

## Annex B - Business cases

The business case examines two sites owned by CDC; Trinity Road main office, and

Financial modelling is based on tendered costs and an estimate of the amount of solar generated electricity consumed on site. Modelling based on the assumptions listed below gives the following high level viability indicators for both sites taken in aggregate:

District	Capital Costs (£)	ROI	Payback Years	NPV
CDC	268,471	9.3%	14.0	41,756

The summary results for each site individually are as follows:

Site Name	System size (kWp)	Tariff Modelled:	Risk Factor Applied to Tenants (%)	Capital Costs incl. Battery (£)	PV specific Investment cost (£kWp)	ROI (Target 8.2%)	Payback (yrs)	NPV (£)	Comparison to Target Revenue Return (Income) / Expense	RAG - (Confidence: consumption profile & spill)	
<u>Trinity</u> <u>Road</u>	158	Council (Mid)	0%	209.782	739	✓ 10.1%	<b>x</b> 13.0	৵ 79.000	<ul> <li>✓ -(1,888</li> </ul>	High	-

• Green ticks, yellow exclamation marks and red crosses are simply visual prompts for discussion, and represent indicative threshold levels within the modelled variables.



• The financial modelling assumes a project life of 20 years (it should be noted that solar panels are generally reckoned to have a useful life of 25-30 years). Replacement of inverters (that convert solar direct current electricity into mains alternating current) is assumed at 10 year intervals, and batteries (where relevant) at 20 year intervals.

• 'PV system size' is the size of the solar array measured in kiloWatts(peak) (kWp). For reference one kWp represents approximately 2.5 panels, or about 5 square metres area.



• For installation at Trinity Road, 'Tariff' relates to the avoided cost of purchased electricity, which is known approximately for the first year of operation (to the end of the current electricity supply contract) estimated to be 43p/kWh next year, and thereafter is assumed to follow the 'best guess' estimate of future electricity prices provided by an external professional consultancy firm.

• 'Tenant risk factor' is applied where some uncertainty exists over the volume of electricity a tenant is likely to consume, or where there may be other risks to project revenue, such as tenancy voids.

• 'Capital costs' are the full capital costs of all works at each site, as quoted by the winning tenderer. These capital costs are inclusive of any electricity storage battery, if the site is appropriate and if a battery is proposed by the tenderer.

• 'PV specific investment cost' is the overall project cost for the PV-only element (ie, ignoring any battery cost), divided by the size of the solar installation, presented as £ per kWp. This is an industry standard way of looking at installation cost, and can vary quite widely between sites depending on a number of factors including type of panels and inverter, installation size, the complexity of roof layouts, type of mounting system, ease of access and scaffolding, etc.

• 'Return on Investment (Rol)' is the overall % return on the capital cost over the project life. 8.2% target Rol is an indicative minimum level of return that Council finance officers have suggested projects should seek to achieve.

• 'Payback' is the simple payback period - i.e. the length of time in years it will take for the projected revenues to equal the original capital cost.

• 'NPV' is the Net Present Value of all the costs and revenues over the whole project life, with the value of future costs and revenues discounted by a factor taken from Treasury Green Book guidance. NPV is a way of presenting the value of a project that recognises that the value (or usefulness) of  $\pounds I$  in the hand today is greater than the usefulness of a promise of  $\pounds I$  in the future.



• 'Comparison to Target Revenue' Return shows whether the project generates more (in red text) annual revenue (on average) than the amount needed to meet the Council's target return on investment, or less annual revenue (in black text).

• 'Confidence level on consumption and spill' is a subjective judgement, based on engagement with tenants, and access to and quality / completeness of electricity consumption data, which indicates the (current) level of confidence in the assumptions regarding how much solar generated electricity will be consumed on site (and therefore generate revenue for the Council), and how much may be 'spilled' back to the electricity grid (where for the tenanted property we have assumed no revenue in order to be conservative in this modelling, and for Trinity Road we have assumed 5p/kWh). 'High' confidence would indicate that detailed site consumption data (half-hourly data points for at least one year) has been available, and has been used by the proposed installer to demonstrate how much electricity will be consumed, per half hour, in a typical year. 'Low' confidence would indicate that the site consumption data is limited, and may comprise, eg, a single value for annual electricity consumption, meaning the estimate of likely on-site consumption will have higher uncertainty.

## Use of the Cotswold Climate Investment

The financial model demonstrates the use of part of the  $\pm 0.5$ m capital raised from the public to fully fund the PV / battery installations, through the Cotswold Climate Investment (CCI). Using this capital for this project is beneficial since the rate of interest paid to investors is relatively modest (2.1%) compared to the current rate at which councils may borrow from the Public Works Loan Board.

A particular characteristic of this financing should be noted. The CCI is a 5 year annuity investment, meaning that investors are paid back both principal and interest over the 5 years. The CCI has a further 4 years to run, and by the end of the four year period, investors will be completely repaid. This means that the repayment of the loan is higher than project income in the early years, which is shown in the cash flow graphs below, but from year 5 onwards the scheme is strongly cash generative. Therefore, whilst the overall project has a good return on investment, the payback periods are relatively long.

Individual site business case summaries are provided below:



## Trinity Road - Solar Energy Storage - Financial Pro Forma & Benefit/

Inputs requ	iired	Demand +/-:	0% Council (Mid) 0%	
2		Select Tariff:		
A. Model	Inputs	Risk Factor +/-:		
Category	Item	Value	Unit	
System Summary	PV System Size	158	kWp	
	Storage System Size	89.6	kWh	
	Storage System Size	0	N/A	
Costs	PV System Cost	£202,726		
	Inverter	£7,056		
Grant Funding	Utility Incentives	£0		
Financing	Financing	Yes	"Yes"/"No"	
	% Financed	100%	Grant/Internal funds utilised	
	Term	20		
Certainty	Rate	4.0%	Over 191/2 not over 20	
PV Specs	Annual PV Production (yr 1)	134,942	kWh	
	Annual PV Degradation Rate	0.5%	%	
	PV Spill to grid	16.8%	%	
Retail Billing	Tenant consumption rate	£0.43	£/kWh	
Details	Grid export rate	£0.08	£/kWh	
	Energy inflation	3.0%	%	
Add'l Storage	Storage roundtrip efficiency	0.0%		
Specs	Storage useful life	0	N/A	
Operating Costs	PV O&M costs	£0	£/kW	
	Other costs	£0	PM Resource CDC	
	O+M cost escalator	2.5%	%/yr	
	Inverter as % of installed cost	3.4%	%	
	Inverter life	20	yrs	
	Inverter cost reduction	0.0%	Cost reduction of technology	
Depreciation	Depreciation method	None	"None", "Straight Line"	
	Depreciation basis	£209,782		
VAT Rate	VAT applicable?	5.0%		
	VAT-able?	Yes	"Yes"/"No"	
Discount Rate	Discount rate for NPV calc.	3.5%	%	

## **B. Model Outputs**

Category	Item	Value	Unit
Direct Financia	Benefits and Costs		
from financial	pro-forma model at right)		
Direct	IRR	6.1%	Rate where NPV = zero
Direct	ROI	10.1%	Total growth, Yield on capital invested.
Financial	Simple Payback Years	13	Years
Metrics	NPV	£79,000	Value of investment over period.
	Benefit/Cost Ratio	0.4	>I = Good investment
Annual and Cu	mulative Cash Flows		
-0.4		Year	
0.2	Ar	nnual Cash Flow	1
-0.3		umulative Cash Flo	
-0.2			
2 -0.1			
0	5	10	5 20 25
2 0.0		/	
0.1	/		
0.2			
	$\sim$		
0.3			
Annual avoided			
Average avoir	emissions impacts:		
and the second	f emissions impacts: ded monthly kWh	11,245	kWh/month
	f emissions impacts: ded monthly kWh Nitrogen Oxides	11,245	kWh/month kg/yr
	f emissions impacts: ded monthly kWh Nitrogen Oxides Methane	11,245 185 88	kWh/month kg/yr kg/yr
	f emissions impacts: ded monthly kWh Nitrogen Oxides Methane Carbon Dioxide	11,245 185 88 34,132	kWh/month kg/yr kg/yr kg/yr
Annual avoided	f emissions impacts: ded monthly kWh Nitrogen Oxides Methane Carbon Dioxide I emissions equivalencies:	11,245 185 88 34,132	kWh/month kg/yr kg/yr kg/yr
Annual avoided	f emissions impacts: ded monthly kWh Nitrogen Oxides Methane Carbon Dioxide I emissions equivalencies: CO <sup>2</sup> avoidance	11,245 185 88 34,132 84,486	kWh/month kg/yr kg/yr kg/yr average passenger vehicle miles
Annual avoided Avoided emissions	f emissions impacts: ded monthly kWh Nitrogen Oxides Methane Carbon Dioxide I emissions equivalencies: CO <sup>2</sup> avoidance CO <sup>2</sup> emissions	11,245 185 88 34,132 84,486 4.2	kWh/month kg/yr kg/yr kg/yr average passenger vehicle miles average home's annual electricity use



