

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 7/RP/2014**

- Subject : Review of order dated 19.12.2013 in Petition No. 263/MP/2012 relating to maintaining and ensuring integrated secured grid operation in Southern Region in terms of regulation 5.2 of IEGC.
- Date of hearing : 18.3.2014
- Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson  
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member  
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
- Petitioner : SLDC, APTRANSCO
- Respondents : Southern Regional Load Despatch Centre and others.
- Parties present : Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, APTRANSCO  
Shri Y. Balasubramanyam, APTRANSCO  
Shri M. Murali Krishna, APTRANSCO  
Shri V. Suresh, SRLDC

**Record of Proceedings**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the present petition has been filled under section 94 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 103 of the CERC (Conductor of Business ) Regulations for review of order dated 19.12.2013 in Petition No. 263/MP/2012. Leaned counsel for the petitioner further submitted as under:

- (a) In compliance with the Commission's direction dated 19.12.2013, on 12.1.2014 the petitioner has submitted the compliance report indicating implementation of quantum of relief by AUFR in the format prescribed by SRLDC for certification by SRLDC and SPRC.
- (b) As per the said order dated 19.12.2013, the additional feeders were identified and proposed for enhancing the quantum of load relief of UFRs of four stages.
- (c) The quantum of load relief targeted needs review, considering the ground realities of compliance and realization. Till date the targeted quantum of load relief was carried out based on the maximum demand conditions. Any additional

quantum needed was reviewed and accordingly, additional feeders were provided to the maximum extent possible.

(d) At present all the available 132 kV feeders were taken into consideration for implementation of various protective schemes and the total quantum of the loads identified under the various schemes is 8661 MW. On the other hand, as per the impugned order, the declared load relief considering the feeders which are available for monitoring at SRLDC SCADA is only 3796 MW. Therefore, the system will operate when the relief quantum has been fixed not on average but on maximum demand of the feeder.

(e) As the loads on the feeders are dynamic and are subjected to variations depending on the availability of generation and demand the assertion of targeted quantum based always on the average value on the feeder is practically not feasible.

(f) Under the minimum demand conditions in December 2013 at 7772 MW, the system will not operate under the load relief of 8661 MW. Therefore, the load relief has to be fixed on the maximum demand of the feeder.

2. The representative of SRLDC submitted as under:

(a) The claim of the petitioner that the quantum identified for relief through protection system in the State of AP is about 8661 MW is not correct as the quantum identified for relief through AUFR is much less. The petitioner has conveniently mentioned the total quantum of all types of protection systems like SPS, Islanding Scheme, AUFR and df/dt but highlights only AUFR and df/dt quantum as required quantum. However, the purposes of different types of protection schemes and triggering factors are different.

(b) The quantum considered for relief through AUFR and df/dt scheme is same as that of approved value decided by Protection Co-ordination Committee (PCC) of SRPC during the year 2012. Only changes suggested by NPC at present is dividing the same quantum into four stages of operation instead of three stages earlier.

(c) Since year 2012, the petitioner declared that the PCC approved quantum has been connected for relief through AUFR and df/dt protection scheme. However, it is consistently observed that relief realized during operation of AUFR and df/dt operation was 10%- 30% of expected relief. Despite regular discussion and analysis in PCC/OCC, there was no improvement in the situation and thereby SRLDC was forced to insist on SLDCs to extend the feeder-wise

SCADA details to SRLDC and monitor the load available in the identified feeders for relief. From the monitoring, it has been confirmed that the load available for relief at any point of time is of the order of 30% - 50% only.

(d) With regard to feeder-wise discrepancy or less load available, SLDC is responsible to monitor and ensure the availability of declared quantum through appropriate feeders. As it is not happening, SRLDC was forced to monitor and point out the deficiency. SLDC should not transfer its responsibility to SRLDC. Further the petitioner is required to make necessary arrangement to get field data from all the identified feeders to SLDC SCADA and onward transmission to SRLDC SCADA.

(e) With regard to computation of quantum of relief, the present average demand for the month of February 2014 was about 90% of the maximum demand and even the ratio between minimum and maximum demand was about 85%. Accordingly, it is evident that the load available for relief shall not be less than 85% of approved value at any point of time. Meeting this criteria atleast to nearest value will be possible only if the average value of feeder is considered for computation.

(f) With regard to the petitioner contention that all the radial feeders in the State of AP have been used for various types of protection schemes and there by it is unable to identify additional feeders, it is clarified that AUFRR and df/dt is the last line of defense, life saving protection scheme of the grid and thereby the petitioner shall not have any reservation in identifying city/urban feeders for such protection scheme. Atleast for stage-IV of operation, operation of such feeders is to be considered as an instance that will be a rare occasion.

3. After hearing the learned counsel, the Commission directed to admit the petition and issue notice to the respondents and SRPC who shall clarify how the targets relief quantum has been fixed and the feasibility of provide relief is ascertain.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to serve copy of the petition to the respondents and SRPC by 4.4.2014. The respondents were directed to file their replies by 21.4.2014, with an advance copy to the petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, on or before 30.4.2014.

7. The Commission directed SRPC Secretariat to depute an officer well acquainted with the facts of the case on the next date of hearing to assist the Commission

6. The petition shall be listed for hearing on 8.5.2014.

By order of the Commission

SD/-  
(T. Rout)  
Chief (Law)