

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

Petition No. 6/2001

Coram

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

In the matter of

Non-compliance of directions of ERLDC by Damodar Valley Corporation

And in the matter of

Eastern Regional Load Despatch Centre **-Petitioner**
Vs Damodar Valley
Corporation **-Respondent**

Present:

1. Shr | K.K. Das, GM, Powergrid S.K.
2. Shr | Sinha, Addl. GM, ERLDC S.K.
3. Shr | Soonee, DGM, ERLDC
4. Shr | Mohammad S. Mondal, DVC
5. Shr | T.K. Ghosh, DVC R.B. Bal,
6. Shr | CE, DVC

ORDER **(Date of Hearing: 28th June 2001)**

This petition has been filed by Eastern Regional Load Despatch Centre, Kolkata seeking direction to the respondent, Damodar Valley Corporation, to furnish the requisition of drawal faithfully and adhere to the drawal schedule issued by the petitioner. A further direction has been sought to the respondent to back down generation during high frequency and shed load during low frequency as also to comply with directives of the petitioner during real time operation. Another direction that has been sought by the petitioner is that the respondent should also regulate its own generation, load and that of other consumers including captive power plants in its control area.

2. According to the petitioner, frequency in the Eastern Region has been showing very wide fluctuations touching 53 Hz during off peak hours and coming down to 49-48.5 Hz during peak hours. It has been alleged that the respondent has persistently violated the directions of the petitioner and deviated from the schedule with impunity during November and December, 2000, the details of which have been furnished at Annexure-I and Annexure IV respectively of the petition. It is further alleged that the respondent has injected energy into grid even at high frequency. The petitioner has also adverted to certain instances of unit synchronising by the respondent at high frequency, without prior intimation to the petitioner. According to the petitioner, it has been raising the question of injection of energy into the grid at high frequency, which used to be discussed at the various committees of Eastern Regional Electricity Board and also through direct correspondence with the petitioner, but to no avail. It is further alleged that the respondent had been drawing power from NTPC stations without submitting any requisition for such drawal, which is jeopardizing the entire scheduling process. The respondent has not paid any heed to the instructions given by the petitioner to reduce drawal in time of low frequency and stop injection of energy during high frequency.

3. The respondent in its reply has not denied the huge frequency variations in the Eastern Regional Grid. It has stated that reasons for high frequency are attributable to high generation by NTPC or less drawals by other constituents or under drawals by consumers having captive power plants. However, no specific instances have been brought to our notice. The respondent has clarified that in situation of high frequency, it has taken steps to reduce load to bring down the frequency to the desired level. It has been averred on behalf of the respondent that other constituents have been similarly violating the grid discipline, but the petitioner has deliberately suppressed this fact with a view to isolating the respondent. The respondent on its part has been making all efforts to adhere the drawal schedule . The respondent has placed on record certain instances

of under-drawal at low frequency with a view to establishing that it has been helping the grid when frequency is below the optimum level.

4. At the hearing on 28-6-2001, the representative of the petitioner had demonstrated to us that during November 2000, the respondent had injected energy into the grid to the extent of 4-5 million unit per day under high frequency conditions. This trend was continued during December, 2000 as well. The representative of the petitioner made an elaborate presentation before us to support the averments made in the petition. It was presented that during January, 2001, while other constituents of the region had tried to control frequency manually, the respondent continued its deviation from the schedule, despite instructions from the petitioner to the contrary. The representative of the respondent reiterated the averment made in its response that the respondent had been assisting the grid by injection of power and under-drawing power during low frequency. The representative of the respondent reiterated that other constituents have not been following the grid discipline and that NTPC has also been over -generating during high frequency.

5. After hearing the parties we were prima facie satisfied that the respondent had not been adhering to the schedule issued by the petitioner. When faced with such a situation, the representative of the respondent stated that it would make all efforts to stick to the schedule. We had directed the representative of the respondent to file an affidavit. The affidavit has been filed on 04-07-2001, wherein it has been stated that the respondent will try to maintain the daily schedule given by the petitioner as close as possible within the existing constraints. We are not satisfied with the affidavit. Therefore, we proceed to examine the issues raised and issue appropriate directions.

6. Section 55 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 provides that the Regional Load Despatch Centre, shall be the apex body to ensure integrated operation of the power system in the region. It empowers the Regional Load Despatch Centre to give such directions and exercise such supervision and control as may be required for ensuring integrated grid operation and for achieving the maximum economy and efficiency in the operation of power system in the region under its control. Every person connected with the operation of the power system, be it licensee or the Board is bound to comply with the directions issued by the Regional Load Despatch Centre, whether such a direction is considered reasonable or otherwise. Further, IEGC provides that in times of high frequency, the generating stations under the control of the utilities shall back down when necessary or shed load in times of low frequency, as directed by the Regional Load Despatch Centre. This direction was reiterated in the Commission's order dated 17-8-2000 in Enquiry No.1/2000 (Enquiry into grid disturbances on 25th July, 2000 in the Eastern Region) wherein it was directed that "the generating stations under the control of the utilities are required to back down when necessary, in times of high frequency as directed by RLDC" and " all SEBs shall voluntarily initiate such actions as backing down in times of high frequency or shed load in times of low frequency". The manner of preparation of daily schedule by the petitioner on the inputs supplied by the constituents was also the subject matter of consideration of the Commission in Enquiry No.1/2000. In the said order it was made clear that the schedule prepared by the petitioner shall be binding of all constituents irrespective of whether they agree with the schedule or not. It was further directed that the constituents would make a workable schedule so that integrity of the grid is not jeopardized.

7. We have found that the respondent has on certain occasions failed to comply with the directions issued by the petitioner as an apex body for integrated operation of the power system in the eastern region. The respondent has not strictly followed the

directions contained in the order dated 17-8-2000 on the question of placing requisition for power. It has failed to follow the schedule prepared by the petitioner, though as per the Commission's earlier directions, the schedule is binding on the respondent, even if it is to its dislike. At the cost of repetition, we reiterate that the schedule prepared by the petitioner and notified to the constituents shall have the same force as that of an agreement between the parties, breach of which involves civil/penal consequences.

8. At this stage we consider it appropriate to take a lenient view of the matter. Any future violation of the directions of the Commission by the respondent on the questions involving requisitioning of power, or failure to abide by the directions of the petitioner shall invite serious consequences and appropriate proceedings under the Electricity Regulatory Commissions Act, 1998 shall be initiated against the persons responsible for violation of the directions.

9. We find that some of the directions issued by the petitioner to the respondent are of general nature. We direct the petitioner to issue specific directions whenever any violation of the kind, noted above, is brought to its notice.

(K.N. Sinha)
Member

(G.S.Rajamani)
Member


"**(D.P.Iyengar)**
Member

New Delhi dated the 17th July, 2001.

-5-