

ORISSA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
BIDYUT NIYAMAK BHAWAN
UNIT-VIII, BHUBANESWAR - 751 012

Present: Shri B. K. Dash, Chairperson
Shri K.C. Badu, Member
Shri B.K. Misra, Member

Case No.132/2009

M/s A.C.C. Limited
Vrs.
OPTCL

.... **Petitioner**

.... **Respondent**

In the matter of: For establishment of communication and SCADA system by 31.12.2009 upto the nearest 220/132 KV s/s of OPTCL.

For the petitioner: Mr. R.P. Mahapatra, athorised representative for ACC Ltd

For the respondent: Mr. M.C. Muduli, AE, Mr. S.C. Patra, DGM, (Telecom),
OPTCL

Date of Hearing : 18.12.2009

Date of Order : 04.01.2010

ORDER

Mr. R.P. Mahapatra, athorised representative of the petitioner stated that the petitioner had filed a petition on 21.7.09 for exemption under Clause 1.8 of Orissa Grid Code, (OGC) Regulations, 2006 to permit synchronization of 2x15 MW CGP of the petitioner with the respondent's system pending commissioning of PLCC/SCADA which was registered as Case No. 92/09 and disposed of by this Commission vide order its dtd. 27.8.09 with the following observation:

"After hearing the parties and perusal of the case records the commission allowed time to M/s.ACC upto 31.12.09 to establish the communication and SCADA system under Regulation 1.8 of the OGC upto the nearest 220/132Kv S/s of OPTCL the SCADA interface point at Katapalli. The Commission observes that as the OPTCL is yet to establish SCADA interface system in its own 220/132 KV Grid s/s , denying the synchronization of the User's CGP to the State Grid on the ground of SCADA and Communication System is not appropriate. The Commission

had earlier ordered to increase the limit of any generator for injecting of power 5MW and above for establishment of SCADA and communication to power injection from generator (including CGP) upto 25MW. OPTCL is therefore, directed to allow synchronization of the CGP units of M/s.ACC with the State Grid subject to the condition that the latter puts load limiters at its end and OPTCL's Bargarh S/s to limit power injection maximum upto 25 MW only. OPTCL should not insist on a particular make of communication system and should adopt any developed mode of communication ,if technically feasible".

2. He also quoted the order dtd.15.7.09 passed by the Commission in Case No. 2/09 relating to leased line data communication facilities to the CGPs at paras 12(v) and 14 which are given below for better convenience.

"However, such provisions are to be exercised in a transparent and non-discriminating way by M/s. OPTCL (i.e. the STU, which also now operates the SLDC) in order to develop the electricity industry in a smooth and co-ordinated manner. Hence, the principle of due consultation with relevant stakeholders has been enshrined in Regulation 10.9 of the OGC, which states that mutually agreed procedure should be drawn up between the licensee and other users outlining inter responsibility, accountability and recording day-to day communication and data transmission on operational matters. To our understanding, such a procedure acceptable to all the user(s)/requester(s) is yet to be drawn up by SLDC. Therefore, in order to avoid any potential for dispute and/or discrimination between individual user(s)/requester(s) on a case to case basis, it is appropriate that M/s. OPTCL should develop this document as per provision under Clause 10.9 of the OGC, by publishing a Draft Procedure for Communication & Data Transmission, which should also include the scopes of all matters required to be prescribed by the SLDC/STU under the aforesaid General Connectivity Conditions of the CEA Regulations, and inviting comments thereon from all stake holders. Thereafter, it may finalise the agreed procedure, and furnish the same to the Commission for approval (including dissenting views received, if any). Once the same is approved, the

SLDC/STU is to give wide publicity to the procedure and place the same on their website for knowledge of all concerned.

Hence, the Commission at this stage would not like to go into the detailed merits and demerits of one mode of communication over the other. However, the Transmission Licensee should not insist on a particular type/mode of Communication like PLCC, if the Leased Line mode of Communication is found to be technically and economically suitable and may also allow the requester(s) or the user(s) to adopt the same in a non-discriminatory manner. In developing the desired procedure, the STU also will study the practices being followed by the CTU and other STUs in the country, and consider the recent/likely technological developments along with cost optimization. This exercise should be completed within 1 months of issue of this order”.

In spite of the above Orders of the Commission the respondent is not insisting on installation of PLCC/SCADA to expedite procurement action as per the BOQ which has been already communicated. The intention of petition is that the make of the equipments should conform only to the BOQ communicated, which was objected by the petitioner in Case No. 92/09. Till today the respondent has recently published a draft procedure for communication and dated transmission inviting suggestions from the stake holders. The respondent has not taken any action as per the observations of the Commission that “the Transmission Licensee should not have insisted on a particular type/ mode of communication like PLCC, if the leased line mode of communication is found to be technically and economically suitable, the same may be allowed in a non-discriminatory manner. In addition, the respondent insist that only ABB make PLCC equipment be provided, which is in violation of the Orders passed by the Commission in Case Nos.37,38,45 and 47 of 2007.

3. Mr. Mohapatra further stated that as the respondent has not approved the PLCC ordered by it (which is not of ABB make) and its failure to take action as directed by the Commission in Case No.02/2009, the petitioner could not proceed to procure and install the equipment for establishing the speech and data communication up to the nearest SCADA interface point namely 220/132 KV S/S at Katapalli. So he prayed the Commission to allow the petitioner to provide

Leased Line and data communication from its premises to the nearest SCADA interface point at the 220/132 KV Katapalli S/S through leased line and four months time may be allowed for procurement and commissioning of RTU and other equipment for transmitting the speech and data through leased line. He also further prayed to direct the respondent to provide necessary SCADA interface equipments at 220/132KV Katapalli S/S for transmission of speech and data up to the SLDC through Budhipadar 220KV S/S.

4. Mr. M.C. Muduli, AE(Telecom),OPTCL stated that the petitioner has not complied Order dated 27.8.2009 of the Commission in Case No. 92 /2009 for installation of PLCC / SCADA by it. Petitioner has not made any headway so far for compliance of the above order. Since the issue PLCC / SCADA has already been heard and disposed of in Case No. 92/09, the same matter need not again be raised on the ground of res judicata to save the precious time of the Commission, so he prayed that the petition should be dismissed outright, other wise, it shall only give scope to the petitioner to move before the Commission on a variety of twisted grounds instead of complying with the orders within the stipulated time i.e, 31.12.2009. He also submitted that the petitioner has not responded to the Public Notice published in OPTCL's website as well as in the local dailies inviting view / suggestions for preparation of draft procedure. It has brought to the kind notice of the Commission regarding difficulties in completing the exercise in absence of appropriate feedback from different quarters and extention of time for completion of the same upto 31.12.2009. The respondent is implementing the order of the Commission in letter and spirit. As per direction of the Commission at para 6 in Case No. 92/09, it crystal clear that any mode of communication can be adopted subject to technically feasibility. The petitioner has already allowed M/s HINDALCO to connect their RTUs through leased line on test basis and the performance of this link is yet to meet the acceptable level of performance for power system operation. Hence, it shall be prudent to use PLCC links for data and voice communication instead of the leased line to give desired result. He, further stated that the petitioner may provide speech and data communication through PLCC up to its existing SCADA interface point i.e. Meramunadali S/S, as the SCADA interface in Katapalli 220/132 KV S/S is yet to be commissioned.

5. As per direction of the Commission in Case No. 92/09 and 02/09 in the matter of utilizing a particular brand of PLCC equipment, the respondent submitted that, OPTCL management has carried out the said order by allowing the users to use PLCC / SCADA equipment of their choice provided that they should furnish an undertaking in prescribed format to take up the maintenance of all such equipment by themselves. However, if the user requires that maintenance of PLCC/ SCADA shall rest on OPTCL, then the user should have to procure the materials as recommended by OPTCL. In view of the above facts he prayed the Commission to dismiss the petition outright being devoid of merit and also to direct the petitioner to establish PLCC/ SCADA within 31.12.09 and no further time may be allowed to establish PLCC/SCADA upto the nearest existing SCADA interface point of OPTCL.
6. In Case No. 37,38,45,47/2007 (Order dtd. 13.3.08) the commission had observed that OPTCL should not insist on a particular communication equipment and accept any other equipment of other suppliers subject to technical compatibility. For logistic point of view maintenance of PLCC equipment mainly outdoor equipment has to remain with OPTCL. The Commission suggested that to avoid inconvenience, OPTCL may take the responsibility to procure install and commission the communication equipment as per their specified standards and requirements on deposit work basis and include the cost in the final bill of materials to be paid for by the users. This type of bulk procurement by OPTCL may lessen the cost of materials, time of the implementation and litigation if any.
7. After hearing the parties and perusal of the case records the Commission feels that the respondent has started the carrying out of the Commission's order in Case No.2/09 recently. In view of this the Commission allows time up to four months to the petitioner to establish RTU on or before 30.04.2010 at its premises and provide data communication through leased line up to SLDC-Bhubaneswar till such time OPTCL establish its SCADA interface point at the nearest 220/132 Grid S/S i.e.

Katapalli. The petitioner also provide PLCC link up to Katapalli S/S for speech communication and protection purpose.

8. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Sd/
(B. K. Misra)
Member

Sd/
(K.C. Badu)
Member

Sd/
(B. K. Das)
Chairperson