

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 7/RP/2014

Sub : 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 the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2010.

Date of hearing : 27.5.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Smt. Neerja Mathur, Member (EO)

Petitioner : SLDC, APTRANSCO

Respondents : Southern Regional Load Despatch Centre and others.

Parties present : Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, APTRANSCO
Shri M. Balasubramanyam, APTRANSCO
Shri S. Sai Ram, APTRANSCO
Shri V. Suresh, SRLDC
Ms. Jyoti Prasad, POSOCO

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted as under:

(a) The issue involved in the present review petition is that whether the quantum of load relief for AUFR and df/dt relays shall be calculated at maximum load or average load.

(b) The relief should be computed on the basis of average which is also reflected in the reply filed by SRPC wherein SRPC has submitted that average loading of the feeder is being compared with declared average loading of the feeder and the review petitioner was able to achieve 86-87% of the declared average relief.

(c) SRLDC in its reply has also admitted that during the peak demand period of summer, the load available for relief is about 75% of declared quantum.

(d) The quantum of load on feeder is dynamic depending upon the load and generation scenarios. The recording of SRLDC is at fault and it is not able to see the actual real-time relief provided. Therefore, inclusion of urban feeders in UFR, df/dt load relief should not be insisted upon as it affects the consumers.

2. The representative of SRLDC submitted as under:

(a) Learned counsel for the petitioner is mixing facts by stating that maximum demand condition should be met for assessment of relief which in turn should be computed on the basis of maximum load flowing on the feeder. In this regard it is clarified that it is next to impossible that at any moment of time maximum flow on the line would coincide with maximum load conditions. and there has never been a case in the past wherein the quantum of actual load relief has been equal to the declared quantum.

(b) Earlier, the flow declared by the petitioner was taken for granted. However, now SRLDC has started monitoring the same and found that the flow on the feeders is almost always less than the declared amount.

(c) The petitioner's contention that SRLDC is at fault for not being able to monitor the accurate real time load relief, is wrong as SLDC is responsible to to extend the facility of monitoring to RLDC.

(d) Demand conditions of 2012 were considered for calculating quantum of load relief to be made available but now the demand met has further increased. Thus, ideally the quantum of relief should even be more. Therefore, there is no case for petitioner to not to provide the relief decided on the basis of 2012 conditions.

(e) The petitioner has wrongly added the islanding schemes, while computing the load relief as islanding scheme feeders are the ones that ought to remain in service and not to be out during the contingency.

(f) In a scenario where there is no RGMO and FGMO available, overloading of critical lines and large change in load during changeover, any laxity in providing relief form UFR and df/dt relays could prove highly detrimental, as they are the last line of defense in system protection.

3. The representative of the petitioner gave a presentation and highlighted the following facts:

(a) Demand in State system is varying from time to time and season to season which is hindering compliance of quantum of relief to be provided through UFR and df/dt schemes.

(b) In State, maximum and minimum demand is 13164 MW and 9046 MW, respectively, which is very large. Since the average quantum is in between maximum and minimum, it is not able to meet the same through relief provided as it is also calculated at average.

(c) When system demand is lower than the average, the petitioner cannot comply with the load relief declared on the basis of average.

(d) The requirement of load relief is to be assessed realistically.

(e) The quantum was never fixed on basis of average by SRPC.

4. The representative of SRLDC submitted as under:

(a) If we consider the maximum demand for computation of load relief, it will be considerably risking the system.

(b) Kerala has implemented 100% load relief on the basis of average load and mapped around 50% on the SCADA system.

(c) Karnataka has implemented 74% of the relief on basis of average and around 950 MW of additional load has to be identified.

(d) Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu have to identify around 2000 MW and 750 MW, respectively more to comply with Commission's direction.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner and the respondents to submit all the facts to SRPC/CEA. The Commission further directed SRPC/CEA to analyze all the facts and issues raised by the review petitioner and the respondents and convene a meeting to discuss the same and finally recommend the basis on which declared quantum should be calculated.

6. The Commission directed SRPC/CEA to submit their reports/recommendations on or before 20.7.2014 within an advance copy to the review petitioner.

7. The Commission further directed NLDC to state, by 20.7.2014, the practices being followed by other RLDC`s

8. Subject to above, the Commission reserved order in the petition .

By order of the Commission

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