

# CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

## Record of Proceedings

### Adjudication Case Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of 2010

Sub: Maintaining grid security of the entire North East West (NEW) grid by curbing overdrawals and effecting proper load management by Northern Region constituents.

Date of hearing : 25.2.2011.

Coram : Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Adjudicating Officer

Petitioner : Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre, New Delhi

Respondents

1. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
2. Haryana Vidyut Parsaran Nigam Limited, Panchkula
3. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. Jaipur
4. Power Transmission Corporation of Uttarakhand Ltd., Uttarakhand
5. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
6. Power Development Department, Govt. of Jammu and Kashmir, Srinagar
7. Member-Secretary, Northern Regional Power Committee, New Delhi

Parties present :

Shri Ajay Talegaunkar, NRPC  
Shri V.K. Agarwal, NRLDC  
Ms. Joyti Prasad, NRLDC  
Shri Rajiv Porwal, NRLDC  
Shri Rahul Srivastava, Advocate, UPPCL  
Shri Sunil Kumar Jain, UPPCL  
Shri Mukeksh Kumar Gupta, UPPCL  
Shri Aditya Madan, Advocate, RRVPNL  
Shri S.K.Jain, RRVPNL  
Shri Dinesh Khandelwal, RRVPNL

In these petitions, adjudication proceedings have been initiated against the first six respondents for non-compliance of instructions of Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that during the period from 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010, the frequency was below 49.2 Hz. for about 40% of the time and in 228 nos. of time blocks. During this period, the first respondent was overdrawing in 218 nos. of time blocks. Similarly, other respondents were also overdrawing during most of the time blocks when frequency was below 49.2 Hz.

3. The representative of the petitioner explained about the A, B and C messages issued by NRLDC to the respondents during period of low frequency. He explained that while A is caution message to restrict overdrawal, B and C messages indicate that Indian Electricity Grid Code and the Electricity Act, 2003 have been violated by the utility overdrawing from the grid.

4. In response to a query by the Adjudicating Officer regarding time gap between the issue of the messages by the petitioner and its receipt by the respondents, the representative of the petitioner submitted that messages are issued on SCADA system and instantaneously, the same can be seen by the overdrawing utility. He also submitted that the messages are faxed to the respective control centres and message is also sent through mobile phones by using SMS facility. The Adjudicating Officer directed the petitioner to submit the record of messages given to the respondents during the period 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010.

5. The representative of the petitioner also submitted that during the period 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010, the respondents HVPNL and PSEB were overdrawing from the grid while selling power to other utilities. The Adjudicating Officer directed HVPNL and PSEB to submit, on affidavit sufficient reasons to justify sale of power during the period of simultaneous overdrawl and sale of power, latest by 25.3.2011.

6. None appeared on behalf of the respondents Haryana Vidyut Parsaran Nigam Limited, Power Transmission Corporation of Uttarakhand Ltd., Punjab State Electricity Board and Power Development Department, Govt. of Jammu and Kashmir.

7. Learned counsel for the Respondent, RRVPNL submitted that the copy of the show cause notice has not been received by RRVPNL. The Adjudicating Officer directed the staff of the Commission to provide a copy of the show cause notice to the RRVPNL. The Adjudicating Officer directed the RRVPNL to submit the information in regard to overdrawl within two weeks.

8. Learned counsel for UPPCL submitted that the reasons for overdrawl during the period in question had been submitted in reply to Petition No. 129/2010. He further submitted that the officers of UPPCL are making all possible efforts to avoid overdrawl from the grid after the month of April, 2010. Learned counsel further explained that in the month of April, 2010 the State Load Despatch Centre (SLDC) was not in existence in the State of UP. In this regard, the Adjudicating Officer clarified that under Section 31(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 the respondent was responsible for operating the SLDC till the establishment of SLDC by the State Government.

9. The Adjudicating Officer noted that these facts have already been considered by the Commission in Petition No. 129/2010. In the present proceedings UPPCL is required to submit the information about the actions taken by it and the reasons behind lack of action, if any, on the instructions issued by NRLDC from time to time.

10. Learned counsel for UPPCL submitted that to avoid overdrawl in future, UPPCL has prepared an advance planning schedule for arranging power to meet expected demand and has curtailed overdrawl after the month of April, 2010. He further submitted that despite its best efforts, UPPCL could not receive the requisitioned power from the power exchange. The representative of the petitioner clarified that availability of power through the Power Exchanges depends upon the rate quoted by the UPPCL and the final price discovery on the Power Exchanges. Learned counsel for the UPPCL submitted that Under Frequency Relays have been installed by UPPCL.

11. The representative of NRLDC submitted that UFRs are meant to save grid from extreme situations and not for normal demand management. The representative of NRLDC also submitted that during 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010, adequate load relief was not obtained from Under Frequency Relays (UFRs)

even though frequency went below the limits set for these UFRs several times.

12. The representative of Northern Regional Power Committee (NRPC) submitted that in spite of the resolution in NRPC forum for restricting overdrawal, the constituents of the Northern Region had continued to overdraw from the grid.

13. The Adjudicating Officer directed the respondents to submit following information/clarification along with relevant documents, on affidavit latest by 25.3.2011, with an advance copy to the NRLDC:

- (a) Details of actions taken for compliance of the B and C messages issued by NRLDC;
- (b) Whether actions were adequate to comply with NRLDC directions in each B and C messages;
- (c) Details of reduction in overdrawal and manual demand disconnection/power-cuts imposed by the constituents after receiving the B and C messages from NRLDC;
- (d) Details of forced and planned outages, shortage of power, scheduled and unscheduled power cuts, frequency of grid etc. before and after each instance of B and C messages and adequacy of action taken to comply with NRLDC directions;
- (e) Details of forecasted and actual load generation balance during 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010;
- (f) Details of planned and actual sale and purchase of power on short term;
- (g) Details of simultaneous sale of power and overdrawl from the grid during 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010;
- (h) Reasons like prior commitments, to justify sale of power during 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010;

(i) Details of price quoted on Power Exchange during 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010; and

(j) The details of advance planning made by the constituents for meeting the estimated demand during the month of April, 2010 to February, 2011 and the actual implementation of the plan.

14. The Adjudicating Officer directed the representative of NRLDC to submit following information/clarification in respect of B and C messages issued to respondents during the period 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010, after examination of the above mentioned details to be filed by the respondents, on affidavit latest by 31.3.2011, with advance copy to the respondents:

(a) Whether actions taken by the respondents on each of B and C messages were adequate;

(b) Details of action like manual demand disconnection etc. if any, taken for each message.

(c) Details of compliance with each of B and C messages issued to the respondents including the details of reduction in overdrawl, if any, after each message;

(d) Copy of each of B and C messages sued to be respondents with evidence/ record of sending of the messages; and

(e) Details of minute-wise frequency profile and overdrawl/underdrawl by the respondents during 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010.

15. The Adjudicating Officer also directed NRPC to file its written submission within one week.

16. The matters are listed for hearing on 11.4.2011 at 1100 hrs.

Sd/-  
(T. Rout)  
Joint Chief (Law)