

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

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 : 11.4.2011.

Coram : Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Adjudicating Officer

Adjudication Case No. 2/2010

Petitioner : Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre, New Delhi

Respondent : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow

Adjudication Case No. 3/2010

Petitioner : Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre, New Delhi

Respondent : Haryana Vidyut Parsaran Nigam Limited, Panchkula

Adjudication Case No. 4/2010

Petitioner : Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre, New Delhi

Respondent : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. Jaipur

Adjudication Case No. 5/2010

Petitioner : Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre, New Delhi

Respondent : Power Transmission Corporation of Uttarakhand Ltd., Uttarakhand

Adjudication Case No. 6/2010

Petitioner : Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre, New Delhi

Respondent : Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala

Adjudication Case No. 7/2010

Petitioner : Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre, New Delhi

Respondent : Power Development Department, Govt. of Jammu and Kashmir, Srinagar

Parties present : Shri Ajay Talegaunkar, NRPC
Shri V.K. Agarwal, NRLDC
Ms. Joyti Prasad, NRLDC
Shri Rajiv Porwal, NRLDC
Shri Rahul Srivastava, Advocate, UPPCL
Shri Sunil Kumar Jain, UPPCL
Shri Mukeksh Kumar Gupta, UPPCL
Shri Aditya Madan, Advocate, RRVPNL
Shri S.K.Jain, RRVPNL
Shri Dinesh Khandelwal, RRVPNL

Record of Proceedings

These adjudication cases were initiated against the Respondents for non-compliance of the directions of the Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre (NRLDC).

2. During the hearing of the cases, the Respondents in Adjudication Case No. 2/2010 (UPPCL) and Adjudication No.4/2010 (RRVNL) were present. None of the other Respondents were present.

3. During the hearing, learned counsel for UPPCL submitted that the Respondent had taken action on the messages issued by NRLDC. In response to the observations of the Adjudication Officer that the respondent was overdrawing at the frequency below 49.2 Hz even after ten minutes of the receipt of the messages, the learned counsel submitted that conveying the messages to 132 kV sub-station over telephone for load shedding took time. Learned counsel further submitted that the UPPCL communication system took nearly 45 minutes to communicate the message to the field level. He submitted that after establishment of SLDC, the system is being upgraded to make the communication system more effective.

3. The Adjudicating Officer desired to know from the representative of NRLDC regarding the adequacy of response by UPPCL on the directions issued by NRLDC. The representative of the NRLDC submitted that the response was not adequate since the overdrawal by the UPPCL continued at low frequency ever after number of B and C messages.

4. Learned counsel for the RRVNL submitted that the respondent had conveyed/forwarded the B and C messages received from NRLDC to Distribution companies for immediate action. He submitted that number of messages were issued to the Distribution companies to curtail overdrawal at low frequency during the period 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010. Learned counsel also submitted that the SLDC had been taking all possible steps to reduce overdrawal from the grid which has in most cases resulted in improvement of frequency to 49.2 Hz in the sale or next time block. In response to query of the Adjudicating Officer with regard to adequacy of action taken by the DISCOMS, learned counsel submitted that DISCOMS had shed the load but it took time as the process of instructions by SLDC till actual load shedding took about 15 to 20 minutes.

5. The Adjudicating Officer observed that HVVNL, PTCUL, PSEB and Power Development Department, Jammu and Kashmir have not appeared before the Adjudicating Officer despite notice which amounts non-compliance with the direction of the Commission. The Adjudicating Officer decided to prepare the enquiry report under Section 144 of the Electricity Act, 2003 without holding further hearing in respect of these respondents.

6. After hearing the learned counsels and representatives of the parties present, Adjudicating Officer directed all the respondents to submit the following information, latest by 30.4.2011 with advance copy to the petitioner.

- (i) Information as per the Annexure-I attached to this record of proceedings, for analysis of the adequacy of actions taken by the respondents in compliance of the direction of the NRLDC;
- (ii) Whether the distribution companies in the respective States had complied with the direction of the SLDC to ensure compliance of NRLDC directions in B and C messages during the period 1.4.2010 to 9.4.2010;
- (iii) Details of non-compliance, if any, by the distribution companies along with their names; and
- (iv) Status of implementation of automatic demand management scheme as mandated in Indian Electricity Grid Code, 2010.

7. The Adjudicating Officer also directed the NRLDC to file its observation on the data submitted by the respondents in the Annexure-II attached by 15.5.2011.

8. Subject to the above, orders in these proceedings were reserved.

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

