

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

1. Shri D.P. Sinha, Member
2. Shri G.S. Rajamani, Member
3. Shri K.N.Sinha, Member

**Review Petition No.22/2001
in Enquiry
No.1/2QQ1**

In the matter of

The matter of grid disturbance on 2nd January, 2001 in the Northern Region.

And in the matter of

Review of Order dated 15-1-2001 in Enquiry No.1/2001.

And in the matter of

National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd.

Petitioner

VS

1. Union of India
2. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd.
3. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam LTd.
4. Delhi Vidyut Board
5. Haryana Vidyut Parasaran Nigam Ltd.
6. Punjab State Electricity Board
7. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board
8. Power Development Department, Govt, of J&K.
9. Power Deptt., Union Territory of Chandigarh.

Respondents

The following were present:

1. Shri N.P.Singh, ED (Operation Services),
NTPC.

**ORDER (DATE OF HEARING
09-07-2001)**

By this application for review, the petitioner, National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd., is seeking review and modification of some of the directions and observations made by the Commission in its order dated 15-1-2001 in Enquiry No.1/2001 relating to grid disturbance in the Northern Region on 2nd January, 2001.

2. A major grid disturbance in the Northern Region was reported to have occurred on 2nd January, 2001. The Commission initiated *suo motu* proceedings to enquire into the incident. After hearing, the Commission issued an order dated 15-01-2001. In para 11 of the Order, the Commission had reproduced the figures, in a tabulated form, provided by Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre (NRLDC) showing the details of scheduled/ actual generation in respect of Singrauli STPS and Rihand STPS belonging to the petitioner. On analysis of the details, the Commission concluded that two generating stations belonging to the petitioner had been generating in excess to the schedule given to it by RLDC, which constituted a violation of the grid code. Without disputing the correctness of the data contained in the table at para 11 of the Order, the petitioner has pointed out that in the data scheduled ex-bus generation has been compared with the actual gross generation and not actual ex-bus generation. It has been stated by the petitioner that Singrauli STPS and Rihand STPS had backed down to 1470 MW and 730 MW respectively at 0400 hrs. on 2nd January,

2001. According to the petitioner there is bound to be some time lag in the load reduction before the generation exactly matches with the schedule. We do not find any force in the contention of the petitioner. The petitioner has generated power in excess of the schedule at the material times. The provisions of the IEGC clearly stipulate that the generator has to produce electricity in accordance with the schedule prepared by the RLDC. In case the generators are permitted to generate at its will, the scheduling by the RLDCs will lose its significance.

3. It is next contended that the Commission may record that the grid disturbance was due to initiation of fault in the HT line, since prior to the grid disturbance the system frequency and voltage were normal and as such there can be no question of over-generation by the generating stations belonging to the petitioner. We are not satisfied with the submission. Even on consideration of the figures furnished by the petitioner, the conclusion arrived at by the Commission remained unaltered as at 0400 hrs on 2nd January, 2001 against the scheduled generation of 1320 MW, the Sigraulti STPS was generating 1470 MW at 0400 hrs as intimated by the petitioner.

4. At para 15 of the order dated 15-01-2001, the Commission had discounted the argument made on behalf of the petitioner that state level generation should have also been controlled by RLDC. The elaborate reason in favour of the conclusion arrived at by the Commission have been given in that para. The petitioner has now submitted the Commission should take an expert opinion in the matter. We do not find any reason to accept the request now

made on behalf of the petitioner. In fact, the Commission in the order itself has already directed the Central Transmission Utility to examine the necessity of implementing the suggestion made on behalf of the petitioner while considering the review of grid code. The views of all concerned shall be available to the Commission.

5. At para 17 of the order, the Commission had directed for putting the generating stations of capacity of 200 MW and above under free governor operation in a phased manner. The petitioner in its application for review has argued that in the present circumstances, it is not practical to put the generating stations under free governor and accordingly seeks review of the direction. The directions for free governor operation were initially given by the Commission in its order dated 30th October, 1999 in petition No. 1/99. It was directed that to begin with the stipulation regarding free governor shall apply to thermal units with a capacity of 200 MW and above with immediate effect. The directions contained at para 17 of the order dated 15-1-2001 are only a reiteration of the earlier directions with the extension of time for this purpose. In petition 90/2000, WBSEB had sought exemption from free governor for its units in view of the directions in Petition 1/99. The present petitioner in its reply as also at the hearing had opposed the relief sought. It is unfortunate that the petitioner now is seeking a review of the same directions, given more than a year ago and has attempted to evade the issue rather than complying with the directions.

