

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 74/MP/2018**

Subject : Petition for consideration of declared capacity of Nathpa Jhakri Hydro Power Station (6 x 250 MW) and Rampur Hydro Power Station (6 x 68.67 MW) corresponding to Installed capacity including overload capacity in accordance with Regulation 6.5(12) of CERC (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2010

Petitioner : SJVN Limited

Respondent : Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre and Others

Date of hearing : **29.5.2018**

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member  
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Parties present : Shri M.G.Ramachandran, Advocate, SJVNL  
Ms. Anushree Bardhan, Advocate, SJVNL  
Shri R.B.Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Rajeev Agarwal, SJVNL  
Shri Vivek Pandey, Advocate, TPDDL  
Shri Romesh Kapoor, SJVNL  
Shri Suresh Thakur, SJVNL  
Shri D.K.Jain, NRLDC  
Shri Ashok Rajan, NRLDC  
Shri Rajiv Porwal, NRLDC

**Record of Proceedings**

During the hearing, the learned counsel for the Petitioner mainly submitted as under:

(i) As per Regulation 6.5 (12) of the IEGC Regulations, the generating station is to give Declared Capacity (DC) for the day equal to the installed capacity including overload capability, if any, minus auxiliary consumption, corrected for the reservoir level. However, the 5<sup>th</sup> amendment to the said regulations imposed no restriction on the generating station to give DC corresponding to ex bus installed capacity.

(ii) In terms of the above, both the Projects of the Petitioner were giving DC corresponding to installed capacity of the project minus auxiliary consumption. However, the Respondent, NRLDC restricted the DC of the



stations upto ex bus installed capacity on the ground that furnishing DC more than ex bus capacity without spillage condition is violative of Regulation 5.2 (h) of IEGC Regulations.

(iii) The Projects have demonstrated their overload capability as and when scheduling was given by the respondent, NRLDC during peak hours and the decision of NRLDC to restrict the DC has impacted in recovery of capacity charges from the beneficiaries.

Accordingly, the learned counsel prayed that the Respondent may be directed to revise the DC since May, 2017 when the 5<sup>th</sup> amendment to the IEGC Regulations came into force.

2. In response, the learned counsel for the Respondent, BRPL submitted the following:

(i) Regulation 6.5 (12) of the IEGC provides the Petitioner for declaration of DC to their respective RLDCs. However, Regulation 5.2 (h) of the IEGC is related to system security aspects and the consolidated provision as amended till date, including the 5<sup>th</sup> amendment with effect from 1.5.2017.

(ii) Section 28 (3) (e) of the Electricity Act, 2003 indicates that the security aspect of the real time grid operations are within the domain of respective RLDCs. The Commission has given a serious consideration to the security aspect in the operation of the grid as any lapse on this issue will would put the entire regional grid in jeopardy.

(iii) In case the RLDCs are not following the IEGC Regulations, the matter can be brought to the notice of POSOCO for remedial measures. However, the security aspect cannot be allowed to be sacrificed.

(iv) Furnishing of DC more than ex-bus capacity which is inclusive of overload capability and acceptance of the same, if allowed, will make the entire RGMO infructuous.

(v) Reply filed in the matter may be considered.

3. The representative of the Respondent, NRLDC mainly submitted that since the 5<sup>th</sup> amendment of the IEGC provides that the VWO margin shall not be used by RLDC to schedule ancillary services, the margin between DC declared by the generating station considering overload and (IC- Aux) cannot be scheduled. Hence, slight modification in the provisions of URS as well as RRAS Regulations may have to be done. He also submitted most of the utilities, including the Petitioner (for some time) have been following the scheduling procedure as per RLDC letter dated 29.4.2017 on their own and RLDC were not required to interfere with their declaration. The representative also submitted that since the methodology suggested as per SOR dated 13.4.2018 would entail revision in the scheduling software, the implementation is proposed to be effected from 1.6.2018. He further submitted that the reply filed by NRLDC may be considered the matter.



4. The learned counsel for the Respondent, TPDDL prayed for grant of time to file its reply in the matter.
5. The Commission accepted the prayer and granted time to TPDDL to file its reply, on affidavit, on or before **11.6.2018**, with advance copy to the Petitioner, who shall file its rejoinder, if any by **18.6.2018**.
6. Subject to the above, order in the Petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

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

