

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Record of Proceedings

Petition No.129/2010

Sub:_Maintaining grid security of the entire North East West (NEW) grid by curbing overdrawals and effecting proper load management by Northern Region constituents.

Date of hearing : 29.4.2010

Coram : Shri S.Jayaraman, Member
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner : Northern Regional Load Dispatch Centre, New Delhi.

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd and Others

Parties present : 1. Shri Rajiv Kumar, NRLDC
2. Shri Alok Kumar, NRLDC
3. Shri V.K. Aggarwal, NRLDC
4. Shri B.P. Pant, UPPCL
5. Shri Rahul Srivastava (Advocate), UPPCL
6. Shri Dinesh Khandelwal, RRVPNL
7. Shri S.K. Jain, RVPNL

Through this petition, the petitioner, Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre (NRLDC) has made following prayer:

- (i) Direct the Northern Region SLDCs/State control areas to honour Section 5.4.2, 6.4.7 and 6.4.8 of the Indian Electricity Grid Code (IEGC) to curb their overdrawals whenever frequency is below 49.20 HZ so that the NEW grid is secure;
- (ii) Direct the Northern Region SLDCs/State Control areas to honour RLDCs instructions given under Section 29(1) of the Electricity Act, 2003; and

(iii) Direct the Northern region State control areas to take necessary steps for proper load management so as to avoid overdrawal during the coming months.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that this petition has been filed on account of sharp deterioration of frequency profile of the North , North-East and West (NEW) grid from 1st April onwards. He submitted that the frequency of NEW grid was below 49.2 Hz for around 80 % of time which was very alarming situation as barring one or two States, all the States of the Region were over drawing and the hottest months of May and June were yet to be arrive.

3. Learned counsel for UPPCL submitted that the over drawal was beyond their control. The high temperature of around 45° Celsius during this period was unexpected. They tried to get the power through power exchanges, but because of high rate of Rs. 12 per unit, they could not buy the same. A meeting was held under the Chairmanship of Chairman of UPPCL to take stock of the situation. Based on the outcome of the meeting they were now rostering industrial consumers also and advise was given to commercial establishments not to switch on air conditioners between 6:00 PM to 6:00 AM. The rostering in towns of the State of UP was causing mob violence and becoming a law and order problem, he added. Learned counsel further submitted that Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad (Lucknow Bench) had issued contempt notice for disruption of supply of electricity to the High Court affecting judicial proceedings. The representative of the UPPCL submitted that due to forced outage of Obra Power plant, availability of power from the State's own sources had decreased. Further, its request of postponing the planned outage of NTPC stations was not agreed to because of which its Central Sector power had also decreased. The Commission questioned that whether for proper operation and life of the plant,

it was necessary to have regular maintenance, otherwise a situation might arise that the plant goes into outage suddenly affecting the grid security. In response, the representative of UPPCL further informed that they had imposed power cuts on all big towns in the State, and in Kanpur from 9.4.2010, supply for only 13 hours was being given. He expressed hope that the power supply position would improve after 15th May, 2010 when the paddy season would be over and in July, 2010 when State's 250 MW Parichha Unit-II would be commissioned.

4. The Commission observed that rostering was not the long-term solution, there was no supply growth, whereas load growth had taken place considerably. Learned counsel for UPPCL submitted that the UPPCL had tied up for 684 MW during May and 664 MW during June, 2010. Moreover, UPPCL was expecting the demand to come down by 15th May. Delhi was continuously under drawing throughout the day, and earning UI charges he added. In response, the representative of SLDC, Delhi submitted that by under drawing at low frequency Delhi was helping the grid. Its under frequency relays were operating causing inconvenience to its consumers. In April 2010 there had been 87 instances of operation of UFRs in Delhi so far. The Commission clarified that UPPCL's argument was not correct, since in case of high frequency the under drawing utility, and at frequency below 50 Hz, the over drawing State was responsible for violation of grid discipline.

5. The representative of Petitioner submitted that the State of UP was procuring power of the order of 2.5 Million Units per day, while it's over drawal was 1,000 MW. He submitted that presently 1,000 MW transmission corridors was available for transfer of power to Northern Region, but no request was received from UPPCL for booking the corridor. If UPPCL intends to purchase power, they should book the corridor in advance, otherwise it would end up not getting the

same at the last moment. The representative of petitioner informed that they had received Open Access application from UPPCL only for 155 MW and 45 MW for the month of May and June 2010 as against 684 MW and 664 MW, respectively claimed by it. The representative of UPPCL assured to look into the same and apply for the required open access. The Commission directed the UPPCL to submit information in this regard latest by 12.5.2010, with an advance copy to the petitioner.

6. The representative of HPGCL stated that arrangements for purchasing of power was being done and about 50 lakh units were procured from IEX at Rs. 11-12 per unit. He further submitted that power cuts was imposed whenever NRLDC instruct it, but frequency did not improve due to heavy over drawl by UP. The representative of Rajasthan sought two week time to file its reply. Request was allowed. Accordingly, the respondents were directed to file their reply on affidavit by 12.5.2010, with an advance copy to the petitioner.

7. Subject to above, order in the petition was reserved.

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