

Eastern Regional Power Committee, Kolkata

Minutes of Special Meeting on issues related to Scheduling of power from BRBCL, Nabinagar and KBUNL, MTPS Stage-II held on 25.01.2017 at ERPC Kolkata.

List of members present is at **Annexure-A**. Member Secretary, ERPC welcomed all the participants to the special meeting. He informed that this special meeting was convened on a short notice to discuss (1) issue on full load trial operation of KBUNL Stage-II units and (2) issue on Scheduling of BRBCL station.

1. KBUNL Issue

Representative from KBUNL informed that their generating station consists of Stage –I of 2x110 MW (100% dedicated to Bihar state) and Stage-II of 2x195 MW (67.7% (264 MW) allocated to Bihar and remaining 126 MW allocated to other ER states)

The KBUNL bus has connectivity to the STU system and also to the ISTS through 220kV Kanti-Muzaffarpur D/c line.

The present issue concerns ERLDC approval for injection of full load capacity for trial operation of the Stage-II of the station scheduled for February'17. ERLDC has informed that KBUNL must limit its generation to 126 MW which is the quantum of connectivity approved by CTU.

LTA not signed with any constituent.

GM, ERLDC informed that as the connectivity to ISTS is for 126 MW, KBUNL must limit its generation to the same amount as there is probability of full injection through the ISTS which may affect the security and fault level of ISTS system.

KBUNL representative informed that as per their understanding for drawal of Bihar share ISTS connectivity is not required as the station is connected to the STU system also. Also, only 126 MW is required to flow in the 220kV Kanti-Muzaffarpur D/c line.

GM, ERLDC emphasized that KBUNL Stage-II is a regional entity as it has more than one state beneficiary and before permitting full load trial operation, ERLDC must have connectivity for 390 MW. It was also emphasized that connectivity is not to be considered line wise, rather it is the generating station which as a whole gets connected to the ISTS.

NTPC representative informed that as per their understanding, only connectivity quantum with inter state system may be required as per the connectivity regulations.

Powergrid representative disagreed and informed that a complete reading of the connectivity regulations along with the detailed procedures for LTA is required for correct understanding of the issue.

CTU clarified that LTA agreement has not been signed by the beneficiaries of KBUNL Stage-II. CTU representative further mentioned that the status of KBUNL Stage-II as central generating station or as Inter-State Generating Station is not clearly defined. Therefore for full load testing whether only one CTU line is to be considered or all lines including state lines to be considered are not clear---it was further opined. It was emphasized that Connectivity & LTA are to be ensured separately for enabling scheduling. It was pointed out that the nature of Kanti bus is not very clear: whether to consider it as a state bus or a ISTS bus. These issues are arising frequently now a days.

GM, ERLDC observed that CTU must clearly mention that backend connectivity of generating station is 390 MW. CTU replied that the installed capacity of the generating station has been clearly mentioned in the grant of LTA.

CTU representative informed that the nature of the Kanti Bus will also have commercial implications. If the bus is considered as ISTS bus then Bihar may have to pay PoC charges and if the bus is considered as a STU bus then other beneficiaries of KBUNL Stage-II may have to pay the state wheeling charges.

ERLDC informed that in Narora (UP), an example exists for a generating station being connected to both STU and ISTS. There the STU lines connecting the generating station had been pooled in the PoC. If the forum agrees the same solution may be applied in the case of KBUNL also and Bihar lines connected to KBUNL station may be pooled in the ISTS and PoC charges for own drawal to payable by BSPTCL.

ESE, BSPTCL emphasized that the Bihar is not agreeable to payment of PoC charges for own drawal. He further referred Para 6.4.2(c)(iii) of IEGC wherein if a generating station connected both to State & ISTS and the state has more than 50% share then scheduling responsibility lies with SLDC. In that case the role of RLDC will be limited to incorporation of the ISTS interchange schedules as advised by SLDC.

ERLDC expressed their no reservation on KBUNL station-phase I & II being scheduled by SLDC.

Member Secretary, ERPC opined that if SLDC, Bihar schedules KBUNL Stage-II then all issues would be resolved amicably.

ERLDC pointed out that if KBUNL Stage-II is considered as a Central generating station then the jurisdiction of scheduling by RLDC is clear in the grid code. However, if the station be considered as ISGS then SLDC may be entrusted with jurisdiction in line with the operational expediency clause in clause 6.4.3 of IEGC.

CTU, Powergrid representative opined that the operational expediency clause under (6.4.3) was equally applicable to both CGS and ISGS alike.

Chief Engineer, CEA informed that it may be considered that the connectivity of KBUNL Stage-II is with State network & the KBUNL bus is Bihar STU node. In that case the

connectivity with ISTS given by CTU may have to be withdrawn. He cited the example of similar arrangement in case of Simhadri generating station of NTPC.

ESE, interstate, BSPTCL explained that in the JV agreement there is no stipulation to consider KBUNL Stage-II as a central generating station.

CTU and CEA were of the opinion that State transmission charges for 126 MW will be applicable for outside beneficiaries as 126 MW LTA will be considered from Bihar and not Muzzafarpur (ISTS) bus. KBUNL Stage-II will be considered as an embedded system, separate ISTS connectivity is not required. The commercial accounting for the station will have to be carried out by Bihar.

GM, ERLDC was of the view that the 220 kV Kanti –Muzzafarpur being ISTS line, separate STU charges may not be applicable. CEA representative opined that the line must be considered as state tie-line for consistency of accounting procedure and STU charges will have to be payable by other beneficiaries.

GRIDCO observed that loading of STU charges on other beneficiaries may not be commercially accepted. He suggested that as 67.7 % of power from KBUNL Stage-II is already allocated to Bihar, Bihar may consider to avail the remaining quantum of power also. Odisha have already taken up with concerned authorities for surrender of their share and have not signed the LTA agreement. West Bengal, DVC were also of same view as GRIDCO and informed that they have also separately taken up with competent authority for surrender of their respective shares.

CTU confirmed that no LTA agreement has been signed by any beneficiary of KBUNL. CE, CEA informed that in case the LTA agreement is not signed by any beneficiary, the PoC injection charges will be payable by KBUNL.

Director(Projects), BSPTCL informed that the requirement of additional power would be assessed and communicated to competent authority. However, concerning STU charges BSPTCL will be taken up with State Electricity Regulatory Commission.

CTU informed that they will give final notice for LTA agreement signing and if beneficiaries failed to sign then the application process will be cancelled and if required the same may be applied afresh. PoC injection charges will be borne by KBUNL.

KBUNL representative provisionally agreed for the scheduling of KBUNL Stage-II units by SLDC, Bihar pending CERC approval. KBUNL informed that it will file a petition with CERC for its approval of scheduling of Kanti Stage-II by SLDC, Bihar. Till that time Bihar SLDC will continue to schedule Kanti Stage-II.

In view of the consent of KBUNL for scheduling of KBUNL Stage-II by Bihar SLDC, it was decided that the jurisdiction of KBUNL Stage-II be shifted from ERLDC to SLDC Bihar immediately w.e.f 06.02.2017 to enable full load trial operation. KBUNL may approach CERC for ratification of the Central Commission.

2. BRBCL Issue

BRBCL representative informed that BRBCL generation station consists of 4 units of 250 MW. 90% of power from the station is allocated to railways and 10% is allocated to Bihar.

It was further informed that the Unit#1 has been commissioned in March-16 and CoD declared on 15.01.2017. DC is being sent to ERLDC regularly. The two issues of concern are:

- i) DC Certification.
- ii) Scheduling of units

BRBCL representative requested ERPC to issue the allocation order for BRBCL for commencement of scheduling and declaration of availability by the station.

Member Secretary, ERPC informed that as per MoP allocation 90% power is allocated to Railways and 10% power is allocated to Bihar. ERPC has no jurisdiction to allocate the 90% railway share state wise. Also as railways do not have direct interface with the ISTS and as in line with IEGC states have to give advise to RLDC on its drawal schedule based on entitlement in proportion to DC, the consent of states is prerequisite for scheduling.

GM, ERLDC informed that they require state wise percentage allocation and LTA agreements to commence scheduling the station.

Powergrid representative raised the issue of non receipt of transmission charges from BRBCL for 400 kV Nabinagar-SSRM line. On date it was informed that there is huge outstanding on this account & thereby cash flow of Powergrid is being adversely affected.

BRBCL representative informed that as per CERC order, transmission charges are to be paid till commissioning only which is 31.03.16. However, they have referred the issue to CERC for clarification. If CERC confirms by an order BRBCL will release all outstanding dues.

CTU and Powergrid once again requested to release the payment as BRBCL was generating revenue by selling power under infirm mode. BRBCL contended that the cost of infirm power is very less and frequency dependent. Most of the time variable charges are also not recovered. Further, any excess amount collected gets adjusted from capital cost as per CERC regulations.

Powergrid informed that they are unable to get the revenue for this line from PoC also.

Member Secretary, ERPC sought the clarification on the Operationalization of LTA for BRBCL. CTU clarified that the LTA for BRBCL has not yet been made operational in line with approved detailed procedure. Also it was informed that the state wise drawal of railways had been indicated in the LTA application.

CTU informed that the LTA would be operationalized based on system studies keeping in view the evacuation path. So, the LTA may be operationalized upto 1000 MW if evacuation path was available. BRBCL expressed that the LTA may be made operational upto 250 MW

only as only one unit (250 MW) was under COD. CTU informed that the Operationalization of LTA depends on the transmission availability and is not linked with the COD of generating station.

CE, CEA was also of the view that if the whole evacuation path is ready full LTA is to be operationalized.

Member Secretary, ERPC requested BRBCL to consider payment of transmission charges pending direction from CERC.

CE, CEA observed that scheduling of BRBCL could be affected if LTA is not Operationalized.

Powergrid referred the direction of the central commission in petition No- 197/MP/2015 dated-05.11.2015 wherein the CERC observed that:

Quote:

51.....The drawl points from ISTS located within a State shall be treated as a single entity for the purpose of scheduling. This arrangement according to CEA and POSOCO may lead to fragmented control area. Therefore, the group of TSSs situated in a State and connected directly with ISTS shall be treated as one fragmented control area and the responsibility for the purpose of scheduling, metering, balancing, applicability of ISTS charges and losses etc, shall vest in the concerned RLDC. In so far as the TSSs of Indian Railways connected to State network are concerned, the responsibility for these functions shall vest in the concerned SLDC.

Unquote

As all the TSS in Eastern region are embedded within the state network, SLDC will have to coordinate scheduling, metering, etc.

On enquiry on requirement of NOC from STU/SLDC for scheduling to a entity within the control area of state and on implementation of concept of fragmented control area, CTU informed that as per earlier procedure separate NOC was not required for LTA to intra state entity. However, under the 2009 regulation, the intra state entity seeking LTA is to submit NOC from SLDC.

ERLDC clarified that if NOC is not sought by CTU then the same would be sought by ERLDC before commencing the scheduling.

OPTCL representative opined that if no concurrence of state is taken in case of LTA to intra state entity then the commercial settlement mechanism would be impossible. Any intra state entity may then approach CTU for LTA and the implications would have to be borne by the state.

Railway representative informed that they have already approached the appropriate state entities for NOC/clearance.

BSPTCL informed that their system may not carry railway power reliably as per studies.

