Design and Assessment of a Grid-Connected Photovoltaic System for Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University: Economic and Environmental Analysis

Issaka Salifu¹, Agnes Galyuoni² Joshua Apigagua Akanbasiam³, Abdul Mumin Halidu⁴

¹(Department of Electrical/Electronic Engineering, Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, Ghana)

²(Department of Electrical/Electronic Engineering, Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, Ghana)

³(Department of Electrical/Electronic Engineering, Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, Ghana)

⁴(Department of Electrical/Electronic Engineering, Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, Ghana)

ABSTRACT

Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University is the youngest Technical University in Ghana, located in the Upper West Region. However, the supply of reliable energy has been a major concern for the University. The University experiences the regular phenomenon of a power blackout, which affects the activities on the campus. This research questions the kind of alternative energy source that is available for the University in other to mitigate the above challenges. It further looks at the technical, economic, and environmental suitability of that option. This study aimed at designing and assessing a solar PV system for Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University to be connected to the grid. RETScreen Software was employed for the simulation over the guaranteed life of the system. Technical, Economic, and Environmental analyses were conducted on the Grid-connected solar PV system. The results of the study indicate that the designed system generated a yearly energy yield of approximately 162054.53 MWh of which 162026 MWh was delivered to the load and the remaining 28.53 MWh was exported to the grid. Also, the equity payback period of the designed Grid-connected PV system was 2.8 years, with a project duration of 25 years and a simple payback of 3.2 years. The net present value of life cycle costing (LCC) is estimated to be about Gh¢ 4097142. The designed PV system is also capable of saving up to 60059 tonnes of CO2, equivalent to 139672 barrels of crude oil given out by a thermal power station generating an equal amount of electricity. The great potential of employing solar energy in the University is confirmed by the anticipated high energy yield. It was also economically viable to implement the Grid-connected solar PV systems since their NPV is positive and also BCR is greater than 1. This project will meet 100% of Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University's energy requirements and the surplus exported to Grid. The project can save tonnes of CO2 which would have been given out by non-renewable power stations generating an equal amount of electric power, which indicates a great environmental impact for a better world.

KEYWORDS - Grid-connected, Payback, Photovoltaic, RETScreen, Simulation.

Date of Submission: 01-05-2024

Date of Acceptance: 12-05-2024

I. Introduction

The sustenance of all economies is dependent on energy, hence it enables better welfare. In a country where energy supply is lacking, the growth of its economy is brought to a standstill as well as the livelihoods of the people¹. Electricity contributes to about 69% of modern energy used in all sectors of the economy of Ghana². It happens to be the commonest modern type of energy used in the industrial and service sectors of the economy. Electricity production and supply, serves as a source of employment for a large number of professionals in Ghana. It also helps in providing foreign exchange for the country ².

Due to the rapid rate of population growth, technological advancement, and globalization, the rate at which energy is consumed in developing countries of which Ghana is part, is rising at an astronomical rate of 5% per year³. For any country to experience rapid economic growth, it needs a large quantity of energy input. It is therefore imperative for every country to invest in alternative energy sources since energy cannot be created⁴.

Ghana is one of the developing countries, which is dependent on the imported oil in order to meet it needs from the energy required for all sectors. The electricity supply system in Ghana is sometimes characterised by power interruptions, which seriously affect the livelihood of the people and industrial development. In the technological development of any country, dependable and economic power generation is a very critical commodity. Even though Ghana has a challenge in meeting the present energy demand, it is projected that the demand will increase by 10% per annum⁵. Therefore, the country can only achieve its developmental goals with a realistic plan to expand its generation of power.

Ghana has a very high potential for developing solar energy because of its abundant solar resources, which is approximately 35 EJ (exajoules), with mean yearly working hours of 2670 which amounts to about 53,000 MWh a year⁶.

The sun's energy upon touching a solar panel transforms into electricity. Primarily, the choice of location of a PV installation is influenced by the strength of the solar radiation. This stems from the fact that the power output of a PV array is directly proportional to the solar insolation of the input of the system. The output of a PV array is limited by some climatic and environmental factors including temperature, humidity, and precipitation⁷. Amongst the energy sources, solar PV electricity is unique, for many benefits including energy and non-energy, arise from its usage.

The Government of Ghana has a target in the electricity sector, which is to ensure and provide sufficient, affordable, reliable, and maintainable power. However, Ghana is faced with several challenges⁸.

Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University is the youngest Technical University in Ghana, located in the Upper West Region. It was established in September 1999 as a Polytechnic and converted into a Technical University in 2020. The Konta feeder supplies power to the University's electrical energy distribution network⁹.

The overall quantity of electricity sold by the Northern Electricity Distribution Company (NEDCo) in the Upper West Region (Where Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University is located) was 348.2 GWh in 2018. The University's total electricity consumption in 2018 was 459741kWh which is 0.13% of the total energy supplied. The total amount of electricity consumed the same year nationwide was 4978.4 GWh and compared to Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University's electricity consumption, means that Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University accounts for 0.058% of the national total electrical energy consumption¹⁰.

However, the supply of reliable and cost effective energy has been a major concern for Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University. The University sometimes experiences regular phenomenon of a power blackout, which affects the activities on the campus. Also the University accumulates a huge electricity bill at the end of each month, which when there is a default in payment, the University is disconnected from the national Grid. This research questions the kind of alternative energy source that is available for the University in other to mitigate the above challenges. It further looks at the technical, economic, and environmental suitability of that option.

The present study aims at designing a PV (photovoltaics) to provide alternative energy generation for Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University (DHLTU), Wa, Ghana. The technical analysis, economic feasibility, and CO_2 emission savings by implementing the proposed solar PV system have been conducted using a clean energy management software namely, RETScreen 4.0

2.1 Location of the Study

II. Material and Methods

Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University was selected as the location for the present study. The Technical University is situated along the road leading to a village called Kpongu in the Wa Municipality of the Upper West Region. Fig. 1 shows a map of Wa municipality indicating the location of Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University (DHLTU).



Figure 1. Map of Wa Municipality¹¹

The geographical location of Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University (DHLTU) is latitude 10.01°N, with an altitude of 322m above sea level,¹². The University has vast land which is able and capable of embracing renewable energy initiatives for electricity generation.

2.2 Load profile of Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University

The mean yearly electrical power usage can be assessed in two different ways, which are; using the current electrical power records in the form of electricity bills and using a load assessment sheet to conduct a load assessment analysis. In this design, however, the first option was used because it is more accurate and cheap. Table 1 shows Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University's energy consumption per day.

Date of Meter reading	Energy consumed (kWh)	Number of billing days	Average energy use per day (kWh)		
31 st January	60530	30	2017.67		
28 th February	62223	28	2222.25		
31 st March	64422	31	2078.13		
30 th April	61303	30	2043.43		
31 st May	61274	31	1976.58		
30 th June	61312	30	2043.73		
31 st July	60226	31	1942.77		
31 st August	60370	31	1947.42		
30 th September	61240	30	2041.33		
31 st October	60988	31	1967.35		
30 th November	61852	30	2061.73		
31 st December	62532	31	2017.16		
TOTAL	738272	365			

Source: NEDCo (2019)

2.3 PV System Design

A Grid-connected PV system consists of PV arrays, junction boxes, collecting boxes, inverters, transformers, and a commercial grid. PV modules generate DC power. The function of the power conditioner is to change DC voltage to AC voltage. The output from the power conditioner which is AC is then sent to the building and main grids. The PV plant's design requires a decent knowledge of the system and components The system design process is shown in Fig. 2.



Figure 2. System design process

2.4 Selection of design configuration

This study presents a Grid-connected photovoltaic system with a battery backup. Because a system is required to primarily overcome the problem of power unreliability (regular power outage) at the Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University, this option was chosen because it is the most suitable.

Grid-connected PV systems with battery backup have two configurations. In one configuration, the inverter and charge controller form a single unit whiles in the second configuration, the inverter and charge controller are separate units. Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show the two configurations¹³.



Figure 3. System configuration with charge controller and the inverter as one unit



Fig .4. System configuration with charge controller and the inverter as separate units

The second option, where the inverter and charge controller are separate units was proposed for this thesis because it is simple and cost-effective.

2.5 PV-module selection

A PV module consists of several photovoltaic cells in series and parallel. A PV cell transforms directly the solar insolation into power in the form of dc when there is an interaction between sunlight and the semiconductor materials in the PV cells¹⁴. The equivalent circuit of a PV cell is shown in Fig. 5 where the non-linear I-V characteristic can be derived ¹⁴.



Figure 5. Equivalent circuit of photovoltaic cell

There are different types of Photovoltaic modules in the market with various specifications. The two common forms of PV modules are polycrystalline and monocrystalline types¹⁵. In this study monocrystalline silicon, NT-185U1 PV Module which is produced by Sharp Company was selected. This model was selected due to the following reasons: it is widely available in the market, it withstands rigorous operating conditions and it has relatively good efficiency compared to other mono-silicon solar panels. The proposed PV panel has a peak power output of 185Wp, 17.5% encapsulated cell efficiency, and an efficiency of 14.5% respectively¹⁴. The technical specifications of the selected PV module are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. specifications of monocrystalline silicon NT-185U1 PV pane	l
---	---

Item description	Item specification			
Maximum power (Wp)	185 W			
Open-circuit voltage (Voc)	44.9V			
Maximum power voltage (Vmp)	36.2V			
Short-circuit current (Isc)	5.75A			
Maximum power current(Ipm)	5.11A			
Module efficiency (nc)	14.23%			
Length (L)	1575mm			
Width (W)	826mm			

Depth (D)	46mm
Weight (W kg)	17.0kg
Operating temperature (θ°)	- 40 °C to + 90 °C
Source: <u>www.abcsolar.com/pdf/sharp185.pdf</u>	

2.6 Power inverter specification

An inverter in a PV system transforms the DC voltage generated by solar panels into AC voltage of grid frequency¹⁶. The most significant characteristic of an inverter is the conversion frequency. According to¹⁴, the inverter is responsible for converting the DC electricity in the form of energy stored in the battery to usable AC power required by the load. Factors that were considered in selecting the power inverter for the solar installation network included: efficiency, capital cost, and life service of the inverter gadget. I-P HPC-2000W model from the I-panda brand was selected for the study due to its high efficiency ranging between 95% - 99%. The technical specification of the power inverter is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: specification of power inverter I-P HPC-2000W						
Inverter Model (HPC-2000W)	Specification					
Output power	2000W					
D.C. input voltage	24V / 48V					
A.C. output voltage	100V/ 110V / 220V/ 230V / 240V					
Efficiency	95%					
Source: www.solarcontroller-inverter.com/products/I-Panda						

2.7 PV system input parameters

RETScreen energy software was employed to estimate the annual energy output, financial viability, and carbon dioxide reduction of the proposed PV system. The input parameters required to simulate the proposed model were identified in this study as follows. Solar tracking mode was considered to be fixed. The PV panel was assumed to be tilted at the optimal angle of 15.1° facing south (Azimuth angle = 0°). This assumption was based on previous studies by^{16, 17}. A simulation was run on the 458kW PV system capacity. The efficiency of the PV system is mostly affected by low temperatures and occasional dust storm incidents in Ghana. Miscellaneous losses of the PV model and inverter were assumed to be 10% and 5% respectively.

2.8 Determination of power demand

The first step in designing solar power plants is the determination of the daily load demand which is given below:

The load consumption was deduced from the monthly electricity bills. The energy consumed (kWh) in each month was added for one year. This gave the total energy consumption in a year.

Total power consumption in a year = 738272.36kWh

The total energy consumed in a year was divided by 365 (number of days in a year) to get the total average energy required in kW/day. Total PV panel energy demand per day = 2022.664kWh/day. The total average energy demand per day is usually multiplied by a factor that expresses the losses of the system components as shown in (1)¹⁴.

PV panel demand per day = daily average energy consumption \times 1.3 (1)

This is done to avoid the risk of under-sizing the PV system¹⁴

2.9 Sizing of PV module system

The size of the PV module system is determined by its load requirements, solar insolation, and geographical location. In this study, the proposed system is designed for Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University where the least size of the solar array was calculated to be 427.555kW using (2)¹⁴:

Power of solar array = $\frac{\text{daily energy requirement}}{\text{solar insolation}}$ (2)

2.10 Sizing of Inverter

AC power was supplied to the AC loads with the help of an inverter. The input rating of the inverter should be greater than the load whiles the inverter battery must have the same voltage¹⁸. The inverter size for stand-alone systems should be 25-30% bigger than the total Watts of load. However, if the load a is motor then the inverter size must be at least 3 times the capacity of the load. In the case of Grid-connected systems, the input rating of the inverter must be equal to the rating of the PV system in other to give allowance for safe and efficient operation¹⁸. Therefore the size of the inverter is 2000kW.

2.11 Sizing of Battery

A deep cycle battery type was recommended. According to¹⁵, deep-cycle batteries used in solar PV installation provide temporary storage for excess electricity produced by the solar PV array. The battery should be sizeable

enough to be to accumulate adequate power, needed for the day as well as for the night. In this study the size of the battery was calculated as follows:

Total Watt-hours/day utilized by loads was calculated. To cater for battery losses, the total Watt-hours/day was divided by 0.95. The results obtained were divided by the depth of discharge (0.6). The resultant was subsequently divided by the nominal battery voltage. The subsequent answer was multiplied by days of autonomy (the number of days that you need the system to operate when there is no power produced by PV panels).

The required Ampere-hour capacity of the deep-cycle battery was calculated using (3)¹⁴. Battery capacity = $\frac{\text{total watt} - \text{hrs/day} \times \text{DoA}}{0.95 \times 0.6 \times \text{nominal voltage}}$ (3) Total energy consumed per day = 2022.664kWh Nominal voltage = 12V Days of autonomy = 3 days = 72 hours Depth of discharge DoD = 0.6 Battery size = $\frac{2022.664 \times 3}{0.95 \times 0.6 \times 12}$ = 887.13 Total Ampere-hours needed is 302.05 Ah so the rating of the battery is 12 V 890Ah for 3-day autonomy¹⁹.

2.12 Sizing of Solar charge controller

The rating of the solar charge controller is usually Ampere and Voltage capacities. Solar charge controller must tie with the voltage of PV array and batteries. In standard practice, to size, a solar charge controller, the short circuit current (Isc) of the PV array is multiplied by 1.3 times¹⁸.

Solar charge controller rating = Total short circuit current of PV array $\times 1.3$ (4) PV module specification $P_m = 255 W_p$ $V_m = 24 Vdc$ $I_m = 8.28A$ $I_{sc} = 8.76 A$

Solar charge controller rating = (3 strings x 8.76A) x 1.3 = 34.164 A.

2.13 Description of simulation procedures

In this section the procedure used in RETScreen 4.0 software in simulating the proposed Grid-connected PV system in Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University, Ghana is described.

Step 1: Start stage: In this section, project type, facility type, and analysis type were specified. In addition, language type, currency, units, and analysis types were also specified.

Step 2: Load identification: The monthly load for the Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University was specified and the base electricity rate in Ghana was also specified. Furthermore, the parameters specified in this section included system maximum electricity load over maximum monthly mean, electricity rate–base case, and end-use energy efficiency measures.

Step 3: Energy analysis model: In this model, the parameters described are the analysis type of the energy project, the type of PV, manufacturer, PV model, and power capacity. In turn, the annual energy generated was calculated by the RETScreen Software.

Step 4: cost analysis model: In the cost analysis stage, the parameters that were entered included the initial, annual, and periodic costs for the proposed case system as well as credits for any base case costs that are avoided in the proposed case.

Step 5: Emission analysis model: In this worksheet, the annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction as a result of implementing the proposed technology in place of the base case technology was determined. The following were considered in the study; method 1 emission analysis was used, the baseline region/country, baseline changes during project life, and GHG credits transaction fee rates were also considered.

Step 6: Financial analysis model: In this model, financial parameters, like discount rates, inflation rate, project life, and fuel escalation rate were inputted. The main financial indicators (e.g. net present value and simple payback) which are used to evaluate the viability of the project were calculated automatically by the RETScreen software. Some assumptions made were that, the initial investment year was taken to be year 0; the costs and credits were given in year 0 terms, thus the inflation rate (or the escalation rate) was applied from year one onwards and the timing of cash flows occurred at the end of the year.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The simulation results of the proposed photovoltaic system are presented and analysed in this section. 3.1 Load Network Analysis

From the electricity bills, the daily power consumption for the University was estimated to be used in the design and sizing process of the PV system and are presented in Table 3.4. The daily average energy consumption for Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University is 2022.664 kWh and the total energy consumed for the year 2019 was 738272 kWh. From Fig. 6, in the proposed case, Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University will have an annual peak load of 67643 kWh and the base case had an annual peak load of 90191 kWh.

se case load characteristics	D	Proposed case load	ase load characteristics		
		Power gross average		Power net average	
		load		load	
Month		k¥	Month	kV	
January		60,530	January	45,398	
February		62,223	February	46.667	
March		64,422	March	48,317	
April		61,303	April	45,977	
Aay		61,274	May	45,956	
une		61,312			
luly		60,226	June	45,984	
lugust		60,370	July	45,170	
September		61,240	August	45,278	
Dotober		60,988	September	45,930	
lovember		61,852	October	45,741	
December		62,532	November	46,389	
			December	46,899	
system peak electricity load over max monthly aver	age	40.0%			
²eak load - annual		90,191			
		P + 4 + 44	Peak load - annual	67,643	
Electricity	MVh	542,998			
Electricity rate - base case	GHC/kWh	0.989			
Total electricity cost		GHC 537,024,614			

Figure 6. Load Network analysis of Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University

3.2 Technical Analysis

The PV technology selected depended on the data collected about the solar irradiance of the selected site and the daily power consumption (kWh) or types of electric loads. Fig. 7 shows the number and the specification of selected PV panels.

RETScreen Energy Model - Power project					
Proposed case power system					
Analysis type		Mathead d			
Analysis type	-	Method 1 Method 2			
	•	Method 2			
Resource assessment					
Solar tracking mode		Fixed			
Slope	•	15.1	1		
Azimuth	٠	0.0			
	Show data				Electricity
		Daily solar radiation -	Daily solar	Electricity	exported to
	Month	horizontal	radiation - tilted	export rate	grid
		kWh/m²/d	kWh/m²/d	GHC/MWh	MWh
	January	5.73	6.41	0.4	2.732
	February	6.02	6.44	0.4	2.460
	March	6.15	6.25	0.4	2.635
	April	6.10	5.89	0.4	2.428
	May	5.96	5.53	0.4	2.367
	June	5.46	5.00	0.4	2.092
	July	4.92	4.57	0.4	1.998
	August	4.67	4.47	0.4	1.965
	September	5.01	4.98	0.4	2.100
	October	5.60	5.87	0.4	2.511
	November	5.59	6.16	0.4	2.531
	December	5.63	6.39	0.4	2.718
	Annual	5.57	5.66	0.40	28.537
Annual solar radiation - horizontal	MWh/m ²	2.03			
Annual solar radiation - tilted	MWh/m ²	2.07			



Figure 7. Energy Analysis in RETScreen

The energy yield of this PV system depended basically on the solar irradiance of the selected Municipality and the efficiency of the selected PV panel. The number of panels depended on the power required to cover the daily energy consumption.

Studies on the soiling effect on PV cells indicate energy yield of a Solar PV System can reduce drastically when dust and sand are collected on the surface of the PV cell. In a study conducted by²⁰, it was found that the dirt collected on solar panels ("soiling") can have a drastic impact on the performance of PV systems in regions where rainfall is limited for a dry season of several months.

The soiling effect is important in conditions that need consideration in PV system design, especially where sand storms can deposit large amounts of dust and sand on the PV cell. Regarding the previous studies, only dust was considered in this research which is expected to decrease annual energy yield by 10%. This loss of energy production on photovoltaics cells was catered to as "miscellaneous losses," in the model, which represents the percentage decrease in annual production. Furthermore, any other miscellaneous losses from the inverter or other power conditioning were taken as 5%. The selected inverter is reported to operate at 2000 kW, and the percentage of electricity the inverter successfully converts from DC to AC was 95% (Inverter Efficiency).

In this study, a total of 162055.491 MWh of electricity was produced annually of which 162026 MWh was delivered to the load and the remaining 28.53 MWh was exported to the grid.

3.3 Economic Analysis

After choosing those parameters from the previous and related research and performing the analysis, the details of the cost analysis are presented in Fig. 8.

ttings								
) Method 1	0	Notes/Range			Notee	/Range		
D Method 2		 Second currency 			Notes	None		
J Method 2						None		
	0	Cost allocation						
tial costs (credits)	Unit	Quantity	II.	nit cost	,	Amount	Relative costs	
Feasibility study	Unit	Quantity	01	ntcost		Amount	Relative costs	
Feasibility study	cost	1	GHC	691,545	GHC	691,545		
	CUSI		Onc	031,345			0.49/	-
Subtotal:					GHC	691,545	0.1%	
Development			0.110					
Development	cost	1	GHC	1,861,020	GHC	1,861,020		=
Subtotal:					GHC	1,861,020	0.3%	
Engineering								
Engineering	cost	1	GHC	844,070	GHC	844,070		=
Subtotal:					GHC	844,070	0.1%	-
Power system								
Base load - Photovoltaic	kW	427,555.54	GHC	550	GHC	235,155,548		
Peak load - Grid electricity	kW	30,251.55	GHC	320	GHC	9,680,496		
Road construction	km	1	GHC	610,000	GHC	610,000		
Transmission line	km	5	GHC	710,750	GHC	3,553,750		
Substation		5	GHC	882,000	GHC	4,410,000		
	project	15	GHC					
Energy efficiency measures	project			3,000	GHC	45,000		
Inverter	cost	2	GHC	20,000	GHC	40,000		
					GHC	-		=
Subtotal:					GHC	253,494,794	35.1%	
Balance of system & miscellaneous								
Spare parts	%	30.0%	GHC	2,236,003	GHC	670,801		
Transportation	project	2	GHC	532,000	GHC	1,064,000		
Training & commissioning	p-d	15	GHC	582,000	GHC	8,730,000		
Inverter Contingencies	cost %	2 20.0%	GHC	20,000	GHC	40,000 53,479,246		
Interest during construction	15.00%	200 month(s)		320,875,475		401,094,344		
Subtotal:	10.0070	200 1101111(3)		20,010,410		465,078,391	64.4%	
tal initial costs						721,969,820	100.0%	-
inual costs (credits)	Unit	Quantity	Ur	nit cost	- 1	Amount		
0&M		_						
Parts & labour	project	5	GHC	42,825	GHC	214,125		
Fuel	cost %	5 20.0%	GHC GHC	12,500 276,625	GHC GHC	62,500 55,325		
Contingencies Subtotal:	7/0	20.0%	GHC	270,025	GHC	55,325 331,950		
Fuel cost - proposed case					GIL	331,950		
Electricity	MWh	10,072	GHC	0.400	GHC	4,029		
Subtotal:					GHC	4,029		
inual savings	Unit	Quantity	Ur	nit cost	1	Amount		
Fuel cost - base case								
Electricity	MWh	229,465	GHC	989.000		226,940,557		
Subtotal:					GHC	226,940,557		
riadia apata (aradita)	Unit	Year	11-	nit cost		Amount		
riodic costs (credits) Over draft	cost	25	GHC	720,000	GHC	720,000		
or or analt	coat	23	one	120,000	GHC	120,000		

RETScreen Cost Analysis - Power project

Figure 8. Cost analysis

From Fig. 8, the total initial cost of the proposed project is Gh¢721,969,820 for a 25year period which included the balance of the system and Miscellaneous, power system, engineering development, and feasibility study. The initial cost depends largely on the balance of the system and miscellaneous cost which is 64.4% of the total initial cost. The annual cost is Gh¢4029.

The financial viability report and the cumulative cash flow indicated an equity payback of 2.8 years and a simple payback period of 3.2 years as shown in Table 4 and Fig. 9 respectively.

	Table 4: Financial analysis results						
NPV	(GH ¢)	4097142					
SPB	(yrs)	3.2					
EPB	(yrs)	2.8					
BCR	•	1.01					



Considering the simulated results, the project is economically viable because it has a positive net present value (NPV) of Gh \mathbb{C} 4097142. The benefit-cost ratio (BCR) value also indicated a profitable project since the ratio is 1.01 which is greater than 1.

In a similar study conducted by²¹, the NPV value was \$6.911M (GHC3,939,270) and the BCR value was 1.25. These values match the present study.

3.4 GHG Emission Analysis

The reduction of GHG emissions is considered a major factor whiles comparing two energy systems. The utilization of renewable energy as a replacement for traditional power production units reduces the emission of GHG significantly²². This part is helpful in the prediction of the future benefits of air pollution reduction from using the proposed system in place of the base case technology. The result is given in form of the amount of carbon dioxide emissions reduced which is shown in the form of tonnes of GHG emission not emitted or other conservation equivalents as shown in Fig. 10.

 Method 1 Method 2 Method 3 Base case electricity system (Baseline) GHG emission factor factor region Fuel type tCO2/MWh factor <li< th=""><th>ETScreen Emission Reduct</th><th>tion Analysis - Po</th><th>ower project</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></li<>	ETScreen Emission Reduct	tion Analysis - Po	ower project								
○ Method 2 ○ Method 3 base case electricity system (Baseline) GHG emission factor Country - region Fuel type (Exama All types O Helbod 2 (excl. T&D) (Exama All types O Helbod 2 (excl. T&D) (Exama All types O Helbod 2 Country - region (Exama All types O Helbod 2 Country - region (Exama All types 0.198 10.0% (Exama All types (Exama All types (Exama All types (Example in change in GHG emission factor year 25 and beyond (Example in CHG summary (Baseline) (Example in GHG summary (Baseline) Fuel type % (Example in CHG summary (Power project) (Fuel type % Fuel type % (Example in 100.0% 100.0% (Example in 100.0% 10.072 (Example in 100.0% 10.025 (Example in 100.0% 10.02.0288 (Total 100.0	Emission Analysis										
○ Method 3 GHG emission factor factor factor factor factor factor factor factor factor factor factor factor factor vear of change Reason/event for baseline change Vear of change Reason/event for baseline change New solar PV plant under construction If Baseline changes during project life Vear of change Reason/event for baseline change New solar PV plant under construction Change in GHG emission factor GHG emission factor year 25 and beyond to 2218 If Baseline changes during project life Vear of change Reason/event for baseline change Fuel type Fuel % Change in GHG emission factor f	• Method 1										
Ase case electricity system (Baseline) GHG emission factor T&D GHG emission factor T&D GHG emission GetAr Fuel type Fuel type Change in GHG emission Security - region Fuel type TCO2/MWh Si GHG emission CO2/MWh Si GHG emission Fuel type Fuel mix Fuel type Fuel mix Fuel type Fuel mix Fuel type Si Fuel ty	O Method 2										
GHG emission factor (excl. T&D) T&D losses GHG emission factor for (excl. T&D) Country - region Fuel type GHG emission factor for consumption Country - region Fuel type % Change in GHG emission factor Year of change Reason/event for baseline change Sec asse system GHG summary (Baseline) Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Consumption Fuel mix Consumpt	O Method 3										
GHG emission factor (exct. T&D) bases GHG emission factor factor fc02IMWh 0.218 Country - region (exct. T&D) (shana GHG emission factor Year of change Reason/event for baseline change Wew solar PV plant under construction Electricity Teal of change Reason/event for baseline change New solar PV plant under construction Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Electricity Fuel mix fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fuel mix fuel type Fuel mix fab losses Fuel mix fuel type State for to colspan="2">State for to colspan="2">GHG emission factor fuel mix fuel type State for factor Colspan= fuel mix for colspan= for for to colspan= for for to colspan= for for to colspan= for for factor Colspan= fuel mix fuel type State for for factor Colspan= for for factor <											
Fuel type Fuel type Country - region Fuel type Fuel Country - region Fue	ase case electricity system (E	Baseline)									
Country - region Fuel type CO2MWN % CO2MWN Chana All type 0.196 10.0% 0.218 ID Baseline changes during project life Year of change				GHG emission							
Country - region Fuel type tCO2/MWh % tCO2/MWh Chana All types 0.196 10.0% 0.218 ZB Baseline changes during project life Change in GHG emission factor war 25 and beyond CO2/MWh Vear of change 25 GHG emission factor year 25 and beyond tCO2/MWh Reason/event for baseline change New solar PV plant under construction Solar 6HG emission Fuel mix Consumption GHG emission Genesision factor Fuel mix Consumption Fuel mix Genesision				factor	T&D	GHG emission					
Enan All types 0.196 10.0% 0.218 EX Baseline changes during project life Vear of change 25 (HG emission factor year 25 and beyond (CO2MWh) Change in GHG emission factor year 25 and beyond (CO2MWh) See case system GHG summary (Baseline) Image in GHG emission factor Fuel (MWh) Fuel (CO2MWh) Fuel type % Fuel (CO2MWh) GHG emission factor Fuel type % (CO2MWh) GHG emission factor Fuel type % (CO2MWh) (CO2MWh) Electricity 100.0% 1,603,388 0.218 rotal 100.0% 1,603,388 0.218 rotal 100.0% 1,603,388 0.218 rotal 100.0% 1,603,388 0.218 rotal 100.0% 10,072 0.288 Total 100.0% 10,072 0.288 Total 100.0% 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary GHG emission GHG emission Fuel (GHG emission Gemission reduction summary Years of bever project Base case Yr Proposed case ((excl. T&D)	losses	factor	_				
Electricity 100.0% Solar 94.1% Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Consumption Factor Fuel type % 100.0% 1,603.388 0.218 posed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel type % 0.00% 1,603.388 0.218 posed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel type % 0.00% 1,603.388 0.218 posed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Consumption factor Fuel type % 162.055 0.000 10.072 0.288 10.072 0.288 Total 100.0% 10.072 0.288 172,127 0.017 Telectricity 5.9% Total 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary Genission GHG emission Fuel mission											
Year of change 25 GHG emission factor year 25 and beyond ICO2/MWh Reason/event for baseline change Year of change Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Electricity 100.0% Total Total Total Total Total Fuel mix Secase system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Fuel mix Secase system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Colspan="2">GHG emission Fuel mix Secare system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Secare system GHG summ	Ghana		All types	0.196	10.0%	0.218					
Year of change 25 GHG emission factor year 25 and beyond ICO2/MWh Reason/event for baseline change Fuel mix Fuel mix GHG emission factor year 25 and beyond ICO2/MWh Se case system GHG summary (Baseline) Fuel mix Fuel mix GHG emission factor year 25 and beyond ICO2/MWh Electricity 100 0% Secase system GHG summary (Baseline) Fuel mix Consumption factor Fuel mix Consumption <td <<="" colspan="2" td=""><td>A Pasalina changes during n</td><td>rojoct life</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Change in Cl</td><td>LC emission factor</td><td>04 [</td><td>-10.0%</td></td>	<td>A Pasalina changes during n</td> <td>rojoct life</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Change in Cl</td> <td>LC emission factor</td> <td>04 [</td> <td>-10.0%</td>		A Pasalina changes during n	rojoct life				Change in Cl	LC emission factor	04 [-10.0%
Reason/event for baseline change New solar PV plant under construction Se case system GHG summary (Baseline) Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel type % Fuel mix Fuel mix Solar 9% Total 100.0% Total 100.0% Total 100.0% Total 100.0% Total 100.0% Genission reduction summary Genission reduction summary <td>zi baseline changes during p</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> <td></td> <td>CHC</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.196</td>	zi baseline changes during p		25		CHC				0.196		
se case system GHG summary (Baseline) Fuel type Fuel mix Fuel consumption factor Electricity 100.0% 1.603.388 0.218 Total 100.0% 1.603.388 0.218 opposed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel mix Fuel type % MWh COZIMWh factor Solar 94.1% 162.055 0.000 factor Electricity 5.9% 10.072 0.288 172,127 0.017 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Tablesses Total 10.072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Total Total Total 10.0% 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 <td< td=""><td>Reason/event fo</td><td></td><td></td><td>ant under constructio</td><td></td><td>ernission lactor y</td><td>car 20 and beyond</td><td>1002/1111</td><td>0.100</td></td<>	Reason/event fo			ant under constructio		ernission lactor y	car 20 and beyond	1002/1111	0.100		
Fuel mix consumption Fuel of factor Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh Electricity 100.0% 1,603.388 0.218 Total 100.0% 1,603.388 0.218 posed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix GHG emission factor Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh factor Solar 94.1% 1662.055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 100.072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Total 100.0% T82 losses 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary Fuel gHG emission gHG emission Gross annual GHG credits transaction fee occurrence GHG emission GHG emission gHG emission GHG credits transaction fee power project 110.24 66,122.6 2,902.7											
Fuel mix consumption Fuel of factor Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh Electricity 100.0% 1,603.388 0.218 Total 100.0% 1,603.388 0.218 posed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix GHG emission factor Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh factor Solar 94.1% 1662.055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 100.072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Total 100.0% T82 losses 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary Fuel gHG emission gHG emission Gross annual GHG credits transaction fee occurrence GHG emission GHG emission gHG emission GHG credits transaction fee power project 110.24 66,122.6 2,902.7	se case system GHG summa	rv (Baseline)									
Fuel mix consumption factor Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh Electricity 100.0% 1.603.388 0.218 Total 100.0% 1.603.388 0.218 opposed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Fuel mix GHG emission Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh factor Solar 94.1% 102.055 0.000 factor Electricity 5.9% 100.072 0.288 100.072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity 5.9% 3 0.288 Total 100.0% T&D losses 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 T&D losses Total G emission reduction summary GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits Total G emission reduction summary It CO2 It CO2 % GHG credits Total							Fuol	GUC omission			
Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh Electricity 100.0% 1.603.388 0.218 Total 100.0% 1.603.388 0.218 pposed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Fuel mix GHG emission factor Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh Solar 94.1% 162.055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 10.072 0.288 172,127 0.017 Electricity 5.9% 10.0% 3 0.288 Total Total 100.0% T&D losses 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits transaction fee vg trans of old of GHG emission GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits transaction fee vg transoft 10.24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%		Fuel mix							GHG emission		
Electricity 100.0% 1.603.388 0.218 Total 100.0% 1.603.388 0.218 pposed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix Fuel of GHG emission factor Fuel type % MWh tC02/MWh Solar 94.1% 162.055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 10.072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity 5.9% 10.0% 3 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary GHG emission GHG emission reduction fee Total Gemission reduction summary UCO2 UCO2 UCO2 % GHG emission Power project 10.24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%	Fuel type								tCO2		
Total 100.0% 1,603,388 0.218 posed case system GHG summary (Power project) Fuel mix GHG emission factor Fuel mix GHG emission factor MWh Clospan="2">Clospan="2">Clospan="2">Clospan="2">Clospan="2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Clospan=""2"Cl									349,716.8		
Fuel mix Fuel mix GHG emission factor Fuel type % MWN tcoz/MWN Solar 94.1% 162,055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 10,072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 T&D losses 3 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Telebrack 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary MWh 29 Telebrack 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary Frequencing GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits very reduction summary tCO2 tCO2 % GHG credits Power project 110:24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%		100.0%					1,603,388	0.218	349,716.8		
Fuel mix Fuel mix GHG emission factor Fuel type % MWN tcoz/MWN Solar 94.1% 162,055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 10,072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 T&D losses 3 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Telebrack 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary MWh 29 Telebrack 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary Frequencing GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits very reduction summary tCO2 tCO2 % GHG credits Power project 110:24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%											
Fuel mix consumption factor Fuel type % MW/h tCO2/MW/h Solar 94.1% 162.055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 10.072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 T&D losses 172,127 0.017 Common summary T&D losses 172,127 0.017 Total Total Total Gross annual GHG credits Gemission reduction summary Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 Constant and the second and	pposed case system GHG su	mmary (Power pro	oject)								
Fuel mix Fuel type consumption MW/h factor Solar 94.1% 162,055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 10,072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary Tears of occurrence Base case Proposed case GHG emission GHG credits reduction summary tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 % 6HG credits Power project 110.24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%							Fuel	CIIC emission			
Fuel type % MWh tCO2/MWh Solar 94.1% 162,055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 10,072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 Table losses 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Total IG emission reduction summary Fears of occurrence Base case of GHG emission GHG emission of GHG emission reduction end GHG credits transaction fee GHG credits transaction fee Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%		Fuel mix							GHG emission		
Solar 94.1% 162,055 0.000 Electricity 5.9% 10,072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 T&D losses 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary Gross annual GHG emission GHG credits GHG credits yr tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 % Gall Gall Gall Gall Gall Gall Gall GHG credits Gall GHG credits	Fuel type								tCO2		
Electricity 5.9% 10,072 0.288 Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 T&D losses 3 0.288 Gemission reduction summary Gross annual GHG emission GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits vr tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 % Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%									0.0		
Total 100.0% 172,127 0.017 Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 G emission reduction summary Gross annual GHG emission GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits vecurrence GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits credits pwer project 10.24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%									2,901.9		
T&D losses Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 Total Gemission reduction summary Gemission reduction summary Gross annual occurrence yr GHG emission GHG emission yr GHG emission GHG emission yr GHG emission CO2 GHG credits transaction fee tcO2 Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%									2,901.9		
Electricity exported to grid MWh 29 10.0% 3 0.288 Total Gemission reduction summary Frequencies GHG emission GHG emission GHG emission yr tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 % Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%	i viai	100.070			T&D losses		112,121	0.017	2,501.9		
Total Gemission reduction summary Gross annual Years of occurrence Base case of GHG emission GHG credits occurrence GHG emission GHG emission GHG credits yr tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%	Electricity exported to grid	MWh	29			1	3	0.288	0.8		
Gemission reduction summary Gross annual Years of expression Base case of HG emission occurrence GHG emission yr tCO2 tCO2 % Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%	Electrony experied to grid		20		10.070		5		-		
Years of occurrence Base case GHG emission Proposed case GHG emission GHG emission reduction GHG credits transaction fee tCO2 yr tCO2 tCO2 % Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%								10101	_,		
Years of occurrence Base case GHG emission Proposed case GHG emission GHG emission reduction GHG credits transaction fee tCO2 yr tCO2 tCO2 % Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%	G emission reduction summa	ary									
Years of occurrence Base case GHG emission Proposed case GHG emission GHG emission reduction GHG credits transaction fee yr tCO2 tCO2 % Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%							Groce annual		Net annual		
occurrence GHG emission GHG emission reduction transaction fee yr tCO2 tCO2 tCO2 % Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%		Voare of	Page case	Dropogod case				GUG crodite	GHG emission		
yr tCO2 tCO2 % Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%									reduction		
Power project 1 to 24 66,122.6 2,902.7 63,219.9 5%									tCO2		
	Power project								60,058.9		
	i onor project								63,061.8		
		20 and boyond	00,120.1	0,041.0			00,000.0	0,0	00,001.0		
Net annual GHG emission reduction 60,059 tCO2 is equivalent to 139,672 Barrels of crude oil not consumed	Net annual GHG emission I	reduction	60,059	tCO2	is equivalent to	139,672	Barrels of crude of	il not consumed			

Fig. 10. GHG Emission analysis worksheet from RETScreen 4.0

The data can vary as per the need. Therefore, this study was able to show that the input data for a 25year lifetime for the system reduced the amount of GHG emission from 66122.6 tonnes to 2902.7 tonnes representing 4.39% of the base case. From Fig. 10 the net annual GHG emission reduction of the proposed case was 60049 tCO₂ which is equivalent to 139,672 barrels of crude oil not consumed by a power plant generating equivalent electricity to the one from the proposed case.

The results of the current study are supported by findings of previous studies in the area of carbon dioxide reduction by the installation of renewable energy, though there are differences in the mitigation volumes. Research conducted by⁵, found that 90 MMtCO₂ will be avoided if renewable energy technology is integrated into Ghana's energy generation system and this is equivalent to a 40% reduction of current fuels used in energy generation. Also,¹⁷, found that 1313 metric tonnes of carbon dioxide which is equivalent to a car having a CO₂ emission of 150g/km and covering 10000 km/year, can be avoided if a 2.5MW PV system is installed.

IV. CONCLUSION

There is sufficient solar radiation at the selected site (Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University) for generating electricity to serve the institution and the surplus electricity can be sold to the Utility company. Considering the outcome of the simulation, it is obvious that the proposed Solar PV-based power plant can be suitably commissioned at Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University. The great potential of employing solar energy in the University is confirmed by the anticipated high energy yield. It was also economically viable to implement the Grid-connected solar PV systems since their NPV is positive and also BCR is greater than 1. This

project will meet 100% of Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University's energy requirements and the surplus exported to Grid.

The project can save tonnes of CO_2 which would have been given out by non-renewable power stations generating an equal amount of electric power, which indicates a great environmental impact for a better world.

REFERENCES

- [1]. UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA). (2018). Transforming lives through renewable energy access in Africa UNDP's Contributions.
- [2]. Ministry of Energy Ghana. (2010). National Energy policy. Accra.
- [3]. E.H. Borgstein, R. Lamberts, J.L.M. Hensen, Energy Build. 128 (2016) 734-755.
- Kuamoah, C. (2020). Renewable Energy Deployment in Ghana: The Hype, Hope and Reality. Insight on Africa, 12(1), 45-64. doi:10.1177/0975087819898581
- [5]. Awopoane, A. K., Zobaa, A. F., & Banuenumah, W. (2017). Techno-economic and environmental analysis of power generation expansion plan of Ghana. Energy Policy. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.01.034
- [6]. Eshun, M. E., & Amoako-Tuffour, J. (2016). A review of the trends in Ghana. Energy, Sustainability and Society, 5(1)
- [7]. Gong, X., & Kulkarni, M. (2005). Design optimization of a large scale rooftop Photovoltaic system. Solar Energy, 78, 362–374. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2020117771
- [8]. Kumi, E. N. (2017). The Electricity Situation in Ghana: Challenges and Opportunities. Washington DC: Center for Global Development.
- [9]. Northen Electricity Distribution Company (2018).
- [10]. Energy Commission of Ghana. (2019). National Energy Energy Statistics Review. Accra.
- [11]. Ghana Statistical Service. (2013). 2010 Population and Housing Census: National Analytical Report. Accra.
- [12]. Sarsah, E. A., & Uba, F. A. (2013). Monthly-Specific Daily Global Solar Radiation Estimates Based on Sunshine Hours In Wa, Ghana. International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research, 2(8), 246-254
- [13]. Rehman, S., Ahmed, M. A., Mohamed, M. H., & Al-Sulaiman, F. A. (2017). Feasibility study of the grid-connected 10 MW installed capacity PV power plants in Saudi Arabia. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 80, 319–329. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.218
- [14]. Mohammed, A. Y., Mohammed, F. I., & Ibrahim, M. Y. (2017). Grid-Connected Photovoltaic System. 2017 International Conference on Communication, Control, Computing and Electronics Engineering (ICCCCEE). Khartoum.
- [15]. Saani, S. H., & Mohammed, K. (2018, August). Residential solar Photovoltaic system vs grid supply: An economic analysis using RETScreen. Journal of Solar Energy Research (JSER), 3(2), 107-114.
- [16]. Saleh, S. S. (2017). Feasibility Analysis of 5, 8, and 10 kW Grid-Connected Photovoltaic Systems in Saudi Arabia. Eastern Mediterranean University, Mechanical Engineering, Famagusta, North Cyprus.
- [17]. Mensah, L. D., Yamoah, J. O., & Adaramola, M. S. (2019). Performance evaluation of a utility-scale grid-tied solar photovoltaic (PV) installation in Ghana. Energy for Sustainable Development, 48, 82–87. doi:10.1016/j.esd.2018.11.003
- [18]. Ballaji, A., Ananda, H. M., Swamy, K. N., & Venkatesh, B. M. (2018). Design, Analysis, and Economic Investigation of Standalone Roof Top Solar PV System for Rural India. International Journal of Applied Engineering Research.
- [19]. Omar, M. A., & Mahmoud, M. M. (2019). Design and Simulation of a PV System Operating in Grid-Connected and Stand-Alone Modes for Areas of Daily Grid Blackouts. International Journal of Photoenergy, 1-9. doi:10.1155/2019/5216583
- [20]. Kimber, A., Mitchell, L., Nogradi, S. and Wenger, H. (2006) The Effect of Soiling on Large Grid-Connected Photovoltaic Systems in California and the Southwest Region of the United States. 4th IEEE World Conference on Photovoltaic Energy Conversion, Waikoloa, HI, 7-12 May 2006, 2391-2395. https://doi.org/10.1109/WCPEC.2006.279690
- [21]. Michael Obeng , Samuel Gyamfi , Nana Sarfo Derkyi , Amos T. Kabo-bah and Forson Peprah (2019). Technical and economic feasibility of a 50 MW Grid-connected solar PV at UENR Nsoatre Campus
- [22]. Rafique, M. M., & Bahaidarah, H. M. (2019). Thermo-economic and environmental feasibility of a solar power plant as a renewable and green source of electrification. International Journal of Green Energy. doi:10.1080/15435075.20191677237