Reactive Power Planning for RE Evacuation in India 2026: Costs, Grid Code, Design

By Sudarshan Karweer · 01 September 2026 · growthifye.com

A practical 2026 guide to reactive power planning for RE evacuation in India: grid code limits, sizing, costs, studies and lender risks.

India's renewable buildout has made reactive power planning a frontline transmission issue. For solar, wind, hybrid and storage-linked projects, the question is no longer whether voltage support will be needed, but where, how much, at what dynamic response, and who pays for underperformance when the project reaches testing and commercial operation.

In 2026, this topic matters because many projects still carry simplified assumptions from bid stage: inverter nameplate MVAr capability is taken at face value, transformer tap ranges are copied from old designs, pooling substation compensation is under-scoped, and grid strength at the interconnection point is assumed to remain static. By the time detailed studies are run, developers face a familiar problem: the plant can export MW in a steady-state case, but struggles to hold voltage, meet power factor obligations, or clear dynamic compliance events without derating active power.

For lenders, utilities and C&I offtakers, that translates into real risk: commissioning delays, capex change orders, lower annual generation, more restrictive operating envelopes, and disputes over whether the fault sits with the generating plant, the evacuation system, or the transmission utility.

This article looks at reactive power planning for renewable evacuation in India in 2026 from a practitioner's perspective: the regulatory context, common design mistakes, study methodology, cost benchmarks, contract allocation and implementation priorities.

Why reactive power planning has become critical in 2026

India's interstate and intrastate grids are carrying much larger shares of inverter-based resources than they were even three years ago. New ISTS-connected solar and wind clusters, hybrid projects with storage, and larger RE park evacuations are changing network behaviour in three ways.

- Voltage sensitivity is increasing at remote evacuation nodes.
- Short-circuit strength at many renewable interconnection points is relatively modest compared with conventional generation-heavy nodes.
- Reactive power demand is becoming more dynamic because of switching events, changing dispatch, line charging, transformer operating points and inverter controls.

At the same time, transmission buildout is uneven. A project may have nominal connectivity and sufficient thermal capacity on paper, yet still face weak-grid conditions during certain seasons, line outages or partial commissioning states.

This is why reactive planning can no longer be treated as a post-award equipment decision. It must be integrated with evacuation design, interconnection studies, control philosophy and contractual performance guarantees.

From a revenue perspective, the issue is straightforward. If a plant has to back down active power to preserve reactive headroom, the project loses saleable energy. On a 250 MW AC project, even a 2% average effective active-power limitation during high-irradiance periods can cut annual export materially.

Depending on CUF, tariff and settlement structure, this can mean several crore rupees of yearly downside. At tariffs in the range of about Rs 2.4-3.5/kWh for utility-scale projects, that is not a design footnote.

What the Indian grid framework effectively expects

While project-specific obligations depend on connectivity conditions, utility directions, CEA technical standards, Grid Code requirements and approval-stage comments, the practical expectation in 2026 is clear: renewable projects must be able to support voltage at the interconnection point across a defined operating range, and they must demonstrate this through credible studies and testing.

In practice, developers are usually assessed on a combination of these items:

- Reactive capability at the point of interconnection or pooling point
- Power factor performance over a specified active power range
- Voltage regulation and compliance under normal and contingency conditions
- Dynamic behaviour during faults, recovery and post-fault voltage support
- Coordination between plant controllers, inverter controls, OLTC settings and external compensation devices

A common mistake is to read the inverter datasheet as equivalent to delivered reactive capability at the grid boundary. It is not. Actual delivered MVAr is shaped by:

- DC/AC ratio and clipping profile
- Transformer impedance and tap position
- Collector system reactive losses
- Cable charging and line charging effects
- Auxiliary load behaviour
- Ambient temperature and equipment operating limits
- Active-power dispatch at the time reactive support is demanded

As a result, a project that appears compliant at inverter terminals may not be compliant at the 220 kV or 400 kV interconnection bus.

The core design question: inverter-only support or hybrid compensation

For most medium and large RE projects in India, the real design choice is not between providing or not providing reactive support. The choice is between relying primarily on inverter capability versus deploying a layered architecture using inverters plus fixed and dynamic compensation.

The right answer depends on grid strength, line length, project size, point of interconnection voltage, and utility expectations.

A practical framework is:

- Inverter-only approach: viable where the grid is relatively strong, evacuation distance is limited, and compliance margins are comfortable in all key scenarios.
- Inverter plus switched capacitor/reactor banks: useful where seasonal and operating-point variation needs staged compensation at reasonable cost.
- Inverter plus dynamic compensation: often needed where voltage volatility, weak-grid conditions or severe contingency cases make steady-state devices inadequate.

For many 100-500 MW projects evacuating at 220 kV or above, some combination of these is becoming normal in 2026.

Broad indicative cost ranges seen in the market can vary significantly by voltage level, OEM, civil scope and utility-specific requirements, but practitioners often work with rough planning assumptions such as:

- Fixed or switched capacitor/reactor installations at substation level: from roughly Rs 0.25-0.6 crore per MVAr equivalent depending on configuration and voltage class
- Dynamic compensation solutions on a project basis: much higher capex, often justified only where study outcomes and compliance risk support the case
- Control, relay, SCADA integration and testing additions: not large versus primary equipment cost, but often decisive for successful approvals

These are planning numbers only. Final project economics should be built from equipment specification, harmonic filtering needs, bus configuration, space constraints and performance obligations.

Where projects go wrong in sizing reactive support

Sizing errors generally arise from using one study case where ten are needed.

A robust methodology should examine at least the following conditions:

- Maximum export, high irradiance or high wind output
- Low export with long EHV line energised
- Minimum and maximum grid voltage scenarios
- N-1 outage cases affecting voltage profile
- Different transformer tap positions
- Seasonal cases, especially monsoon and summer extremes
- Partial project commissioning and staged bay readiness
- Nearby generation and transmission additions that alter short-circuit levels

Developers often under-scope these interactions:

- Reactive absorption at low active power
- Overvoltage risk due to line and cable charging
- Collector network losses and voltage rise in oversized cable systems
- Impact of BESS operating mode on net reactive exchange
- Interaction between OLTC logic and plant voltage control loops
- Harmonic and resonance implications of capacitor banks and filters

A particularly expensive issue is designing to a single forecasted short-circuit level. In reality, short-circuit strength at the node can shift depending on network topology and dispatch. If the plant controller and compensation philosophy are not validated across a range of SCR conditions, the project may behave acceptably in one season and poorly in another.

This is where detailed [Power system studies](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/powersystemstudies) and early coordination with the transmission utility pay for themselves. A study package that only satisfies filing formality is not enough. Developers need bankable answers on steady-state load flow, fault levels, dynamic response, control interactions and operability under realistic grid states.

Reactive power and substation design are inseparable

Reactive planning is often discussed as if it were purely a controls or transmission issue. In practice, it is deeply tied to substation architecture.

Key design interfaces include:

- Bus arrangement and bay availability for future compensation additions
- Transformer MVA sizing, impedance and tap range
- Shunt reactor or capacitor switching philosophy
- Space allocation, clearances and civil provisions for later augmentation
- Metering and SCADA points for utility visibility
- Protection coordination during switching and abnormal voltage conditions

This is why early-stage [HV/EHV substation design](/coreservices/transmissionengineering/hvehvsubstationdesign) matters. If the pooling or interconnection substation is laid out without considering future reactor/capacitor bays, filter footprint, cable routing, auxiliary load integration and control-room I/O expansion, even a technically simple correction later can become a six-month delay.

For RE park developers and large hybrid portfolios, there is also a portfolio effect. Standardised substation templates reduce engineering time, but over-standardisation can lead to poor reactive outcomes if one template is replicated across weak and strong grid nodes without adaptation.

In 2026, the smarter approach is modular standardisation: standard protection, control and civil philosophy, but project-specific reactive sizing and voltage-control strategy.

Contracting and lender issues developers should not ignore

Reactive power failures create disputes because responsibility is often split across packages.

Typical interfaces are:

- Plant EPC contractor
- Pooling substation contractor
- Transmission line package contractor
- Compensation equipment OEM or integrator
- Utility-owned bay or interconnection facilities
- SCADA and controller integration vendor

If performance obligations are vague, every party can argue that the grid was different from the assumptions used at bid stage.

Project contracts should therefore define:

- Point at which reactive performance is measured
- Grid conditions assumed for guaranteed performance and the treatment of variation
- Active-power derating rules, if any, to provide reactive support
- Responsibilities for model validation and study updates after utility comments
- Testing procedures and witness requirements

- Delay-risk allocation where utility-side infrastructure is incomplete
- Warranty consequences if control instability or non-compliance is found after COD

Lenders should ask specific questions during technical due diligence.

- Has the reactive capability been verified at the actual interconnection point, not only at inverter level?
- Are there dynamic studies, not just load flow snapshots?
- Is there sufficient capex contingency for compensation augmentation?
- Do testing timelines align with utility outage windows and commissioning windows?
- Can the project maintain contracted energy output while staying within voltage and PF requirements?

If the answer to these is uncertain, the financing case should reflect that uncertainty. In 2026, this is not an academic issue. Delay liquidated damages, extra capex and generation shortfall risk can all arise from weak reactive planning.

A practical 2026 roadmap for developers, C&I buyers and utilities

For developers:

- Start reactive studies at concept stage, before finalising POI assumptions and substation layout.
- Validate both injection and absorption requirements.
- Budget for staged compensation rather than assuming inverter headroom will solve everything.
- Keep controller integration and testing scope inside a single accountable workstream where possible.

For C&I buyers sourcing large open-access or captive RE:

- Ask whether the generator's evacuation design includes adequate reactive support and voltage compliance margin.
- Review whether weak-grid operation could affect availability or contracted supply quality.
- Check if compensation or controller upgrades are likely to appear later as pass-through cost claims.

For utilities and policymakers:

- Push for study assumptions that reflect realistic seasonal and contingency network states.
- Standardise practical compliance templates for renewable reactive capability submissions.
- Encourage earlier coordination between generation developers and transmission planners.
- Reduce repeated approval cycles caused by inconsistent model requirements across agencies and utilities.

A sensible engineering sequence for a new project is:

- Screen the node for voltage sensitivity and likely compensation need
- Freeze preliminary evacuation single-line philosophy
- Run iterative steady-state and dynamic studies
- Finalise compensation architecture and control logic
- Integrate design into substation, protection and SCADA scope
- Lock contractual guarantees and testing procedures
- Revalidate before commissioning against actual as-built network conditions

That sequence is cheaper than redesign after equipment ordering.

The commercial takeaway

Reactive power planning is now central to evacuation readiness, compliance and project returns in India. It affects not only whether a renewable project can connect, but whether it can sustain export at expected output, survive testing without redesign, and preserve lender confidence through commissioning.

The winners in 2026 will be the developers and asset owners who stop treating reactive support as a late-stage OEM checkbox and instead integrate it into transmission strategy from day one. That means realistic studies, project-specific compensation design, tight substation interfaces, and contracts that clearly assign performance responsibility.

For Indian RE developers, C&I consumers, lenders and utilities, the message is simple: voltage control and reactive capability are now commercial variables. If they are under-engineered, someone will pay for it in time, capex or lost generation.

If you are planning an RE evacuation scheme, evaluating node readiness, or stress-testing a project's bankability assumptions, contact Growthifye's advisory desk for practical support on transmission strategy, Power system studies and implementation 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