Powering the Mountains with the Sun.

Abstract

Hotels in the Himalayan foothills pay commercial tariffs for grid electricity and run diesel generators when supply fails, yet published proof on rooftop solar for such hotels seldom uses a hotel's own bills. This paper assesses a proposed 200.4 kWp rooftop plant at Welcomhotel by ITC Hotels, Mashobra, Shimla, a hotel of approximately 70 rooms, using 17 months of HPSEBL bills (April 2025 to August 2026), diesel generator records, monthly occupancy and two vendor recommendations. In the twelve months that ended in March 2026, the hotel used 562,852 kWh. It was charged for 566,338 kVAh. The average cost was ?7.93 for each kVAh. The amount of energy used each month was closely linked to hotel occupancy. The Pearson correlation was 0.88. The Spearman correlation was 0.85, with 17 months of data. When the hotel was only 14 to 20 per cent full, the energy use was still 60 per cent or more of the average month. The borderline cost of a grid unit is about ?8.15 under the levies printed on the August 2026 bill. The vendor's estimate of 249,000 kWh a year would equal 44% of 2025?26 grid consumption. At the mediated Ekam price of ?66 lakh plus ?9 lakh of other costs, simple payback is 5.6 years if only the energy charge is saved and 4.1 years if duty and cesses are also avoided (8.7 and 5.5 years when discounted at 10%). The generators cost ?29?32 per unit to run, but possible diesel savings are small next to grid conservation and depend on a design decision not yet made. All rupee figures are nominal. The paper lists the items still to be confirmed before purchase.

Keywords: rooftop solar; hill hotels; Himachal Pradesh; electricity tariff; diesel generator; techno-economic analysis; hospitality energy management.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Background

In the foothills of the Himalayas, electricity is more than light for a hotel. The guest rooms and water are. During the cold months, the kitchens, laundry and ventilation systems are powered by electricity. The diesel generators kick in when the main power source is disrupted. That is at a significantly higher cost per unit of energy. In fact, the reliance on energy systems is a fundamental part of how hotel firms work, as research on climate and energy risks in the lodging industry shows (Mota et al., 2024). Energy efficiency is another concern highlighted by research on hotel sustainability (Blanco-Moreno et al., 2025).

The easiest approach for a hotel to lower the amount of electricity it buys from the grid is to install rooftop photovoltaic (PV) systems. But the real-world examples of this aren?t as good as the hype around it. Most studies on hotels enforcing power conversations discusses the reasons for and barriers to that, in a broad approach (Haider et al., 2026) or look at just one hotel in a particularly favourable position (Barbara et al., 2024). Few of the studies reviewed here combine

a hotel's own metered consumption, its actual tariff, its diesel generator records and a live vendor quotation. That combination is what an owner needs before placing a purchase order, and this paper provides it for one property.

1.2 The case and the research gap

The property under study is Welcomhotel by ITC Hotels, located in Mashobra, Shimla. It is a hotel with around 70 rooms. The hotel is owned by Zed Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.. Managed by ITC Hotels. It gets its power supply from Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Limited, known as HPSEBL. The electricity is provided under a two-part tariff. The hotel has received quotes for a solar plant with a capacity of about 200 kW. The hotel wants to know if the investment in solar power makes sense. It is also interested in finding out the size of the solar plant. Additionally, the hotel is curious about how much of the benefit depends on assumptions that have not yet been confirmed. The literature reviewed in Chapter 2 does not report utility-bill-based economics for a mid-sized, chain-managed hill hotel, and the hotels around this property have no solar installations that could serve as a local reference.

1.3 Objectives

The study has four objectives:

1. to describe the hotel's electricity use, tariff, maximum demand and diesel generator operation from 17 months of utility bills and operating records;
2. to test how monthly consumption links to occupancy and what that means for the load when occupancy is low;
3. to evaluate the roof?s capacity, technical limits and vendor proposals, for a rooftop PV plant;
4. to calculate the financial return of the plant based on the given assumptions highlighting diesel savings separately since those depend on a technical choice that has not been made yet.

1.4 Scope

The paper is a single-site case study supported by a literature review. It uses no survey or interview data. Every number about the hotel comes from its HPSEBL bills (consumption months April 2025 to August 2026), its diesel generator log (April 2025 to September 2026), its occupancy record (April 2025 to September 2026) or the hotel's written brief. Figures for the solar proposals come from the vendors' quotations as communicated to the author. Where a figure is calculated rather than reported, the text says so.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

2.1 Sustainable energy consumption in hotels

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Hotels offer services 24/7. Their energy needs depend on how many people are staying. The research on sustainability in hospitality has shown that energy performance, usage of resources and managing the environment are main areas of focus (Blanco-Moreno et al. 2025). The situation in mountain or hill places has an additional layer. Mota et al. (2024) studied the influence of climate change on hotels. Noted such regions are very reliant on energy-intensive systems. The expense increases when these systems fail. Service quality falls. So, controlling the energy use at a constant level is crucial not only for the environment but also for seamless functioning.

2.2 Solar PV on hotel roofs

Haider et al. (2026) explored the determinants of hotel rooftop panel installation. They identified four primary factors that influence the decision: money, technology, the way the hotel is run and government laws. Hotels are being driven to solar by saving money, caring about the environment, obtaining advice, and feeling confident in the solar firms. High upfront expenses, technical limitations, and uncertain or unstable policies are more difficult. The authors also note that few studies have focused on hotels. Barbara et al. (2024) analysed a motel that installed panels and changed to LED lighting. They discovered it saved money and cut pollutants. The findings relied on how much of the solar power the hotel consumed directly, and the cost of electricity in the area. These two elements are the basis of the analysis: self-consumption and the avoided fee. These are discussed in detail below.

2.3 Storage. Diesel. Resilience.

Luo and Cao (2025) proposed a model of a zero-emission hotel building and found that storage combined with energy management enhanced the durability of the facility during power outages. The structure they were looking at was not in the Himalayas, but the essential point still holds. Solar power is only useful during an outage if the system is set up to work when it is needed. Grid-connected standard inverters stop working when the power goes out. The decision to save power from a hotel?s diesel generator during outages has to be considered separately as done in Section 7.4 of this article.

2.4 Diesel, storage & resilience

Khatter (2025) states that technology helps to make the hospitality business more environmentally friendly through the use of energy management systems and building technologies, while Yolcu et al. (2025) point out that digitalisation and efficiency are related subjects in research on hotel technology. In a tourist example, Valett et al. (2026) demonstrate that digital energy management can change the decision from focusing on costs to additionally considering carbon and performance. For a hotel with no building management system, the true concern is more limited: whether the existing sub-meters and the inverters' own monitoring offer sufficient data to assess the plant's output, versus the load, which Section 6.4 discusses.

2.5 Guests and credibility

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Singh and Mittal (2026) found that online reviews and how guests feel about practices affect whether they decide to book a green hotel in India. Still, a positive view does not always mean a guest will actually make a booking. Park et al. (2024) say that if green practices are not designed well, they can actually make a guest?s stay less enjoyable. The study by Thongmun and colleagues in 2025 found that when hotels include elements that support sustainability along with messages about it, guests are more inclined to behave in ways that are good for the environment. Another study by Singh and Mishra in 2026 showed that when the people involved with hotels are dedicated to sustainability, the hotel does a good job with sustainability efforts. Taken together, these studies suggest a point: guests are more likely to trust a plant if its energy production is measured and made public.

2.6 Solar yield in Himachal Pradesh

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Vendor claims about generation should be checked against independent data. Sharma and Singh (2026) simulated a 14.82 kWp solar system at twelve district headquarters across Himachal Pradesh. These sites ranged in elevation from 360 meters to 3,025 meters above sea level. They used PVsyst and Meteonorm data to model the system. The results showed that specific yield increased from 1,345 kWh/kWp per year at the lowest elevations to 1,798 kWh/kWp per year at the highest points. That?s 138 more kWh per kWp each year for every 1,000 meters of elevation gained. This study was published outside the five publisher platforms used in the review, so it is included only as a local reference. It is a model of one system design, not a measurement, from an actual hotel solar plant.

Chapter 3. Conceptual Framework

Two well?known frameworks shape the analysis. I notice that the Technology?Organisation?Environment framework (Tornatzky & Fleischer, 1990) separates the forces that push a firm to adopt a technology into the technology itself, the organisation?s resources and the external environment. The triple bottom line (Elkington, 1997) looks at the

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

outcome by considering environmental and social outcomes. Rogers (2003) diffusion theory points out that adoption is easier when potential adopters can see the innovation working nearby. The hotels around this property have no installations, so the demonstration effect is absent here.

Figure 1 applies these ideas to the case. Rooftop generation and metering feed the hotel's energy system. Organisational factors include capital, engineering capacity and management support. Environmental factors include tariffs and levies, utility rules and climate. These factors affect the system. The outcomes that are measured are the cost of electricity, supply resilience and environmental performance.

Figure 1. *Conceptual framework of the case study: rooftop generation and metering interact with the hotel's energy system, under organisational and environmental influences, to determine the outcomes assessed (adapted from Tornatzky & Fleischer, 1990, and Elkington, 1997).*

Chapter 4. Research Methodology

4.1 Design

The research is done using a single-case study methodology and approach. The article opens with a literature review for context and comparison. Then data is gathered for the case by looking into utility bills and operating records. The assumptions are applied in a discounted cash-flow model to assess the proposed plant. Chapter 2 draws on peer-reviewed articles from Taylor & Francis, Emerald, Elsevier, Wiley and Springer Nature, found by searching the publishers' platforms for combinations of terms on solar energy, hotels, digital energy management and mountain tourism, and screened for relevance to hotel or commercial-building energy. One regional benchmark outside these platforms is identified in Section 2.6.

4.2 Case data

Table 1. Data sources and how they were used

Source	**Content**	**Use**
HPSEBL electricity bills (17)	Bills dated May 2025 to September 2026, covering consumption from April 2025 to August 2026	Consumption, demand, tariff, charges
Diesel generator log (Excel)		

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Monthly diesel litres, generator units and running hours, April 2025 to September 2026

Diesel cost and generator use

Hotel occupancy record

Monthly occupancy, April 2025 to September 2026

Association between occupancy and consumption

Hotel engineering brief

Rooms, connected load, roof, equipment, diesel price, project assumptions

System description and assumptions

Vendor quotations

Ekam Energy and Powermore proposals and negotiated prices

Capacity, price, generation estimate

Consumer, installation and bill identifiers appearing on the bills were not used.

4.3 Treatment of the bills

Each bill is labelled with the month in which it was issued but covers the meter-reading period that ended on the first day of that month. The bill labelled May 2025, for example, covers 1 April to 1 May 2025 and is treated as April 2025 consumption. The data support this mapping: the lowest consumption appears in the bill covering August 2025, which is also the month of lowest occupancy (13.86%).

Two energy units appear in the bills. Active energy (kWh) is the energy actually used. Apparent energy (kVAh) is the quantity HPSEBL meters and bills; it is slightly larger than kWh because of reactive power, and the ratio of the two is the power factor. This paper uses kWh for physical comparisons, namely the association with occupancy and the match with solar output, which is also measured in kWh. It uses kVAh for anything tied to the tariff, such as the cost per unit.

Figures were copied from each bill by hand, so every bill's own arithmetic was recomputed as a check on copying errors. The peak, normal and night readings must add up to the total kVAh. The energy charge plus the demand charge and any fuel and power purchase adjustment (FPPAS) must equal the net charge. The net charge plus electricity duty, cesses and municipal tax must equal the amount payable. All 17 bills reconcile. In one bill, for March 2026 consumption, the printed energy charge is ?512.62 higher than the units multiplied by the printed rate of ?6.20. The difference equals about 51,262 units at ?6.21 and 1,711 units at ?6.20, which suggests the bill was prorated across the tariff change. The printed amount is used. Late payment

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

surcharges and deposit-interest adjustments are excluded because they depend on when the hotel paid.

4.4 Analysis

We measured the association between consumption and occupancy with two coefficients on the 17 monthly pairs. Pearson?s r shows how closely the points follow a line. Spearman?s ? ranks the months by occupancy and by consumption. Checks whether the two rankings agree, so it does not need a straight line and is less affected by one or two extreme months. We calculated two?sided p?values for both. We obtained a 95?% confidence interval for r using Fisher?s z transformation. With 17 months and strong seasonality, the coefficients describe the association; they do not prove that occupancy causes the consumption.

Diesel cost was calculated at the stated purchase price of ?87 per litre applied to both reporting periods. The financial model projects 25 years of savings net of operation and maintenance costs. Reports simple

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

payback, discounted payback, internal rate of return (IRR) and net present value (NPV). Its inputs are listed in Table 10. Every input that was not supplied by the hotel or a vendor is labelled as an assumption. Tested in the sensitivity analysis.

All rupee amounts are nominal, meaning they are stated in the rupees of the month in which they were billed or quoted. No inflation adjustment has been applied to the bills, so a comparison between 2025 and 2026, such as the cost per unit, combines real tariff changes with general price changes. Rupee amounts use the Indian digit?grouping convention (1 lakh = 100,000); physical quantities use grouping.

Chapter 5. Energy Profile of the Hotel

5.1 Property and supply

Table 2 summarises the supply arrangement as recorded on the bills and in the hotel's brief. Guest rooms are heated by Samsung and Daikin VRV systems and hot water is produced by AO Smith heat pumps, all electric. The rated capacities (kW) of these systems were not available for this study, so their share of the connected load cannot be stated. The area-wise meters already installed in the hotel could provide it. The hotel has no central building management system,

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

since at about 70 rooms the owner judged that one would not pay for itself, and no neighbouring hotel has installed solar.

Table 2. Electricity supply and installed generation

Item	Value
Property	Welcomhotel by ITC Hotels, Mashobra, Shimla; approximately 70 rooms; owned by Zed Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., managed by ITC Hotels
Utility and tariff category	HPSEBL; CS-Two Part
Supply voltage	Availed 22 kV; standard 11 kV; metering at 22 kV
Sanctioned and billing contract demand	250 kVA (application made to raise it to 350 kVA)
Highest recorded demand, 17 months	221 kVA (May 2026)
Connected load	461 kW as printed on the bills; the hotel brief gives approximately 611 kW
Diesel generators	Two sets, 320 kVA and 250 kVA

Sources: HPSEBL bills; hotel engineering brief. The connected load differs between the two sources and should be reconciled with the utility's records.

5.2 Consumption and occupancy

From April 2025 to March 2026, the hotel used 562,852 kWh of electricity from the grid. HPSEBL billed the hotel for 566,338 kVAh. This shows that the hotel used 46,900 kWh each month on average. The hotel?s monthly electricity use varied, with usage at 28,074 kWh in August 2025 and the highest at 60,052 kWh in June 2025. Across all 17 months, the highest amount was 68,924 kWh in June 2026. The highest amount was 68,924 kWh in June 2026. The

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

average occupancy was 44.7% in the twelve months and 50.2% in April to August 2026. The average occupancy was 44.7% in the twelve months and 50.2% in April to August 2026. Figure 2 shows both sets of data, and Table 3 contains the numbers. Figure 2 shows both sets of data, and Table 3 contains the numbers.

Figure ***2.*** *Monthly grid consumption (billed kVAh) and hotel occupancy, April 2025 to August 2026. Source: HPSEBL bills; hotel occupancy records.*

Table 3. Monthly grid consumption, demand and charges

Consumption month	**Occupancy (%)**	**Active energy (kWh)**	**Billed energy (kVAh)**	**Max demand (kVA)**	**Power factor**	**Charges payable (?)**	**? per kVAh**
Apr-25	69.43	49,895	50,112	162	0.996	3,95,188	7.89
May-25	49.89	47,270	47,433				

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

317	138
318	0.997
319	3,75,992
320	7.93
321	Jun-25
322	81.35
323	60,052
324	60,302
325	180
326	0.996
327	4,68,201
328	7.76
329	Jul-25
330	19.70
331	36,759
332	36,897
333	116
334	0.996
335	3,00,499
336	8.14
337	Aug-25
338	13.86
339	28,074
340	28,260
341	132

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

342	0.993
343	2,38,614
344	8.44
345	Sep-25
346	18.65
347	28,321
348	28,537
349	118
350	0.992
351	2,40,598
352	8.43
353	Oct-25
354	47.22
355	46,071
356	46,357
357	137
358	0.994
359	3,68,282
360	7.94
361	Nov-25
362	46.52
363	50,907
364	51,210
365	178
366	0.994

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

367	4,03,055
368	7.87
369	Dec-25
370	53.26
371	58,997
372	59,304
373	191
374	0.995
375	4,61,050
376	7.77
377	Jan-26
378	38.78
379	54,747
380	55,014
381	172
382	0.995
383	4,30,311
384	7.82
385	Feb-26
386	40.12
387	49,665
388	49,939
389	164
390	0.995
391	3,93,948

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

392 7.89

393 Mar-26

394 57.52

395 52,094

396 52,973

397 205

398 0.983

399 4,15,668

400 7.85

401 Apr-26

402 67.16

403 63,056

404 63,982

405 205

406 0.986

407 5,00,444

408 7.82

409 May-26

410 66.66

411 67,502

412 68,480

413 221

414 0.986

415 6,00,607

416 8.77

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

417 Jun-26

418 74.00

419 68,924

420 69,800

421 196

422 0.987

423 6,05,274

424 8.67

425 Jul-26

426 21.55

427 38,904

428 39,878

429 121

430 0.976

431 3,61,290

432 9.06

433 Aug-26

434 21.69

435 40,008

436 41,194

437 162

438 0.971

439 3,72,021

440 9.03

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Source: HPSEBL bills. Charges payable = net energy and demand charges + electricity duty and cesses + municipal tax; they exclude late payment surcharge and deposit-interest adjustments.

Consumption and occupancy move together. Table 4 shows a Pearson correlation of 0.88 (95% confidence interval 0.70 to 0.96, $p < 0.001$). A Spearman correlation of 0.85 ($p < 0.001$) exists between occupancy and monthly kWh, and the coefficients for kVAh are almost identical. Both indicate a positive association. Months with more guests use electricity. Figure 3 shows the 17 months.

Table 4. Correlation between monthly occupancy and grid consumption (n = 17 months)

Measure	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**95% confidence interval**
Pearson r, kWh	0.88	< 0.001	0.70 to 0.96
Spearman ?, kWh	0.85	< 0.001	not calculated
Pearson r, kVAh	0.88	< 0.001	0.68 to 0.96
Spearman ?, kVAh	0.85	< 0.001	

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

not calculated

Source: author's calculation from the bills and the occupancy record. The Spearman coefficient is identical for kWh and kVAh because both rank the months in the same order.

Figure 3. *Monthly grid consumption against occupancy, with Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients (17 months).*

The association is strong but far from proportional. In the three months with occupancy (13.9%, 18.7% and 19.7%), the occupancy was only 31% to 44% of the twelve-month average of 44.7%, but the energy use was 28,074, 28,321 and 36,759 kWh. That is 60%, 60% and 78% of the month. A large part of the energy use continues when there are few guests in the house. This matters for the plant because it means that the energy use during the day does not go away in the off-season.

The cold months show a pattern. January 2026 had an occupancy of 38.8%, which's lower than April 2025 (69.4%) and October 2025 (47.2%). However, the hotel used 54,747 kWh in January compared to 49,895 kWh in April 2025 and 46,071 kWh in October 2025. December 2025, with 53.3% occupancy, 58,997 kWh were used. This is what electric room heating and heat-pump water heating would use in this weather. However, the electricity bills alone cannot tell the difference between heating and other energy uses. The area-wise meters could.

A comparison of the same months in the two years, in Table 5, shows a rise in 2026 that occupancy does not explain. Consumption was higher in all five months. In April and June, it rose by 26% and 15%, although occupancy was lower, by 2.3 and 7.4 percentage points. The data supplied do not show the reason. New equipment, a different mix of guests and services, or changes in operation are all possible, and the hotel's engineering team is best placed to say which.

Table 5. Same-month comparison of occupancy and grid consumption, 2025 and 2026

Month

Occupancy 2025 (%)

Occupancy 2026 (%)

kWh 2025

kWh 2026

Change in kWh

April

69.43

67.16

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

502 49,895

503 63,056

504 +26.4%

505 May

506 49.89

507 66.66

508 47,270

509 67,502

510 +42.8%

511 June

512 81.35

513 74.00

514 60,052

515 68,924

516 +14.8%

517 July

518 19.70

519 21.55

520 36,759

521 38,904

522 +5.8%

523 August

524 13.86

525 21.69

526 28,074

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

527 40,008

528 +42.5%

529 *Source: calculated from HPSEBL bills and the occupancy record.*

530 **Table 6. Comparison of the two reporting periods**

531 **Indicator**

532 **Apr 2025 ? Mar 2026 (12 months)**

533 **Apr ? Aug 2026 (5 months)**

534 Grid consumption (kWh)

535 562,852

536 278,394

537 Billed consumption (kVAh)

538 566,338

539 283,334

540 Average monthly consumption (kWh)

541 46,904

542 55,679

543 Average occupancy (simple mean of months)

544 44.7%

545 50.2%

546 Charges payable (?)

547 44,91,406

548 24,39,636

549 Average charge per kVAh (?)

550 7.93

551 8.61

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Highest recorded demand (kVA)	
205	
221	
Average power factor (kWh ' kVAh)	
0.994	
0.983	

Source: calculated from HPSEBL bills. Nominal rupees; no inflation adjustment.

The average charge per kVAh rose from ?7.93 to ?8.61 between the two periods although the energy rate did not rise, as the next section explains.

5.3 Tariff and cost structure

The bills show an energy charge of rupees 6.21 per kVAh for consumption up to February 2026. Then the rate changes to rupees 6.20 for consumption starting in April 2026. The bill for March 2026 has a mix of both rates. This is mentioned in Section 4.3. The rate is the same for peak hours, normal hours and night hours. So the tariff does not encourage moving energy use from one time band to another. Peak hours accounted for 17.4% of consumption and night hours for 24.0% in the first twelve months (Figure 4). The demand charge is ?170 per kVA per month. Electricity duty is 12% of the energy charge, and milk and environment cesses are 10 paise per unit each. A fuel and power purchase adjustment (FPPAS) appears only in the bills for April and May 2026 consumption, at ?6,591.95 and ?17,904.87. Energy charges made up 78.3% of the payable amount in the first twelve months, the demand charge 9.7% and duty and cesses 11.9%.

Figure 4. *Time-band split of billed consumption and composition of charges, April 2025 to March 2026. Source: HPSEBL bills.*

A further levy of ?1 per unit first appears on the bill for May 2026 consumption, charged for ?55,225.81, which is 25 of the 31 days' units, and on every unit from June 2026. It increased duty and cesses from ?0.94 per kVAh to ?1.94 per kVAh. Explains most of the rise in the cost per unit shown in Figure 5. Under the structure printed on the August 2026 bill, each additional unit drawn from the grid carries ?6.20 of energy charge, ?0.74 of electricity duty, ?0.20 of two cesses, ?1.00 of the levy and ?0.01 of municipal tax, about ?8.15, in all. Before the new levy, the same sum was about ?7.17. This marginal cost is the value used for the savings in Chapter 7.

Figure 5. *Charge per kVAh by component, April 2025 to August 2026 (nominal rupees). Source: calculated from HPSEBL bills.*

5.4 Demand and power factor

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Maximum recorded demand stayed between 116 and 221 kVA, below the sanctioned 250 kVA in every month (Figure 6). The bills charge demand at the higher of recorded demand and 85% of contract demand, which is 212.5 kVA. This floor applied in 16 of the 17 months, and the only month billed on recorded demand was May 2026, at 221 kVA. Demand charges are therefore close to fixed at ?36,125 a month, and solar generation cannot be expected to reduce them. Nor can it be assumed to reduce maximum demand, since the peak could occur in the evening or in winter when the plant produces little.

Figure 6. *Maximum recorded demand and demand billed against the sanctioned contract demand, April 2025 to August 2026. Source: HPSEBL bills.*

An application has been made to raise contract demand to 350 kVA. If the same 85% floor applies at the new level, billed demand would be at least 297.5 kVA, which at ?170 per kVA raises the demand charge by ?14,450 a month, or about ?1.73 lakh a year, whatever the actual use. This is a calculation from the bill rules, not a utility statement, and the hotel may expect load growth that the bills do not yet show. It matters to the solar decision only because it changes the hotel's fixed cost, not the plant's savings.

Power factor declined over the period. It was 0.99 or above in most months of 2025 and fell to 0.976 and 0.971 in July and August 2026. Because the utility bills in kVAh, a lower power factor raises billed units for the same real energy. The cause is not identified in the data. It also matters for solar: the plant reduces real power drawn from the grid, while the reactive component remains, so the reduction in billed kVAh may be slightly smaller than the energy generated.

5.5 Diesel generator operation

The 250 kVA set ran for 324.5 hours between April 2025 and March 2026. It produced 20,956 units of electricity using 7,079 litres of diesel. This means it generated 2.96 units per litre. At a cost of ?87 per litre, the total fuel cost came to ?6,15,873. That works out to ?29.4 per unit generated.

From April to September 2026, the 250 kVA set ran for 70.3 hours. The 320 kVA set ran for 30.7 hours. Together, they produced 6,105.7 units using 2,258.5 litres of diesel. This gives a production rate of 2.70 units per litre. The cost per unit was ?32.2. (See Table 7 for details.)

Diesel power ended up costing four times the marginal grid cost during the same period. Up to March 2026, the grid cost was ?7.17 per unit. Later, in August 2026, the grid bill showed a cost of ?8.15 per unit. So, using diesel was more expensive than grid power, especially in the earlier period.

Table 7. Diesel generator operation

Indicator

Apr 2025 ? Mar 2026

Apr ? Sep 2026

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Diesel consumed (litres)	
7,079	
2,258.5	
Units generated	
20,956	
6,105.7	
Running hours, 250 kVA set	
324.5	
70.3	
Running hours, 320 kVA set	
not recorded	
30.65	
Diesel cost at ?87 per litre (?)	
6,15,873	
1,96,490	
Fuel cost per unit generated (?)	
29.4	
32.2	
Units per litre	
2.96	
2.70	

Source: hotel diesel log; price from hotel brief, applied to both periods. Generator units are as recorded in the log.

Figure 7. *Monthly diesel consumption of the generators, April 2025 to September 2026. Source: hotel diesel log.*

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Diesel use is concentrated in a few months. January and March 2026 together account for 3,832 litres, 54% of the twelve-month total. The log does not give reasons for generator operation, so this paper does not attribute the use to grid outages or to any other cause. Generator output was about 3.7% of the energy drawn from the grid over the twelve months.

Chapter 6. The Proposed Solar Installation

6.1 Roof and capacity

The plant is proposed on the GI sheet roofs of the hotel. Their structural condition is reported as good, and the roofs face south. The vendor has asked for a load allowance of approximately 20?25 kg per square metre. The hotel's engineering assessment of the available capacity is 200 kW, which falls to 160 kW if safety rails are installed. Larger panels from Avaada could raise the capacity to 238 kW on the same roof area. Table 8 shows what each option would generate if it matched the yield implied by the Ekam proposal.

Table 8. Roof capacity options

Option	Capacity	Indicative annual output at Ekam's specific yield (kWh)
With safety rails, Tata TOPCon bifacial	160 kW	about 198,800
Base case, Tata TOPCon bifacial (Ekam)	200.4 kWp	249,000 (vendor estimate)
Avaada panels, larger module size	238 kW	about 295,700

Capacity and vendor estimate from the hotel brief. The 160 kW and 238 kW outputs are scaled by the author at 1,242.5 kWh per kWp and are not vendor figures. Whether the 238 kW layout passes the structural check has not been assessed.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Snow stays on the roofs for about 6 to 8 days a year at most and clears by itself because of the south-facing slope. If the plant produced nothing on all 8 days, the loss would be 2.2% of days. Winter days produce less than average, so the loss of annual energy would be smaller than that.

6.2 Vendor proposals

Table 9. Proposals received

Item	**Ekam Energy (Tata Power Solar channel partner)**	**Powermore**
Plant size reviewed	About 200.4 kWp panels, 150 kW inverter capacity	254.88 kWp (earlier proposal)
Estimated annual generation	About 2.49 lakh units (249,000 kWh)	Not provided
Quoted amount	?66.65 lakh including stated GST	Not provided
Final negotiated price	?66 lakh	?61 lakh (capacity basis to be confirmed)
O&M	?0.75 per watt per year (Tata); 5% annual increase; coverage and GST to be confirmed	Not provided
Module degradation stated	1% in the first year, 0.5% a year thereafter	Not provided

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Source: vendor proposals as communicated by the hotel. The degradation figures should be checked against the manufacturer's warranty.

Two details need confirmation before the proposals can be compared fairly. The Powermore price of ?61 lakh was negotiated against an earlier proposal for 254.88 kWp, and the capacity it now covers is not stated. The selected capacity is 200 kW. If Powermore's price is for an equivalent 200 kWp system with the same yield, the project cost would be ?5 lakh lower, and Chapter 7 shows that case. If it is for a different size or panel type, the comparison is not valid.

The Ekam estimate of 249,000 kWh corresponds to a specific yield of 1,242.5 kWh per kWp per year. This is below the 1,345 to 1,798 kWh per kWp range simulated for Himachal Pradesh by Sharma and Singh (2026). Their figures are for a different panel type and are simulated, so they are not a guarantee, but the vendor's estimate does not appear optimistic. The analysis uses the vendor figure as the central case and tests a 10% shortfall.

6.3 Matching generation to load

The plant would produce about 20,750 kWh a month on average. In the twelve months to March 2026, the hotel drew between 28,074 and 60,052 kWh a month, so average solar output is at most 74% of the lowest monthly draw, and annual output equals 44% of annual grid consumption (Figure 8). The three lowest-occupancy months, which still used 60% or more of the average month (Section 5.2), also exceed average solar output. On these totals, little energy should be exported. Monthly totals do not prove this hour by hour. On a clear day in a low-occupancy month, midday output could exceed the instantaneous load. Hourly load data from the area-wise meters would settle the question and should be obtained before the plant size is fixed.

Figure 8. *Monthly grid consumption (kWh) against the average monthly output of the proposed 200.4 kWp plant. Source: HPSEBL bills; vendor generation estimate.*

6.4 Generator interaction and monitoring

Standard grid-tied inverters disconnect when grid supply fails, which is a safety requirement. The proposed plant will therefore stop when the hotel switches to diesel unless it is designed to operate with the generator. Whether the quoted scope includes equipment that allows this has not been confirmed. The base case therefore assumes no diesel savings, and Section 7.4 shows possible savings separately.

For monitoring, area-wise energy meters are installed, and an internet connection is fixed on the wall below the roof at the proposed inverter locations. This is enough to use the inverters' own monitoring portals, so the hotel's engineers can compare plant output with the area meters' readings without any new building-wide system. Commissioning has not been scheduled.

Chapter 7. Financial Evaluation

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

7.1 Assumptions

Table 10. Model inputs

Input	**Value**	**Basis**
Plant size	200.4 kWp	Ekam proposal
Year-1 generation	249,000 kWh	Vendor estimate
Degradation	1% after year 1, then 0.5% a year	Vendor statement; to be checked against warranty
Project cost, Ekam	?66 lakh negotiated + ?9 lakh other costs = ?75 lakh	Negotiated price; other costs are the mid-point of ?8?10 lakh
Project cost, Powermore	?61 lakh + ?9 lakh = ?70 lakh	As above; capacity basis unconfirmed
O&M	?0.75 per watt per year on 200,400 W = ?1,50,300 in year 1; +5% a year; GST excluded	Tata rate and escalation from the hotel brief
Value of each unit generated, Case A	?6.20 (energy charge only)	

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Current bill	
Value of each unit generated, Case B	
?8.15 (energy charge, electricity duty, cesses, municipal tax)	
Calculated from the August 2026 bill; ?7.17 before the new ?1 levy	
Tariff change over time	
None in the base case (nominal)	
Rate was ?6.21 and then ?6.20 during the 17 months	
Share of generation used on site	
100%	
Assumption; tested in Table 12	
Project life	
25 years	
Assumption; to be matched with warranty	
Discount rate for NPV	
10% (nominal)	
Illustrative; replace with the company's hurdle rate	
Income tax and depreciation	
Not included (pre-tax analysis)	
Rate and eligibility to be confirmed by the accounts team	
Inverter replacement	
Not included	
No cost quoted	

Cases A and B bracket the value of a unit saved. Case A assumes that only the energy charge is avoided. Case B assumes that duty and cesses fall in proportion to the units drawn, as they are calculated on the bills, and reflects levies in force since mid-2026, which can change. Whether duty and cesses apply to solar energy used on site should be confirmed with HPSEBL. The demand charge is not reduced in either case.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

All rupee figures in the model are nominal. Holding the tariff in nominal terms is conservative. Why? Because if inflation is near the 4% target set by the Reserve Bank of India in 2025, then each unit saved loses 4% of its real value every year. At the same time, O&M costs are expected to go up by 5% each year. So a rupee saved in year 15 is worth less than a rupee spent today.

That?s why the evaluation reports use NPV and discounted payback along with payback. It doesn?t rely on lifetime totals. The sensitivity analysis also includes a case where the value of a unit increases by 4% each year. This keeps the value of each unit steady in terms.

7.2 Results

Table 11 gives the results for the Ekam price and for the Powermore price, each with ?9 lakh of other costs. Year-1 savings from avoided grid purchases are ?15.44 lakh in Case A and ?20.30 lakh in Case B, before O&M of ?1.50 lakh. On Ekam's pricing, simple payback is 5.6 years in Case A and 4.1 years in Case B; discounted at 10%, the figures are 8.7 and 5.5 years. Varying other costs between ?8 and ?10 lakh moves simple payback by only about 0.1 year.

Table 11. Results by vendor price and value of a unit saved

Case

Year-1 net saving (? lakh)

Simple payback (years)

Discounted payback at 10% (years)

IRR, 25 years

NPV at 10% (? lakh)

Ekam, ?75 lakh, Case A (?6.20)

13.94

5.6

8.7

16.9%

38.8

Ekam, ?75 lakh, Case B (?8.15)

18.80

4.1

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

814 5.5

815 23.8%

816 81.2

817 Powermore, ?70 lakh, Case A

818 13.94

819 5.2

820 7.8

821 18.3%

822 43.8

823 Powermore, ?70 lakh, Case B

824 18.80

825 3.8

826 5.0

827 25.6%

828 86.2

829 *Source: author's model using the inputs in Table 10. Nominal rupees; pre-tax.*

830 ***Figure 9.*** *Cumulative net cash flow over 25 years by vendor price and value of a unit saved*
831 *(Case A solid, Case B dashed; nominal, undiscounted).*

832 Over 25 years the plant would generate about 5.84 million kWh. The cost per kWh, taking the
833 project cost plus 25 years of O&M and discounting both costs and output at 10%, is ?4.41, below
834 the ?6.20 energy charge the plant displaces today.

835 *7.3 Sensitivity*

836 **Table 12. Sensitivity of the Ekam case (?75 lakh)**

837 **Change from base**

838 **Case A net saving (? lakh)**

839 **Case A payback (years)**

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Case A IRR	
Case B payback (years)	
Case B IRR	
Base case	
13.94	
5.6	
16.9%	
4.1	
23.8%	
Generation 10% lower	
12.39	
6.3	
14.6%	
4.6	
21.0%	
Only 80% of output used on site	
10.85	
7.2	
12.2%	
5.2	
18.1%	
Project cost 10% higher	
13.94	
6.1	
15.1%	

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

4.5

21.5%

Value of a unit rises 4% a year

13.94

5.1

21.5%

3.8

28.2%

18% GST added to O&M

13.66

5.7

16.3%

4.1

23.3%

Project cost at Powermore price (?70 lakh)

13.94

5.2

18.3%

3.8

25.6%

Source: author's model. Payback is simple payback. Using 80% of output on site means 20% of generation brings no savings, for example because it is exported without credit.

The result depends a lot on how much of the generation the hotel uses on its own and on how much each unit is worth. If 80 per cent of the output is used at the location, the simple payback period becomes 7.3 years in Case A. That's why hourly load data is important. A 10 per cent increase in project cost has a greater effect than a 20 per cent decrease in self-consumption. Adding 18% GST to the O&M charge changes payback by less than 0.15 years. If the value of a unit rises with inflation at 4% a year, payback falls to 5.1 years in Case A.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

7.4 Generator-related savings, shown separately

The base case assumes no savings on diesel, because they depend on whether the plant is designed to work alongside the generators, which has not been decided. Table 13 shows what different shares of the generators' fuel use in the twelve months to March 2026 would be worth if solar could displace them. These are scenarios, not forecasts. They exclude the cost of any equipment needed to let solar operate with the generators, as no price is available.

Table 13. Possible diesel savings if solar can operate with the generators (April 2025 ? March 2026 fuel use, ?87 per litre)

Share of generator fuel displaced

Diesel saved (litres a year)

Value (?)

Compared with Case A year-1 saving

0% (base case)

0

0

0%

10%

708

61,587

4.0%

25%

1,770

1,53,968

10.0%

50%

3,540

3,07,937

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

19.9%

Source: author's calculation from the diesel log and the stated price. Savings would be higher in a year with more generator use.

Even with half of the generators' fuel displaced, the saving is about one-fifth of the grid savings in Case A. The decision to buy the plant therefore rests on grid savings, and diesel savings are an extra to be pursued if the engineering proves practicable.

7.5 Items awaiting confirmation

1. income-tax rate and depreciation eligibility (accounts team);
2. whether electricity duty and cesses apply to solar energy used on site, and how self-consumed solar is accounted for in a kVAh-based bill (HPSEBL);
3. what the Powermore price of ?61 lakh covers;
4. what the O&M rate covers, whether GST is added and for how long;
5. the manufacturer's warranty terms for degradation;
6. whether the structural assessment accepts 20?25 kg per square metre across the full 200 kW layout;
7. inverter replacement cost and timing.

Chapter 8. Discussion

The case supports the general finding in the literature that hotel solar can be economically sound when the hotel uses most of what it generates (Barbara et al., 2024). Here the condition appears to be met on monthly totals, because a large part of the hotel's load continues at low occupancy. The remaining uncertainty is hourly self-consumption and the value of each unit saved, the same two factors the literature flags.

The barriers and enablers described by Haider et al. (2026) appear in this case in concrete form (Table 14). The financial barrier is modest relative to the savings. The technical constraint that matters most is the roof: safety rails would cut capacity from 200 kW to 160 kW, about a fifth of the output. Organisational capacity is a strength, since the property has a chief engineer, a managing company and area-wise meters, which smaller hotels would usually lack.

Table 14. Barriers and enablers observed in this case

Barriers

Enablers

Roof load limit of 20?25 kg per square metre; safety rails reduce capacity to 160 kW

Roofs in good condition, south-facing, with snow clearing by itself

Other costs of ?8?10 lakh are not final

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Two competing quotations; negotiated prices ?66 lakh and ?61 lakh

Tax rate and depreciation not yet confirmed

Load that continues at low occupancy (60% or more of the average month)

Solar?generator operation unresolved

Marginal grid cost about ?8.15 per unit against diesel at ?29?32 per unit

Billing basis for solar in a kVAh tariff and treatment of duty unconfirmed

Area-wise meters and internet at the inverter locations

No nearby solar hotels to learn from; commissioning date not set

Management by an established hotel operator with a chief engineer

Source: author's synthesis from the hotel brief, bills and Chapters 5 to 7.

On monitoring, the decision not to install a central building management system looks reasonable at this size. The inverter portals and the existing area meters are enough to measure output against load, which is the information Valett et al. (2026) and Khatter (2025) identify as the useful part of digital energy management. Reporting measured output to guests would also respond to the credibility concerns raised by Singh and Mittal (2026) and Park et al. (2024), but this study has no guest data and cannot say whether it would improve bookings.

Chapter 9. Conclusions and Recommendations

9.1 Conclusions

Seventeen months of bills show a hotel that draws about 46,900 kWh a month, pays about ?8.15 for each additional unit under the latest levies, and keeps using 60% or more of an average month's energy even when occupancy is 14?20%. A 200.4 kWp plant producing 249,000 kWh a year would offset about 44% of the grid energy drawn in 2025?26. On the negotiated Ekam price of ?66 lakh plus ?9 lakh of other costs, simple payback is 5.6 years if only the energy charge is saved and 4.1 years if duty and cesses are also avoided; discounted at 10%, the paybacks are 8.7 and 5.5 years. The generators cost about ?29 to ?32 per unit to run, but the possible diesel saving from solar is small besides the grid savings and depends on an engineering decision that has not been made.

9.2 Recommendations

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

1. Proceed with a plant of about 200 kW, subject to a written structural assessment of the roof, and obtain a quotation for the 160 kW safety-rail configuration so that the cost of the rails is known.
2. Obtain hourly load data from the area-wise meters for a low-occupancy month and a high-occupancy month to confirm full self-consumption.
3. Resolve the items in Section 7.5 in writing before the purchase order, in particular the treatment of solar under the kVAh tariff and the Powermore scope.
4. Treat solar operation with the generators as a separate engineering study and cost it before counting any diesel savings.
5. Review the application for 350 kVA contract demand against the recorded maximum of 221 kVA, because it would raise fixed charges if the 85% billing floor applies.
6. Once installed, report monthly generation, grid consumption and savings against this study's estimates.

9.3 Limitations and further research

This is a single-site study, and the results apply to this property's tariff, load and roof. The solar generation figure is a vendor estimate, not a measurement. Hourly load data, equipment ratings, tax treatment, inverter replacement and the Powermore scope were not available. Correlation over 17 months shows association only. Carbon savings were not quantified. Several of the 2025?2026 studies cited were published recently, and their details should be re-checked against the publishers' pages before submission. Future work should compare measured plant output with this study's estimates after a full year of operation and extend the approach to other hill hotels.

Appendix A. Detailed Bill Data

Table A1. Monthly figures transcribed from the HPSEBL bills (nominal rupees)

Month

kWh

kVAh

Normal kVAh

Peak kVAh

Night kVAh

Rate (?)

Energy charge (?)

Demand + FPPAS (?)

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Duty & cesses (?)	
Payable (?)	
Apr-25	
49,895	
50,112	
30,302	
8,277	
11,533	
6.21	
3,11,196	
36,125	
47,366	
3,95,188	
May-25	
47,270	
47,433	
29,042	
7,692	
10,699	
6.21	
2,94,559	
36,125	
44,834	
3,75,992	
Jun-25	

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

1040 60,052

1041 60,302

1042 37,332

1043 10,333

1044 12,637

1045 6.21

1046 3,74,475

1047 36,125

1048 56,997

1049 4,68,201

1050 Jul-25

1051 36,759

1052 36,897

1053 22,447

1054 5,840

1055 8,610

1056 6.21

1057 2,29,130

1058 36,125

1059 34,875

1060 3,00,499

1061 Aug-25

1062 28,074

1063 28,260

1064 17,315

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

1065 4,544

1066 6,401

1067 6.21

1068 1,75,495

1069 36,125

1070 26,711

1071 2,38,614

1072 Sep-25

1073 28,321

1074 28,537

1075 17,340

1076 4,704

1077 6,493

1078 6.21

1079 1,77,215

1080 36,125

1081 26,973

1082 2,40,598

1083 Oct-25

1084 46,071

1085 46,357

1086 27,556

1087 7,643

1088 11,158

1089 6.21

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

1090 2,87,877

1091 36,125

1092 43,817

1093 3,68,282

1094 Nov-25

1095 50,907

1096 51,210

1097 29,045

1098 9,405

1099 12,760

1100 6.21

1101 3,18,014

1102 36,125

1103 48,404

1104 4,03,055

1105 Dec-25

1106 58,997

1107 59,304

1108 33,788

1109 11,099

1110 14,417

1111 6.21

1112 3,68,278

1113 36,125

1114 56,054

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

1115 4,61,050

1116 Jan-26

1117 54,747

1118 55,014

1119 30,644

1120 9,890

1121 14,480

1122 6.21

1123 3,41,637

1124 36,125

1125 51,999

1126 4,30,311

1127 Feb-26

1128 49,665

1129 49,939

1130 27,467

1131 9,153

1132 13,319

1133 6.21

1134 3,10,121

1135 36,125

1136 47,202

1137 3,93,948

1138 Mar-26

1139 52,094

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

1140 52,973

1141 29,667

1142 9,888

1143 13,418

1144 6.21/6.20

1145 3,28,945

1146 36,125

1147 50,068

1148 4,15,668

1149 Apr-26

1150 63,056

1151 63,982

1152 36,421

1153 10,823

1154 16,738

1155 6.20

1156 3,96,688

1157 42,717

1158 60,399

1159 5,00,444

1160 May-26

1161 67,502

1162 68,480

1163 39,819

1164 11,344

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

1165 17,317

1166 6.20

1167 4,24,576

1168 55,475

1169 1,19,871

1170 6,00,607

1171 Jun-26

1172 68,924

1173 69,800

1174 41,399

1175 10,931

1176 17,470

1177 6.20

1178 4,32,760

1179 36,125

1180 1,35,691

1181 6,05,274

1182 Jul-26

1183 38,904

1184 39,878

1185 22,879

1186 6,182

1187 10,817

1188 6.20

1189 2,47,244

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

	36,125
	77,523
	3,61,290
	Aug-26
	40,008
	41,194
	23,973
	6,618
	10,603
	6.20
	2,55,403
	36,125
	80,081
	3,72,021

Source: HPSEBL bills. Municipal tax (1 paisa per unit) is included in Payable but not shown separately. Demand + FPPAS is the demand charge plus any fuel and power purchase adjustment. The March 2026 bill prints ?6.20, but its energy charge equals a mix of ?6.21 and ?6.20 (Section 4.3).

References

Barbara, C. E., D'Adamo, I., Gastaldi, M., & Nizami, A. S. (2024). Clean energy for a sustainable future: Analysis of a PV system and LED bulbs in a hotel. Energy, 299, 131547. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2024.131547

Blanco-Moreno, S., Aydemir-Dev, M., Santos, C. R., & Bayram-Arl?, N. (2025). Emerging sustainability themes in the hospitality sector: A bibliometric analysis. European Research on Management and Business Economics, 31(1), 100272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2025.100272

Elkington, J. (1997). Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business. Capstone.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Haider, S., Prabakar, S., & Ahmad, M. R. (2026). Global insights on rooftop solar adoption in the hospitality sector using systematic literature review. Discover Global Society, 4, 37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44282-026-00334-5

Khatter, A. (2025). Leveraging technology for environmental sustainability in the hospitality sector: Innovations and strategies. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 32(4), 4523?4534. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.3200

Luo, H., & Cao, S. (2025). Energy resilience enhancement against grid outages for a zero-emission hotel building via optimal energy management of onshore and offshore energy storages. Energy Nexus, 18, 100431. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nexus.2025.100431

Mota, L., Leite, E., & Ghasemi, V. (2024). Exploring the impact of climate change on lodging establishments: A systematic literature review. Quality & Quantity, 60, 8143?8168. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-024-01834-9

Park, H., Bitaab, M., Lee, M., & Back, K.-J. (2024). The two sides of hotel green practices in customer experience: An integrated approach of the Kano model and business analytics. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 41(4), 659?671. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2024.2333411

Reserve Bank of India. (2025). Review of monetary policy framework: A discussion paper. https://www.rbi.org.in/Scripts/PublicationsView.aspx?id=23171

Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.

Sharma, A., & Singh, M. (2026). Influence of altitude on the energy payback time of grid-connected photovoltaic systems: A district-level analysis in Himachal Pradesh, India. Al-Mustaqbal Journal of Sustainability in Engineering Sciences, 4(1), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.62723/2959-5932.1033

Singh, A. B., & Mishra, Y. (2026). Modelling sustainable hospitality practices and sustainability performance in Indian hotels using structural equation modelling. Discover Sustainability, 7, 1431. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-026-03906-2

Singh, S., & Mittal, A. (2026). Green hotel choice in the digital era: How online reviews and attitude towards sustainable practices shape booking intention. International Hospitality Review. https://doi.org/10.1108/IHR-03-2026-0019

Thongmun, S., Soonsan, N., & Thai, N. T. (2025). The best of both worlds: Can smart hotels promote guests' sustainable behaviours? Anatolia, 36(3), 618?633. https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2025.2458837

Tornatzky, L. G., & Fleischer, M. (1990). The processes of technological innovation. Lexington Books.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Valett, L., Keller, R., K'rner, M.-F., Leinauer, C., & Str'ker, J. (2026). From cost to carbon efficiency through digitalization: A quantitative case study in sustainable tourism. Sustainability Analytics and Modeling, 6, 100061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.samod.2026.100061

Yolcu, S., ?ahin, A., & Dirsehan, T. (2025). Gaining ground: How technology fuels hotel competitiveness: A systematic review of the literature. Tourism Planning & Development. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2025.2534903

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR