

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Record of Proceedings

Adjudication Case No. 6/2009

Sub: Maintaining grid security of the Southern Regional Grid by curbing overdawals and effecting proper load management by TNEB.

.Date of hearing : 19.2.2010.

Coram : Shri V. S. Verma, Adjudicating Officer

Petitioner : Southern Regional Load Despatch Centre, Bangalore

Respondents : 1. Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Chennai
2. Member-Secretary, Southern Regional Power Committee

Parties present : Shri V.Suresh, SRLDC
Shri V.Chandran, TNEB
Shri M.L.Batra, Member-Secretary, SRPC
Ms. Joyti Prasad, NRLDC

This petition pertains to the adjudication proceedings against first respondent for non-compliance of instructions of the petitioner.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that TNEB had overdrawn 200 to 1000 MW while system frequency was below 49.2 Hz. during 9.10.2009 to 15.10.2009. He mentioned that TNEB, in its reply dated 9.2.2010, acknowledged the fact that it took four time blocks to curtail its overdrawal and bring back the frequency above 49.2 Hz. He reiterated that forced outage during the subject period was 500 MW against 500-970 MW claimed by the respondent. It was also mentioned by the representative of the petitioner that TNEB had not shown any progress for implementation of special schemes for mitigating loss of generation due to sudden fall in wind generation, though it was persistently taken up by SRLDC and SRPC secretariat in various meetings of SRPC since July, 2009.

3. The representative of the petitioner, referring to TNEB submission dated 9.2.2010, stated that the action taken by TNEB were either inadequate or delayed or both. He contended that the instances referred by TNEB in their reply on remedial action were few but the number of instances of persistent violation of grid discipline by TNEB were more than 40, during the subject period. He further

stated that the details furnished by TNEB were of generic nature without giving details about feeder opening, load relief etc.

4. The representative of the first respondent submitted that they had taken all possible action on SRLDC directions and the frequency was brought above 49.2 Hz in a short span of time. He admitted that at times the actions taken were not sufficient and also that the actions taken were not intimated to SRLDC.

5. On a query by the Adjudicating Officer regarding the procedure for deciding and implementing load shedding, the representative of the first respondent stated that for normal load shedding, scheme was prepared in advance and implemented accordingly. During contingency, the load shedding instructions were to be passed to field sub-stations through sub-LDCs, which used to take time to implement the actual load shedding. It was also stated by him that sometimes qualified personnel was not available to implement the load shedding immediately as per instruction by SLDC/sub-LDC. In response to query as to how they contacted the sub-stations, he stated that it was through P&T telephone. On the specific query about the time required for effecting load shedding after the message was passed by SLDC, the representative of the first respondent stated that it took normally about 5 minutes but sometimes it was 10 to 15 minutes or even more.

6. When enquired about the automatic scheme for demand management and pre-decided procedures for dealing with system contingency situations, the representative of the first respondent stated that though there was a scheme for daily rotational load shedding, which was done manually, there was no automatic demand management scheme for contingency measures. He further stated that written instructions were available in the control room for tackling routine operation.

7. On a query about the availability of Power Line Career Communication (PLCC) for communicating instructions from SLDC to the field sub-stations for implementing the load shedding, it was informed that it was not always available and normal P&T telephone was used for communication which delays the implementation of the instruction for load shedding.

8. Member Secretary, SRPC submitted that the main reason behind the over drawal by the state was inadequate capacity addition. He stated that increase in installed capacity in the State from 2004-05 to 2009-10 was only 427 MW (excluding wind) in comparison to the increase in peak demand by 3376 MW during the same period. He also mentioned that the reduction in wind generation was not so sudden as claimed by TNEB and it takes about two to three hours for substantial change in wind generation. Member Secretary, SRPC suggested measures including short-term purchase of power, contingency plan for change in wind generation, establishment of base load generating stations, installation of gas based generating station for operation flexibility, control of demand from SLDC, expediting the Kundah VII pumped storage plant and more judicious use

of Kadamparai pumped storage machines to compensate for wind generation variations to avoid overdrawl by the State.

9. The representative of the first respondent was directed to furnish the following information on affidavit latest by 4.3.2010 with an advance copy to the petitioner:

- (i) Normal load shedding / demand management scheme and schemes for contingency measures;
- (ii) Action taken against the officials non-complying with the SLDC instructions in time; and
- (iii) Details of PLCC availability.

10. Subject to above, Adjudicating Officer reserved orders.

Sd
(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)