

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 287/MP/2019

- Subject : Petition invoking Regulation 1.5(iv) read with Regulation 5.2(u) and Regulation 6.5(11) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2010 for enforcement of 'must run' status granted to solar power projects and Regulation 111 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 seeking direction to State Load Dispatch Centre to stop issuing backing down instructions to the Petitioners.
- Date of Hearing : 7.3.2023
- Coram : Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P. K. Singh, Member
- Petitioners : Wardha Solar (Maharashtra) Private Ltd. (WSMPL) and Anr.
- Respondents : Karnataka State Load Despatch Centre (KSLDC) and 3 Ors
- Parties Present : Shri Amit Kapur, Advocate, WSMPL
Ms. Gayatri Aryan, Advocate, WSMPL
Shri Ankitesh Ojha, Advocate, WSMPL
Shri Shabaaz Hussain, Advocate, KSLDC & KPTCL
Shri Fahad Khan, Advocate, KSLDC & KPTCL
Ms. Stephania Pinto, Advocate, KSLDC & KPTCL
Ms. Ilma Subhan, Advocate, KSLDC & KPTCL
Shri Yeshwanth, Advocate, KSLDC & KPTCL
Shri Venkateshan M., POSOCO
Shri Gajendra Singh, POSOCO

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the representative of POSOCO (now, Grid Controller of India Ltd.) submitted that in compliance with the direction of the Commission, POSOCO has already filed its report conducting an inquiry into whether the backing down/curtailment of generation in the case of the Petitioners herein was on account of grid safety/ security or for any other purpose. The representative of POSOCO further referred to the said report and mainly submitted as under:

- (a) In the said report, POSOCO has carried out the curtailment analysis based on the data submitted by KSLDC and the Petitioners for the period from 1.4.2018 to 31.3.2019. Also, the curtailment analysis has been done in two categories, Category 1 is for the blocks where the curtailment was instructed locally based on the transmission constraints and Category 2 is for the blocks where curtailment was instructed from KSLDC globally for the State. POSOCO has also classified the curtailment data into two categories, namely, cases of curtailment for grid security and the cases of curtailment for 'other than grid security'.

(b) Insofar as WSMPL's 40 MW project connected to 110 kV Nalwar S/s is concerned, it has been indicated that under Category 1a, out of the total cases of curtailment in 5953 time blocks, curtailment in 4514 time blocks had been for grid security whereas in 1439 time blocks, it had been for the reasons other than grid security. However, for this Category 1a, the transmission line limit has been considered as 20 MW as remarked by KSLDC which stated that the said line had been commissioned in the year 1964 and is not taking the permitted load due to aging of conductors. However, as per the technical data noted from the public domain, limit of the said line worked out to 85 MW and considering this limit, the report at Category 1b indicates that curtailment in entire 5953 time blocks had been due to the reasons other than grid security. For Category 2, out of the total cases of curtailment under 156 time blocks, curtailment in 4 time blocks had been due to grid security and in balance 152 time blocks it had been for the reasons other than grid security.

(c) For WSMPL's balance 10 MW project and PSEPL's 40 MW project, which are connected to 110 kV Yelburga S/s, it has been indicated that under Category 1a (considering transmission line limit @ 69 MW), out of total cases of curtailment in 6175 time blocks, curtailment in 16 time blocks had been due to grid security whereas in balance 6159 time blocks, it had been due to reasons other than grid security. Under Category 1b (considering transmission line limit @ 86 MW as per KPTCL's implementation letter), time blocks under which the curtailment had been for the grid security worked out to 4 and for the balance 6171 time blocks, the curtailment had been for the reasons other than grid security. Under Category 2, out of the total case of curtailment in 117 time blocks, in 113 time blocks the curtailment had been for the reasons other than grid security and only in 4 time blocks the curtailment had been for the purpose of grid security.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioners submitted that as such the report prepared by POSOCO supports the contention of the Petitioners that the curtailment instruction by KSLDC in respect of their Projects had been for the reasons other than the grid security. However, the Petitioners may be permitted to file its response once the Respondents, KSLDC/KPTCL file their comments on such report.

3. Learned proxy counsel for the Respondents No. 1 to 4 sought time to file reply on the report submitted by POSOCO.

4. Considering that neither the Petitioner nor the Respondents, KSLDC & KPTCL have filed any comments/response on the report submitted by POSOCO, the Commission permitted the Respondents file their respective comments/response, as last opportunity, within three weeks with copy to the Petitioner who may file its response thereon within three weeks thereafter.

5. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the matter for order.

By order of the Commission

**Sd/-
(T.D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)**