrain, conductor configuration, compensation requirement and right-of-way complexity. A 220 kV line in benign terrain may be materially cheaper than a 400 kV double-circuit line with difficult tower spotting, crossings and long-lead equipment. Substation bay costs can range from roughly Rs 8 crore to Rs 20 crore or more depending on voltage class and protection, metering, SAS and bus arrangement requirements. These are broad directional figures; bankable estimates need route survey and system-specific design.

The 2026 connectivity process: approvals, studies and documentation that matter

A large number of avoidable delays arise because developers treat connectivity as a document-submission exercise rather than a technical integration process. In reality, the review chain now expects stronger engineering maturity before granting or operationalising connectivity.

A robust connectivity package should typically anticipate the following components:

- Plant capacity and technology details, including inverter or turbine model families
- Single-line diagram from generator transformer to grid interconnection point
- Reactive power management philosophy, including inverter capability, STATCOM/SVC if applicable, capacitor/reactor logic and voltage-control mode
- Fault-level contribution estimates at the point of interconnection

- Protection scheme and relay coordination concept
- Metering and communication architecture compliant with grid and scheduling requirements
- Forecast of seasonal and diurnal injection patterns
- Dynamic model files and PSCAD/PSSE-compatible representation where requested
- Black-start limitations, ramp-rate characteristics and frequency response capability

Power system studies are often the decisive step. Depending on the project and point of connection, studies may include load flow, short-circuit, transient stability, voltage stability, reactive compensation sizing, insulation coordination, protection coordination, harmonic analysis and sub-synchronous interaction checks in select contexts. Hybrid RE and BESS-linked projects require even more careful study because injection patterns are less static and plant controllers can materially affect grid behaviour.

For example, a 500 MW solar-plus-storage project connecting at 400 kV may pass steady-state load flow but still require redesign if voltage recovery performance, fault ride-through behaviour or dynamic reactive support is inadequate under severe contingencies. Similarly, an aggregation of inverter-based projects around the same node can create control-interaction risks that are not obvious from the initial application.

From a timeline standpoint, sophisticated sponsors should assume that connectivity, bay allocation, study validation, detailed engineering, procurement and construction interfaces can collectively consume 12 to 24 months, and sometimes longer in heavily loaded corridors. Projects that assume a 9- to 12-month transmission path without route and substation readiness often build in avoidable COD risk.

Evacuation design choices that affect cost, losses and curtailment

Evacuation is not just about connecting to the nearest substation. The design of the evacuation scheme can materially affect annual delivered energy, auxiliary consumption, reactive power penalties, and future expandability.

The first decision is voltage level. A 100 MW project may evacuate at 220 kV in one region but require 400 kV integration in another due to distance, fault levels, system strength or corridor planning. Pushing too low a voltage over a long dedicated line increases losses and can complicate voltage control. Over-designing at too high a voltage can inflate capex and bay costs.

The second decision is whether to build radial evacuation or tie into a larger pooling arrangement. Radial schemes may be simpler from a control perspective but can expose the generator to outage risk if redundancy is limited. Shared pooling can improve system utilisation but requires tight coordination on interface specifications, metering boundaries and outage planning.

Third, reactive power design is now central. Grid compliance cannot be left to generic inverter settings. Plants must demonstrate the ability to support voltage within required operating ranges, manage night-time reactive exchange where applicable, and avoid nuisance tripping during disturbances. In practical terms, this may mean adding STATCOM capacity, revising collector-network design, resizing transformer taps, or changing the control hierarchy between PPC and inverter controllers.

Fourth, curtailment exposure should be modelled economically. A project with a slightly higher evacuation capex but stronger access to uncongested transmission may outperform a lower-capex project that loses 2% to 6% annual generation to congestion or dispatch restrictions. At a tariff of Rs 2.5 to Rs 3.2 per kWh, even a 3% generation loss on a 300 MW project can have a substantial net-present-value impact over the PPA term.

Grid codes, compliance and testing: where projects often fail late

India’s grid-code and technical-compliance environment has tightened as inverter-based generation becomes a larger share of the mix. Compliance is no longer a box-ticking exercise undertaken shortly before synchronisation. It must be embedded in equipment selection, controller settings and testing plans from the start.

Common late-stage failure points include:

- Mismatch between submitted and actual inverter or turbine control models
- Inadequate fault ride-through performance during validation tests
- Reactive capability shortfall at low active power operation
- Protection settings that are too conservative and cause avoidable tripping
- SCADA and telemetry gaps affecting scheduling, despatch and visibility
- Harmonic distortion or resonance concerns at the interconnection point
- Poor coordination between EPC, OEM and transmission contractor responsibilities

The practical lesson is simple: model governance matters. If the system study used one set of OEM parameters and the commissioned plant behaves differently, approval cycles can reopen. Growth-stage developers often underestimate this risk, especially when OEM substitutions occur after financing.

Testing and commissioning plans should be frozen early with clear responsibility matrices. That includes relay testing, communication and time synchronisation checks, plant controller validation, ramp-rate testing, reactive performance verification, and disturbance recording readiness. For lenders, these items are not technical footnotes; they are preconditions for stable revenue operations.

What lenders, utilities and policymakers should watch in 2026

For lenders, the key issue is transmission dependency mapping. A prudent credit review should separate generator-complete risk from grid-ready risk. Questions worth asking include: Is the interconnection substation already commissioned? Are transmission packages under execution, awarded, or only planned? Are there known right-of-way bottlenecks? Has the project passed preliminary and detailed studies? Is dynamic model acceptance complete? What is the realistic margin between transmission readiness and target COD?

For utilities and offtakers, congestion management and visibility are increasingly important. As more solar, wind and hybrid projects connect to the same corridors, operational data quality and forecasting integration become critical. Curtailment, if poorly signalled or unevenly applied, can create settlement disputes and weaken investor confidence. Better telemetry, centralised forecasting integration and transparent outage planning can reduce these frictions.

For policymakers, the 2026 priority is not only adding transmission kilometres but improving corridor readiness and inter-agency execution. Green Energy Corridor investments, ISTS augmentation, renewable energy zone planning, and digital substation modernisation all matter, but the implementation chain has to be synchronised with generation tendering. Announcing generation volumes without matching transmission readiness only pushes risk downstream to developers, discoms and financiers.

Policy attention should also focus on standardising technical data requirements, speeding study reviews, and reducing ambiguity in interconnection responsibility boundaries. In many projects, weeks are lost not because the engineering is impossible, but because documentation formats, model requirements or interface definitions are inconsistent across stakeholders.

A practical checklist for project sponsors planning connectivity and evacuation

Before bidding, land acquisition or financial close, project sponsors should complete a transmission diligence exercise at almost the same depth as resource assessment. At minimum, the checklist should cover:

- Nearest feasible ISTS and STU interconnection points with distance and voltage mapping
- Bay availability and expansion requirement at the target substation
- Upstream network loading and congestion risk under peak RE injection
- Dedicated line routing constraints, crossings and right-of-way sensitivity
- Preliminary capex estimate for line, bay, protection, SAS, metering and communication
- Required system studies and data readiness from OEMs
- Grid-code compliance matrix covering fault ride-through, reactive power and telemetry
- Construction interface plan between plant EPC and transmission works
- COD sensitivity analysis under 3-month, 6-month and 12-month transmission delays
- Delivered-tariff impact of transmission losses, charges and curtailment scenarios

The strongest developers in India are now integrating this analysis before finalising bid strategy. That is the right approach. A tariff that looks competitive on paper can become unworkable if evacuation assumptions are weak. Conversely, a project that invests early in transmission engineering often secures faster approvals, cleaner commissioning and better long-term plant availability.

Transmission is no longer a back-end package to be solved after the PPA. In 2026, it is a core value driver for renewable projects, open-access supply structures and utility planning across India. Sponsors who understand connectivity, evacuation design, grid studies and compliance as one integrated discipline will be better placed to deliver projects on time and protect returns.

If your team is evaluating ISTS connectivity, grid evacuation options, substation interfaces or power system studies, contact Growthifye's advisory desk for a practical review of technical, regulatory and bankability risks before they become project delays.

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