

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Review Petition No. 4/2014

In

Petition No. 208/SM/2011

Coram:

Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson

Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Shri A.K. Singhal, Member

Ms. Neerja Mathur, Member (EO)

Date of Hearing: 25.02.2014

Date of order: 06.06.2014

In the matter of

Review of order dated 18.12.2013 passed in Petition No. 208/SM/2011 on implementation of the Automatic Demand Management Scheme.

And

In the matter of

State Load Despatch Centre
Gujarat Energy Transmission Co. Ltd.,
132 kV Gotri Sub-station compound,
Near T.B hospital, Gotri Road,
Vadodara- 390021, Gujarat

Review Petitioner

The following were present:

1. Ms. Swapna Seshadari, Advocate, SLDC, Gujarat
2. Shri B.B. Mehta, SLDC, Gujarat
3. Shri B.M. Shah, SLDC, Gujarat

ORDER

The Review Petitioner, State Load Despatch Centre, Gujarat has filed this Review Petition seeking review of the Commission`s order dated 18.12.2013 in Petition No. 208/SM/2011 wherein the Commission had directed staff of the Commission to



process the case for initiation of action under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against the Officers-in-charge of STUs/SLDCs of the respondent States.

2. The Review Petitioner has submitted that the order dated 18.12.2013 has been passed by the Commission without considering the earlier record of proceedings including order dated 7.8.2013 in Petition No. 246/MP/2009 and various other materials on record which are errors apparent on the face of the record. The Review Petitioner has submitted that there are otherwise sufficient cause for review of the order dated 18.12.2013.

3. The Review Petitioner has submitted that in reply to the Suo Motu Petition No. 208/2011, the Review Petitioner had filed an affidavit explaining the steps taken by it for compliance of Regulation 5.4.2 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2010 (Grid Code). The Review Petitioner has further submitted that the Commission in the Record of Proceedings dated 10.1.2012 has taken note of the submission of the representative of Gujarat SLDC that Automatic Load Management Scheme had not been implemented by the State as there was no deficit power situation in the State to which the Commission clarified that the scheme had to be implemented as per the Grid Code to curtail overdrawal from the grid. The Review Petitioner has submitted that the following steps have been taken by the Review Petitioner for implementation of the scheme:

- (a) On 16.1.2012, importance of ADMS was discussed by Managing Director, GETCO in a high level meeting of all Discoms;



(b) In the first State Operation Co-ordination Committee (SOCC) meeting held on 24.3.2012, the Review Petitioner emphasized that ADMS has to be compulsorily implemented by all distribution Companies at the earliest;

(c) In the second SOCC meeting held on 20.8.2012, the Review Petitioner after taking note of the tardy progress made by the distribution companies in the matter of ADMS, directed the distribution companies to prepare concrete plan for implementation of ADMS;

(d) In the third OCC meeting held on 1.1.2013, the Review Petitioner directed Torrent Power who was stated to have developed scheme for implementation of ADMS, to share the logic of its scheme with other distribution companies to help them in formulating their own scheme;

(e) In the 4th SOCC meeting held on 11.5.2013, the Review Petitioner took note of the fact that none of the distribution companies in the state has taken any measures for implementation of ADMS. The Review Petitioner suggested the distribution companies to include the following logic with 'AND' condition as a feature of the ADMS:

(i) Average frequency block is below 49.8 Hz and there is downward trend of system frequency;

(ii) State overdrawal is more than 150 MW;

(iii) Particular DISCOM overdrawal is more than 50 MW.

(f) In the 5th SOCC meeting held on 31.10.2013, all distribution companies informed that load had been identified for implementation of ADMS. The Review



Petitioner reiterated the logic suggested by it in the 4th SOCC meeting to be implemented by the distribution companies. The Review Petitioner also entrusted the responsibility to SE, SLDC to find out the technology and implement the scheme, for which all distribution companies agreed.

4. The Review Petitioner has further submitted that the Commission in its order dated 7.8.2013 in Petition No. 246/MP/2009 has noted the various steps taken by the Review Petitioner and the distribution companies of the State for planning load management and contingency measures and has directed SLDC and distribution companies to formulate and implement the state-of-the-art demand management schemes like ADMS. The Review Petitioner has submitted that the said order was sent to the distribution companies of the State for compliance as they play a key role for implementation of ADMS.

5. The Review Petitioner has submitted that it has acted in a bonafide manner and has carefully pursued with the distribution companies to get the ADMS implemented. The Review Petitioner has submitted that it is not aware about the kind of technology and logic being used by Delhi Transco Limited with respect to its distribution company, NDPL. The Review Petitioner has submitted that if the technology and logic of ADMS is shared by Delhi Transco Limited, SLDC, Gujarat will explore the possibility of implementing the same technology and logic for ADMS in the State of Gujarat.

6. The Review Petitioner in its affidavit dated 6.3.2014 has submitted that it has sought and received proposals from a few vendors who have indicated that six months time would be required to implement the scheme throughout the State of Gujarat.

7. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that notwithstanding the fact that Gujarat is a power surplus State, SLDC, Gujarat has initiated the process of implementation of ADMS which will be completed by January, 2015. Learned counsel requested the Commission to review the impugned order and discharge the notice issued under Section 142 of the Act against the officer-in-charge as the Review Petitioner has taken necessary steps and has evolved its own technology to implement ADMS as soon as possible.

8. We have considered the submission of the Review Petitioner. In the present petition, the Review Petitioner has sought review of the order of the Commission proposing to initiate action against GUVNL as well as against SLDCs of other States for their failure to implement ADMS as required under the Grid Code. The Review Petitioner has submitted that it has taken several steps for implementation of ADMS which have not been considered by the Commission and therefore, the order suffers from the error apparent on the face of the record.

9. Regulation 5.4.2 (d) of the Grid Code provides for implementation of demand management schemes by State Load Despatch Centre through their respective State Electricity Boards/Distribution licensees. In our order dated 1.12.2011 in Petition No.



208/SM/2011, we had *inter-alia* directed STUs to submit status of the automatic load management scheme and reasons for not implementing the scheme. During the course of hearing on 10.1.2014, the representative of National Load Despatch Centre had submitted that none of the States of the Western Region has implemented the scheme. Accordingly, in our order dated 18.12.2013 we had directed all SLDCs to send the report containing the details of ADMS scheme and periodic reports on progress of implementation of the scheme to the Central Commission. As our directions were not complied with, we had directed the staff of the Commission to process the case for initiation of action under Section 142 of the Act against the Officers in-charge of STUs/SLDCs of the respondent States for non-compliance with our directions and the provisions of the Act and the Grid Code.

10. While passing the impugned order, the Commission's order dated 7.8.2013 in Petition No. 246/MP/2013 was available in which the Commission had noted the steps taken by the Review Petitioner and the distribution companies of the State for planning load management and emergency measures. The decision in the said order could not be taken into account while passing the impugned order. It is, however, noted that the steps taken by the Review Petitioner as enumerated in para 3 above were not placed before the Commission by the Review Petitioner in its reply to Petition No. 208/SM/2011. In view of this, there is no error apparent on the face of the record in the order dated 18.12.2013.



11. The Review Petitioner has submitted that Gujarat is a power surplus State and Demand Management is not required as such. In this regard, we would like to clarify that as per CEA data available on its website, the State of Gujarat has never been power surplus in the past 6 years and only the power deficit in the State has decreased. The representative of Gujarat during the course of hearing has stated that due to variation in wind generation it faces problem in load generation balance. Hence, in day to day or real time operation, ADMS will be useful to handle sudden variation in wind generation, by curtailing load, as and when required. Therefore, the petitioner's contention that Gujarat is a power surplus State and it does not require ADMS, is not correct. Further, it is noted that power scenario may change from time to time and ADMS serves the purpose of providing security to the system. The details of changed power scenario during 2007-08 to December 2013 is extracted as under:

Years	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14
Energy Deficit	11133 MU	6631 MU	3149 MU	4117 MU	267 MU	149 MU	9 MU
Peak Deficit	3234 MW	2881 MW	891 MW	839 MW	192 MW	39 MW	0 MW

12. It is an admitted fact that the Review Petitioner has not been successful in getting the ADMS implemented through its distribution companies. However, from the documents on record, it emerges that SLDC Gujarat has made genuine efforts in getting the ADMS implemented by its distribution companies. The Review Petitioner has also issued certain methodology for implementation of the ADMS. Considering all aspects including the commitment of SLDC, Gujarat to implement ADMS, we are not inclined to initiate action under Section 142 of the Act against the Review Petitioner. Accordingly, we direct that notice under section 142 of the Act be not issued against the Review Petitioner. At the same time, we direct the Review Petitioner to fully implement the

scheme by January 2015 and submit bi-monthly progress report to WRPC Secretariat with copy to the Commission and WRLDC. We direct WRPC and WRLDC to monitor implementation of the scheme and extend assistance to the Review Petitioner in implementation. Any laxity on the part of the Review Petitioner in future will be viewed seriously and accordingly dealt with.

13. Review Petition No. 4/RP/2014 is disposed of in terms of the above.

Sd/-	sd/-	sd/-	sd/-
(Neerja Mathur)	(A.K.Singhal)	(M. Deena Dayalan)	(Gireesh B.Pradhan)
Member	Member	Member	Chairperson

