The Renewable Energy Tariff Toolbox User Manual









www.ecreee.org

This study has been elaborated by MRC Group of Companies on behalf of the EUEI PDF and ECREEE, and the contributions of the GIZ.

Supported by

European Union Energy Initiative Partnership Dialogue Facility (EUEI PDF)



c/o Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH P.O. Box 5180, 65726 Eschborn, Germany

info@euei-pdf.org www.euei-pdf.org

Authors Alice Waltham, MRC Group Alejo Loira, MRC Group

With comments and contributions by

Nicola Bugatti, ECREEE Lucius Mayer Tasch, GIZ Mohammed Sokona, ADB Silvia Puddu, EUEI PDF Crispen Zana, EUEI PDF

Place and date of publication

Bonn, August 2017

The **Partnership Dialogue Facility (EUEI PDF)** is an instrument of the EU Energy Initiative (EUEI). It currently receives contributions from the European Commission, Austria, Finland, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Sweden.



AUSTRIAN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION



Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development







TABLE OF CONTENTS

| LIST | OF TABLES | 4 |
|------|--|-----|
| LIST | OF FIGURES | 5 |
| ACR | RONYMS | 6 |
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 8 |
| 1.1. | Functionalities and applications of the models | 9 |
| 1.2. | Structure of this report | 11 |
| 1.3. | Structure of the models | 12 |
| 1.4. | Protect/unprotect the model | 15 |
| 1.5. | Reference data | 16 |
| 2. | IPP MODEL | 17 |
| 2.1. | Inputs | 17 |
| 2.2. | Running the model | 27 |
| 2.3. | Calculations underpinning the model | 28 |
| 2.4. | Outputs | 31 |
| 2.5. | Key questions | 33 |
| 3. | PROSUMER MODEL | |
| 3.1. | Inputs | 44 |
| 3.2. | Running the model | 55 |
| 3.3. | Calculations underpinning the model | 56 |
| 3.4. | Outputs | 60 |
| 3.5. | Key questions | 63 |
| 4. | GREEN MINI GRID (GMG) MODEL | 66 |
| 4.1. | Inputs | 66 |
| 4.2. | Running the model | 76 |
| 4.3. | Calculations underpinning the model | 77 |
| 4.4. | Outputs | 79 |
| 4.5. | Key questions | 80 |
| 5. | SUPPLY CURVE MODEL | 85 |
| 5.1. | Approach | 85 |
| 5.2. | Inputs | 85 |
| 5.3. | Running the model | |
| 5.4. | Calculations underpinning the model | 90 |
| 5.5. | Outputs | |
| 5.6. | Key questions | |
| 6. | ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING WORKBOOKS | |
| 6.1. | Wind power capacity profiles | 94 |
| 6.2. | Fuel Unit Conversion Tool | |
| 6.3. | Reference Input Data | |
| 7. | BIBLIOGKAPHY | 110 |

List of tables

| Table 1: General inputs | 17 |
|--|----|
| Table 2: Reference project inputs | |
| Table 3: Avoided costs and system impact inputs | 24 |
| Table 4: General inputs | 44 |
| Table 5: Reference project inputs | 45 |
| Table 6: Avoided cost and system impact inputs | 52 |
| Table 7: Benefits to consumers from onsite generation | 58 |
| Table 8: General inputs | 66 |
| Table 9: Reference project inputs | 68 |
| Table 10: Avoided costs and system impact | 72 |
| Table 11: Inputs for the supply curve model | 85 |
| Table 12: General inputs | 94 |
| Table 13: Inputs for the Fuel Unit Conversion Tool | 97 |
| Table 14: Production inputs | 99 |
| Table 15: OPEX Inputs | 99 |
| Table 16: CAPEX Inputs | 99 |
| Table 17: Production Inputs | |
| Table 18: OPEX Inputs | |
| Table 19: CAPEX Inputs (utility scale) | |
| Table 20: CAPEX Inputs (rooftop grid connected >1kW) | |
| Table 21: Production Inputs | |
| Table 22: Non-Fuel OPEX Inputs | |
| Table 23: CAPEX Inputs | |
| Table 24: Production Inputs | |
| Table 25: OPEX Inputs | |
| Table 26: CAPEX Inputs | |
| Table 27: Production Inputs | |
| Table 28: Inputs for coal | |
| Table 29: Inputs for stored hydro | |
| Table 30: Inputs for natural Gas – Open Cycle Gas Turbine | |
| Table 31: Inputs for natural Gas – Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) | |
| Table 32: Inputs for heavy fuel oil | |
| Table 33: Inputs for light fuel oil | |
| Table 34: Inputs for fuel costs | |
| Table 35: Inputs for oil | |
| Table 36: Inputs for coal | |

List of Figures

| Figure 1: Toolbox structure | 12 |
|--|----|
| Figure 2: reference project calculation | 13 |
| Figure 3: Macro to protect or unprotect the workbook | 16 |
| Figure 4: Process underlying the modelling behind the IPP reference project approach | 29 |
| Figure 5: Output tariffs for base case and three scenarios | 31 |
| Figure 6: Output graphs for the reference project | 32 |
| Figure 7: Breakdown of tariff by categories of costs | 33 |
| Figure 8: Taxes input to the model | 36 |
| Figure 9: Grant and soft loan inputs to model | 37 |
| Figure 10: Greenhouse gas emissions inputs | 38 |
| Figure 11: Scenario inputs | 39 |
| Figure 12: Scenario outputs | 39 |
| Figure 13: Currency in inputs | 41 |
| Figure 14: Currency in outputs | 41 |
| Figure 15: Breakdown of tariff (from outputs) | 42 |
| Figure 16: Tariff evolution for an indexed tariff over 25 years | 43 |
| Figure 17: Output graphs for the reference project | 60 |
| Figure 18: Example of changing the customer names | 64 |
| Figure 19: Generator type in "Lists" sheet of prosumer model | 65 |
| Figure 20: Building blocks model | 77 |
| Figure 21: Output graphs for the reference project | 79 |
| Figure 22: Macro to calculate required subsidy | 82 |
| Figure 23: Subsidy for a given category | 82 |
| Figure 24: Power generation sources making up the target | 92 |

Acronyms

| EBIT | Earnings before interest and tax |
|----------------|--|
| EBITDA | Earnings before interest, tax, depreciation and amortization |
| ECOWAS | Economic Community of West African States |
| ECREEE | ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency |
| EMRC | Energy Market and Regulatory Consultants (member of the MRC) |
| ERERA | ECOWAS Regional Electricity Regulatory Authority |
| EUEI PDF | EU Energy Initiative Partnership Dialogue Facility |
| FCFtE | Free Cash Flow to Equity |
| FCFtF | Free Cash Flow to the Firm |
| FIT | Feed in tariff |
| GHG | Greenhouse Gas |
| GMG | Green Mini Grid |
| IIF | Inflation Indexation Factor |
| IPP | Independent Power Producer |
| IRR | Internal Rate of Return |
| kW | Kilowatt |
| kWh | Kilowatt hour |
| LCOE | Levelised cost of electricity |
| MW | Megawatt |
| MWh | Megawatt hour |
| NPV | Net Present Value |
| 0&M | Operation and Maintenance |
| PPA | Power purchase agreement |
| PV | Photovoltaic |
| RE | Renewable energy |
| RES | Renewable Energy Sources |
| RES-E | Electricity from Renewable Energy Sources |
| | |
| RIF | Revenue Indexation Factor |
| RIF Var O&M | Revenue Indexation Factor Variable Operations and Maintenance |

Foreword



Fellow citizens, partners and readers!

It is a great honour and pleasure for me to present this manual for the Renewable Energy Tariff Toolbox.

Despite the vast energy resources of its 15 Member States, the energy market remains largely underdeveloped. Expanding access to modern, reliable, and affordable energy services has therefore become a key regional priority.

As part of efforts to increase access to modern energy services in the region, the ECOWAS authority established the ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE) in 2010. Since its establishment, ECREEE has sought to actualize its vision and mandate of developing viable sustainable energy markets in the ECOWAS region.

The interest in low carbon renewable energy technologies is gaining momentum in West Africa. Renewable energy (RE) deployment is seen by ECOWAS Member Countries as a way to satisfy their need for power generation in access.

However, the lack of clear renewable energy policies and incentives still constitutes an important barrier for private sector participation in the RE sector. Traditionally, many project developers have to negotiate with authorities the conditions applicable to each individual project such as individual feed-in tariffs (FiT). In recent years, tenders to select independent power producers have become increasingly prevalent in the region, and government institutions as well as the potential offtakers see a need to determine acceptable tariffs. Many ministries, regulators and utilities still lack appropriate instruments and methodologies to calculate fair and transparent renewable energy tariffs. Therefore, this remains a key barrier for RE projects and the renewable energy sector development in the region.

Thus, the ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE) and the EUEI Partnership Dialogue Facility (EUEI PDF), have joined forces to develop a set of tools that can be used to set or assess tariffs for grid-connected and off-grid renewable energy systems in West Africa. Dear readers, it is my hope that this tool will pave the way to an accelerated deployment of renewable energies, not only at the regional level but also at a global level.

This manual accompanies the toolbox that contains four main separate models:

- 1. Renewable Independent Power Producer (IPP),
- 2. Prosumers¹,
- 3. Green Mini-grids (GMG) and
- 4. Supply curve.

As the Executive Director of the ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE), I would like to thank the EUEI Partnership Dialogue Facility (EUEI PDF) for their strong and continuous support that we wish to continue in future.

be fed back into the grid. The word is a combination of terms "producer" and "consumer".

¹ The neologism "prosumer" refers to a small-scale end-users who, in addition to using electricity from the grid, generates power for own consumption and/or to

Mahama Kappiah Executive Director ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE)

Foreword



Sub-Saharan Africa faces an enormous energy challenge. Although the picture varies widely across the region, economic and population growth is leading to an increasing demand for energy; governments will need to significantly expand installed generation capacity and make extensive upgrades to the power grid.

Despite substantial progress in some countries, electrification efforts do not keep pace with population growth in the region.

In spite of abundant resources of renewable energy in Africa and declining costs of renewable technologies, the continent's share of primary energy supply remains low. Unfortunately, quick deployment of new technologies cannot be expected from market dynamics alone and the private sector will not commit without minimum requirements being met in terms of a stable and attractive policy environment. Policy instruments, such a sound energy planning, are thus necessary to unlock potential. Measures have to be taken to attract investment in decentralised as well as centralised renewable energy production in order to meet both the need to increase access to clean energy and the rapidly growing demand in a sustainable way. ~

The proper design of fair and transparent renewable energy tariffs is one of the keys to opening the sector to cost-competitive projects that again will contribute to boosting the development of the renewable energy sector in the region. Yet, many ministries, regulators and utilities in sub-Saharan Africa lack appropriate instruments and methods to design renewable tariffs. To tackle this problem, the EU Energy Initiative Partnership Dialogue Facility (EUEI PDF) supported the ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE) in the development of a set of standard models (Toolbox) to calculate and design renewable energy tariffs and the present user manual. The Toolbox will be a useful instrument for the design and negotiation of PPAs, tenders, bidding processes and feed-in tariffs. It will also help the user to understand the impact of tariff levels on consumer habits.

Although the Toolbox has been developed for the ECOWAS region, the models are flexible and can be easily adapted to the specific environment and needs of any country and region.

This Toolkit is a tangible result of the longstanding collaboration between the EUEI PDF and ECREEE, and shows the joint commitment to paving the way to a more sustainable future in the region. At the end of 2018, the EUEI PDF will change name and continue supporting sustainable energy in Africa as the Global Energy Transformation Programme (GET.pro). As a European multi-donor platform, GET.pro will deliver on international energy and climate targets by mobilising private investments in renewable energy and supporting partner regions and countries in advancing their energy transition. Besides this transition, I strongly hope to continue our successful collaboration in the future.

I would like to thank the authors and all contributors from the ECOWAS region for their efforts to make this Toolbox a reality. It is our expectation that it will build a stepping stone for attracting the highly needed investment into Africa's energy markets and promoting the use of renewable energy.

Daniel Werner EUEI PDF Programme Manager

1. Introduction

Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) state governments see renewable energy deployment as a way to improve the power sector and expand electricity access; however, the lack of clear renewable energy (RE) policy instruments is, still today, a main barrier for increase of RE generation and specifically the participation of private entrepreneurs.

Traditionally, many project developers have had to negotiate with authorities the conditions applicable to each individual project such as, for example, individual feed-in tariffs. In recent years, tenders to select independent power producers have become increasingly prevalent in the region, tenders for which ceiling tariffs are needed but seldom used. In sum, many ministries, regulators and utilities still lack appropriate instruments and methodologies to design fair and transparent RE tariffs hindering the development of cost-competitive projects and the RE sector in the region.

In 2017, the ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE), requested EU Energy Initiative Partnership Dialogue Facility (EUEI PDF) support for the development of a set of tools (toolbox) to define tariffs for renewable energy.

To this end, EMRC (a member of the MRC Group of Companies) was commissioned by EUEI PDF to develop a toolbox consisting of several standard tariff models to calculate tariffs for renewable technologies and an associated user manual. Additional contributions to the development of the toolbox were provided by GIZ.

1.1. Functionalities and applications of the models

During the course of the project, we established with stakeholders that the main functionalities the model is able to calculate are:

- Cost reflective and technology specific tariffs (e.g.: calculation of the levelised cost of electricity (LCOE) of different renewable technologies),
- The costs avoided as a result of having renewable electricity generation, for example the avoided cost of generating from conventional technologies,
- Expanding the calculation of avoided cost of generation to allow the optional addition of wider social avoided costs (for example, avoided emissions, or the additional cost of balancing variable generation),
- The associated network cost and losses of generation (relevant to the consideration of minigrids, cross border trade and geographically remote generation),
- The ability to consider different avoided costs in different major grid systems (for example, different avoided costs for the separate islands on Cape Verde),
- The ability to quantify potential PPA duration and indexation options (% forex link for example), and
- Supply curve calculation of renewable energy targets,

These functionalities will help the user to calculate potential:

- > Feed in tariffs for grid-connected systems (both national grid and mini-grids),
- > Ceiling tariffs or reference prices that could be used for tenders and bilateral negotiations,
- Appropriate tariffs for off-grid mini-grid systems,
- Tariffs at which excess generation by prosumers in net metering/billing systems could be credited,
- The impact of renewable tariffs on system costs and consumer tariffs, these outputs can be used to separately consider the impact on consumer tariffs if the regulator has a suitable model for retail tariffs²,
- The potential penetration of renewable energy at various levels of support or, conversely, the marginal pricing needed to achieve a desired level of renewable penetration.

The table hereafter summaries the main features and functionalities of the models.

| Model | Main features |
|----------------------|--|
| 1. IPP Model | Calculates Feed-in tariffs (FiTs) for grid-connected systems (national grid and minigrids) and Ceiling tariffs (the maximum prices) or reference prices that could be used for competitive tenders and bilateral negotiations including the ability to quantify potential PPA duration and indexation options Calculates cost reflective and technology specific tariffs (e.g.: calculation of the levelised cost of electricity (LCOE) of different renewable technologies) Calculates the costs avoided as a result of having renewable electricity generation, for example the avoided cost of generating from conventional technologies, with the option of expanding the calculation to allow the addition of wider social avoided costs (i.g., avoided emissions, or the additional cost of balancing variable generation) Allows to consider different avoided costs for separate islands) |
| 2. Prosumer model | Calculates Tariffs at which excess generation by prosumers in net metering/billing systems can be credited Calculates the net cost for the utility through the system impact assessment: distributed generation being installed at the end-user consumption point, it directly reduces all flows (energy and economic) upstream in the power system. |

Figure 1 : Main features and functionalities of the models

² The model does not calculate the consumer tariffs as it would make it more complex to use, as we would need extra inputs that are not directly related to renewable energy. The outputs of the model can be used to measure the impact on consumer tariffs.

| 3. | GMG model | Calculates appropriate tariffs for off-grid mini-grid systems as well as the associated network cost and losses of generation (relevant to the consideration of mini-grids, cross border trade and geographically remote generation) Calculates the "system impact" using the projection of the avoided cost applied to the projected green mini grids development. |
|----|-----------------------|--|
| 4. | Supply Curve Model | identifies a required incentive level to reach a certain renewable energy penetration target in a year given various renewable energy technologies which are available (wind, solar PV, concentrating solar power (CSP), geothermal and biomass). |
| 5. | Fuel Cost Tool | This tool helps the user to convert fuel specific costs (which may be in a wide variety of units) into the units of currency/MWh that are required for the above models. For example, the user may wish to convert procurement of heavy fuel oil in US\$/barrel or coal in US\$/ton into US\$/MWh so it can be used in their renewable IPP model. |
| 6. | Wind Power Curve | This tool is useful if the user has wind speed data and wishes to calculate an estimated capacity factor for wind energy, i.e. the ratio of the actual electrical energy output of a wind turbine over a given period of time to its potential output if it were possible for it to operate at full nameplate capacity |

1.2. Structure of this report

This manual is intended to provide you with further detail and descriptions of the toolbox models, included definitions and guidance on the use and implications of key items and concepts.

The report is split into sections in accordance with the individual excel models which are supplied as part of the Toolbox. This means that there is a separate section for **Independent Power Producers (IPPs)** (Section 2), **Green Mini-Grids** (Section 3), **Prosumers**³ (Section 3) and the **Supply Curve Model** (Section 5). Each section is split into the following subsections:

- Inputs: Discusses key inputs and their impact on the results
- **Running the model**: How the user should proceed to run the model
- > Calculations underpinning the calculations: and methodologies behind the solve
- Outputs: Key outputs which can be viewed
- Key questions: Includes a list of questions, suggested by regional stakeholders, which the user can use the model to answer and how to interpret them.

There are two models (Section 5) that support the use of these main models, which allow the user to calculate capacity factors from wind data and support fuel unit conversions. Finally, we provide

³ The neologism "prosumer" refers to a small-scale end-users who, in addition to using electricity from the grid, generates power for own consumption and/or to be fed back into the grid. The word is a combination of terms "producer" and "consumer".

international reference data (Section 6.3) that can be used to check or validate local data. Finally, the report includes a bibliography (Section 7).

1.3. Structure of the models

The Toolbox is self-contained within four separate Excel models:

- IPP model
- Green mini grid model
- Prosumer model
- Supply Curve model.

Additionally, there are two separate calculation modules to help estimate wind power capacity factors and to convert fuel cost units into currency/MWh.

Figure 2: Toolbox structure

The toolbox is made up of 6 Excel models:



For each of the mini grids, IPP and prosumer projects there is an option to run three different cases. These are:

- A reference project calculation,
- An avoided cost calculation, and
- A supply impact calculation.

The three approaches which can be applied in each of the IPP's, Prosumers and Green Mini-Grids are discussed in more detail.

1.3.1. Reference project

Using the "reference project" module of any of the models will allow the user to consider either (1) a typical project in their country (for example an "average" solar PV project) to support setting feed-

in tariffs, or (2) a specific project, for example, if there is a tender to develop in a specific location, or a speculative application from a potential developer that needs to be evaluated.

The target of a reference project is to achieve required Project Equity Internal Rate of Return (Equity IRR) by adjusting the relevant electricity tariff (currency units per kWh) for the base year⁴.

In order for the model to calculate this tariff level, it requires the following main assumptions:

- Technical characteristics of the project
- Project reference costs,
- Useful Life/Depreciation,
- Financing,
- Gearing ratio,
- Cost of Debt, and
- Required Return for Equity.

Once the inputs are complete, the user presses a "macro" button to allow the Excel workbook to iterate to an answer. Figure shows how this calculation works, and it is discussed in more detail in Section 2.3 for the IPP model.

Figure 3: reference project calculation



Using the above calculations, a reference project is configured. That is, a reference power plant or mini-grid with certain associated power generation characteristics, performance levels and unit costs is used to compute the tariff required to achieve a certain target internal rate of return to equity (Equity IRR).

In general terms, the model calculates the expected inflows and outflows of money for the project during its useful life to obtain the returns for the developer with a certain tariff level. For every year in the projection period, the energy output of the plant is computed, then multiplied by the unit tariff to obtain the revenues for the year. Operating costs, investment costs and financing costs are discounted to obtain the free cash flow available to repay the project shareholders. The yearly returns to shareholders are used to calculate the Equity IRR.

⁴ After the base year the tariff gets escalated by an indexation factor defined by the user.

The tariff is computed through an iterative process, which changes the tariff level to drive the Equity IRR to its target value. Essentially the model runs itself multiple times, changing the tariff level a little each time, until it finds a tariff level where the Equity IRR matches the target level defined by the user.

This iterative process will yield the tariff associated with the Equity IRR whenever there is a possible solution. If the inputs to the model are such that no solution is possible, the iteration process will yield an error. If this happens, the user should check the inputs to resolve the issue.

1.3.2. Avoided cost

An avoided cost calculation compares two scenarios, one usually looking at a baseline scenario where the project is not implemented and the other looking at the scenario where the project is implemented. The cost associated with the baseline scenario where the renewable project is not implemented will provide the "avoided cost" for the renewable project. In other words, it gives a figure for what would need to be spent to deliver the energy from other sources.

Under this approach, we will obtain the "cost of the alternative", which provides a reference to set tariffs for renewable generation and mini-grids. By knowing the cost of the alternative solution, we know the cost avoided by developing the renewable project. This could be either higher or lower than the cost of developing the renewable project.

Using the "avoided cost" module of any of the models will allow the user to consider either (1) setting feed-in tariffs at a level that ensures that consumers pay no more for renewables than the conventional alternative, or (2) to support policy makers and regulators in understanding the cost implications of a renewable project relative to the alternative.

Since we are taking the alternative solution as the reference, there is no need to consider the unit costs of the renewable project itself to obtain the avoided cost,⁵ unless you wish to see the gap between the two. Also, the avoided cost itself can be directly used as a tariff or just considered as a reference level to reason on tariffs, in combination or not with the application of the reference project approach.

Avoided cost can be "private avoided cost" or "social avoided cost" depending on whether the cost of externalities is included. Externalities are just an additional cost to be included in the calculations, but measuring and pricing them is complicated. Not all countries will have cost data associated with emissions, for example.

The main assumptions required for this calculation are:

Baseline generation cost (considering the actual baseline energy mix applicable to the alternative solution) is a common cost to all approaches in the baseline case.

⁵ But the project costs (investment, operating costs and financing costs) are still required to compute the developer's rate of return for impact assessment calculations.

- In the case of distributed generation, the baseline alternative is to be fully supplied at the enduser tariff. In this case the main interest is to evaluate the avoided cost from the standpoint of the prosumer. The baseline generation cost is still calculated and used in the impact assessment section of the distributed generation model; there it is used to calculate the impact on reduced generation required at the main system level (baseline generation mix).
- In the case of mini-grids, alternative supply takes into account the bulk supply tariff (baseline generation costs plus main interconnected system network costs), which include the cost of extending the main system to interconnect the mini-grid area (if applicable).

1.3.3. System impact

A system does not remain unaffected by the development of renewable generation or green minigrids. There are positive (savings) and negative (revenue losses) impacts across the whole system (power generation, power transmission, power distribution and retailing) as a result of changes. It is essential to be able to compute what would happen in the system's economic balance if a certain level of IPP/prosumer/GMG penetration is targeted and achieved.

Using the "system impact" module of any of the models will allow the user to consider either (1) setting feed-in tariffs at a level that ensures that consumers pay no more for renewables than the conventional alternative, or (2) to support policy makers and regulators in understanding the cost implications of a renewable project relative to the alternative.

In the model the following specifics are applied:

- The system impact is calculated in a straightforward fashion. In some cases the system impact is as simple as multiplying the unit tariff by the number of projects of that type that are simulated to be developed.
- The unit cost per item if applied to a user-defined implementation scenario, where the expected volume/number of units of each IPP, prosumer, or green mini-grid is set year by year.
- The outputs provide the economic impact of supporting that particular RES policy under a certain development scenario.

1.4. Protect/unprotect the model

It is possible to protect the models to prevent the accidental editing of calculations. This protection should allow users to change the inputs and run the macros, but not to edit calculation cells.

However, in the future users may wish to add extra functionality to the model to reflect their national situation or changes in policy. This is entirely possible, and can be done by pressing the "unprotect workbook" macro on the Dashboard. This unprotects all cells, so calculations can be edited freely. Once the edits are complete, the user can protect the workbook again by pressing the "protect workbook" macro.

The status of the workbook is indicated beneath the macro buttons (protected/ not protected).

Figure 1: Macro to protect or unprotect the workbook

| Protect workbook |
|--------------------|
| Unprotect workbook |
| Not Protected |

1.5. Reference data

All models are very sensitive to the data used, and any model requires good data to give robust outputs.

It should be noted that the models in the toolbox can work with a fairly minimal set of data, although it allows the user to enter very detailed data if this is available.

Several stakeholders within the ECOWAS region may currently not have sufficient data to fully populate all model inputs. Therefore, reference values or ranges of values have been supplied for each model in Section 6.3. If users wish to update this in the future, a full set of sources is provided.

In any case, it shall be highlighted that values taken from the reference input data will never fully replace the specific data set required to calculate tariffs in any jurisdiction, costs will vary greatly due to transportation costs and local conditions.

This reference can be used to cross check and validate local information. However, it is not intended to be a replacement for proper diligence in seeking country-specific data. Tariffs should wherever possible be based on data that properly reflects the technical and economic conditions applicable to the environment where renewable generation and mini-grids are to be developed and operated.

2. IPP model

This section looks at the inputs, calculations, outputs and key questions of IPP's.

2.1. Inputs

The inputs for the IPP are split into four sections; general, reference project inputs, avoided cost inputs and system impact. Each of these is discussed in turn below.

2.1.1. General inputs

General inputs are detailed below. These inputs are required to run the model in any configuration.

| Table | 1: | General | inputs |
|-------|----|---------|--------|
| | | | |

| Currency unit | String | Text | This input is for display purposes only (i.e. USD, EUR, GBP) | Display only | E10 |
|---|--------|------|--|--|----------|
| Inflation | Float | % | This is the inflation projection for the project lifetime. Note the first year of operation has by default zero inflation) | Inflates all O&M costs for the renewable project (including fuel if applicable) | H13:AJ13 |
| VAT | Float | % | The electricity sales VAT in the country being considered | Increases calculated required tariff by VAT (and LCOE for baseline alternatives) | F15 |
| Import duties | Float | % | The import duty level in the country | Later possible to specify which capex items pay import tax | F16 |
| Applicable corporate taxation scheme | String | Text | Drop down box to select tax scheme (profit tax, revenue tax, or the maximum of the two) | Tax applied in financial model of reference | F18 |
| Corporate profit tax | Float | % | The corporate profit tax in the country over profit | project as specified by | F19 |
| Corporate income tax | Float | % | The corporate profit tax in the country over revenue or sales | user selection | F20 |

| Corporate | Float | Years | Any tax breaks given to | Tax applied | 119 |
|--------------|-------|-------|---------------------------|--------------|-----|
| tax holidays | | | renewable energy projects | in financial | |
| | | | | model | |

Note that the decision was made early in the project to allow only one currency in the model. This significantly simplifies the model, to improve ease of use. However, it is still a simplification. Projects will typically have capital and some operational costs in an international currency (USD or EUR) for the capital plant and some operational costs in a local currency. We believe this simplification is justified as the bulk of the costs for a renewable project are capital costs denominated in an international currency, which will typically be financed by loans or equity in that currency. Similarly for avoided costs, the cost of the plant and the fuel is typically denominated in an international currency (such as USD).

The inflation factor applied should be that expected to be relevant to operational costs (fixed and variable Operation and Maintenance, O&M). This may be the inflation rate of an international currency if a long term O&M contract with the installers is expected, or may be a local rate of inflation if there is a significant local labour component.

Inflation is entered separately for fuel costs.

2.1.2. Reference project inputs

Reference project inputs are detailed below. These inputs are required to run the model (1) for a reference or specific renewable IPP project, or (2) to calculate the system impact cost of an IPP. For the second calculation, the avoided cost inputs (Section 2.1.3) are also needed.

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Cell reference |
|---|---------|-------|--|----------------|
| Plant Description | String | - | Description of the plant (e.g. technology, scale, location) | E27 |
| Generator Nameplate Capacity | Float | MW | Capacity in MW of the plant | F29 |
| Annual Capacity Degradation | Float | % | The annual capacity degradation factor for the plant | F30 |
| Simulation Horizon (PPA duration) | Integer | years | Number of years the plant will be operational receiving the PPA tariff. It is | F31 |

Table 2: Reference project inputs

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Cell reference |
|--|--------|------|---|----------------|
| | | | equal to the PPA duration. Note that the depreciation period is entered separately. | |
| Capacity Factor | Float | % | Expected electrical output divided by the maximum possible output. | F33 |
| Other Losses | Float | % | e.g. onsite technical losses before injection to the grid | F34 |
| Tariff Indexation Factor 1 (Inflation) | Float | % | Projected inflation for use in indexation (leave blank if no inflation indexation) | H39:AJ39 |
| Weight for Tariff Indexation Factor 1 (Inflation) | Float | % | The weighting given to the inflation factor (for fully inflation-linked enter 100%, for no link enter 0%) | H40:AJ40 |
| Tariff indexation Factor 2 (Exchange Rate) | Float | % | Projected exchange rate change (%) for use in indexation (leave blank if no forex indexation or if denominated in forex) | H42:AJ42 |
| Weight for Tariff Indexation Factor 2 (Exchange Rate) | Float | % | The weighting given to the forex factor (for fully linked enter 100%, for no link enter 0%) | H43:AJ43 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Cell reference |
|------------------|---------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Tariff | Float | % | Other factor (%) | H45:AJ45 |
| Indexation | | | for use in | |
| Factor 3 (Other) | | | indexation | |
| | | | (leave blank if | |
| | | | no other | |
| | | | indexation) | |
| Weight for | Float | % | The weighting | H46:AJ46 |
| Tariff | | | given to the | |
| Indexation | | | other factor | |
| Factor 3 (Other) | | | | |
| Total Tariff | Float | % | Combines the | H48:AJ48 |
| Indexation | | | various | |
| Factor | | | indexation | |
| | | | factors | |
| Baseline GHG | Float | Tonnes | The greenhouse | F50 |
| emissions | | CO ₂ /MWh | gas emissions | |
| | | | for the typical | |
| | | | grid mix in | |
| | | | tonnes of CO ₂ | |
| | | | equivalent per | |
| | | | MWh | |
| GHG price for | Float | Currency/tonne | This is the price | F51 |
| renewable IPP | | CO ₂ | paid to an IPP | |
| | | | developer for | |
| | | | each tonne of | |
| | | | greenhouse | |
| | | | gases they | |
| | | | avoid emitting | |
| Other revenues | Float | Currency/MWh | The price per | F53 |
| | | | MWh for any | |
| | | | other revenues | |
| | | | the plant would | |
| | Elso el | 6 | receive | |
| Subsidies | Float | Currency | Absolute figures | F56:AJ56 |
| | | | for nominal | |
| | | | subsidy per | |
| | | | year (or | |
| | | | negative to | |
| | | | represent | |
| Cronte | Floot | Cumperson | charges) | |
| Grants | Float | Currency | Absolute figures | F57:AJ57 |
| | | | | |
| | | | grants per year, | |
| | | | in year 0 to | |
| | | | roprocent | |
| | | | represent | |
| OPEX | | | upironi grani. | |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Cell reference |
|-----------------|--------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Fixed O&M | Float | Currency/year | The fixed O&M | F60 |
| | | | costs per year | |
| Variable O&M | Float | Currency/MWh | The variable | F61 |
| | | | O&M costs per | |
| | | | MWh | |
| | | | (excluding fuel) | |
| Fuel costs | Float | Currency/MWh | Fuel costs, a | F62 |
| | | | separate fuel | |
| | | | unit conversion | |
| | | | model allows | |
| | | | from other fuel | |
| | | | units to | |
| | | | currency/MWb | |
| Ffficiency | Float | % | The fuel | F63 |
| Lincicity | Tiout | 70 | conversion | 103 |
| | | | efficiency of the | |
| | | | plant (only | |
| | | | applicable if | |
| | | | fuelled) | |
| Other OPEX | Float | Currency/year | Any other Opex | F64:68 |
| | | | costs per year | |
| CAPEX | | | | |
| CAPEX | Float | Currency | Total cost for | F71 |
| Generation | | | size of project – | |
| Equipment | | | | |
| | | | currency/ivivvn | |
| | | | 1 MW in | |
| | | | "Generator | |
| | | | Nameplate | |
| | | | Capacity" | |
| Balance of | Float | Currency | | F72 |
| Plant | | | | |
| Interconnection | Float | Currency | | F73 |
| Development | Float | Currency | | F74 |
| Interests | Float | Currency | The interest | F75 |
| During | | | costs | |
| Construction | | | accumulated | |
| | | | during the | |
| | | | construction | |
| | EL | 6 | period | 576 77 |
| Other CAPEX | Float | Currency | Any other capex | F/6:// |
| | | | costs to the | |
| | | | plant not | |
| | | | the other | |
| | | | categories | |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Cell reference |
|--|---------|----------------|---|----------------|
| Import duties | Integer | 1/0 for yes/no | Select yes (1) or no (0) for whether import duties apply to each item | G71:77 |
| Asset's Useful Life (depreciation period) | Integer | Years | Number of years over which the plant will be depreciated in accounts. Note that the simulation horizon (PPA duration) is entered separately. | F80 |
| Working Capital | | | | |
| Initial Working Capital Investment | Float | Currency | Initial investment to face short term working capital requirements | F83 |
| Cash Conversion Cycle | Float | Days | Average number of days required to convert investment in inventory into cash from sales. | F84 |
| Batteries | | | | |
| Levelized cost of storage | Float | Currency/MWh | Levelised cost to provide storage (implicitly includes replacement) | F87 |
| Storage used in average year | Float | MWh/year | Sizing of storage determines cost | F88 |
| Efficiency of storage | Float | % | Reduces output as a result of efficiency losses in storage. | F89 |
| Financing parame | eters | | | |
| Debt to Total Capital | Float | % | The ratio of debt to capital | F92 |
| Debt term | Integer | Years | The total debt period | F93 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Cell reference |
|------------------------|--------|------|------------------|----------------|
| Debt interest | Float | % | The pre-tax | F94 |
| rate | | | nominal | |
| | | | interest rate on | |
| | | | debt | |
| Target Equity | Float | % | Target post tax | F95 |
| IRR | | | nominal | |
| | | | internal rate of | |
| | | | return required | |
| | | | for equity | |
| Scenarios | | | | |
| Capacity Factor | Float | % | % change from | F99:H99 |
| | | | base case for | |
| | | | each of | |
| | | | scenarios 1, 2, | |
| | | | and 3. Can be | |
| | | | positive | |
| | | | (increase) or | |
| | | | negative | |
| | | | (decrease). | |
| OPEX | Float | % | % change from | F100:H100 |
| | | | base case for | |
| | | | each of | |
| | | | scenarios 1, 2, | |
| | | | and 3. Can be | |
| | | | positive | |
| | | | (increase) or | |
| | | | negative | |
| | | | (decrease). | |
| CAPEX | Float | % | % change from | F101:H101 |
| | | | base case for | |
| | | | each of | |
| | | | scenarios 1, 2, | |
| | | | and 3. Can be | |
| | | | positive | |
| | | | (increase) or | |
| | | | negative | |
| | | | (decrease). | |

At the end of the reference project inputs the user can define up to three different scenario. Each scenario is built up applying % variations to the base case inputs for Capacity Factor, OPEX and CAPEX. Variations can be positive (increase over base case) or negative (decrease over base case).

If the calculation is for a generic feed in tariff, users may choose to enter 1MW in "Generator Nameplate Capacity" to allow them to enter standardised cost assumptions in currency per MW.

It is possible to enter fuel costs (for example, biomass costs) for renewable technologies. There is a separate fuel unit conversion tool (see section 6.2) that allows the user to convert the fuel from other units to currency/MWh – for example from USD/tonne to USD/MWh.

Tariff indexation means it is possible to represent any indexation within the feed-in tariff or PPA, for example the regulator may index feed-in tariffs to inflation. It is worth noting that setting indexation to zero may mean the initial tariff is higher to make the generator whole for inflation.

It is possible to enter both grants and subsidies, by the year entered (initial year or during operation). There is a technical difference in the definition between them, as grants are sums that usually do not have to be repaid but are to be used for defined purposes. Subsidies, on the other hand, refer to direct contributions, tax breaks and other special assistance that governments provide businesses to offset operating costs over a lengthy time period. However, there is no difference in how they are used in the model.

Once the inputs are complete, the user presses a "macro" button to allow the Excel workbook to iterate to find the renewable energy tariff (PPA or feed in tariff) that will give the targeted IRR to investors.

2.1.3. Avoided cost and system impact inputs

Reference project inputs are detailed below. These inputs are required to run the model (1) to calculate the "avoided cost" for any new renewable IPP project, or (2) to calculate the system impact cost of an IPP. For the both calculations, the reference project costs (Section 2.1.2) are also needed.

The nine following types of technology can be considered to be in the baseline energy mix: Nuclear, Coal, Hydro, Natural Gas, Light Fuel Oil (LFO), Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO), Solar PV, Wind and Other Renewable Energy Sources (RES). The user is free to re-label the name of these technologies and adapt them to the specific mix of the system under study (in "Lists" sheet). Not all technologies have fuel input cells, so be cautious about which ones are relabelled.

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------|---|--|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Baseline energ | Baseline energy mix – information entered for each technology type | | | | | | | | |
| Technical data | | | | | | | | | |
| Generation Mix | Float | % | The percentage the technology accounts for in the generation mix (by MWh) | Weighting by technology in avoided cost | F110:N110 | | | | |

Table 3: Avoided costs and system impact inputs

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------|
| Plant Size | Float | MW | The average capacity of the plant | Electricity production | F111:M111 |
| Investment Cost | Float | currency/MW | The total investment cost per MW for the technology | Overnight capex | F112:M112 |
| Lifetime of Investment | Integer | Years | Lifetime of the technology plant from when built | Time in operation | F113:M113 |
| GHG Emissions Factor | Float | tCO2e/MWh | Greenhouse gas emissions per MWh from the technology | Revenue for emissions avoided by renewable technology | F114:M114 |
| Average LCOE (for Other RES) | Float | currency/MWh | Only applicable to the "Other RES" technology type | Input to baseline LCOE | M115 |
| GHG price for avoided cost | Float | currency/tonne CO ₂ | This is the social price (or carbon tax cost) for each tonne of greenhouse gases emitted | Additional avoided cost for emissions avoided by renewable technology | F117 |
| Financing data | | | | | |
| % Debt | Float | % | The ratio of financing supplied by debt (this is used to then calculate the % equity) | Debt | F121:M121 |
| Cost of Equity (Post- Tax) | Float | % | Target post - tax nominal internal rate of return required for equity | Model finds the LCOE given the cost of equity and debt | F123:M123 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | | | | reference |
| Cost of Debt | Float | % | The pre-tax | | F124:M124 |
| | | | nominal | | |
| | | | interest rate | | |
| Dabt Tarma | latorox | Veere | on debt | Debt | F12C-N412C |
| (Loop Topor) | integer | rears | ne Ioan | Dept | F120:IVI120 |
| | nuts | | penou | тераушениз | |
| Canacity | Float | % | The yearly | Input to net | F129·M129 |
| Degradation | Hout | 70 | capacity | electricity | 1 123.101123 |
| Factor | | | degradation | production | |
| | | | factor | | |
| | | | applicable to | | |
| | | | plants of the | | |
| | | | technology | | |
| | | | type | | |
| Efficiency | Float | % | The | Efficiency of | F130:M130 |
| | | | efficiency of | energy | |
| | | | the plant | of fuel for | |
| | | | | electricity | |
| | | | | production | |
| Equivalent | Float | Hours | Equivalent | Calculates | F131:M131 |
| Full Load | | | full load | capacity | |
| Hours | | | house in a | factor for | |
| | | | year of the | electricity | |
| | | | plant of the | production | |
| | | | specific | | |
| | | | type | | |
| Fuel Cost: for e | ach technolog | y except hydro th | e user can selec | t either Option | 1 OR option |
| 2 | | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | | |
| Option 1: Annu | ally Adjusted (| % change year on | year) | - | - |
| Fuel Cost, | Float | Currency/MWh | The cost of | Fuel cost | F136:M136 |
| Starting Price | | | fuel per | | |
| | | | MWh in the | | |
| Final Cast | Fleet | 0/ | base year | First seat | F407.N4407 |
| Fuel Cost, | Float | % | The annual | Fuel cost | F137:IVI137 |
| Increase | | | the cost of | | |
| merease | | | fuel per | | |
| | | | MWh | | |
| | | | relative to | | |
| | | | the base year | | |
| Option 2: Line | ar Function (y | = ax + b) | | | |
| a (increase | Float | Currency/MWh | The cost | Fuel cost | F139:M139 |
| per annum) | | | increase per | | |
| | | | annum | | |
| | | | which is | | |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|--------------------|--------|--------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | applied to the fuel cost per MWh | | |
| b | Float | Currency/MWh | The cost of fuel per MWh in the base year | Fuel cost | F140:M140 |
| Non-fuel OPEX | | | | | |
| Initial Year | Float | Currency/MW | Base year OPEX costs which aren't covered under fuel costs per MW | Operational expenditure | F143:M143 |
| Annual Increase | Float | % | Yearly increase in non-fuel OPEX costs | Operational expenditure | F144:M144 |

Depending on whether an average or a marginal energy generation mix is desired, a different configuration of plants and costs to compute the baseline generation cost is required. For example, the regulator might decide to compute just the last technology or plants being dispatched (for example heavy fuel oil generators).

As mentioned above, although not marked as input cells, users can change the titles of technologies if they wish to introduce a different fuel mix.

Many baseline mix technologies have fuel costs (oil, coal, gas etc.). There is a separate fuel unit conversion tool (see section 6.2) that allows the user to convert the fuel from other units to currency/MWh – for example from USD/barrel to USD/MWh.

2.2. Running the model

Here is a brief guide to running the IPP model:

The version history tab can be used to keep track of cases or scenarios run in the model.

- 1. Users are advised to start from the dashboard on the DASHBOARD tab.
- **2.** The dashboard contains a macro button linking to the inputs sheet (or users can select the INPUTS tab).

Entry of main inputs to the model:

Inputs

- **3.** Input cells are coloured yellow . Selection boxes that allow an input format or assumption to be entered are green . These cells can (and should) be changed by users to match the case or scenario under consideration. Inputs are described in Section 2.1.
- **4.** The underlying calculations are shown on the relevant worksheets. We suggest you avoid changing these calculations unless required. Calculation cells are white . Inactive calculations (for alternative scenarios) are grey .
- Run the macro on the dashboard to update the model calculations (to iterate to the required feed in tariff).

Please click on the button "Update Calcs" below to update all calculations in this model



*Note: depending on the inputs, updating calculation can take up to 1-2 minutes

View outputs by pressing the button on the dashboard (or by going to the OUTPUTS tab).

Access to selected model outputs:

Outputs

Users can edit the outputs (or any part of the model) to suit their own requirements. See Section 2.4 for the standard outputs. Take care when adding or removing lines as it may affect the macro calculation.

2.3. Calculations underpinning the model

2.3.1. Reference Project

For Large Scale Projects such as IPP's, the aim is to calculate the base year energy tariff such that the target Equity IRR is achieved over the lifespan of the project. This is done by assessing the project finance and ensuring the internal rate of return on the free cash flow to equity matches the target. The overall approach is described in Figure 2.



Figure 2: Process underlying the modelling behind the IPP reference project approach

The associated calculations are given on the Reference IPP worksheet.

The modelling calculates the following information:

- Yearly net production given the set of inputs defined such as: capacity, degradation factor, capacity factor and other losses.
 - Production calculation block (rows 7 to 17): This block calculates the yearly net production given the set of inputs defined for the generator such as: capacity, degradation factor, capacity factor and other losses.
 - Net production in year = capacity x (1 percent annual capacity degradation) x (degradation factor in previous year) x number of hours in year x capacity factor x (1-other losses)
- Yearly revenues given the set of inputs defined: revenue indexation factor (RIF), GHG price, baseline GHG emissions (tons/MWh) and other revenues earnt per MWh.
 - Revenue calculation block (rows 19 to 27): This block calculates the total yearly revenues given the set of inputs defined: revenue indexation factor (RIF), GHG price, baseline GHG emissions (tons/MWh) and other revenues earnt per MWh.
 - It also uses the energy tariff which is solved by the use of a goal seek in the macro for the base year. This is therefore an iterative calculation.
 - Yearly revenue = (1+ RIF % variation) x RIF in previous year x [(energy tariff x net production) + (baseline GHG emissions x GHG tariff x net production) + (Other revenues x net production)]
- Yearly OPEX given the set of inputs defined: inflation indexation factor (IIF), Variable O&M and Fixed O&M.
 - Operating expenditures calculation block (rows 30 to 43): This block calculates the total yearly OPEX given the set of inputs defined: inflation indexation factor (IIF), Variable O&M and Fixed O&M (can be split into 6 different categories).

- 30
- Yearly total Opex= (1+IIF % variation) x IIF in previous year x [(Var O&M cost x gross production) + Fixed O&M + Other Fixed O&M]
- Note: opex calculation uses gross production
- Yearly debt service costs including principal payments (assuming a fixed yearly repayment) and interest payments (calculated based on the interest rate multiplied by the average of the opening and closing debt in the year).
 - Financing costs/Debt service (rows 90 to 100): This block calculates the yearly interest and principal repayments to service the debt defined in the inputs (defined as a percentage of the overall capital).
 - Principal payments: these assume a fixed yearly repayment i.e. Total debt divided by total debt term.
 - Interest payments: interest payments are calculated based on the interest rate multiplied by the average of the opening and closing debt in same year.
- Yearly depreciation (using the straight line approach)
 - Depreciation (row 103 to 108):-this is modelled using straight line depreciation, based on the asset's useful life defined in the inputs.
- > The Project Finance (rows 58 to 88): The project finance block calculates:
 - EBITDA = total revenue total operating costs
 - EBIT = EBITDA depreciation
 - Profit before tax = EBIT financing costs
 - Net profit = Profit before tax corporate tax
 - It then calculates the Free Cash Flow to the Firm (FCFtF) in each year:
 - Free Cash Flow to Firm = Net profit + Depreciation + [(1- corporate tax rate)x financing costs] investment
 - The FCFtF is then used to calculate the Free Cash Flow to Equity in each year:
 - Free Cash Flow to Equity= FCFtF [(1- corporate tax rate)x financing costs] + net new debt

When the macro is run, the energy revenue tariff is solved such that the Equity IRR (based on the FCFtE) matches the target IRR defined in the inputs.

2.3.2. Avoided cost

The calculated avoided cost for the IPP component of the model is the baseline generation cost (the alternative to having the IPP project online).

The associated calculations are given on the Reference IPP worksheet.

The calculation here is similar to the reference project, replicated for each technology in the baseline energy mix.

The difference from the reference project approach is that the calculation gives a current levelised cost of energy (LCOE) based on the net present value of production for each technology.

These are combined by the share of the generation mix to give an overall levelised cost of energy from the baseline mix. This is the avoided cost tariff.

The Avoided Cost worksheet calculates the financial performance of the Reference IPP project, if they are paid the LCOE of the baseline mix (the avoided cost tariff). The resulting Project IRR and Equity IRR are reported.

2.3.3. System impact

For Large Scale Projects such as IPP's, the system impact is equivalent to the cost the IPP tariff has on the system. The unit tariff paid to IPPs times the expected deployment level (energy integrated into the system from IPPs) will provide the financial impact.

Of course that would also mean that incumbent generators might see their sales reduced if the extra generation from RES IPP's is not fully absorbed by demand growth.

2.4. Outputs

2.4.1. Reference project

The outputs show the reference project tariff required to deliver the Equity IRR. This is given inclusive and exclusive of VAT.

The base case is the main model output. In addition, the scenarios outputs give the tariffs obtained in each of the three additional scenarios the user can define as a % change from base case for each of scenarios 1, 2, and 3. These are calculated when the user runs the macro for that set of inputs.

Figure 3: Output tariffs for base case and three scenarios

| | RASE CASE | | | SCENARO1 | SCEWARD 2 | SCENARO J | |
|--------------------------|-----------|--|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Reference project tanffi | : | 4x8.42 SUR/MWh 545.52 SUR/MWh | (val excluded) (val included) | 508.06 604.59 | 446.68 559.52 | 400.66 SUR/MWh 490.06 SUR/MWh | (var excluded) (var included) |
| | : | 45.54 ⁵ 000 canta/MWh 54.55 ⁵ 000 canta/MWh | (VAT excluded) (VAT included) | 50.61 60.46 | 44.87 53.30 | 41.65 DUR cards/AWh 49.60 DUR cards/AWh | (VAT encluded) (VAT included) |

There is an option to add a local currency in the output sheet, so that users can more intuitively see the tariff in a local currency.

There are also 4 graphs showing: tariff evolution, debt repayment schedule, free cash flow to the firm and free cash flow to equity.



Figure 4: Output graphs for the reference project

To aid understanding of the tariff, the outputs also report a breakdown of the net present value (NPV) by the main three categories of expenditure: capex, opex and financing costs. This helps to indicate where the key costs that make up the required tariff.



Figure 5: Breakdown of tariff by categories of costs

The model reports the value of Government tax relief (tax holidays) in aggregate and in net present value. This is calculated by the macro, effectively by comparing the values with the tax holiday (in years) set to zero as well as with the input value. If there are no tax holidays in the inputs, this value is zero.

2.4.2. Avoided cost

For the avoided cost scenario, the model reports the Avoided Cost Tariff and the Equity IRR that investors in the reference project would receive if the project was paid the Avoided Cost Tariff.

2.4.3. System impact

For the first 10 years of output, the model reports the total energy produced by reference IPPs, and the tariff they are paid (in real terms), giving a resulting total tariff cost (in real terms) that the counterparty will have to meet.

The impact in nominal terms is also calculated and available in the impact worksheet. But only the real terms one (not inflated) is shown, as it is usually better to evaluate impacts and their evolution over time in values expressed in the same year (the initial one).

2.5. Key questions

During the course of the project, we established with stakeholders the main functionalities the model has to be able to calculate. As part of the "key questions", we consider how each of these can be addressed using the model.

2.5.1. How do I calculate feed in tariffs for grid-connected systems?

The user can calculate feed in tariffs based on either the cost of a reference project or the avoided cost of conventional generation by changing the inputs to match the country specific data and technology under consideration.

2.5.2. Can the model calculate cost reflective and technology specific tariffs?

Yes – the reference project module calculates this tariff.

The inputs will need to be changed for each technology. So the user would (for example) enter the input data for solar PV and run the macro to calculate a solar PV tariff. This model could be saved under an appropriate name (e.g. "Solar PV Tariff 2017 – Model v0-1 - date") as a record of the calculations. The user can then start again with wind technology data, saving that as a new name (e.g. "Wind Tariff 2017 – Model v0-1 - date").

The version history worksheet can be used to keep track of the review process.

2.5.3. What is the most affordable tariff that ensures a fair return on investment for the developer?

The reference project module calculates this tariff, based on an input rate of return. It is important to have good data for all reference project inputs to ensure the calculated tariff both gives a fair return to the investor and is the lowest tariff that ensures that fair return.

2.5.4. Can the model calculate the costs avoided as a result of having renewable electricity generation?

Yes – the avoided costs module calculates this tariff as the avoided cost of generating from conventional technologies.

Since the tariff is based on the avoided cost of the baseline energy mix, it does not depend on the renewable energy technology chosen. The calculation only needs to be performed once for all renewable technologies.

However, the resulting return to the project developer will vary by technology, and so the reference project data should also be changed for each case you wish to consider.

2.5.5. Can you expand the calculation of avoided cost of generation to allow the optional addition of wider social avoided costs?

The challenge of including wider social avoided costs (for example, avoided emissions, or the additional cost of balancing variable generation), is in defining a figure for these costs.

If a cost is available for GHG emissions in currency/CO2 equivalent, this can be considered in the avoided cost module as an additional social (or actual) avoided cost.

If other costs are available, they can be added to the relevant variable or fixed costs of the baseline energy mix.

On the other hand, if the renewable generation increase the costs of the system, for example if they are variable and lead to an additional cost in balancing the system, the user may wish to represent this cost in the model.

If the renewable generator is required to meet this cost itself (for example by having a battery to mitigate the variability of output), this can be added as a capex and/or a variable or fixed cost.

If the utility faces this cost, this can be applied as a reduction to the avoided cost or an increase to the system impact.

2.5.6. Can you consider different avoided costs in different major grid systems?

Yes. It is possible to consider different avoided costs in different major grid systems (for example, different avoided costs for the separate islands on Cape Verde) simply by rerunning the model for these different systems, just like for each of the different technologies.

Instead of just having "Solar PV Tariff 2017" the user would create "Solar PV Tariff 2017 - Santiago" and "Solar PV Tariff 2017- Boa Vista" etc.

2.5.7. Can you consider potential PPA duration and indexation options?

Yes. The model makes it possible to define the years of project operation (effectively the years it is paid a PPA for) and the indexation of the renewable tariff.

Users can consider scenarios based around these parameters.

2.5.8. Can the model support tenders or bilateral negotiations?

Yes. The model allows you to input project-specific data to calculate ceiling tariffs or reference prices. You can also enter project specific data to evaluate tenders and bilateral negotiations, by

essentially mimicking the financial modelling the developer will be carrying out. This can help give confidence in the outcome.

2.5.9. Can the model consider the impact of renewable tariffs on system costs and consumer tariffs?

The model can consider the impact of renewable energy tariffs in a number of ways:

- The IPP model calculates separately the "avoided cost" tariff. The difference between this avoided cost and the actual tariff given to the renewable generator can give an indication of the impact. For example, if the avoided cost tariff is used, the impact on consumer tariffs will be zero. If the "reference project" tariff is used, the difference between the reference project tariff and the avoided cost tariff gives an indication of the likely direction of impact (positive or negative) on consumer tariffs.
- The model also calculates the "system impact": for the first 10 years of output, the model reports the total energy produced by reference IPPs, and the tariff they are paid, giving a resulting total tariff cost that the counterparty will have to meet. This is cash that will need to be available to the utility to meet their obligations under the PPA.

However, the model does not calculate the resulting retail tariffs. For that, a full system retail tariff model is needed. The outputs of the renewable energy tariff model can be an input to that model.

2.5.10. Should tax be included in the project costs?

Yes. Any costs that apply to the project should be reflected in the model. The model includes tax inputs such as corporation tax, VAT and import duties. It is also possible to represent any corporation tax holidays or import duty exemptions.



Figure 6: Taxes input to the model
2.5.11. What payment should be made to IPPs when the DisCo doesn't need that energy injection for a certain period? How would the tariff address the issue of guarantees?

The payment regime is given in the PPA. The model assumes that the generator is able to get payment for all of their power up to an entered capacity factor. A "take or pay" clause in a PPA might reflect this capacity factor (e.g. 25%) to give the IPP certainty of revenue.

If the take or pay clause covers less of the project capacity factor (e.g. 15%), the developer is likely to consider scenarios where only this capacity factor is possible, and view the full capacity factor as potential upside. This means the developer will probably need a higher tariff to proceed with the project.

Similarly with sovereign guarantees or Escrow arrangements – these allow the developer to have a better security of payments. Better certainty of payments may be a precondition for some developers. If it is not a precondition, the risk mitigation may reduce the project IRR they require to proceed.

If the grid is likely to not be available for some of the time, or if the counterparty is not fully creditworthy, regulators and ministries should weigh up the degree of certainty they are prepared to give developers against the cost of tariff they are happy to pay. Giving developers more certainty in a take or pay clause or a sovereign guarantee means they can accept a less high tariff.

The tariff model will not make this policy decision for you, but it does allow you to consider scenarios based on changing the project's capacity factor or Equity IRR.

2.5.12. Can the model include a tariff for use of transmission services for the IPP?

Yes. Any ongoing tariffs that the project pays (such as transmission charges) can be included in Opex. Any upfront costs that the project pays (such as connection charges) can be included in Capex.

2.5.13. Can the model include soft-loans and grants in calculations?

Yes. These form part of the inputs.

Grants or subsidies can be entered per year (in year zero for upfront grants). Soft loans would be entered as part of the financing inputs. If multiple loans are used, the average can be applied.

Figure 7: Grant and soft loan inputs to model



2.5.14. Can the toolbox tariff be accepted by IPPs?

It isn't quite this simple.

Whether the tariffs from the toolbox are acceptable to IPPs will depend on the inputs. As with all models, the toolbox is only as good as the data that goes in.

Whether the tariffs from the toolbox are acceptable to IPPs will also depend on the associated conditions – the terms of the PPA, any guarantees, and their confidence in the ability of the utility to pay. Improving all these factors will improve the acceptability to IPPs.

2.5.15. Can the tariff include Greenhouse Gases for carbon credits?

Yes. If carbon credits are expected to apply, the reference project model should include them. These can be added in the inputs. The credits will apply relative to the baseline CO2 emissions that are avoided (by not using other forms of generation).

Figure 8: Greenhouse gas emissions inputs



The calculation of the avoided costs can also reflect an estimate of the social avoided cost by emitting less carbon from the baseline technologies.

2.5.16. What is the expected rate of return for a IPP project/shareholder? Sharing data on cost of finance?

The cost of finance will be heavily dependent on the perceived risk for the investment country, including the investors perception of the risk profile, the perceived credit-worthiness of the counterparty and any mitigation instruments available (for example, government guarantees).

Some data is available in published reports, for example:

- Report of experience in Kenya and Ghana (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016), and
- Cost of financing used for tariff model in Nigeria (Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission, 2016).

2.5.17. How can we include the alternative cost based on import energy that may change by time of day?

It is possible to enter different costs in the baseline energy mix – and these can be weighted based on the actual mix imported.

2.5.18. How can the model consider uncertainties?

The model allows you to consider scenarios. So you can enter high, low and medium assumptions to consider a range of outcomes. There are two ways to do this – automatic and manual.

For three inputs, capacity factor, opex and capex, it is possible to run scenarios to calculate the tariff required to give the equity IRR under three different scenarios. These three scenarios are part of the inputs, and the results are given as different required tariffs to deliver the same IRR in the outputs. You must run the Macro to update these outputs.

Figure 9: Scenario inputs

| Scenarios | | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 |
|-----------------|------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Capacity Factor | % over Base Case | +0.00% | +20.00% | +10.00% |
| OPEX | % over Base Case | +10.00% | +0.00% | -20.00% |
| CAPEX | % over Base Case | 10.00% | 120.00% | -5.00% |

Figure 10: Scenario outputs

| | BASE CASE | | | SCENARIO1 | SCENARIO 2 | SCENARIO 3 | |
|--------------------------|-----------|--|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Reference project faill: | 2 | 404.08 EUR/MWH STOLER EUR/MWH | (WAT excluded) (WAT included) | 707.85 842.34 | 404.18 516.68 | 494.18 EUR/MWN STG.08 FUR/MWN | {VAT excluded) {VAT included) |
| | : | 43.43 ⁻ 500 cents/KWh 51.62 ⁻ 508 cents/KWh | (WAT excluded) (WAT included) | 70.75 \$4.73 | 40.42 51.47 | 43.42 EUR cents/KWh 51.67 FUR cents/KWh | {VAT excluded) {VAT included) |

For any input, you can consider the impact on IRR of a different outturn scenario in a manual process. For example, you can enter the central case firstly. Then if you change a parameter (e.g. capacity factor, Capex, project life) but leave the tariff the same (do not press the calculate button) you will see the impact on project IRR if the project has a higher or lower capacity factor than expected.

The process is as follows:

- 1. INPUTS sheet: Enter central case data in inputs
- 2. DASHBOARD sheet: Press to calculate tariffs



^{*}Note: depending on the inputs, updating calculation can take up to 1.2 minutes.

- **3.** OUTPUTS sheet: Record the tariff output and Equity IRR from the outputs the Equity IRR should be the target Equity IRR (in this case 15%).
- **4.** INPUTS sheet: Change the input you want to consider a sensitivity around to the lower value in the range. DO NOT recalculate.

| Reference Project | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-----|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| Reference Project | | | | | | cluded) |
| | Tariff: | 4 | 31.75 | USD/MWh | (VAT excluded) | cluded) |
| | | 5 | 13.78 | | (VAT Included) | cluded) |
| | | : | 43.18 51.38 | USD cents/kWh USD cents/kWh | (VAT excluded) (VAT included) | cluded) |
| | Local currency: | GMD | | | | |
| | Exchange rate of USD to GMD: 1 USD equals | | 46 | GMD | | |
| | Tariff in local currency: | 1 | 9,861 19.86 | GMD/MWh GMD/kWh | | |
| | Equity IRR using Reference Project Tariff: | | 5.51% | % | | |

- 5. OUTPUTS sheet: Record the Equity IRR from the outputs the tariff should be the same, but the Equity IRR will have changed (in this case 5.5%).
- 6. INPUTS sheet: Change the input you want to consider a sensitivity around to the higher value in the range. DO NOT recalculate.
- **7.** OUTPUTS sheet: Record the Equity IRR from the outputs the tariff should be the same, but the Equity IRR will have changed (in this case 26.4%).

Reference Project

| Tariff: | 431.75 USD/MWh (VAT ex |
|---|------------------------------|
| | 513.78 (VAT inc |
| | 43.18 USD cents/kWh (VAT ex |
| | 51.38 USD cents/kWh (VAT inc |
| Local currency: | GMD |
| Exchange rate of USD to GMD: 1 USD equals | 46 GMD |
| Tariff in local currency: | 19,861 GMD/MWh |
| | 19.85 GMD/kWh |
| | |

2.5.19. How to carry out USD to local currency conversion?

The model is set up so that the inputs are all in one currency for ease of use. The bulk of the costs for renewable energy projects are up front capital costs. These are normally in USD or EUR. Therefore, users may often (but not always) choose to run the model in an international currency. Any text can be entered as an input for currency and will change throughout the model.

Figure 11: Currency in inputs

| Currency | EUR |
|----------|-----|
| | |

On the outputs sheet, it is possible to then convert the outputs to local currency for ease of reporting and comprehension.

Figure 12: Currency in outputs

Reference Project 431.75 USD/MWh Reference project tariff: (VAT excluded) 513.78 (VAT included) 43.18 USD cents/kWh (VAT excluded) 51.38 USD cents/kWh (VAT included) Local currency: NGN 315 NGN Exchange rate of USD to NGN: 1 USD equals 136,002 NGN/MWh Reference project tariff in local currency: , 136.00 NGN/kWh Equity IRR using Reference Project Tariff: 26.44% % Avoided Cost (in real terms) Avoided Cost Tariff (VAT excluded): 98.01 USD/MWh , Equity IRR using Avoided Cost as tariff: 7.37% 30,874 NGN/MWh Avoided cost tariff in local currency: . 30.87 NGN/kWh

2.5.20. What is the range for tariff indexation for IPPs?

The choice of indexation depends on the policy decision, and is at the discretion of the Ministry or Regulator designing the tariff.

If the project inputs are in an international currency (e.g. USD, EUR) it will normally be expected that the project is either paid in international currency or indexed to that currency. An example might be fully indexed to USD, or indexed for the capital cost portion (visible in the graph on the outputs).



It is also reasonably common to index tariffs (at least partly) to inflation. This has two advantages:

- It means that the project risk is reduced for the developer (who faces ongoing interest and Opex costs in nominal terms),
- It means the initial tariff does not need to be so high to give the same return to the investor, as it will increase year on year. Customers instead see an inflation increase in cost.

The indexation chosen is entered on the inputs sheet. The outputs sheet shows the tariff evolution.



Figure 14: Tariff evolution for an indexed tariff over 25 years

2.5.21. What about decommissioning (end of life) costs?

The environmental permit will normally require the project developer to decommission the plant at the end of its life and to restore the site to its previous condition.

The cost for this should be met by the operator. However, it is not an input for the model. The reason is that with renewable projects the costs of decommissioning are typically met by the value of the materials when the generator is decommissioned.

3. Prosumer model

This section looks at the inputs, calculations, outputs and key questions of Prosumer model.

3.1. Inputs

3.1.1. General inputs

General inputs are detailed below. These inputs are required to run the model in any configuration.

Table 4: General inputs

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|---|-----------------|-------|---|--|-------------------|
| Currency unit | String | - | This input is for display purposes only (i.e. USD, EUR, GBP) | Display only | E10 |
| Inflation | Float | % | This is the inflation projection for the project lifetime. Note the first year of operation has by default zero inflation) | Inflates all O&M costs for the renewable project | H13:P13 |
| VAT | Float | % | The electricity sales VAT in the country being considered | Increases calculated required tariff by VAT (and LCOE for baseline alternatives) | F15 |
| Applicable corporate taxation scheme | String | - | Drop down box to select tax scheme (profit tax, revenue tax, or the maximum of the two) | Tax applied in financial model of reference | F17 |
| Corporate profit tax | Float | % | The corporate profit tax in the country over profit | project as specified by | F18 |
| Corporate income tax | Float | % | The corporate profit tax in the country over revenue or sales | user selection | F19 |
| Corporate tax holidays | Float | Years | Any tax breaks given to renewable energy projects | Tax applied in financial model | 118 |

Note that the decision was made early in the project to allow only one currency in the model. This significantly simplifies the model, to improve ease of use. However, it is still a simplification. Projects might have capital and some operational costs in an international currency (USD or EUR) for the capital plant and some operational costs in a local currency. Similarly for avoided costs, the cost of the plant and the fuel is typically denominated in an international currency (such as USD).

The inflation factor applied should be that expected to be relevant to operational costs (fixed and variable Operation and Maintenance, O&M). This may be the inflation rate of an international currency if a long term O&M contract with the installers is expected, or may be a local rate of inflation if there is a significant local labour component.

Inflation is entered separately for fuel costs.

The prosumer model does not allow import tax to be defined. Any import tax will normally be considered as part of the capital costs for smaller installations like prosumers, who do not typically import materials themselves, but instead buy equipment from retailers/dealers that have already imported. The prosumer model is already the most complex (and large) model in the toolbox, so this simplification was considered necessary.

3.1.2. Reference project inputs

Reference project inputs are detailed below. These inputs are required to run the model (1) for a reference or specific renewable IPP project, or (2) to calculate the system impact cost of an IPP. For the second calculation, the avoided cost inputs (Section 3.1.4) are also needed.

Prosumer reference project input information is required for every customer and a maximum of 10 customers can be considered at any one time. If you need more customer classes, simply populate multiple copies of the model (two models could give 20 customer classes, for example).

Please note that the customer categories considered in this module are an editable input, which allows the user the possibility to change categories (this can be done in the "Lists" sheet). Not all customer classes need to be used, and there is even the option to merge all customers into a single group if so desired. You could also specify the technology – for example "Hotel with wind turbine" and "Residential customer with solar PV".

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell | | |
|------------|---------|------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | | | reference | | |
| General | General | | | | | | |
| ls it a | String | - | Yes/No | Whether | G26:P26 | | |
| corporate | | | | corporate tax | | | |
| tax paying | | | | applies to the | | | |
| entity? | | | | financial model | | | |
| Is energy | String | - | Yes/No | Energy banking | G27:P27 | | |
| banking | | | | means the | | | |
| allowed? | | | | consumer | | | |

Table 5: Reference project inputs

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|------------------------------------|---------|-------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | avoids more cost from using grid electricity because they "bank" the energy they don't use on the grid. | |
| Banking efficincy | Float | % | Proportion of each kWh exported to the grid that is credited against the prosumers utility bill | Energy banking - % of exported energy that is "banked" | G28:P28 |
| Production inp | outs | | | | |
| Generator Type | String | - | The type of technology the prosumer has installed at their site (wind, solar PV, etc). | The generator type options can be changed on the "lists" sheet if required, there is only one renewable technology per customer type | G30:P30 |
| Generator Nameplate Capacity | Float | kW | Capacity of the generator | Generator gross production. | G31:P31 |
| Annual Capacity Degradation | Float | % | The annual capacity degradation factor | Generator gross production. | G32:P32 |
| Project Useful Life | Integer | years | The lifetime of the project | The end of the financial projection. | G33:P33 |
| Production input method | String | - | The user can chose between "standard day", "Standard month", "full year" and "Capacity Factor" | Depending on the option chosen, different inputs are required | G35:P35 |
| Select Generation Profile | Integer | - | The user can select a profile from 10 pre- defined profiles. | Only required if "standard day", "Standard month", or "full year" input modes are selected. Chooses a generator profile from "profiles" sheet | G36:P36 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|--|----------------|---------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | reference |
| | | | | to calculate the energy output of the generator (it is also used to populate the "DG Hourly" sheet used in avoided cost calculation) | |
| Capacity Factor | Float | % | Only applicable if "Capacity Factor" selected in production input method | Selected generation profile in "profiles" sheet that determines gross production | G37:P37 |
| Any energy losses that apply | Float | % | Any energy losses that are the responsibility of the prosumer – could be onsite losses or any network losses that are chargeable to generation. | Net production after losses | G40:P40 |
| Revenue input | S | | | | |
| Tariff indexation factor | Float | % | One indexation factor applies to all prosumers. | Nominal tariff and resulting revenues. Tariff is paid on net production. | F43 |
| Other revenues | Float | Currenc v/kWh | Other revenues may | Revenues | G44:P44 |
| | | ,, | subsidies or payment for carbon credits. | production net of losses) | |
| Initial Subsidies (during investment) | Float | USD | subsidies or payment for carbon credits. Absolute figures for nominal subsidy per year (or negative to represent charges) | negative) | G46:P46 |
| Initial Subsidies (during investment) Initial Grants (during investment) | Float | USD | subsidies or payment for carbon credits. Absolute figures for nominal subsidy per year (or negative to represent charges) Absolute figures for nominal grants per year, can be charged in year 0 to represent upfront grant. | (Inditiplied by production net of losses) Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) | G46:P46 G47:P47 |
| Initial Subsidies (during investment) Initial Grants (during investment) Annual Subsidies (during operation) | Float Float | USD USD/ye ar | subsidies or payment for carbon credits. Absolute figures for nominal subsidy per year (or negative to represent charges) Absolute figures for nominal grants per year, can be charged in year 0 to represent upfront grant. Absolute figures for nominal subsidy per year (or negative to represent charges) | (Inditiplied by production net of losses) Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) | G46:P46 G47:P47 G48:P48 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|---|---------|-------------------|--|---|---------|
| (during operation) | | | can be charged in year 0 to represent upfront grant. | charge if negative) | |
| OPEX inputs | | | | | |
| Fixed O&M | Float | Currenc y/year | Base year (year 1) fixed O&M costs | Operational expenditure, all | G52:P52 |
| Variable O&M | Float | Currenc y/kWh | Base year Var O&M costs | indexed by inflation | G53:P53 |
| Other OPEX | Float | Currenc y/year | Any other OPEX costs per year for the base year = | | G54:P54 |
| CAPEX inputs | | | | | |
| Equipment | Float | Currenc y | Overnight capex cost of equipment (including any applicable import tax for prosumers) | Total CAPEX in year 0 | G57:P57 |
| Installation | Float | Currenc y | Overnight capex cost of installations | Total CAPEX in year 0 | G58:P58 |
| Other CAPEX | Float | Currenc y | Overnight cost of any other capex | Total CAPEX in year 0 | G59:P59 |
| Financing inpu | ts | | | | |
| Maximum project life (for graphs only) | Integer | Years | Calculated as the maximum project life. | Used to set area for output graphs only | F61 |
| Debt to Total Capital | Float | % | The ratio of debt to capital, set to zero if no loans are likely to be available | Debt | F64 |
| Debt term | Integer | Years | The total debt period | Principal repayments | F65 |
| Debt interest rate | Float | % | The pre-tax nominal interest rate on debt | Interest payments | F66 |
| Target Equity IRR | Float | % | Target post tax nominal internal rate of return required for equity | Model macro iterates to find tariff that gives this return to prosumer investors | F67 |
| Consumption i | nputs | | | | |
| Annual consumption growth rate | Float | % | This is uniform across all customers (assumption to manage model complexity) | Rate at which the consumer increases onsite demand, set to zero if no increase. | F71 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|--|---------|----------------|---|--|---------|
| Consumption input method | String | - | The user can chose between "standard day", "Standard month", "full year" and "Annual Consumption" | Consumption tariff profiles are set on the "profiles" sheet if the user wishes to represent the usage profile of the prosumer (for more complete calculation of onsite use and export). | G72:P72 |
| Annual consumption | Float | kWh | Only applicable if user has selected "Annual Consumption" | The single demand tariff applied if the user does not wish to set a time-of-use tariff. | G73:P73 |
| Peak annual consumption | Float | kW | The peak consumption over the year | Generation capacity/peak demand used in the calculation of the generation capacity/peak demand ratio shown in the Reference Prosumer sheet. It is useful in sizing the generator vs the consumption. | G74:P74 |
| Consider savings for self- consumption in equity cashflows? | Boolean | (Yes or No) | It allows the user to choose to consider or not self-consumption in the calculation. If considered, savings in the electricity bill linked to self-consumed energy are treated as a revenue to the prosumer. | In case the avoided cost is higher than the RE tariff, then more self- consumption will bring the required RE tariff down. | F78 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|---|--------|-------------------|---|---|---------|
| Consumption Tariff Indexation rate | Float | % | Demand tariff escalation is assumed uniform across all customers (assumption to manage model complexity) | Indexation of demand tariff costs. | F80 |
| Consumption Fixed Tariff component | Float | Currenc y/year | Applies to all input selections, the fixed or "standing" charge for electricity consumers in each category | Used in the calculation of avoided cost. Although it does not change between scenarios, it is useful to see the total impact on bills. | G81:P81 |
| Consumption tariff input method | String | - | The user can choose between "standard day", "Standard month", "full year" and "Average Tariff" | Consumption tariff profiles are set on the "profiles" sheet if the user wishes to represent a time-of-use or seasonal demand tariff. | G82:P82 |
| Consumption Energy Tariff component | Float | Currenc y/kWh | Only applicable if user has selected "Average Tariff" | The single demand tariff applied if the user does not wish to set a time-of-use tariff. | G83:P83 |

3.1.3. Profiles worksheet

The inputs required in this sheet are related to the Prosumer data on their:

- **Consumption profiles** (columns F to O):- this is the prosumers hourly consumption profile
- Generation profiles (columns Q to Z):- this is the profile of the generator capacity loading level, meaning the % of its nominal installed capacity that is actually generating each hour
- **End-user consumption tariffs** (columns AB to AK):

For each of these profiles, you have the option of inputting data in three different formats:

- Including a "standard 24 hour profile" (rows 8 to 31)
- Including a "standard 24 hour profile for each month of the year" (rows 37 to 324)
- Including a "full year profile" which requires an input for every hour of each day in the year (rows 330 to 9089)

Which input is applied is based on the user selection for

- Production input method: choose from (1) Capacity Factor to use the single capacity factor value on the inputs sheet, or (2) select Standard Day to use a standard 24 hour profile in the "Profiles" worksheet, or (3) select Standard Month to use a standard 24 hour profile for each month of the year in the "Profiles" worksheet, or (4) select Full Year to use the "full year profile" which requires an input for every hour of each day in the year.
- Consumption input method: choose from (1) Annual Consumption to use the single Annual Consumption value on the inputs sheet, or (2) select Standard Day to use a standard 24 hour profile in the "Profiles" worksheet, or (3) select Standard Month to use a standard 24 hour profile for each month of the year in the "Profiles" worksheet, or (4) select Full Year to use the "full year profile" which requires an input for every hour of each day in the year.
- Consumption tariff input method: choose from (1) Average Tariff to use the single Average Tariff value on the inputs sheet, or (2) select Standard Day to use a standard 24 hour profile in the "Profiles" worksheet, or (3) select Standard Month to use a standard 24 hour profile for each month of the year in the "Profiles" worksheet, or (4) select Full Year to use the "full year profile" which requires an input for every hour of each day in the year.

If limited data is available on profiles, users may prefer to use the capacity factor, average annual consumption and average tariff inputs. These are less intensive in terms of their input requirements. The other options are available to users to increase the modelling accuracy once data becomes available.

3.1.4. Avoided cost and system impact inputs

In the case of prosumers, understanding avoided costs and system impact is different to the method used in the IPP case.

Avoided costs in the case of IPPs are the costs avoided by the system thanks to the presence of the IPP (so avoided generation costs). In the case of prosumers, the same approach can also be used. In this case, the default is to credit the consumer with both the avoided cost of generation from other sources and the avoided cost of transmission losses.

However, there is an alternative way to consider avoided cost. In this second interpretation, the avoided costs refer to the cost savings obtained by the prosumer by installing its own generation. This is done to reflect the fact that under netting schemes (such as net metering), the return perceived by the prosumer is actually the avoided cost in its electricity bill.

The avoided cost for the utility is calculated in the system impact assessment. In the system impact, the costs and benefits associated with a certain prosumer uptake are calculated. The system impact analysis details the financial impact of new prosumers on the generation, transmission and distribution levels for a general case where no banking schemes are present. In banking schemes, depending on their characteristics, ad-hoc additional considerations would be required.

Required inputs are detailed below. These inputs are required to run the model (1) to calculate the "avoided cost" for any new prosumer project under net metering schemes or just the avoided cost of energy import, or (2) to calculate the system impact cost of prosumer uptake on the utility. For both calculations, the reference project costs (Section 3.1.2) are also needed.

The nine following types of technology can be considered to be in the baseline energy mix: Nuclear, Coal, Hydro, Natural Gas, Light Fuel Oil (LFO), Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO), Solar PV, Wind and Other Renewable Energy Sources (RES). As previously, these names can be changed by the user.

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|---|--------------|-------------------|---|--|----------------------|
| Set avoided cost tariff based on baseline generation mix (@ XXX /MWh)? | Yes/No | - | Dropdown box to choose whether avoided cost tariff is based on the standard (baseline generation mix increased by transmission losses) | Selection of avoided cost for calculation of the IRR to the prosumer if this tariff is selected. | reference G88:P88 |
| Manual input of avoided cost tariff | Float | Currenc y/ MWh | or a manual input Manual input for avoided cost if the user chooses to enter their own figure | Selection of avoided cost for calculation of the IRR to the prosumer if this tariff is selected. | G89:P89 |
| Baseline energy n | nix — inforn | nation ente | ered for each technolog | gy type | |
| Technical data | | | | | |
| Generation Mix | Float | % | The percentage the technology accounts for in the generation mix (by MWh) | Weighting by technology in avoided cost | F92:N92 |
| Plant Size | Float | MW | The average capacity of the plant | Electricity production | F93:M93 |
| Investment Cost | Float | currenc y/ MW | The total investment cost per MW for the technology | Overnight capex | F94:M94 |

Table 6: Avoided cost and system impact inputs

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|-----------------------------------|---------|----------------------------|--|--|-----------|
| | | | | | reference |
| Lifetime of Investment | Integer | Years | Lifetime of the technology plant from when built | Time in operation | F95:M95 |
| GHG Emissions Factor | Float | tCO2e/ MWh | Greenhouse gas emissions per MWh from the technology | Revenue for emissions avoided by renewable technology | F96:M96 |
| Average LCOE (for Other RES) | Float | currenc y/ MWh | Only applicable to the "Other RES" technology type | Input to baseline LCOE | N97 |
| GHG price for avoided cost | Float | currenc y/ tonne CO2 | This is the social price (or carbon tax cost) for each tonne of greenhouse gases emitted | Additional avoided cost for emissions avoided by renewable technology | F99 |
| Financing data | | | | | |
| % Debt | Float | % | The ratio of financing supplied by debt (this is used to then calculate the % equity) | Debt | F103:M103 |
| Cost of Equity (Post-Tax) | Float | % | Target post -tax nominal internal rate of return required for equity | Model finds the LCOE given the cost of equity and | F105:M105 |
| Cost of Debt | Float | % | The pre-tax nominal interest rate on debt | debt | F106:M106 |
| Debt Term (Loan Tenor) | Integer | Years | The loan period | Debt repayments | F108:M108 |
| Technology Input | S | | | | |
| Capacity Degradation Factor | Float | % | The yearly capacity degradation factor applicable to plants of the technology type | Input to net electricity production | F111:M111 |
| Efficiency | Float | % | The efficiency of the plant | Efficiency of energy conversion of fuel for electricity production | F112:M112 |
| Equivalent Full Load Hours | Float | Hours | Equivalent full load house in a year of the plant of the | Calculates capacity factor for electricity production | F113:M113 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference | | | | |
|---|-------------|------------------|---|---|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | specific technology type | | | | | | |
| Fuel Cost: for each technology except hydro, wind and solar PV the user can select either | | | | | | | | | |
| Option 1 OR option 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Evol Cost | Float | Currenc | The cost of fuel per | Eucl cost | E110·M110 | | | | |
| Starting Price | Float | y/MWh | MWh in the base year | ruercost | F113.IVI113 | | | | |
| Fuel Cost, Annual Increase | Float | % | The annual escalation in the cost of fuel per MWh relative to the base year | Fuel cost | F120:M120 | | | | |
| Option 2: Linear | Function (y | = ax + b) | | | | | | | |
| a (increase per annum) | Float | Currenc y/MWh | The cost increase per annum which is applied to the fuel cost per MWh | Fuel cost | F122:M122 | | | | |
| b | Float | Currenc y/MWh | The cost of fuel per MWh in the base year | Fuel cost | F123:M123 | | | | |
| Non-fuel OPEX | | | | | | | | | |
| Initial Year | Float | Currenc y/MW | Base year OPEX costs which aren't covered under fuel costs per MW | Operational expenditure | F126:M126 | | | | |
| Annual Increase | Float | % | Yearly increase in non-fuel OPEX costs | Operational expenditure | F127:M127 | | | | |
| Prosumer increas | e projectio | n | | | | | | | |
| Numbers of prosumers | Float | Number | The number of prosumers by each customer category, for each year. | Overall cost of the prosumer support | G135:P144 | | | | |
| Network costs an | d loss inpu | ts | | | | | | | |
| Charge - Energy Component | Float | y/MWh | charge on energy at the exit (delivery point) of transmission | Reduced transmission payments as a result of distributed generation being used by the prosumer rather than electricity from the network – this cost will have | F147 | | | | |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|--|--------|-------------------|--|--|-----------|
| | | | | | reference |
| | | | | to be recovered by the utility from other customers | |
| Distribution Charge - Energy Component | Float | currenc y /MWh | Energy distribution charge on energy at the exit (delivery point) of distribution | Reduced distribution payments as a result of distributed generation being used by the prosumer rather than electricity from the network – this cost will have to be recovered by the utility from other customers | F148 |
| Transmission grid losses | Float | % | Transmission grid losses on energy that is transported on the transmission system | The utility benefits because they do not suffer network losses on the energy the prosumer uses themselves onsite | F149 |
| Distribution network losses | Float | % | Distribution network losses on energy that is transported on the distribution system | The utility benefits because they do not suffer network losses on the energy the prosumer uses themselves onsite | F150 |

3.2. Running the model

Here is a brief guide to running the Prosumer model:

- 1. The version history tab can be used to keep track of cases or scenarios run in the model.
- **2.** Users are advised to start from the dashboard on the DASHBOARD tab.
- **3.** The dashboard contains a macro button linking to the inputs sheet (or users can select the INPUTS tab).

Entry of main inputs to the model:



- **4.** Input cells are coloured yellow . Selection boxes that allow an input format or assumption to be entered are green . These cells can (and should) be changed by users to match the case or scenario under consideration. Inputs are described in Section 2.1.
- **5.** The underlying calculations are shown on the relevant worksheets. We suggest you avoid changing these calculations unless required. Calculation cells are white . Inactive calculations (for alternative scenarios) are grey .
- 6. Run the macro on the dashboard to update the model calculations (to iterate to the required feed in Please click on the button "Update Calcs" below to update all calculations in this model

Update Model Calculations *Note: depending on the inputs, updating calculation can take up to 1-2 minutes

tariff).

7. View outputs by pressing the button on the dashboard (or by going to the OUTPUTS tab).

Access to selected model outputs:

Outputs

Users can edit the outputs (or any part of the model) to suit their own requirements. See Section 3.4 for the standard outputs. Take care when adding or removing lines as it may affect the macro calculation.

3.3. Calculations underpinning the model

3.3.1. Reference project

For distributed and microgeneration, the approach is slightly different due to the variety of inputs considered. Generation profiles can be adjusted to consider a simple load factor or average daily/monthly/yearly profiles (useful for solar or wind volatility). Customer profiles and customer demand tariffs can also be adjusted.

The reference project approach remains the same, in that a target IRR is calculated on the generation cash flow.

For each prosumer (maximum of 10 in total) the following calculation blocks apply:

- Production (i.e. generation) calculation block (rows 6 to 16): This block calculates the yearly net production given the set of inputs defined for the prosumer such as: capacity, degradation factor and other losses.
 - Net Export production in year = capacity x (1-degradation factor) x (degradation factor in previous year) x equivalent full load hours x (1- other losses). In case self-consumption is considered, then it is discounted by the self-consumed energy to obtain the net energy injected into the grid.
 - **Equivalent Full Load Hours:** This is dependent on the combination of selected assumptions on the input sheet:
 - The user selects a production input method, in the case where the capacity factor approach is chosen then:
 - Capacity Factor only applicable if Capacity Factor is chosen as the production input method for the prosumer in question
 - Equivalent full load hours (row 12) = Number of hours in year x capacity factor
 - $\circ \quad$ in the case where the capacity factor approach is NOT chosen then:
 - The generation profile is chosen as the production input method for the prosumer in question.
 - Equivalent full load hours6 (row 12) = Sum of hourly generator capacity loading levels in the year.
- Production revenue calculation block (rows 22 to 27): This block calculates the total yearly production revenues given the set of inputs defined: revenue indexation factor (RIF) and other revenues earnt per MWh. It also requires an energy tariff which is solved by the use of a goal seek in the macro for the base year.
 - Yearly revenue = (1+ RIF) x RIF in previous year x [(energy tariff x net export production) + (Other revenues x net production)]
- Production costs calculation block (rows 35 to 48): This block calculates the total yearly production costs given the set of inputs defined: inflation indexation factor (IIF), Variable O&M unit cost, Depreciation (which is calculated as straight line when the prosumer is a corporate tax paying entity, otherwise zero), Fixed O&M and other Opex.
 - **Yearly total Opex**= (1+IIF) x IIF in previous year x [(Var O&M cost x gross production) + Fixed O&M + Other Fixed O&M] + depreciation
- Financing costs/Debt service (rows 51 to 60): This block calculates the yearly interest and principal repayments to service the debt defined in the inputs (defined as a percentage of the overall).

⁶ Note that the above is calculated separately on the profiles sheet based on an average day, average month or full year profile.

- **Principal payments**:- these assume a fixed yearly repayment i.e. Total debt divided by total debt term.
- **Interest payments:** interest payments are calculated based on the interest rate multiplied by the average of the opening and closing debt in same year.
- Generation Cash flow (row 63 to 71): This block calculates the net asset value for each year modelled.
 - Cash flow= Revenue (including subsidies and grants) operating expenses + new debt
 debt service taxes investment
- IRR (rows 73 to 75): When the macro is run, the energy revenue tariff is solved such that the Equity IRR (based on the generation cash flow) matches the target IRR defined in the inputs.

3.3.2. Avoided cost

For prosumers, the avoided cost is the cost saved by the customer (or prosumer) in its energy bill due to installing onsite generation.

Energy banking means the consumer avoids more cost from using grid electricity because they "bank" the energy they don't use on the grid.

Table 7 summarises this.

Table 7: Benefits to consumers from onsite generation

| | | Without DG | With DG and No Banking | With DG and Energy Banking | With DG and Cash Banking |
|----------------------|-----|------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Net consumption cost | USD | A | В | С | D |
| Avoided Cost | USD | 0 | A-B | A-C | A-D |

In more detail:

- Without any onsite generation, they import all their needs from the grid they have their normal bill.
- With onsite generation, they will use some of the power they generate (that would have cost them B to import) so they have a lower total bill (A-B)
- With onsite generation and "energy banking" or "cash banking" the customer can save more, as any excess generation they export on the grid they can import later on when they need it effectively treating the grid like a battery. This can either be in kWh or cash terms.

If the customer is on an average tariff, they will save the same whether they are energy banking or cash banking – the only difference is when there are "time-of day" or other variable tariffs.

It is worth noting that with energy and cash banking the calculation never allows utility bills for the customer to go negative, the lowest that the energy component of a bill can be is zero, therefore if the generation is oversized they still only benefit as through it matched their own consumption. They would also still need to pay any fixed or standing charges.

For each prosumer the following 15 calculations columns are carried out on the DG_Hourly sheet:

- Gross Consumption (e.g. Column F):- this retrieves the hourly consumption in kWh from the Profiles sheet
- Generation unit profile (e.g. Column G):- depending on the selection made in row 74 of the inputs sheet, this retrieves the specified hours generation factor from the Profiles sheet or considers the defined capacity factor from the inputs sheet row 76.
- Generation in kWh net of losses (e.g. Column H):- this calculates the kWh's generated in the hour by using the unit profile multiplied by the capacity reduced by any losses defined in the inputs sheet
- Net consumption (e.g. Column I):- in the case where consumption was more than generation, this column calculates the gross consumption minus generation in kWh net of losses
- Excess generation (e.g. Column J):- in the case where consumption was less than generation, this column calculates the excess generation minus consumption
- Self-consumed generation (e.g. Column K):- this is calculated by gross consumption minus net consumption.
- Consumption During Generation Hours (e.g. Column L):- this column reports the prosumers consumption during hours in which it also generates.
- Consumption cost without DG (e.g. Column M):- this multiplies the end user tariff in the hour defined in the profiles sheet by the gross consumption in the hour.
- Net consumption cost with DG (e.g. column N):- this multiplies the end user tariff in the hour defined in the profiles sheet by the net consumption in the hour.

The following four columns consider an Energy Banking Approach:

- Energy Bank (e.g. column O):- When the energy bank (kWhs) is less than or equal to net consumption of the prosumer, it adds the energy bank level from the previous hour plus excess generation minus net consumption.
- Energy bank withdrawals (e.g. Column P):- this simply compares the energy bank level in the current hour versus the previous hour.
- Net Consumption after banking (e.g. column Q):- this reduces the net consumption by the energy bank withdrawals.
- Net Consumption cost after banking (e.g. column R):- this multiplies the end user tariff in the hour defined in the profiles sheet by the net consumption after banking in the hour.

The cash banking approach (columns S to U) is consistent with the above, except that it looks as the cost in cash terms

3.3.3. System impact

System impact is detailed by value chain segment (generation, transmission, distribution) and additional (not allocated to a particular agent).

Arguably, the most delicate case is that of Distributed Generation. Distributed Generation being installed at the end-user consumption point, it directly reduces all flows (energy and economic) upstream in the power system.

The main positive impact is energy loss reduction in the transmission and distribution networks.

The main negative impact is loss of power output (sales) from incumbent generators, together with a reduction in all regulated charges dependent on energy tariff components.

3.4. Outputs

3.4.1. Reference project

The outputs show the reference project tariff required to deliver the Equity IRR. This is given inclusive and exclusive of VAT. The tariff is paid on export generation; but if the option to consider self-generation is not selected, then it is applied to total generation (both that used onsite and that exported to the grid).

The outputs also list for each customer class the gross consumption (in kWh), the onsite generation (in kWh), net consumption imported from the grid (in kWh), excess generation (in kWh) and self-consumed generation (in kWh).

There is also a graph showing tariff evolution for each customer class.

Figure 15: Output graphs for the reference project



3.4.2. Avoided cost

For the avoided cost scenario, the model reports the Avoided Cost Tariff and the Equity IRR that investors in the reference project would receive if the project was paid no tariff, and just received the benefit of reducing their import from the grid, or if energy banking or cash banking were available on their energy bills.

3.4.3. System impact

For the first 10 years of output, the model reports the total energy produced by reference prosumers for the uptake level scenario defined in the inputs, and the tariff they are paid (in real terms), giving a resulting total tariff cost (in real terms) that the counterparty will have to meet.

The impact is expressed in real terms (not inflated) because it is usually easier to evaluate impacts and their evolution over time in values expressed in the currency of the base year.

The system impact is calculated from:

- At Generation Level
 - The revenue loss by baseline generators (third party) for the energy the prosumer is self-generating and not buying from the system anymore.
 - The revenue loss by baseline generators for the excess energy the prosumer generates and injects into the system, effectively replacing baseline generation.
- At Transmission Level

- The transmission charges lost by the transmission agent due to the prosumer selfconsumption, which is energy that does not need to be wheeled through the grid anymore.
- The savings on the acquisition of energy for energy loss in the power transmission system linked to the energy the prosumer is self-generating and does not need to go through the network anymore.
- At Distribution Level
 - The distribution charges lost by the distribution agent due to the prosumer selfconsumption, which is energy that does not need to be wheeled through the network anymore.
 - The savings on the acquisition of energy for energy loss in the power distribution system linked to the energy the prosumer is self-generating and does not need to go through the network anymore.
- Additional Savings
 - The value of excess energy injected by the prosumer into the system, valued at the unit price of baseline generation. This is equal to the revenue loss by baseline generators. Whether one or the other are present depends on the system situation, in cases of excess generation capacity there is revenue loss; in cases of capacity scarcity, the system is saving on new baseline generation by integrating excess energy from prosumers.
- Additional Costs
 - Net Payment for gross billing FiT: net extra cost of paying the FiT for export energy compared to the previous cost of supplying the prosumer before installing its own distributed generation. It assumes a gross billing scheme, so it is equal to the FiT level applied to all energy generated energy minus the invoice for energy consumption paid by the prosumer.
 - Additional Value of Energy Banking received by prosumers: extra value obtained by prosumers under an energy banking scheme, thus extra cost to the system as it means a loss of revenue to the system except the prosumer.
 - Additional Value of Cash Banking received by prosumers: extra value obtained by prosumers under a cash banking scheme, thus extra cost to the system as it means a loss of revenue to the system except the prosumer.

3.5. Key questions

3.5.1. What is the price per kWh that renders a minisolar PV plant feasible/profitable?

The reference project module calculates this tariff, based on an input rate of return. It is important to have good data for all reference project inputs to ensure the calculated tariff both gives a fair return to the investor and is the lowest tariff that ensures that fair return. This calculation offers the possibility to take into account the value the consumer saves by not importing as much electricity, just by choosing "Yes" in the option to consider self-consumption savings in the input sheet.

3.5.2. How is the consumption of the prosumer measured?

In terms of metering, there are a numbers of ways meters can be configured to measure

- The most reliable form of energy metering is to have an import meter measuring the power the prosumer takes from the grid and an export meter measuring the power the prosumer delivers to the grid. If the support is intended for renewable energy only, audits may be needed to check the prosumer is not also generating power from other sources (e.g. diesel).
- There are commonly energy meters installed at the same time as the generator is installed, these energy meters measure the total output of the renewable generator. However, not all manufacturers produce meters that are as accurate as the meters used to measure import and export to the grid, therefore, you may wish to make a regulatory decision to apply the same requirements to the meter measuring electricity output from the generator as to other electricity meters, and have the same options for the utility or regulator to check its accuracy.
- Some import meters can run in reverse if the generation is exported to the grid. This is a form or energy banking based on kWh, commonly called net metering. Sometimes this is even done by accident, and the utility may not know it is happening. It has disadvantages for the utility as there is no way to see how power is actually flowing on their network. Therefore, separate import and export metering is often used, even if there is a policy decision to value both equally.

The tariffs represented in the model can represent different ways of paying the prosumer for the energy produced.

- > The Feed in tariff (FiT) for the export energy under a reference project approach:
 - With the option to consider self-consumption deactivated ("No" selected) provides the tariff level that should be paid in a gross scheme and also that same FiT could be applied to the excess energy injected into the system. This option would be assuming the same value for electricity generated regardless of its use (injected into the system or consumed by the prosumer).

- With the option to consider self-consumption activated ("Yes" selected) it provides the tariff level to be applied to export energy only to achieve the target return, after valuing self-consumed energy at the savings in the electricity bill for the prosumer.
- The avoided cost level will provide the value of the saving the prosumer obtains when a netting scheme is in place. In netting schemes there are no tariffs, volumes are exchanged (either energy volumes or energy volumes valued at the end-user tariff).

3.5.3. How can I change names for types of customers?

It is simple to change the customer names using the lists sheet. Simply overwrite the labels to your preferred names:



Figure 16: Example of changing the customer names

The names should automatically change throughout the model to match your preferences. Note the numbers are used in some parts of the model as park of index functions.

3.5.4. How does the tariff design reflect the economic situation of consumers?

This is a difficult question for regulators and ministries to answer, because in this case there are two consumers to consider: (1) the prosumer that has installed renewable generation onsite and (2) the other consumers who buy energy from the utility. The needs of both have to be balanced in policy design.

The model does not tell the user how to set policy, but it can help by showing the system impact of different policy choices. Any extra costs that are incurred as a result of supporting the prosumers will need to be recovered elsewhere, either through electricity tariffs to other consumers or through general taxation.

3.5.5. Should the tariff paid to prosumers be indexed to the consumption tariff or linked to investment?

The model allows the user to choose the indexation for feed in tariffs. This could be (for example) linked to inflation.

For energy or cash banking, the tariff is naturally based on the consumption tariff.

3.5.6. Must prosumer tariffs only support renewable technology?

Not necessarily. The model was designed with renewable technology in mind, but it is possible to edit the generator types on the "Lists" sheet. The choice of technology to support is a policy decision.

If there is a fuel cost, it should be included with the "Variable O&M" in Currency/kWh. The fuel cost conversion tool can be used to convert the fuel cost into the correct units.

Figure 17: Generator type in "Lists" sheet of prosumer model



3.5.7. Can we consider the evolution of prosumers' generation based on feed in tariff incentive?

The model allows the user to input scenarios for the expansion of prosumer generation (numbers of customer by category). This is an input rather than an output of the model, but it does allow the consideration of the overall system-wide impact of introducing the tariff.

4. Green mini grid (GMG) model

This section looks at the inputs, calculations, outputs and key questions of green mini grids.

4.1. Inputs

The inputs for the mini-grids are split into four sections; general, reference project inputs, avoided cost inputs and system impact. Each of these is discussed in turn below.

4.1.1. General inputs

General inputs are detailed below. These inputs are required to run the model in any configuration.

Table 8: General inputs

| Name | Input | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|---|--------|------|---|--|-----------|
| | format | | | | reference |
| Currency unit | String | - | This input is for display purposes only (i.e. USD, EUR, GBP) | Display only | E10 |
| Inflation | Float | % | This is the inflation projection for the project lifetime. Note the first year of operation has by default zero inflation) | Inflates customer tariff only. The rest of the model is in real terms and then tariffs are inflated to be nominal (effectively inflation applies to all inputs). | H13:P13 |
| VAT | Float | % | The electricity sales VAT in the country being considered | Increases calculated required tariff by VAT (and LCOE for baseline alternatives) | F15 |
| Applicable corporate taxation scheme | String | - | Drop down box to select tax scheme (profit tax, revenue tax, or the maximum of the two) | Tax applied to financial model of reference | F16 |
| Corporate profit tax | Float | % | The corporate profit tax in the country over profit | project as | F18 |

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------|---|--------------------------------------|------|
| Corporate income tax | Float | % | The corporate profit tax in the country over revenue or sales | specified by user selection | F19 |
| Corporate tax holidays | Integer | Years | Any tax breaks given to renewable energy projects | Tax applied in financial model | F20 |
| Project simulation period | Integer | Years | Number of years the green mini-grid will be operational | Number of years modelled | F22 |

4.1.2. Reference project inputs

Reference project inputs are detailed below. These inputs are required to run the model (1) for a reference or specific renewable project, or (2) to calculate the system impact cost. For the second calculation, the avoided cost inputs are also needed.

Please note that the customer categories considered in this module are an editable input, which allows the user the possibility to change categories or merge all customers into a single group if so desired. This can be done in the "inputs" sheet.

Reference project information for mini-grids includes:

- Demand information for customers connected to the green mini-grid this is defined for different groups of customers (i.e. residential, commercial, industrial etc),
- Collection efficiency what proportion of their bills these customers pay,
- Mini Grid generation inputs up to five different types of mini grid generation can be defined in the "Lists" sheet,
- Bulk supply over demand allows the user to specify a proportion of the mini-grid demand that is met by grid electricity (negative to represent selling to the grid at the wholesale price), this will always be zero for an isolated grid,
- Mini Grid Network input data is required for general aspects of the isolated grid, distribution network and connections,
- Network loss inputs technical losses on the mini-grid network (can include commercial losses – theft – if required),
- Bulk supply generation inputs bulk supply from the main grid for mini-grids that are connected to the main interconnected system,
- Batteries allow flexibility in output if required, but increase the cost of the overall system,
- Financing inputs for the green mini-grid developer, and
- Grants and subsidies upfront or annual support.

Unlike the renewable IPP model, the green mini-grid model is calculated in real terms and then the tariff is indexed to inflation to give a nominal output.

CAPEX figures should be inclusive of all applicable taxes and transport costs; in particular, CAPEX

| Name | Input | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|---------------|----------|------|--|--------------|-----------|
| | format | | | | reference |
| Demand Info | rmation | | The second second second second | | 524.25 |
| Initial | Integer | - | The number of customers | Revenue | E31:35 |
| customer | | | in the customer group in | from fixed | |
| # | | | the base year | charge | |
| Customers | Float | % | The per annum growth | Revenue | F31:35 |
| growth | | | expected for each | from fixed | |
| | | | customer group | charge | |
| Initial | Float | kWh | The initial demand in the | Revenue | G31:35 |
| Demand | | | customer group in the | from unit | |
| | | | base year | charge | |
| Demand | Float | % | The per annum growth in | Revenue | H31:35 |
| growth | | | demand expected for | from unit | |
| | | | each customer group | charge | |
| Cost | Float | % | The split of the total cost | Allows | 131:35 |
| responsibili | | | covered by each | cross | |
| ty | | | customer group. Note: | subsidy | |
| | | | the sum across the | between | |
| | | | groups should add up to | tariff | |
| | | | 100%. | classes | |
| Cost to | Float | % | The proportion of the | Allocation | J31:35 |
| energy | | | customer groups billings | of costs | |
| charge | | | which are based on | between | |
| | | | energy charges rather | fixed tariff | |
| | | | than fixed charges. | and unit | |
| | | | | tariff (note | |
| | | | | that in | |
| | | | | reality | |
| | | | | most costs | |
| | | | | are fixed, | |
| | | | | but most | |
| | | | | customers | |
| | | | | prefer a | |
| | | | | unit | |
| | | | | charge) | |
| Subsidy for | Float | % | The % of the tariff for the | Total | L31:35 |
| this | | | specific customer class | revenue | |
| category | | | that is subsidised | and tariff | |
| only | | | | by | |
| | | | | customer | |
| | | | | class | |
| Collection ef | ficiency | | | | |
| Collection | Float | % | The % of money collected | Total | F47 |
| efficiency | | | from customers over the | revenue | |

Table 9: Reference project inputs

figures should include any import duties that may apply to mini-grid equipment.

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|-------------------|--|
| | | | money billed to customers | | | |
| Mini Grid generation inputs | | | | | | |
| Installed Capacity | Float | kW | The installed capacity | Variable Opex | E41:45 | |
| Capacity Factor | Float | % | The capacity factor of the technology in question | Production | F41:45 | |
| Useful Life | Integer | Years | The useful life of the specific mini grid generation technology in question | Replaced after useful life | G41:45 | |
| Capital Costs | Float | Currenc y | Cost of capital for the mini grid technology. It shall be inclusive of any import duties (if any is applicable). | Capex. Replaced after useful life, later costs | H41:45 | |
| Fuel Costs | Float | Currenc y/kWh | Base year fuel cost if applicable (i.e. not applicable for wind, solar, hydro) | Variable Opex | I41:45 | |
| Fuel Cost Increase (real p.a.) | Float | % | Annual increase in fuel cost from the initial value (since the model is in real terms, this must be a real % increase). | Variable Opex | J41:45 | |
| Fixed O&M Costs | Float | Currenc y/year | Annual fixed O&M costs in base year | Opex | K41:45 | |
| Variable O&M Costs | Float | Currenc y/kWh | Variable O&M costs in base year | Opex | L41:45 | |
| Other OPEX | Float | Currenc y/year | Any other fixed yearly OPEX costs | Opex | M41:45 | |
| Bulk supply o | over demar | nd | | | | |
| Bulk supply over demand | Float | % | Proportion of the mini- grid demand that is met by grid electricity (negative to represent selling to the grid at the wholesale price). Note: an entry of 0% would model an isolated mini- grid. | Opex | F47 | |
| Mini Grid Ne | twork | | | | | |
| Useful Life | Integer | Years | The useful life of the relevant network component. | Replaced after useful life, later costs | E51:53 | |

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| Capital Costs | Float | Currenc y | The capital cost of the relevant network component | Capex. | F51:53 |
| O&M Costs | Float | Currenc y/year | Annual O&M costs of the relevant network component | Opex | G51:53 |
| Service OPEX | Float | Currenc y/ custome r/year | Service costs of the relevant network component per customer per year | Opex | H51:53 |
| Other OPEX | Float | Currenc y/year | Other annual opex costs of the relevant network component | Opex | 151:53 |
| Network loss | s inputs | | | | |
| Network losses | Float | % | % loss over the total energy injected into the network | Reduces supply where revenue can be collected | F55 |
| Bulk supply g | generation | inputs | | | |
| Bulk supply tariff (energy component) | Float | Currenc y/MWh | Cost per MWh of power from the bulk supply | Opex | F63 |
| Bulk supply tariff (fixed component) | Float | Currenc y/year | Cost per year of power from the bulk supply | Opex | F64 |
| Batteries | | | | | |
| Levelized cost of storage | Float | Currenc y/MWh | Levelised cost to provide storage (implicitly includes replacement) | Fixed O&M costs per year | F58 |
| Storage used in average year | Float | MWh/y ear | Sizing of storage determines cost | Fixed O&M costs per year | F59 |
| Efficiency of storage | Float | % | Reduces output as a result of efficiency losses in storage. | Input to net electricity production | F60 |
| Financing inp | outs | | | | |
| Inflation rate | Float | % | Used to calculate the real equity return and real interest rate. Note: (please check that it is | Real project returns | F67 |

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|---|-----------------|--------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | aligned with overall inflation projection) | | |
| Debt to Total Capital (Gearing) | Float | % | The percentage of investments financed with debt | Debt | F68 |
| Debt Term (loan period) | Integer | Years | The repayment period of loans | Principal repayment s | F69 |
| Debt interest rate (nominal) | Float | % | The pre-tax nominal interest rate on debt | Interest payments | F70 |
| Post-tax return on equity (real) | Float | % | Target post tax real internal rate of return required for equity | Model macro iterates to find tariff that gives this return to investors | F72 |
| Grants and s | ubsidies | | | | |
| Initial Subsidies | Float | USD | Absolute figures for nominal subsidy per year (or negative to represent charges) | Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) | F79 |
| Initial Grants | Float | USD | Absolute figures for nominal grants per year, can be charged in year 0 to represent upfront grant. | Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) | F80 |
| Subsidies during Operation | Float | USD/ye ar | Absolute figures for nominal subsidy per year (or negative to represent charges) | Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) | G84:P84 |
| Grants during Operation | Float | USD/ye ar | Absolute figures for nominal grants per year, can be charged in year 0 to represent upfront grant. | Revenue (could be a tax or charge if negative) | G85:P85 |

There are multiple methods to set cost responsibility across customer categories. All of them try to match as close as possible the burden each type of customer imposes on the network (on capital investment or on operating costs) and their responsibility in the associated costs. In the case of network investments, since networks are sized to supply a certain maximum peak energy, many

methods link responsibility in costs to contributions to peak demand at different voltage levels. Examples of such methods are: coincidental demand at peak hours, non-coincidental peak demand by category, or a mix of coincidental demand at peak and at off-peak hours by customer category.

Another, more complex method, is the Average-Excess Demand. This method uses a weighted average of the average-demand allocators and the Excess-Demand Allocators, based on the system load factor.

In the absence of any specific criterion, an initial estimate for the cost responsibility can be set to equal the fraction of total energy delivered to that customer group. This implies equal cost responsibility per unit of energy delivered to customer categories. Avoided cost and system impact inputs.

4.1.3. Avoided cost and system impact

These inputs are required to run the model (1) to calculate the "avoided cost" for any new renewable project, or (2) to calculate the system impact cost. For the both calculations, the reference project costs are also needed.

The nine following types of technology can considered to be in the baseline energy mix: Nuclear, Coal, Hydro, Natural Gas, Light Fuel Oil (LFO), Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO), Solar PV, Wind and Other Renewable Energy Sources (RES). The user can replace the titles with their own energy mix if preferred.

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference | | | | | |
|--|---------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Baseline energy mix – information entered for each technology type | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technical data | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generation Mix | Float | % | The percentage the technology accounts for in the generation mix (by MWh) | Weighting by technology in avoided cost | F101:N101 | | | | | |
| Plant Size | Float | MW | The average capacity of the plant | Electricity production | F102:M102 | | | | | |
| Investment Cost | Float | currency/M W | The total investment cost per MW for the technology | Overnight capex | F103:M103 | | | | | |
| Lifetime of Investment | Integer | Years | Lifetime of the technology plant from when built | Time in operation | F104:M104 | | | | | |
| GHG Emissions Factor | Float | tCO2e/MWh | Greenhouse gas emissions per MWh | Revenue for emissions | F105:M105 | | | | | |

Table 10: Avoided costs and system impact
| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | from the technology | avoided by renewable technology | |
| Average LCOE (for Other RES) | Float | currency/M Wh | Only applicable to the "Other RES" technology type | Input to baseline LCOE | N106 |
| GHG price for avoided cost | Float | currency/ton ne CO2 | This is the social price (or carbon tax cost) for each tonne of greenhouse gases emitted | Additional avoided cost for emissions avoided by renewable technology | F108 |
| Financing data | | | T C | 5.1. | 5442 14442 |
| % Debt | Float | % | The ratio of financing supplied by debt (this is used to then calculate the % equity) | Debt | F112:M112 |
| Cost of Equity (Post-Tax) | Float | % | Target post -tax nominal internal rate of return required for equity | Model finds the LCOE given the cost of | F114:M114 |
| Cost of Debt | Float | % | The pre-tax nominal interest rate on debt | equity and debt | F115:M115 |
| Debt Term (Loan Tenor) | Integer | Years | The loan period | Debt repayment s | F117:M117 |
| Technology Inpu | uts | | | | |
| Capacity Degradation Factor | Float | % | The yearly capacity degradation factor applicable to plants of the technology type | Input to net electricity production | F120:M120 |
| Efficiency | Float | % | The efficiency of the plant | Efficiency of energy conversion of fuel for electricity production | F121:M121 |
| Equivalent Full Load Hours | Float | Hours ogy except hydr | Equivalent full load house in a year of the plant of the specific technology type to the user can select of | Calculates capacity factor for electricity production | F122:M122 |

| Name | Format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | | | | | reference |
| Option 1: Annua | ally Adjuste | ed (% change yea | ar on year) | | |
| Fuel Cost, | Float | Currency/M | The cost of fuel per | Fuel cost | F127:M127 |
| Starting Price | | Wh | MWh in the base | | |
| | | | year | | |
| Fuel Cost, | Float | % | The annual | Fuel cost | F128:M128 |
| Annual | | | escalation in the | | |
| Increase | | | cost of fuel per | | |
| | | | MWh relative to | | |
| | | | the base year | | |
| Option 2: Linea | r Function | (y = ax + b) | | | 5422 14422 |
| a (increase | Float | Currency/M | The cost increase | Fuel cost | F130:M130 |
| per annum) | | Wh | per annum which is | | |
| | | | applied to the fuel | | |
| | Floot | Curropov/NA | The sect of fuel per | Fuel cert | F121, M121 |
| U | FIUAL | W/b | MWb in the base | Fuercost | FIST.IVITST |
| | | VVII | woor | | |
| Non-fuel OPEX | | | уса | | |
| Initial Year | Eloat | Currency/M | Base year OPEX | Operationa | F134·M13\$ |
| initial real | Tioat | W/ | costs which aren't | I | 1104.101109 |
| | | •• | covered under fuel | ' expenditur | |
| | | | costs per MW | e | |
| Annual | Float | % | Yearly increase in | Operationa | F135:M135 |
| Increase | | | non-fuel OPEX | | |
| | | | costs | expenditur | |
| | | | | e | |
| Network costs a | nd losses | | | | |
| Transmission | Float | Currency/M | The fixed charge | Total | F138 |
| Charge - Fixed | | Wh | component of the | Avoided | |
| Component | | | transmission | Cost | |
| | | | charge, over energy | | |
| | | | at the exit (delivery | | |
| | | | point) of | | |
| | | | transmission | | |
| Distribution | Float | Currency/M | The fixed charge | Total | F139 |
| Charge - Fixed | | Wh | component of the | Avoided | |
| Component | | | distribution | Cost | |
| | | | charge, over energy | | |
| | | | at the exit (delivery | | |
| | | | transmission | | |
| Transmission | Float | Currency/M | | Total | F140 |
| Charge - | ribat | W/h | component of the | Avoided | 1140 |
| Energy | | VVII | transmission | Cost | |
| Component | | | charge, over energy | 0050 | |
| Component | | | at the exit (delivery | | |
| | | | point) of | | |
| | | | transmission | | |

Depending on whether an average or a marginal energy generation mix is desired, a different configuration of plants and costs to compute the baseline generation cost is required. For example, the regulator might decide to compute just the last technology or plants being dispatched (for example heavy fuel oil generators).

Although not marked as input cells, users can change the titles of technologies if they wish to introduce a different fuel mix.

Many baseline mix technologies have fuel costs (oil, coal, gas etc.). There is a separate fuel unit conversion tool (see section 6.2) that allows the user to convert the fuel from other units to currency/MWh – for example from USD/barrel to USD/MWh.

4.2. Running the model

Here is a brief guide to running the green mini-grid model:

- 1. The version history tab can be used to keep track of cases or scenarios run in the model.
- 2. Users are advised to start from the dashboard on the DASHBOARD tab.
- **3.** The dashboard contains a macro button linking to the inputs sheet (or users can select the INPUTS tab).

| Entry of main inputs to the model: | Inputs |
|------------------------------------|--------|
|------------------------------------|--------|

- **4.** Input cells are coloured yellow . Selection boxes that allow an input format or assumption to be entered are green . These cells can (and should) be changed by users to match the case or scenario under consideration. Inputs are described in Section 2.1.
- **5.** The underlying calculations are shown on the relevant worksheets. We suggest you avoid changing these calculations unless required. Calculation cells are white . Inactive calculations (for alternative scenarios) are grey.
- 6. In this case, unlike the IPP, there is no need to run a macro the model calculations will update automatically.
- 7. View outputs by pressing the button on the dashboard (or by going to the OUTPUTS tab).

Access to selected model outputs:

Outputs

Users can edit the outputs (or any part of the model) to suit their own requirements. See Section 4.4 for the standard outputs.

There is an additional macro within the inputs, which allows the user to calculate the subsidy required to deliver a particular average tariff level (for example, to ensure a single national tariff).

4.3. Calculations underpinning the model

4.3.1. Reference project

For green mini-grids (GMGs), the approach for reference project is slightly different. This is because demand is also a factor in determining tariffs.

Tariffs for the GMG are modelled based on a revenue requirement approach, with building blocks as typically done for regulated network systems. End-users tariffs are obtained allocating revenue requirements across customers and then further split according to fixed and energy components.

Under this approach, all cost items (Fuel and other O&M, depreciation and allowed returns) are calculated in real terms and used to build up the total required tariff in real terms. Then, for information purposes, inflation can be applied to the tariffs to convert them to nominal terms. This is the usual practice adopted in calculating returns for network regulated businesses.





If the mini-grid is an isolated system, so it needs to balance both hour-by-hour and over the lifetime. We have two ways of reflecting this in the model:

1. When doing the modelling it is assumed that thermal power generation is available to balance the system over the year. The thermal capacity factor is reported in the inputs sheet based on the model calculations. You should check that the capacity factor is realistic for the plant used. If no thermal generation is used in the mini-grid, then the renewable generation will need to cover all demand. If it does not you will see this error in each year on the outputs sheet:

| Green MiniGrid | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------------|
| | Year-> | 1 |
| Error messages - check inputs | | Error - Demand |
| | | exceeds supply |
| | | |

Once the inputs are corrected, the error message will be resolved:

Green MiniGrid

Error messages - check inputs

2. The user can also use the inputs to represent any battery storage on the mini-grid. The battery storage will not increase the energy available to meet demand overall, but can shift it (for example, by making solar PV energy also available at night). The batteries or other storage will have a cost to run and an efficiency loss, so this is reflected in the financial model.

The associated calculations are given on the Reference GMG worksheet.

The modelling calculates the following information:

- Demand (rows 7 to 22): Demand (in energy and number of customers) is projected according to the initial values and year-on-year growth set in the inputs.
- Generation Mix (rows 24 to 34):- The thermal power generation is used to balance the system, after taking out the % supplied from the bulk system. In case the GMG is isolated, the share from the bulk system will be 0%. Row 34 shows the check that indicates generation and demand are balanced for the GMG. There should be enough thermal power generation capacity entered in the inputs to balance the GMG system.
- Revenue Requirement: tariffs for the GMG are modelled through a revenue requirement approach, as typically done for regulated network systems.
- Total Revenue Requirement = (O&M costs + Depreciation + Return on Capital).
- Tariffs (rows 153 to 211): End-users tariffs are obtained in 2 steps. (1st) allocating the Revenue Requirement to customer categories according to the data entered in the inputs. (2nd) distributing those allocated costs into fixed and energy components, also as per the inputs.

4.3.2. Avoided cost

For mini-grids, the avoided cost is the cost of the alternative scenario, that is to supply those same customers (i.e. demand) from the main system.

It considers the costs of bulk supply generation, transmission losses, transmission charges, distribution losses, distribution charges and main system extension costs (i.e. the additional direct cost to interconnect the GMG is computed).

4.3.3. System impact

The system impact is the projection of the avoided cost applied to the projected GMG development (number of future reference GMG over the years).

This is calculated for the reference GMG defined, in case multiple GMG with different characteristics and tariffs exist. The model should be run for all of them independently with their development scenarios.

4.4. Outputs

4.4.1. Reference project

The outputs show the reference project tariff by customer class required to deliver the Equity IRR. This is given inclusive and exclusive of VAT.

There are also 4 graphs showing: tariff evolution, debt repayment schedule, free cash flow to the firm and free cash flow to equity.





4.4.2. Avoided cost

For the avoided cost scenario, the model reports the Avoided Cost Tariff and the Equity IRR that investors in the reference project would receive if the project was paid the Avoided Cost Tariff.

4.4.3. System impact

For the first 10 years of output, the model reports the total energy produced by reference IPPs, and the tariff they are paid (in real terms), giving a resulting total tariff cost (in real terms) that the counterparty will have to meet.

4.5. Key questions

4.5.1. How to calculate the final tariff to be charge by GMG operators?

The user can calculate GMG tariffs based on either the cost of a reference project or the avoided cost of expanding the existing grid by changing the inputs to match the country specific data and technology under consideration.

To calculate the tariff for a reference project, the inputs will need to be changed for each specific mini-grid application, unless they are expected to be very similar. So the user would (for example) enter the input data for a project targeting a specific location and run the macro to calculate the required GMG tariff to make the project economic. This model could be saved under an appropriate name (e.g. "Location A 2017 – Model v0-1 - date") as a record of the calculations. The user can then start again with wind technology data, saving that as a new name (e.g. "Location B 2017 – Model v0-1 - date").

The version history worksheet can be used to keep track of the review process.

The reference project module calculates the tariff, based on an input rate of return. It is important to have good data for all reference project inputs to ensure the calculated tariff both gives a fair return to the investor and is the lowest tariff that ensures that fair return.

The avoided costs module calculates the tariff as the avoided cost of expanding the main interconnected network and increasing generation to meet the demand in that location. Unlike for the IPP, this tariff will be location dependent as it will cost different amounts to expand the network to each location.

4.5.2. How can I change names for types of customers?

It is simple to change the customer names using the Lists sheet. Simply overwrite the labels to your preferred names:

| D | Е | F | G | н | I. | |
|--------------|---|---|---------------|---|----|------|
| nerator Type | | | Consumer Type | | | Fuel |
| lar PV | | 1 | Residential | | 1 | Opti |
| nd | | 2 | Commercial | | 2 | Opti |
| dro | | 3 | Institutional | | | |
| ermal | | 4 | Industrial | | | |
| her | | 5 | Other | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

The names should change throughout the model to match your preferences.

4.5.3. Can the mini-grid tariff take subsidies into account?

Yes. The model allows the user to input both the initial subsidies and grants and any ongoing annual subsidies or grants during operation.

4.5.4. What is the billing type if a flat tariff is applied? (subscription type)

The model allows the user to specify how much of the total cost is recovered through fixed charges and how much through unit charges. If you set the "costs to energy charge" to zero you will see the impact of charging just a fixed charge.

| (| Cost to energy charge | Cost to fixed charge |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% |
| | 75.00% | 25.00% |
| | 75.00% | 25.00% |
| | 75.00% | 25.00% |
| | 75.00% | 25.00% |

4.5.5. How can a mini-grid tariff be in accordance with the uniform tariff principle?

Once the mini-grid tariff is determined in a neutral manner, what is obtained can be called "technical tariff". This technical tariff is necessarily unique to the mini-grid studied and therefore does not need to match the uniform tariff in the country.

What happens is that once that technical tariff is determined, the applied tariff does not need to match it. The applied tariff for the mini-grid can be set at the uniform tariff level as long as a

compensation mechanism is in place to make up for the gap in between the technical tariff and the applied tariff.

There are multiple options, but the easiest one is to calculate the uniform tariff for all system costs (including the mini-grid costs). Then that uniform tariff is applied to all electricity consumers, regardless of whether they are served from the main interconnected system or from a mini-grid. Since the mini-grid operator is only collecting the uniform tariff (applied tariff), which is usually lower than the technical tariff the operator would be entitled to receive, the main interconnected system operator (who is over-collecting money, because the uniform tariff in his case is higher than it would be required for him) should transfer the difference to cover the gap of the mini-grid operator. Alternatively, the subsidy could be provided by Government or by donor finding. Whatever the source, it is useful to be able to calculate the subsidy needed.

The mini-grid model supports this approach, because it allows the user to calculate the technical tariff required by the mini-grid, and then to calculate the subsidy needed to reduce this tariff to the national tariff.

The user simply enters the desired average tariff for the mini-grid, and presses the "Calculate Subsidy macro button. The macro goal seeks the required subsidy by iteration and enters the results in the per year subsidy in the inputs.

The desired tariff must be entered for all years, otherwise the macro will assume blank years need a subsidy to bring the tariff to zero!

Figure 20: Macro to calculate required subsidy



To reverse this step, simply delete the subsidy.

An additional feature is that you can choose to subsidise individual customer categories only.

If this is required, the user enters the % subsidy on the tariff (for example, if the required tariff is 40 cents/kWh and the user wishes this to be reduced to 20 cents/kWh for a particular consumer group, they would set the subsidy to 50% for that consumer group).

Figure 21: Subsidy for a given category

| Subsidy for this |
|------------------|
| category only |
| % |
| 50.00% |
| 0.00% |
| 0.00% |
| 0.00% |
| 0.00% |

In this case, the user can see the required subsidy per year in the outputs.

4.5.6. Can you have a different tariff by time of day?

The model is not designed to have different tariffs by time of day because (1) it is a significant increase in calculation time (like that in the prosumer model) and (2) that would require a lot more information about the consumers consumption profile than is typically known for a new mini-grid, which is often in an area that has not been reliably supplied in the past. For simplicity and ease of use, this function was not added.

An operator may desire to have a different tariff, for example to encourage more use when the sun is shining and solar panels are generating. Provided the average tariff he proposes (weighted by use at that time) matches the average tariff from this model, that may be acceptable. It is up to policy makers and regulators to decide if that is appropriate for the specific application.

4.5.7. Avoided cost - can it consider diesel gensets?

Avoided cost calculation already takes that into account, as it is including the alternative costs of generation associated with what is defined as baseline. If the baseline is defined to include diesel genset or other forms of alternative supply (past, present or future) then the avoided cost will also include them.

The model takes into account as externality only the reduction in GHG emission obtained from replacing baseline generation by renewable energy generation. The range of other possible externalities is very broad and their valuation should be done ad-hoc. For example, improved quality of life from lower noise and diesel fumes.

4.5.8. Appropriate tariffs (cost reflective or with the option for defined subsidies to reach a desired "maximum tariff") for off-grid mini-grid systems or other contexts where wider network or other costs need to be considered?

It is a good exercise to first calculate a neutral tariff without any form of subsidy or grant, to know the non-subsidized technical tariff level that would be required by the project. Then the user can

change the input on grants/subsidies to the mini-grid project and observe the evolution of output tariffs until it feels the resulting tariff is within this desired "maximum tariff" threshold.

The model offers the user the option to automatically obtain the subsidy that would be required every year to obtain a certain applicable tariff level (maximum tariff). This can be done in the "Inputs" sheet, at the end of the Reference Project section.

The objective of the supply curve model is to identify a required incentive level to reach a certain renewable energy penetration level in a year given various renewable energy technologies which are available (wind, solar PV, concentrating solar power (CSP), geothermal and biomass).



5.1. Approach

A target IRR defined for each renewable technology plant, and a number of simulations are run for each renewable energy technology in which the investment costs, load factor, fuel and O&M costs are assumed to follow a uniform distribution in between a minimum and maximum range.

For each simulation, an energy tariff is calculated which allows the target IRR to be achieved. The supply curve is then built up on the cumulative large set of renewable energy tariffs associated to each individual project. This effectively constitutes a supply curve of the potential renewable energy market.

5.2. Inputs

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|---|--|-------------------|
| Basic data | | | | | |
| Currency unit | String | - | This input is for display purposes only (i.e. USD, EUR, GBP) | Display only | B46 |
| Base Year | Integer | Date year | Start date for cost inflation (e.g. 2016) | The year when real prices are based and also the year on which inflation starts (if inflation is activated). Cost inputs should be | C46 |

Table 11: Inputs for the supply curve model

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|---|-----------------|-----------|--|---|-------------------|
| | | | | expressed in prices of the Base Year. | |
| Project - Year #0 | Integer | Date year | Start date for projection (e.g. 2017) | This is the year for which the supply curve is calculated, it is also the year before the assumed entry into operation of the simulated renewable projects (which is Year 1). | D46 |
| #Years (available projection data) | Integer | Years | Duration of overall projection, maximum of 60 years | Years used to project future cashflows and thus calculate the LCOE of individual projects. | E46 |
| Capital Structure | e | <u> </u> | , | | |
| Equity Ratio | Float | % | The percentage of investments financed with equity. | The higher the equity ratio, the higher the average required return, and thus higher LCOE. | F46 |
| Cost of Equity | Float | % | Target IRR (post- tax nominal) required for equity | Model macro iterates to find tariff that gives this return to investors in the individually simulated projects used to build the supply curve. | G46 |
| Loan rate | Float | % | Interest rate (pre- tax nominal) | Interest payments to be passed-through into the tariffs. | H46 |
| Loan Maturity | Integer | Years | The repayment period of loans | Principal repayments to be passed- through into the tariffs. | 146 |
| Tax Structure | | | | | |
| VAT | Float | % | The electricity sales VAT in the country being considered | Increases calculated required tariff by VAT (and LCOE for baseline alternatives) | K46 |
| Profits tax | Float | % | The corporate profit tax in the country over profit | Tax applied to financial model of each project. In the supply curve approach no fiscal or | L46 |

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|--|-----------------|----------|--|--|-------------------|
| | | | | tax incentives are modelled. This assumption is made to manage the complexity of the model. | |
| Other taxes | Float | Unit/MWh | Any tax expressed on electricity output | Tax applied to financial model of each project | M46 |
| Amortization period | Integer | Years | Depreciation period (for profit and taxation purposes) | Depreciation period | N46 |
| Inflation parame | eters | | | | |
| Real/Nominal | String | - | Selection sets the model to consider values to be in real or nominal terms, and thus consider or not inflation. | Calculation using inflation on a year by year basis or not. | O46 |
| Expected annual inflation factor | Float | % | This is the inflation projection for the project lifetime. Note the first year of operation has by default zero inflation) | Inflation applies to energy and capacity prices used in revenue forecasts and to non-fuel OPEX. | P46 |
| Technical data for | or 5 techn | ologies | | | |
| Technology name | String | - | Name to identify the technology type | Display only | B51:55 |
| Total Potential | Float | MW | Maximum potential installed capacity in country for technology type. Typically a physical potential based on national studies. | Sets the threshold to not be overshot. If a target is set above threshold, not result is found. | C51:55 |
| Avg Plant Efficiency | Float | % | Fuel conversion efficiency (zero for unfuelled plants). | Input to net electricity production | D51:55 |

| Internal ConsumptionFloat%Internal electricity consumption (not available to export to grid).Input to net electricity productionE51:5Degradation - 1st yrFloat%The yearly capacity degradation factor applicable to plants of the technology typeInput to net electricity productionF51:5Degradation - 1st yrFloat%The yearly capacity degradation factor applicable to plants of the technology typeInput to net electricity productionF51:5Degradation - 2nd-6th yrFloat%The yearly capacity degradation factor applicable to plants of the technology typeInput to net electricity productionG51:5Useful lifeIntegerYearsLifetime of generation.Period considered to calculate LCOE for each project.H51:5Capacity factor (min/max)Float%The capacity factor for the technology inInput to net electricity production (andJ51:K! | ronco |
|--|-------|
| Degradation - 1st yrFloat%The yearly capacity degradation factor applicable to plants of the technology typeInput to net electricity productionF51:5Degradation - 2nd-6th yrFloat%The yearly capacity degradation factor applicable to plants of the technology typeInput to net electricity productionG51:5Useful lifeIntegerYearsLifetime of generation.Period considered to calculate LCOE for each project.H51:5Capacity factor (min/max)Float%The capacity generation.Period considered to calculate LCOE for each project.H51:5 | :55 |
| Degradation - 2nd-6th yrFloat%The yearly capacity degradation factor applicable to plants of the technology typeInput to net electricity productionG51:5Useful lifeIntegerYearsLifetime of generation.Period considered to calculate LCOE for each project.H51:5Capacity factor (min/max)Float%The capacity factor for the technology inInput to net electricity production (andJ51:K! | :55 |
| Useful lifeIntegerYearsLifetime of generation.Period considered to calculate LCOE for each project.H51:5Capacity factor (min/max)Float%The capacity factor for the technology inInput to net electricity production (andJ51:KS | :55 |
| Capacity factor (min/max)Float%The capacity factor for the technology inInput to net electricity production (andJ51:K! | :55 |
| question. range used in simulations) | K55 |
| Investment Cost: | |
| Investment costFloatCurrency/ kWOvernight capital costs (min/max range)Capital costs (and range used in simulations)C60:D | :D64 |
| Non-fuel O&M Costs: | |
| Fixed O&M Float Currency/ Annual expected Operational costs C69:D Cost kW year operations and maintenance costs (min/max range) operational costs C69:D | :D73 |
| Other costs | |
| Fuel Cost Float Expected fuel Operational costs C78:D Currency/ Currency/ cost (min/max (and range used in simulations) Float Float <t< td=""><td>:D82</td></t<> | :D82 |
| Right for useFloatCurrency/Cost of right for use of landCapital costsH78:8 | :82 |
| Grid connection Float Currency/ unit Cost of grid connection Capital costs 178:82 Construction parameters Construction Capital costs 178:82 | 82 |

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------|--|--|-------------------|
| Construction Period | Integer | Years | Construction period (max 3 years) | Capital cost profile | J78:82 |
| Year -2 | Float | % | % of construction cost in year -2 (3 years before operation) | Capital cost profile | K78:82 |
| Year -1 | Float | % | % of construction cost in year -1 (2 years before operation) | Capital cost profile | L78:82 |
| Year 0 | Float | % | % of construction cost in year 0 (year before operation) | If construction period is set to 1, this is automatically 100%, else it is calculated as the difference between 100% and the cumulated progress in year -1 and -2. | M78:82 |
| Cost Drivers Percentiles | Float | % | Percentages that represent how costs are distributed in the range between the Min and the Max. | They define what values projects can take in between the Min and the Max range. | C89:F92 |

Technical data can be entered for five renewable technologies. The technology titles can be changed by the user.

5.3. Running the model

Here is a brief guide to running the supply curve model:

- **1.** The version history tab can be used to keep track of cases or scenarios run in the model.
- 2. Users are advised to start from the dashboard on the Supply Curve Control Panel tab, which contains both the inputs, outputs and macros to run the model.
- **3.** Input cells are coloured yellow . Selection boxes that allow an input format or assumption to be entered are green . These cells can (and should) be changed by users to match the case or scenario under consideration. Inputs are described in Section 2.1.

- **4.** The underlying calculations are shown on the relevant worksheets. We suggest you avoid changing these calculations unless required. Calculation cells are white . Inactive calculations are grey .
- 5. Run the macro at the top of the worksheet to update the model calculations (to run all the scenarios that give the range of possible projects).



- 6. You will see a progress bar showing the project simulations.
- 7. The results are shown in two graphs.

Users can edit any part of the model to suit their own requirements. However, we would recommend only expert users familiar with macros do so for this model.

5.4. Calculations underpinning the model

- For each renewable energy technology, a total of 256 simulations are carried out (1,280 simulations in total).
- In each simulation the investment costs, load factor, fuel and O&M costs are uniformly adjusted using the cost driver percentiles.
- Each simulation is a financial model for that project, much like those for the renewable IPP reference project model.
- For each combination of inputs for each generator, an energy tariff is solved which allows the target IRR (cell J46) to be achieved.
- By clicking the macro all 1,280 simulations are solved (a progress bar shows the status of the solves).

5.5. Outputs

5.5.1. Across all technologies

The first graph shows the total electricity from renewable energy sources (RES-E). It is a supply curve, and by entering a target renewable generation (in GWh), and the chart will output the required incentive to achieve this.

> Once the macro is solved, cell C21 can be adjusted to reflect a desired RES-E target.

Cell C22 will then show the required incentive which will be required to reach such levels of renewable penetration.

This is the price required to achieve the target renewable energy level (the target renewable level is met by finding the price needed to meet the required returns for each simulated project that forms the supply curve).



5.5.2. Technology specific

The second graph allows the user to consider technology-specific tariffs. It is a supply curve, and by entering a technology-specific generation target (in MWh), the chart will output the required incentive to achieve this.

- If you want to see the required incentive tariff required for a specific technology type, this can be done by selecting the specific technology on the toggle.
- > Once the macro is solved, cell N21 can be adjusted to reflect a desired RES-E target.
- Cell N22 will then show the required incentive which will be required to reach such levels of technology-specific renewable penetration.

As before, this is the payment required to achieve the target.



5.5.3. Energy mix for RES-E target

The third chart is a pie chart of the electricity mix that makes up the target renewable generation (in GWh) set in cell C21.



Figure 22: Power generation sources making up the target

5.6. Key questions

From the key questions, this model can be used to calculate the marginal pricing needed to achieve a desired level of renewable penetration.

It is possible to calculate not only overall renewable energy penetration target pricing but also set specific targets for different technologies.

This analysis does not replace the reference project or avoided cost analysis that should also be carried out to value specific developments, but it completes them providing a more general view on the aggregate of the power system.

6. Additional supporting workbooks

There are two workbooks that help convert input data into the formats required for the other models:

- One model helps the user estimate wind power capacity factors. This is useful if you have wind speed data and wish to calculate an estimated capacity factor.
- The other model helps the user to convert fuel costs (which may be in a wide variety of units) into the units of currency/MWh that are required for the other models.

6.1. Wind power capacity profiles

This model helps the user estimate wind power capacity factors. This is useful if you have wind speed data and wish to calculate an estimated capacity factor.

6.1.1. Inputs

Table 12: General inputs

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| Project name | String | Text | Name of project or other identifier | For user reference only | C5 |
| Location | String | Text | Location of project or other identifier | For user reference only | C6 |
| Wind Turbine Da | ata | | | | |
| Туре | String | Text | Type of turbines that would be built at that location (for reference project) | For user reference only | С9 |
| Manufacturer | String | Text | Manufacturer of turbines that would be built at that location (for reference project) | For user reference only | C10 |
| Power capacity | Float | MW | Power capacity of reference turbine (must be consistent with power aero data) | For user reference only, not used in calculations | C11 |
| Wind measurem | ent data | (<mark>met ma</mark> s | st) | | |
| Metering height | Float | metre s | Height of mast used to collect wind speed data | Used to calculate Weibull Parameters to give probabilistic wind distribution around mean | C14 |

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|---|--|-------------------|
| Rotor height | Float | metre s | Height of rotor of the proposed reference wind turbine (hub height) | Used to calculate Weibull Parameters | C15 |
| Average speed | Float | m/s | Average (arithmetic mean) wind speed measured | Used to calculate Weibull Parameters | C16 |
| Stand dev | Float | m/s | Standard deviation of wind speed measured | Used to calculate Weibull Parameters | C17 |
| Hours in Year | Integer | hours | Input parameter, will typically be 8,766 hours to take into account leap years | Used to scale up probability adjusted output by hours in year to give expected MWh. | C18 |
| Range | Float | m/s | Lower and upper bounds of wind speed from manufacturer's power curve | Power output based on wind speed. | A29:C44 |
| Power aero | Float | kW | Power aero for that wind speed range from manufacturer's power curve | Power output based on wind speed. | F29:F44 |

6.1.2. Running the model

The model is simple to run, simply enter the required inputs and the outputs will be calculated automatically. The main model is on a single worksheet, with further sheets for version history and cover page.

6.1.3. Calculations underpinning the model

The model assumes a probabilistic (Weibull) distribution of wind speeds based on the average wind speed and standard deviation. This allocates a probability of measurements in each of the ranges in the power curve.

The Weibeull distribution, that is, the wind power density function, is defined by two parameters: shape "k" and scale "c". The numerical method selected to determine those parameters is the empirical method of Lysen7, In this method:

Parameter "k" is calculated as:

⁷ Introduction to Wind Energy, E.H. Lysen, 1983.

$$k = \left(\frac{wind \ speed \ standard \ deviation}{average \ wind \ speed}\right)^{-1.086}$$

Parameter "c" is obtained as:

$$c = average wind speed \cdot \left(0.568 + \frac{0.433}{k}\right)^{-1/k}$$

Wind data is then extrapolated from the metering height (h1) to the rotor height (h2) using the logarithmic method (where hr is a reference height of 10m for which the formula parameters were obtained):

$$c2 = c1 \cdot \frac{h2}{h1} \left(\frac{0.37 - 0.088 \cdot \ln(c1)}{1 - 0.088 \cdot \ln(\frac{h1}{hr})} \right)$$
$$k2 = k1 \cdot \frac{1 - 0.088 \cdot \ln(\frac{h1}{hr})}{1 - 0.088 \cdot \ln(\frac{h2}{hr})}$$

The power aero from the manufacturer gives the expected kW output in that wind speed range.

The power aero is multiplied by the probability of wind speeds being in that range to give a probability adjusted output. The probability adjusted output is then multiplied by hours in the year to give the expected electricity output in MWh.

6.1.4. Outputs

The model reports annual energy production outputs as follows:

- Wind energy delivered in MWh,
- Capacity factor (%), and
- Equivalent Full Load Hours.

These outputs are useful as inputs in the other models.

6.2. Fuel Unit Conversion Tool

This model helps the user to convert fuel costs (which may be in a wide variety of units) into the units of currency/MWh that are required for the other models. For example, the user may wish to convert procurement of heavy fuel oil in US\$/barrel or coal in US\$/tonne into US\$/MWh so it can be used in their renewable IPP model.

6.2.1. Inputs

Table 13: Inputs for the Fuel Unit Conversion Tool

| Name | Input format | Unit | Description | Impact | Cell reference |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| Fuel Type | String | Text | Name of project or other identifier, selection box. | Selects the fuel parameters for conversion | D5 |
| Heating Value: Standard or User Defined? | String | Text | Select whether to enter a heating value or use one from a predefined list in "Fuel Data - heating values" sheet | Input to conversion calculation to currency/MWh | D6 |
| Lower Heating Value (LHV) or Higher Heating Value (HHV)? | String | Text | Select whether to use higher or lower heating value | Changes conversion calculation to currency/MWh | D7 |
| User defined entry (for LHV or HHV) | Float | User can select units | If user defined selected above, input figure, and select the applicable units. | Allows user to enter their own heating value. Units for the heating value can be selected in drop down boxes F9 and F10. | D9 |
| Fuel Price Input | Float | User can select units | User input figure for fuel cost, and select the applicable units. | Input to convert units into currency/MWh. Units for the fuel price input can be selected by entering the currency in cell F15 and selecting the unit in drop down box F16. | D15 |

6.2.2. Running the model

The model is simple to run, simply enter the required inputs and the outputs will be calculated automatically. The inputs and outputs are on a single worksheet, with further sheets for the detailed conversion of heating values and conversion of units, as well as the usual version history and cover page.

6.2.3. Calculations underpinning the model

While the model is simple, some of the underlying calculations are less simple because of the number of units that are typically used in the energy sector.

The worksheet "fuel data – heating values" uses standard data (Argonne National Laboratory, 2016) and converts it to a format the model can "read".

The worksheet "unit conversion calculations" uses information on fuel density and standard conversions to create a matrix that can convert the units of any fuel between energy, volume and mass units that are commonly used to price energy commodities.

The input and output sheet accesses these conversion factors to allow the user to convert easily between these units.

6.2.4. Outputs

The output is a single fuel cost figure in currency/MWh that is used as an input to the other models. For this toolbox we always want the output in currency per MWh. In fact, for other conversions a different output unit can be chosen, which gives the model the widest possible applicability.

6.3. Reference Input Data

We have been asked to collate some reference input data to support ECOWAS countries in populating the model.

The data provided is extracted from the reference sources given. In some cases we have converted unit, but we have not validated the data. EMRC does not warrant the accuracy of this information, nor its suitability to be applied in any particular case. Users of the model should use due caution and refer to the data sources before deciding if this input data is applicable to their circumstances. In most cases, national data that takes into account local logistical and other considerations should

be preferred to generic international information.

6.3.1. Reference Technology Costs

In the tariff models, we neglect scrap values at the end of life, as they have been estimated to be close to decommissioning costs and the discounted value of the difference at the end of life is expected to be very small (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016).

6.3.1.1. Wind

Table 14: Production inputs

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|--------------------------------|-------|--------------|--------------|---|
| Annual Capacity Degradation | % | 1.4% | 1.8% | Based on UK data, depends on wind speed (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) |
| Project Useful Life | Years | 25 | 25 | International (IRENA, 2015) |
| Capacity Factor | % | 18% | 54% | International (IRENA, 2016b), 30% average (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) |

Table 15: OPEX Inputs

Excludes country-specific cost of importing equipment and labour.

| Input | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|-----------|----------|-------|-------|------------------------------------|
| | | range | range | |
| Fixed O&M | USD/year | 1.5% | 3% | % capex per year (IRENA, 2016b) |

Table 16: CAPEX Inputs

Excludes grid connection costs (country specific).

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|----------------|--------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Installed cost | USD/MW | 1,560,000 | 2,540,000 | Upper range from Kenya and Ghana (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016), lower range global average (IRENA, 2016b) |

6.3.1.2. Solar PV

Table 17: Production Inputs

| Input | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| | | range | range | |
| Annual Capacity Degradation | % | 0.5% | 0.5% | No range given (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) |
| Project Useful Life | Years | 10 | 25 | (IRENA, 2016a) |
| Capacity Factor | % | 10% | 30% | (IRENA, 2016b) |

Table 18: OPEX Inputs

Excludes country-specific cost of importing equipment and labour. Excludes battery systems.

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Fixed O&M | USD/year | 10,000/MW | 30,000/MW | O&M costs for utility- scale plants in the United States (IRENA, 2016b) – or 1% of capex (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) |

Table 19: CAPEX Inputs (utility scale)

Excludes grid connection costs (country specific). Excludes battery systems.

| Input | | | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|-------------------|-----------|------|--------|-----------|-----------|--|
| | | | | range | range | |
| Total (Africa) | installed | cost | USD/MW | 1,400,000 | 3,000,000 | Likely achievable only close to major ports where transport costs are low and there is access to civil engineering expertise (IRENA, 2016a) |

Table 20: CAPEX Inputs (rooftop grid connected >1kW)

Excludes grid connection costs (country specific). Excludes battery systems.

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---|
| Total installed cost (Africa) | USD/MW | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000 | Based on systems mostly concentrated in North Africa and South Africa (IRENA, 2016a) |

^{6.3.1.3.} Biomass

Table 21: Production Inputs

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|--------------------------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Annual Capacity Degradation | % | 0.3% | 0.4% | As a rule of thumb you may deduct 2.5 – 3.5 % during the lifetime (e.g. from 40% to 37%). |
| Project Useful Life | Years | 20 | 25 | (IRENA, 2015) (IRENA, 2012) (ARUP , 2016) |
| Capacity Factor | % | 85 | 85 | (IRENA, 2012) |

Table 22: Non-Fuel OPEX Inputs

Excludes country-specific cost of importing equipment and labour.

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Fixed O&M | USD/MW/year | 3% | 6% | % capex per year (IRENA, 2012) |
| Fuel costs – agricultural residues | USD/MWh | 3.5 | 11.4 | USD 20 – 50/tonne for agricultural residues. Higher heating value for agricultural residues 15.8 – 20.5 MJ/kg. (IRENA, 2012) |
| Efficiency | % | 36% | 36% | For stoker (IRENA, 2012) |
| Variable O&M | USD/MWh | 5 | 12 | Lower limit (IRENA, 2012), upper limit (ARUP , 2016) |

Table 23: CAPEX Inputs

Excludes grid connection costs (country specific).

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|----------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---|
| Installed cost | USD/MW | 3,171,000 | 4,594,000 | Based on an exchange rate of \$1.29/£1 (ARUP , 2016) |
| 6 | 3.1.4. | Small Hydro | | |

Table 24: Production Inputs

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|--------------------------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Annual Capacity Degradation | % | 0 | 0 | No significant degradation (Parsons Brinckerhoff |
| 208.444400 | | | | 2011) |
| Project Useful Life | Years | 30 | 30 | No range given (IRENA, 2015) |
| Capacity Factor | % | 34% | 50% | Kenya and Ghana (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) |

Table 25: OPEX Inputs

Excludes country-specific cost of importing equipment and labour.

| Input | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|-----------|----------|-------|-------|--|
| | | range | range | |
| Fixed O&M | USD/year | 1.5% | 2.8% | % of capex per year (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) |

Table 26: CAPEX Inputs

Excludes grid connection costs (country specific).

| Input | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|----------------|--------|-----------|-----------|--|
| | | range | range | |
| Installed cost | USD/MW | 2,500,000 | 3,200,000 | Kenya and Ghana (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) |

6.3.1.5. **Battery Storage**

Table 27: Production Inputs

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|---|---------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Levelized cost of storage (mini-grid) | USD/MWh | 372 | 507 | Based on a lithium ion battery in a microgrid system, storing around 1,400 MWh/year (Lazard, 2016) |
| Levelized cost of storage (commercial) | USD/MWh | 624 | 1,234 | Based on a lithium ion battery in a commercial system, storing around 50 MWh/year (Lazard, 2016) |
| Efficiency of storage | % | 92% | 93% | Lithium ion battery (Lazard, 2016) |

6.3.2. Financing inputs

Some data is available, for example:

- > Report of experience in Kenya and Ghana (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016), and
- Cost of financing used for tariff mode Nigeria (Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission, 2016).

However, this is very country dependent so we have not provided the breakdown here.

6.3.3. Baseline Energy Mix

The proportion of each technology in the generation mix and plant size is very country dependent. Exiting plant should be based on actual data where available.

6.3.3.1. Coal

Table 28: Inputs for coal

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|---|
| Investment Cost | USD/MW | 3,535,000 | 3,535,000 | Advanced super critical with SO2 and NOx controls (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2016) |
| Lifetime of Investment | Years | 32 | 40 | (Mott MacDonald, 2010) |
| GHG Emissions Factor | tCO2e/MWh | 0.786 | 0.990 | (Houses of Parliament, 2011) |
| Capacity Degradation Factor | % | 2.9% | 3% | (Mott MacDonald, 2010) |

| Efficiency | % | 42.9% | 44.9% | (Mott MacDonald, 2010) | | |
|------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Equivalent Full Load | Hours/year | Calculate from capacity factors. | | | | |
| Hours | | | | | | |
| Capacity Factor | % | 45% | 100% | (Mott MacDonald, 2010) | | |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Initial | USD/MW | | | | | |
| Year | | | | | | |
| Fixed | USD/MW | 32,000 | 32,000 | (National Renewable | | |
| | | | | Energy Laboratory, 2016) | | |
| Variable | USD/MWh | 5 | 5 | (National Renewable | | |
| | | | | Energy Laboratory, 2016) | | |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Annual | % | N/A | N/A | Inflation only | | |
| Increase | | | | | | |

6.3.3.2. Stored Hydro

Table 29: Inputs for stored hydro

| Input | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|-----------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|---|
| | | range | range | |
| Investment Cost | USD/MW | 1,005,000 | 4,251,000 | Lower range (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) Upper range (ARUP, 2016) |
| Lifetime of Investment | Years | 30 | 30 | In fact, lifetimes are longer, but electromechanical plant may need to be replaced at this point. |
| GHG Emissions Factor | tCO2e/MWh | 0 | 0 | Zero carbon. |
| Capacity Degradation Factor | % | 0 | 0 | No significant degradation (Parsons Brinckerhoff, 2011) |
| Efficiency | % | 100% | 100% | Not relevant for hydro |
| Equivalent Full Load Hours | Hours/year | Calculate fr | om capacity | factors. |
| Capacity Factor | % | 50% | 60% | (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Initial Year | USD/MW | 1% | 1.7% | Lower range (Pueyo, Bawakyillenuo, & Osiolo, 2016) Upper range (ARUP, 2016) |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Annual Increase | % | N/A | N/A | Inflation only |

6.3.3.3. Natural Gas – Open Cycle Gas Turbine

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|-----------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---|
| Investment Cost | USD/MW | \$869,000 | \$869,000 | USA (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2016) |
| Lifetime of Investment | Years | 20 | 20 | USA (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2016) |
| GHG Emissions Factor | tCO2e/MWh | | | |
| Capacity Degradation Factor | % | 3,5 % | 3,6 % | (Mott MacDonald, 2010) |
| Efficiency | % | 38.3% | 42.2% | LHV (LeighFisher Ltd, 2016) |
| Equivalent Full Load Hours | Hours/year | Calculate f | rom capacit | y factors. |
| Capacity Factor | % | 5% | 30% | USA (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2016) |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Initial Year | | | | |
| – Fixed | USD/MW | 7,000 | 7,000 | USA (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2016) |
| – Variable | USD/MWh | 13 | 13 | USA (National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2016) |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Annual Increase | % | N/A | N/A | Inflation only |

Table 30: Inputs for natural Gas – Open Cycle Gas Turbine

6.3.3.4. Natural Gas – Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT)

Table 31: Inputs for natural Gas – Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT)

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|-----------------------------|------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Investment Cost | USD/MW | \$1,017,000 | \$1,017,000 | USA (National |
| | | | | Renewable Energy |
| | | | | Laboratory, 2016) |
| Lifetime of Investment | Years | 20 | 35 | USA (National |
| | | | | Renewable Energy |
| | | | | Laboratory, 2016), |
| | | | | (LeighFisher Ltd, 2016) |
| GHG Emissions Factor | tCO2e/MWh | 0.365 | 0.488 | (Houses of Parliament, |
| | | | | 2011) |
| Capacity Degradation | % | 3.5% | 3.6% | (Mott MacDonald, |
| Factor | | | | 2010) |
| Efficiency | % | 58.8% | 60.7% | LHV (LeighFisher Ltd, |
| | | | | 2016) |
| Equivalent Full Load | Hours/year | Calculate fro | m capacity fa | ctors. |
| Hours | | | | |
| Capacity Factor | % | 48% | 87% | USA (National |
| | | | | Renewable Energy |
| | | | | Laboratory, 2016) |

| Non-fuel OPEX | , Initial | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|-------------------|
| - | Fixed | USD/MW | 14,000 | 14,000 | USA (National |
| | | | | | Renewable Energy |
| | | | | | Laboratory, 2016) |
| - | Variable | USD/MWh | 3 | 3 | USA (National |
| | | | | | Renewable Energy |
| | | | | | Laboratory, 2016) |
| Non-fuel OPEX | , Annual | % | N/A | N/A | Inflation only |

6.3.3.5. Heavy Fuel Oil

Table 32: Inputs for heavy fuel oil

| Input | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------|---|
| | | range | range | |
| Investment Cost | USD/MW | 650,000 | 1,400,000 | Lower range (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017), upper range (AF Mercados EMI, 2012) |
| Lifetime of Investment | Years | 20 | 20 | (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016a) |
| GHG Emissions Factor | tCO2e/MWh | 0.778 | 0.778 | (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017) |
| Capacity Degradation Factor | % | 1% | 1% | (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017) |
| Efficiency | % | 34% | 42% | (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016a), (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017) |
| Equivalent Full Load Hours | Hours/year | Calculate | from capacity | r factors. |
| Capacity Factor | % | 1% | 84% | Depends on whether run as peaking or baseload. |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Initial Year | USD/MW | | | |
| – Fixed | USD/MW | 13,000 | 13,000 | (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016a) |
| – Variable | USD/MWh | 3 | 4 | (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016a), (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017) |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Annual Increase | % | N/A | N/A | Inflation only |

6.3.3.6. Light Fuel Oil

Table 33: Inputs for light fuel oil

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|--------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---|
| Investment Cost | USD/MW | 650,000 | 1,100,000 | Lower range (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017), upper range (AF Mercados EMI, 2012) |
| Lifetime of Investment | Years | 20 | 20 | (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016a) |
| GHG Emissions Factor | tCO2e/MWh | 0.778 | 0.778 | (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017) |
| Capacity Degradation Factor | % | 1% | 1% | (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017) |
| Efficiency | % | 35% | 42% | (Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017) |
| Equivalent Full Load Hours | Hours/year | Calculate f | rom capacity | / factors. |
| Capacity Factor | % | 1% | 84% | Depends on whether run as peaking or baseload. |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Initial Year | USD/MW | | | |
| Fixed | USD/MW | 13,000 | 15,000 | (Department of Business,Energy and IndustrialStrategy,2016a),(Baurzhan & Jenkins, 2017) |
| Variable | USD/MWh | 3 | 4 | (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy,2016a), 2017) |
| Non-fuel OPEX, Annual Increase | % | N/A | N/A | Inflation only |

6.3.3.7. Fuel Costs – International Oil, Gas and Coal

Our fuel prices are taken from a publicly available source in the UK (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016b). These are only a guide and will need to be adjusted to reflect local costs, such as transportation costs and any price regulations.

Gas

Gas is provided in p/therm in the source used (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016b). Other sources may quote \$/mmbtu. We recommend converting to US\$/MWh (or

other chosen currency) so that units used in the model are consistent. Fuel conversion factors are readily available in textbooks or online.

Table 34: Inputs for fuel costs

| Input | Unit | Min range | Max range | Source (and notes) |
|----------------------------|---------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Fuel Cost, Starting Price | USD/MWh | 12 | 22.96 | UK 2017 |
| Fuel Cost, Annual Increase | % | 3.7% | 4.9% | Real. Should be increased by the inflation rate used in the model. |

Oil

Oil is provided in US\$/bbl in the source used (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016b).

Table 35: Inputs for oil

| Input | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|----------------------------|---------|-------|-------|--|
| | | range | range | |
| Fuel Cost, Starting Price | USD/MWh | 13.53 | 36.48 | UK 2017 |
| Fuel Cost, Annual Increase | % | 4.8% | 6.2% | Real. Should be increased by the inflation rate used in the model. |

Coal

Coal is provided in US\$/tonne of steam coal in the source used (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2016b).

Table 36: Inputs for coal

| Input | Unit | Min | Max | Source (and notes) |
|----------------------------|---------|-------|-------|--|
| | | range | range | |
| Fuel Cost, Starting Price | USD/MWh | 4.30 | 6.26 | UK 2017 |
| Fuel Cost, Annual Increase | % | 3.3% | 6.4% | Real. Should be increased by the inflation rate used in the model. |

6.3.3.8. Others for Baseline Energy Mix

Note that small hydro, wind and solar PV data is available in section 6.3.1 above.
Renewable LCOE can be used to enter any technologies not defined in the other categories.

6.3.4. Mini Grid Costs

Mini-grids are very specific projects and it is not adequate to extrapolate generic standard reference costs. Location and technical characteristics of the mini-grid should be tailored for each project.

Instead, it is advisable to rely on the application of mini grid design tools such as HOMER (http://www.homerenergy.com/HOMER_pro.html). This kind of engineering software includes equipment databases and allow the user to specify a mini-grid configuration in detail.

7. Bibliography

AF Mercados EMI. (2012). The Gambia - FIT Model and Standard PPA.

- Argonne National Laboratory. (2016). GREET Transportation Fuel Cycle Analysis Model, GREET 1.8b, https://greet.es.anl.gov/.
- ARUP . (2016). Department of Energy and Climate Change Review of Renewable Electricity Generation Cost and Technical Assumptions – Study Report.
- Baurzhan, S., & Jenkins, G. P. (2017). On-Grid Solar PV versus Diesel Electricity Generation in Sub-Saharan Africa: Economics and GHG Emissions. Sustainability 2017, 9, 372.

Carbon Trust . (2011). Conversion Factors - Energy and carbon conversions.

Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. (2016a). Electricity Generation Costs.

- Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. (2016b). BEIS 2016 Fossil Fuel Price Assumptions.
- EIA. (2017). Construction cost data for electric generators installed in 2014.
- Houses of Parliament. (2011). Carbon Footprint of Electricity Generation. London: The Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology.
- IRENA. (2012). Biomass for Power Generation.
- IRENA. (2015). Renewable Power Generation Costs in 2014.
- IRENA. (2016a). Solar PV in Africa: Costs and Markets.
- IRENA. (2016b). The Power to Change: Solar and Wind Cost Reduction Potential to 2025.
- Lazard. (2016). Lazard's Levelized Cost of Storage Version 2.0.
- LeighFisher Ltd. (2016). Electricity Generation Costs and Hurdle Rates Lot 3: Non-Renewable Technologies.
- Mott MacDonald. (2010). UK Electricity Generation Costs Update.
- National Renewable Energy Laboratory. (2016). 2016 Annual Technology Baseline.
- Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission. (2016). MYTO 2.1 Model 2015.
- Parsons Brinckerhoff. (2011). Electricity Generation Cost Model 2011 Update Revision 1 Department for Energy and Climate Change.
- Pueyo, A., Bawakyillenuo, S., & Osiolo, H. (2016). Cost and Returns of Renewable Energy in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparison of Kenya and Ghana. Institute of Development Studies.

