

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 246/2009 (Suo motu)**

**Coram**

- 1. Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson**
- 2. Shri S.Jayaraman, Member**
- 3. Shri V.S.Verma, Member**

**DATE OF HEARING: 11.2.1010**

**DATE OF ORDER: 28.4.2010**

**In the matter of**

Maintenance of Grid Discipline-Non compliance of statutory provisions by Gujarat Electricity Transmission Corporation.

**And in the matter of**

Gujarat Electricity Transmission Corporation Ltd.,Vadodara.. **Respondent**

**Following were present:**

1. Shri N.H.Suthar, SLDC
2. Shri M.M.Chaudhari, SLDC
3. Shri J.J.Ganoh, PGVCL
4. Shri R.G.Kansagra, PGVCL
5. Shri Amish Desai, MGVCL
6. Shri G.Zala, MGVCL
7. Shri R.K.Patel, DGVCL
8. Shri B.D.Pundya, DGVCL

**ORDER**

It was reported by the Western Regional Load Despatch Centre (WRLDC) that for the period 21.9.2009 to 27.9.2009, the respondent had overdrawn electricity from the regional grid during as many as 261 time-blocks, at frequency below 49.2 HZ, the specified threshold limit, in contravention of the provision of the Indian Electricity Grid Code (the Grid Code) and the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Unscheduled Interchange charges and related matters) Regulations, 2009(UI charges

regulation). It was also reported by the WRLDC that the respondent had exceeded the above mentioned limit of 12% of schedule in 427 time-blocks during the said period 21.9.2009 to 27.9.2009. It was further noted that on six days during the said period, over-drawal by the respondent at frequency below 49.5 HZ, exceeded the limit of 3% on a daily aggregate basis. On receipt of the information, the Commission by its order dated 13.11.2009 directed the respondent to show cause as to why it should not be held guilty of the contraventions reported and punished under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 (the Act) for over-drawl during each occasion in contravention of the provision of the Grid Code and UI charges regulation.

2. In the course of the hearing on 7.1.2010, the representative of the respondent submitted that during the period 21.9.2009 to 27.9.2009, unscheduled inter-change across the Gujarat periphery occurred despite constant intervention and notices by SLDC to the distribution companies of Gujarat on account of unexpected increase in the agriculture demand by 81.36% due to delay in last spell of rain. In pursuance of the directions of the SLDC, area load dispatcher operators of the distribution licensees had tried to restrict the agriculture supply hours to control over-drawl despite several instances of mob attack. It was submitted that the system operator had performed its task as per clauses 6 and 8 of the State Grid Code by issuing necessary directions/messages to the distribution licensees. The representative of the respondent further submitted that the over-drawal during the week was beyond the control of system operator despite taking all

necessary measures in accordance with the State Grid Code. He further requested that SLDC be not held guiltily of violation of the IEGC, considering its past history of maintaining grid discipline. After taking note of the submission of the respondent, notices were issued to the distribution companies operating in the State of Gujarat for filing their replies by 22.1.2010. Accordingly, five distribution companies viz Madhya Gujarat Vij Company Ltd, Paschim Gujarat Vij Company Ltd., Uttar Gujarat Vij Company Ltd., Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Ltd., and Torrent Power Limited filed their replies. The main thrust of the replies of the distribution companies was that the over-drawal during the period 21.1.2009 to 27.9.2009 was attributable to a sort of natural calamity and delay in rain had caused increase in agriculture demand to unexpected level and it was like an unwarranted law and order situation, beyond control. However, Torrent Power Ltd, has submitted that during the said period, there has been no over-drawal by the licensee beyond the permissible limit of the statutory provisions of the Grid Code and UI Charges regulation.

3. The respondent has submitted that the situation was controlled after the period 21.1.2009 to 27.9.2009. As regards the potential risk of grid collapse, the representative of the respondent submitted that over-drawal happened only during a week, due to delay in last spell of rain and there was law and order problem involving safety of SLDC personnel and property. In regard to quantum of load to be curtailed to reduce over-drawal from the grid, the respondent submitted that all the distribution companies

have signed PPA with the generators and SLDC schedules power based on the allocation. He further submitted that the GETCO has metering and SCADA system implemented in its system, hence it knew the drawl of each distribution company. He clarified that based on the differences in the actual/IEGC band the respondent computed the quantum of over-drawal for the whole of Gujarat, and the over drawing distribution companies were asked to curtail demand to reduce over-drawal proportionately. To a pointed question as to whether the SLDC indicated the quantum of load shedding to be carried out by the distribution companies in the messages issued to them, the reply of the representative of the respondent was on the affirmative. In respect of messages sent, representative of the respondent stated that messages for load shedding to be carried out by the distribution companies were sent by FAX and the quantum of load shedding got reflected in the SCADA display.

4. The respondent submitted that its past record is good as Gujarat is a net UI recipient. Representative of the respondent submitted that during the period in question, there was sudden increase in demand caused by delay in last spell of rain. As the same could not be forecast, demand supply gap widened, leading to overdrawl from the grid, he added. He further submitted that situation was corrected after the week, by deferring the planned outages of the generating units. On a question of forecasting the demand, the representative of the respondent submitted that each distribution company had a demand forecast which was aggregated by the

SLDC. He added that this was for operation planning, based on which the planned outages were decided.

5. The main charge against respondent in the show-cause notice dated 13.11.2009 was contravention and non-compliance with the provisions of Para 5.4.2 and Para 6.4.7 of the Grid Code. The said provisions are extracted herein under:

**5.4.2.1 Manual Demand Disconnection**

*(a)As mentioned elsewhere, the constituents shall endeavour to restrict their net drawal from the grid to within their respective drawal schedules whenever the system frequency is below 49.5 Hz. When the frequency falls below 49.2 Hz, requisite load shedding (manual) shall be carried out in the concerned State to curtail the over-drawal."*

**6.4 Demarcation of responsibilities**

*7. Provided that the States, through their SLDCs, shall always endeavour to restrict their net drawal from the grid to within their respective drawal schedules, whenever the system frequency is below 49.5 Hz. When the frequency falls below 49.2 Hz, requisite load shedding shall be carried out in the concerned State(s) to curtail the over-drawal."*

6. On perusal of the replies filed by the respondent and the data submitted by WRLDC, we are of the view that the respondent had diligently taken actions as mandated by the above quoted provisions of the Grid Code. Despite taking the measures, the respondent and the Distribution Companies of the State have failed to curtail over-drawal during the period 21.9.2009 to 27.9.2009. This, in our view, was due to absence of any contingency scheme with the SLDC and the Distribution Companies to address the situations of such nature. The respondent being the apex body in the State to ensure integrated operation of the grid should have evolved a

contingency scheme to be implemented by the distribution companies in the State to handle the unprecedented situations endangering the safety and security of the grid. The Distribution Companies are also expected to put in place their own contingent scheme for implementation within the area of their operation to meet such situations of unprecedented nature.

7. Considering the fact that the respondent has acted with diligence in compliance with the Grid Code, we do not propose to impose any penalty on the respondent, taking a lenient view in the light of the past record of the respondent in maintaining grid discipline.

8. We also direct that the SLDC and Distribution Companies in the State should be prepared with contingency scheme to handle such a situation in future. We cannot allow grid security to be jeopardized by the problems of law and order situation in the State. SLDC and distribution companies are accordingly directed to submit within 15 days, contingency scheme for handling such a situation. We further direct SLDC to ensure that such contingency procedures are placed in the control centre of all the distribution companies, these distribution companies are aware of the same and act accordingly.

9. List this case on 10.6.2010 for further directions.

Sd/-  
**(V.S.VERMA)**  
MEMBER

sd/-  
**(S.JAYARAMAN)**  
MEMBER

sd/-  
**(Dr.PRAMOD DEO)**  
CHAIRPERSON