

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 005/SM/2014**

**Sub:** Non-Compliance of Regulation 5.4.2 (d) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2010.

Respondents : Executive Engineer (SLDC-EO), UPPCL and others

**Petition No. 10/RP/2014**

**Sub:** Review of order dated 18.12.2013 in Petition No. 208/SM/2011 regarding implementation of the Automatic Demand Management Scheme in terms of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2010.

Petitioner : State Load Despatch Centre, Madhya Pradesh

Date of hearing : 22.5.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson  
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member  
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member

Parties present : Shri S.K. Soonee, POSOCO  
Shri V.K. Aggarwal, NLDC  
Shri S.S. Barpanda, NLDC  
Ms. Jyoti Prasad, POSOCO  
Shri V.Kaikhochin, NERLDC  
Shri Surajit Banerjee, ERLDC  
Ms. Supriya Singh, NRLDC  
Shri Rajiv Porwal, NRLDC  
Shri Harish Patel, WRLDC  
Ms. Jayantika Singh, SRLDC  
Shri Rahul Srivastav, Advocate, UP, SLDC  
Shri Zakir Ahmad, UP, SLDC  
Shri M.K. Gupta, UP, SLDC  
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANTRASCO  
Shri Mohit Kr. Shah, Advocate, BSPHC  
Shri K.N. Madhusoodan, Advocate, Mizoram  
Ms. Kavita K.T., Advocate, Mizoram  
Shri Amit Kumar Singh, SLDC, Uttarakhand  
Shri Girish Gupta, CSPDCL

Shri Jayant Bansod, SLDC Maharashtra  
Shri Jayant Kulkarni, SLDC Maharashtra  
Shri F.E. Kharshing, MeECL  
Shri J.K. Baishya, SLDC Assam  
Shri L.K. Mohanti, OPTCL  
Shri G.S.Sal, SLDC Punjab  
Shri Sreenivasan G., KSEB  
Shri Hem Joshi, HVPNL  
Shri Rajseh Kumar Goel, HVPNL  
Shri Ravi Sher Singh, HVPNL  
Shri Ashish Bernard, Advocate, SLDC, MPPTCL  
Shri R.A. Sharma, SLDC, MPPTCL

### **Record of Proceedings**

The representative of NLDC submitted as under:

- (a) The power system size has grown manifold after synchronization of SR grid with NEW grid. In such a large grid, any local disturbance is likely to spread to other parts as well and may endanger a very large area.
- (b) Even after four years, Automatic Demand Management Scheme (ADMS) has not been implemented and FGMO/RGMO is also not operational fully.
- (c) RGMO along with this scheme shall help the system operator to perform secure grid operation.

2. The representative of NRLDC submitted as under:

- (a) Implementation of ADMS becomes additionally important, as a number of States in NR region had raised concerns that they are not able to control their drawal in time and are having difficulty in this regard.
- (b) The States are still overdrawing to the tune of 1000 MW.
- (c) There is no progress in the Northern Region in implementing the scheme.
- (d) The implementation of ADMS will benefit the States to manage their system within schedule.

3. The representative of SRLDC submitted as under:

- (a) There has been no progress in implementation of scheme by Tamil-Nadu and Andhra-Pradesh in the past years.
  - (b) Karnataka has SCADA ability to implement the scheme. However, till date it has also not implemented the scheme, perhaps SLDC is waiting for the approval of higher authority.
  - (c) Kerala has pilot tested ADMS on some feeders but has not implemented the scheme fully.
  - (d) Puducherry has shown its inability to implement the scheme in existing SCADA system. It shall be implementing the same in new SCADA system.
  - (e) Number of States are still confusing ADMS with other schemes such as GSES, AUFR, etc.
4. The representative of ERLDC submitted as under:
- (a) The issue of implementation has been deliberated in ERPC forum regularly in the last two years. However, till date no State has implemented the scheme.
  - (b) Grid parameters are getting deteriorated and quantum of overdrawal below 49.9 Hz is increasing, which is endangering the overall grid .
5. The representative of WRLDC submitted the issue of implementation of ADMS has been deliberated in the WRPC forum regularly and in 22<sup>nd</sup> WRPC meeting it was decided that a committee shall be formulated to implement the ADMS. Even after formation of committee, no progress is visible in this regard.
6. The representative of NERLDC submitted that there are only three established SLDCs in the region and none has implemented ADMS.
7. Learned counsel for APTRANSCO submitted that a meeting may be convened between NLDC and SLDCs so that confusion regarding ADMS may be clarified.
8. The representative of NLDC clarified that there is no confusion regarding ADMS. Regulation 5.4.2 of the Grid Code is very clear in this regard which provides that some load is to be disconnected from the grid when overdrawal reaches beyond the prescribed limit. Further, there have been exhaustive discussions in the SRPC forum regarding implementation of ADMS. The SLDCs are unnecessarily trying to delay

implementation of ADMS by stating that there is confusion in understanding the scheme.

9. Learned counsel for UP, SLDC submitted that UP, SLDC has identified the feeders but the infrastructure for ADMS has to be developed by the distribution companies. SLDC has written several letters to the distribution companies but no response was received from them regarding the progress of implementation of ADMS. Learned counsel submitted that after receiving show cause notice from the Commission, SLDC has issued warning letter to the distribution companies. In response to warning letter, Managing Directors of distribution companies have constituted a committee to implement the ADMS. Learned counsel submitted that SLDC in the State is not independent and is working under STU which limits the scope of its working.

10. The representative of SLDC, Chhattisgarh submitted that feeders have been identified. He further submitted that since Chhattisgarh State is not overdrawing at present, some extra time should be given to SLDC to implement the scheme. The representative of SLDC requested the Commission to discharge it from section 142 notice.

11. The representative of SLDC, Punjab submitted that UFR and df/dt relays have been implemented and are working without fail. He further submitted that as per transfer scheme issued by State Government in April 2010, PSTCL, which also controls SLDC Punjab, is vested with the control of 220 kV and 132 kV sub-stations and transmission lines and PSPCL is vested with the responsibility of distribution system below 66 kV. Therefore, the implementation of ADMS comes under the domain of PSPCL as it is to be implemented on feeders at 66 kV level. The representative of SLDC, Punjab requested the Commission to implead PSPCL instead of PSTCL as party to the petition. He further submitted the matter has been pursued in the State's OCC meetings wherein it has been decided that a committee shall be formed to implement the scheme at the earliest. He submitted that PSERC has also directed PSPCL to implement the ADMS.

12. The representative of SLDC, Haryana submitted that committee has been formed to implement the scheme.

13. The representative of SLDC, Assam submitted that since sub-stations are not technically ready to implement the scheme, ADMS has not been implemented so far. He further submitted that SLDC, Assam has prepared DPR for technically enhancing its transmission system as per recommendations of CEA. The cost of implementation is about ` 816 crore for NER. SLDC, Assam has also requested Central Government to

provide fund for implementation of project. He submitted that it can implement ADMS after technical up-gradation of the system.

14. The representative of SLDC, Meghalaya adopted the submissions made by the representative of SLDC, Assam. He further submitted that at present SLDC is taking very proactive role on demand management through manual disconnection. The representative of SLDC, Meghalaya submitted that SLDC is under administrative control of STU which limits our scope.

15. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner SLDC, Madhya Pradesh submitted as under:

- (a) ADMS is being implemented and the State is very serious in implementing the scheme as it is of national importance.
- (b) There is no financial constraint in implementing the scheme.
- (c) Since there are around 2000 feeders, more time is being taken in implementation of the scheme.
- (d) SLDC, MP had filed its reply in petition No. 264/MP/2012 in which it was submitted that in 27<sup>th</sup> State OCC meeting it was decided that distribution companies will submit action plan for implementation of ADMS. SLDC formulated the scheme and in a meeting held in October, 2012 distribution companies were directed to implement the same. Distribution companies are in process of implementing the scheme.
- (e) Dongfang China has been approached to implement the scheme.
- (f) There has been no willful non-compliance of the order of the Commission. The issues have been of technology challenge, lack of clarity on which is to be done and no proven software or supplier to implement the ADMS fully.
- (g) Learned counsel requested the Commission to discharge the section 142 notice issued against officer-in-charge of SLDC, MP .

16. The Commission observed that despite understanding the scheme technically, SLDCs are not implementing the scheme which is of national importance. The Commission directed the respondents to implement ADMS in pro-active manner and approach the Commission if they face any difficulty in implementation of scheme.

17. The Commission directed NLDC to submit a detailed report, on affidavit by 30.6.2014 regarding implementation of ADMS and publish the same on its website.

18. The Commission directed the respondents to submit on affidavit, by 30.6.2014 an action plan and PERT chart clearly mentioning the targets and deadline to achieve the same, with an advance copy to RLDCs.

19. Subject to above, the Commission reserved order in the petition and Review Petition.

**By order of the Commission**

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