

**ODISHA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
BIDYUT NIYAMAK BHAWAN
PLOT NO.-4, CHUNOKOLI, SHAILASHREE VIHAR
BHUBANESWAR - 751 021**

**Present: Shri U. N. Behera, Chairperson
Shri G. Mohapatra, Member**

Case No. 58/2021

GRIDCO	Petitioner
Vrs.		
DoE, GoO & Others	Respondents

In the matter of: **Application under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and other enabling provisions along with direction of the Commission vide order dated 05.02.2018 in Case No. 44 & 45/2016 & Order dated 09.04.2019 in Case No. 28 & 29 of 2018, seeking direction of the Commission for amendment of the power purchase agreement executed with 8 nos. of Solar PV project developers of 1 MW each commissioned in the State of Odisha under RPSSGP scheme.**

For Petitioner: Ms. Sasmita Patjoshi, DGM (PP), GRIDCO,

Respondents: Shri Tanmay Das on behalf of M/s. Raajratan Energy Holding Pvt. Ltd., Shri R. P. Mahapatra, the authorized representative of M/s. Molisati Vinimay Pvt. Limited, M/s. Vivacity Renewable Energy Pvt. Limited, M/s. Shri Mahavir Ferro Alloys Pvt. Ltd. and M/s. Jay Iron and Steel, Shri Bibhu Charan Swain, the authorized representative of M/s. S. N. Mohanty and M/s. MGM Green Energy Pvt. Ltd., Shri V. Wagle, TPCODL, Shri K. C. Nanda, DGM (Fin.), TPWODL, Ms. Malancha Ghose, Asst. GM (RA), TPNODL and Shri Binod Nayak, Asst. GM (Comm.), TPSODL, Ms. Sonali Pattnaik, ALO I/c, DoE, GoO, the representative of OREDA and the representative of SLDC are present.

Nobody is present on behalf of M/s. Abacus Holding Pvt. Limited.

ORDER

Date of hearing: 23.11.2021

Date of order: 20.12.2021

The petitioner GRIDCO Ltd. has filed the present application under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and other enabling provisions along with direction of the Commission vide Order dated 05.02.2018 in Case Nos. 44 & 45/2016 and Order dated 09.04.2019 in Case Nos. 28 & 29 of 2018, seeking direction of the Commission for amendment of the Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs) executed with 8 nos. of Solar PV project developers of 1 MW each commissioned in the State of Odisha under RPSSGP scheme.

2. The Petitioner-GRIDCO has submitted that they have executed PPAs with 8 nos. of Solar PV Power Developers (SPDs) on dated 21.08.2010 for procurement of solar power of 1 MW capacity each, under “Rooftop PV and Small Solar Power Generation Programme” (RPSSGP) Scheme of MNRE, Govt. of India, which have been approved by the Commission vide its Order dated 04.04.2012 in Case No. 84/2011. However, earlier the Commission vide its order dated 09.07.2010 in Case Nos. 58-105/2010 had determined the tariff @ Rs.18.52/- per kWh for such SPDs with specified technical and financial parameters and GRIDCO has been paying this tariff to all 8 nos. of SPDs since FY 2011-12.
3. GRIDCO has submitted that the downloaded meter data are being utilized for preparation of energy account of respective DISCOMs after processing through Energy Accounting & Settlement System (EASS) billing software. Accordingly Energy Export Statements were also issued to the SPDs with effect from July 2013 as a back to back arrangement. The same has been covered under “Change in Law” Clause of the PPA dated 21.08.2010. However, as per the OERC Order dated 05.02.2018 in Case Nos. 44 & 45/2016 & Order dated 09.04.2019 in Case Nos. 28 & 29/2018 in the matter of preparation of bills for the SPDs under RPSSGP Scheme, the billing is to be made basing on the JMR data instead of State Energy Accounting Statement. In this regard, GRIDCO has made discussions with SLDC, EBC and concerned DISCOMS and it was opined that it would be difficult to account the energy for 8 nos. of solar generators considering the JMR data (Manual Data) as those cannot be processed through the billing software. Further, as per the MoU with IREDA on dated 15.04.2011, on disbursement of GBI under RPSSGP Scheme, billing for the 8 nos. of SPV projects is being done on initial-final reading reflected in the EBC Energy Export Statement of the State Energy Accounting (SEA). Now the solar developers under RPSSGP Scheme except M/s. Shri Mahavir Ferro Alloys Pvt. Ltd. and M/s. Vivacity Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd. have agreed and given their consent for billing on the basis of EBC Energy Export Statements as per initial and final readings.
4. GRIDCO has submitted that the tariff payable to the subject SPV projects commissioned under RPSSGP Scheme is Rs.18.52/kWh for the life period of 25 years as approved by the Commission vide Order dated 09.07.2010. As per the said order, the project cost allowed to the 1 MW solar generators is Rs.17 Crore and CUF @ 18.5%. With this CUF, the solar generators are supposed to export 16,20,000 units

annually. But they failed to generate as per the benchmark fixed by OERC, which is affecting GRIDCO in meeting the RPO. This may be due to improper maintenance of the plants. However, the 1 MW SPV projects of M/s. Abacus Holdings Pvt. Ltd. at Sonapur and M/s. Rajratna Energy Holdings Pvt. Ltd. at Bolangir, have always maintained the annual generation of more than 12 lakh units till date. Further, M/s. Rajratna Energy Holdings Pvt. Ltd. has recently replaced some of the original thin-film Solar Modules with poly-silicon Solar Modules to increase the generation of its plant.

5. GRIDCO has submitted that as per the RPSSGP guidelines issued by MNRE and the MoU signed with IREDA for the calculation of Generation Based Incentive (GBI), the Base rate is Rs.5.50/-kWh for the Projects commissioned during FY 2010-11 and it will be escalated @ 3% every year. Since all the 8 nos. of 1 MW SPV projects got commissioned during FY 2011-12, the Base Rate is Rs.5.67/kWh i.e. with 3% escalation over Rs.5.50/kWh. The GBI applicable for the Scheme is the difference between the generic tariff determined by the CERC (i.e. Rs.17.91/kWh for FY 2011-12) and the Base Rate of Rs.5.67/kWh. Hence, GRIDCO is eligible for reimbursement of the GBI @ Rs.12.24/Kwh (Rs.17.91/Kwh – Rs.5.67/Kwh) only from IREDA. GRIDCO is reimbursing the GBI basing on CERC generic tariff of Rs.17.91/kwh, whereas paying to the solar developers @ Rs.18.52/Kwh, the tariff fixed by OERC, which is Rs.0.61/Kwh more than CERC tariff. Hence, GRIDCO is bearing the burden of Rs.0.61/-kWh. Therefore, GRIDCO has levied the penalty of Rs.0.61/kWh from FY 2013-14 onwards only to those SPV generators under RPSSGP Scheme who are generating less than 12,00,000 units over a Financial Year. No SPD objected on the penalty levied by GRIDCO basing on the Record Notes of discussions dated 17.07.2012 and 05.04.2013 and have been paying penalty @ Rs.0.61/Kwh since FY 2013-14 i.e. from the date of the Record Notes of discussion. But after a lapse of 4 / 5 years, they are objecting to such deduction which is not only barred by law of limitation but also law of promissory estoppel.
6. GRIDCO has submitted that all the PSAs /PPAs executed by GRIDCO under different schemes of MNRE and under State bidding schemes have the provision of Penalty / Compensation for the Shortfall in generation except the subject PPAs executed with the 8 nos. of Solar Developers under RPSSGP Scheme. Also the said PSAs/PPAs have the provision of Minimum and Maximum CUF limits for drawl of power by GRIDCO.

Accordingly, as specified in the Order dated 09.07.2010, the Maximum limit for the generation should be 16 lakh units per annum @ 18.5 % CUF and the Minimum limit may be considered as 12 lakhs units per annum @ 13.6 % CUF as being proposed by GRIDCO through the Record Notes of Discussion dated 05.04.2013.

7. GRIDCO submitted that, they had requested the Commission earlier to include a clause “Penalty for shortfall in generation” in the PPAs dated 21.08.2010 @ Rs.0.61/Kwh to address the shortfall in supply of power as per the benchmark fixed by OERC for RPSSGP Scheme. As directed by the Commission vide Order dated 05.02.2018 in Case Nos. 44 & 45/2016 and Order dated 09.04.2019 in Case Nos. 28 & 29/2018, GRIDCO approached all the 8 nos. of Solar developers under RPSSGP scheme with proposal for amendment of the existing PPA dated 21.08.2010 to include the penalty provision, which was refused by the SPDs. Hence, GRIDCO has prayed the Commission for intervention in the matter and to issue appropriate direction for amendment of the PPAs dated 21.08.2010 to include Penalty Clause as stated above for shortfall in generation by the subject SPDs. GRIDCO has further submitted that in case of amendments in 8 nos. of PPAs dated 21.08.2010 executed under RPSSGP Scheme, the project specific facts will also be incorporated in the PPA as amendments as per the observations of the Commission in its Order dated 04.04.2012 in Case No. 84/2011.
8. The respondent M/s. Abacus Holdings Pvt. Ltd. has submitted that the solar panel efficiency degradation being about 20% over a 25 years period, there would be approximately 0.8% reduction in generation each year as per standard parameters of solar panel manufacturing company and other concerned institutions. However, its 1 MW solar plant is generating more than 12 lakh units of solar power annually in spite of having excessive grid down time (approximately 300 hours annually during generation time). Hence they are not liable to pay any penalty. They are separately filing a claim before WESCO/TPWODL for deemed generation revenue losses incurred due to excessive grid downtime during solar power generation period. Therefore, they have prayed the Commission not to take any adverse view against them.
9. The respondent M/s. Rajratna Energy Holdings Pvt. Ltd. has submitted that it has always maintained annual generation of more than 12 lakh units. Hence it has never been subjected to the said penalty of 61 p/Kwh until now. However, the respondent

has submitted that the Commission has already decided the issue vide its orders dated 05.02.2018 and 09.04.2019, declaring that the PPAs cannot be amended/modified, without the necessary consent of the parties involved. The petitioner has still proceeded to approach the Commission despite the categorical objections made by the SPDs. Hence, the present petition is not maintainable and is barred by the principle of *res judicata*. The endeavour of the petitioner seeking amendment/modification to the PPA unilaterally is contrary to the provisions of PPA and not in conformity to the extant regulatory framework in the state. Neither the RPSSGP scheme nor the orders of the Commission in this regard or the provisions of the PPA provide for any criteria or mandate in respect of a minimum annual generation, and levy/imposition of penalty on account of the annual generation being less than 12 lakh units. Further the record note of discussion in the meeting held on 05.04.2013 is not an accepted note of discussion as it has been unilaterally prepared by the petitioner and not agreed by the solar PV developers. In view of the above the respondent has prayed the Commission to dismiss the present petition with a direction to GRIDCO to refrain from making any deductions on account of annual generation lesser than 12 lakh units from the payable energy tariff of Rs.18.52/Kwh decided by the Commission vide its order dated 09.07.2010 passed in Case Nos. 58-105 of 2010.

10. Shri Bibhu Charan Swain, the authorised representative of the respondents M/s. S N Mohanty (Partnership Firm) and M/s. MGM Green Energy Ltd., has submitted that they have no objection in case EBC reading is adopted in place of joint meter reading (JMR) for raising the energy bills. However, GRIDCO should share the EBC meter readings to the respondents on 1st or 2nd date of each month so as to enable the SPDs to raise the energy bills in time and avail rebate for timely payment.
11. Shri Swain further has submitted that the Commission vide its order in Case No. 87 of 2010, has determined the tariff for the subject solar PV projects at Rs.18.52/Kwh considering the CUF as 18.50% with annual gross generation of 16.21 lakh units per annum and the project life of 25 years. Neither PPA nor the said order of the Commission states that the tariff of Rs.18.52/Kwh is payable only when there is a guaranteed generation of 16.21 lakh units per annum. The solar developers are maintaining the solar power plants with all prudent practice. Since the solar insolation is not uniform throughout the state, the actual CUF varies resulting in varied generation. No such SPDs have achieved 16.21 lakh units per annum in Odisha with

CUF of 18.5%. Once the CUF is less than the assumed CUF of 18.5% the developers loses huge amount for less generation at the tariff of Rs.18.52/Kwh. He has submitted that the statement of GRIDCO that the solar power developer were agreed for deduction of 61 p/Kwh from the entire generation of each month in case they failed to generate 12 lakh units per annum, is not correct as the documents cited by GRIDCO is a record note and not a minutes of meeting or agreement signed by the parties. Further, the respondents have raised objection to the said record note dt.05.04.2013 intimating GRIDCO that it has never been agreed to such deduction of 61 p/Kwh by GRIDCO and also intimated that no such cause of penalty exists in the PPA. Hence such deduction of 61 p/Kwh by GRIDCO is totally unlawful and quite illegal.

12. Shri Swain has stated that the respondents have never agreed for inclusion of penalty provision in the PPA and strongly objects to the unilateral proposal of GRIDCO for amendment of the PPA. He has stated that GRIDCO has relied on the PSA with SECI for procurement of 300 MW solar power with penalty provision and trying to justify for imposition of the same on the 1 MW solar plants which were commissioned long back under RPSSGP scheme of National Solar Mission where such provision and conditions were not there in the scheme document and accordingly the PPA was approved by the Commission. Therefore, the reliance of GRIDCO on the PSA signed with SECI has no merit in the present case. In view of the above, the respondents have prayed the Commission to reject the prayer of GRIDCO for unlawful deduction of 61 p/Kwh from the energy bills of 1 MW solar power developer and direct GRIDCO to refund the deductions made by it earlier along with associated DPS.
13. Shri R P Mohapatra, the authorised representative of the respondents M/s. Shri Mahavir Ferro Alloys Pvt. Ltd., M/s. Vivacity Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd., M/s. Jay Iron and Steel and M/s. Molisati Vinimay Pvt. Ltd., has submitted that the Commission in its order dated 25.02.2018 in Case Nos. 44 & 45 of 2016 and order dated 09.04.2019 in Case Nos. 28 & 29 of 2018 and finally in order dated 22.06.2021 in Case Nos. 53 & 54 of 2020, have directed that any deduction for lesser generation shall be based on incorporation in the PPA which should be placed before the Commission for approval. In this regard, para 60 of the order dated 22.06.2021 in Case Nos. 53 & 54 of 2020 is reproduced below:

“Lastly, the GRIDCO’s unilateral action of deducting penalty for lesser generation without incorporating relevant provisions in the PPA with our approval is a gross

violation of our order. The Commission has categorically in Para 14 of their order has directed that “in absence of legally bound agreement unilateral deduction for lesser generation is not permissible. However, once the PPA is approved GRIDCO shall act upon the same. We direct parties to file the PPA before the Commission within three months for approval”. Our order had been issued on 09.04.2019 which was more than two years ago. But GRIDCO has failed to take any action for approval of the revised PPA but rather has started unilateral deduction of penalty. This tantamounts to defiance of our order.”

14. He has submitted that the present petition has been filed by GRIDCO with the intention to prevent refund of amounts which is illegally deducted from the SPDs. The PSA /PPA executed by GRIDCO with SECI for procurement of 300 MW solar power and with M/s. Aditya Birla Renewable Energy Ltd. as submitted by the petitioner, have provision of minimum and maximum limit for drawal by GRIDCO. This provision is not penalty for lesser generation as was being deducted by GRIDCO from the respondent SPDs. Further, the provisions in the PSA executed with other parties by GRIDCO in 2018 cannot be made applicable mutatis-mutandis to the PPAs executed with 1 MW SPDs in the year 2010. Further in the Commission’s orders relating to suo-motu proceedings for finalisation of tariff of RE sources, there is no provision for deduction of penalty for lesser generation.
15. Shri Mohapatra has submitted that the PPAs executed on 21.08.2010 with the 8 nos. of SPDs, were approved after public hearing and order was passed on 04.04.2012 wherein at para 14 & 15 the Commission has observed as given below:
 - “14. Commission in view of such a scenario observes that both GRIDCO and Developers have not shown any disagreement in the PPA signed between them. It may, therefore, be presumed that executants of PPA have no problem with the PPA and they foresee no legal hassle in the future. However, it is seen that the PPAs are mostly of generic nature and there ought to be clarity on project specific points in each PPA such as name and details of Interconnection point, Delivery Point and metering drawing. GRIDCO and project proponents are therefore advised to have a limited amendment of PPAs incorporating the specific details as mentioned above.
 15. The Commission approves the 8 PPAs in question with the stipulations that modifications which are most in clarificatory in nature be carried out by GRIDCO and the respective developers without further reference to the Commission.”
16. Shri Mohapatra stated that in the absence of adequate data the Commission had determined the tariff for the 8 nos. 1 MW solar PV projects assuming uniform insolation throughout the state with CUF of 18.5%. As per the submission of GRIDCO, the actual CUF achieved is less than 15%. Therefore, the SPDs are

incurring heavy loss due to lesser generation and hence, should be compensated rather than being penalised. The technology available during development of the subject plants, was not well developed and therefore there was lesser generation than anticipated.

17. The respondents TPCODL, TPWODL, TPNODL and TPSODL have submitted that rate of penalty of 61 p/Kwh proposed by GRIDCO is presumably based on the difference between the applicable OERC tariff of Rs.18.52/Kwh and CERC determined tariff of Rs.17.91/Kwh on which GRIDCO is eligible for GBI. They stated that since the extant PPAs do not provide the proposed penalty provision, the Commission may decide the matter keeping both public interest and contractual obligations under the PPAs.
18. Heard the parties and their written submissions are taken into record. The Commission observed that GRIDCO has approached the Commission for amendment of the PPAs dated 21.08.2010 executed with the 1 MW SPDs, to include a clause “Penalty for shortfall in generation” @ Rs.0.61/Kwh to address the shortfall in supply of power as per the benchmark CUF of 18.5% considered by the Commission while determining the tariff for the 1 MW solar plants under RPSSGP Scheme. The Commission observed that this issue was heard by the Commission in Case Nos. 44 and 45 of 2016 and in Case Nos. 28 and 29 of 2018. The Commission at para 14 of its order dated 05.02.2018 passed in Case Nos. 44 & 45 of 2016, had observed as given hereunder:

“14. x x x x x

Regarding deduction of Rs.0.61/ Kwh, for not maintaining 1 lakh units per month generation standard, GRIDCO stated that the same has been agreed in a meeting between the parties subsequent to the signing of PPA. The Petitioner stated that in that meeting it was decided that average annual generation would be 12 lakh units and not one lakh unit per month. The Commission observes that this modification is outside PPA and has not been approved (by Commission) yet. Therefore, in case it has been agreed by parties, the same is to be included in PPA with appropriate amendment/ inclusion and placed before Commission for approval.”

19. Further, the Commission at para 14 of its order dated 09.04.2019 passed in Case Nos. 28 & 29 of 2018, had observed as follows:

“As per law any power purchase by GRIDCO is to be proceeded by approval of the Commission under Section 86 (1) (b) of Electricity Act, 2003. Thus the transactions till date, between parties has not sanctity of law. Therefore, as per our order dated 05.02.2018 the parties were advised to bring about changes in the PPA on this issue and place the same before the Commission for its approval. However, till date this has not materialised. In absence of a legally bound agreement unilateral deduction for

lesser generation is not permissible. However, once the PPA is approved GRIDCO shall act upon the same. We direct parties to file the PPA before the Commission within three months for approval.”

20. The Commission observed that GRIDCO had filed the present petition in view of the aforesaid directions of the Commission in its orders dated 05.02.2018 and 09.04.2019. However, from the submissions made by the respondent SPDs in the present case, it is observed that none of them have agreed for inclusion of proposed penalty clause in the PPA for shortfall in generation. The Commission observed that now solar power is available at much cheaper rate than the tariff of Rs.18.52/Kwh fixed for the subject 1 MW solar plants. In case of supply of less power by the SPDs it is a loss to the SPDs and not to GRIDCO. It is a fact that the normative CUF of 18.5% is not available to the solar generators uniformly throughout the State. That was accepted in absence of recorded data for tariff purpose only at that point of time. It has no relationship with the actual generation which gradually slides over time due to deterioration of the solar cells. However, it will be justified to consider compensation to GRIDCO for shortfall in generation by the SPDs when GRIDCO pays any penalty for not meeting the RPO target for any contract year. In case GRIDCO pays any penalty for not meeting its RPO target, then the developer should compensate GRIDCO and this compensation shall be equal to the penalty payable (including RECs) by GRIDCO. It shall be proportional to the shortfall in solar energy generation during the Contract Year. Thus, GRIDCO may claim such compensation for shortfall in solar generation only when penalty is levied on it for such shortfall. The parties are directed to incorporate the above compensation provision in the PPA and submit the amended PPA for the approval of the Commission.
21. In the present petition GRIDCO has also raised the issue of billing procedure i.e. regarding meter reading for preparation of the monthly energy bills. This issue was also heard by the Commission earlier and the Commission at para 14 of its order dated 05.02.2018 passed in Case Nos. 44 & 45 of 2016, had observed as under:

“14. The billing procedure has been defined in the clause 5(a)(i) of the PPA which shall be on the basis of joint meter reading promptly following the end of each month for the energy supplied and amount will be due on the fourth working day following the delivery of billing invoice by the Petitioner. GRIDCO’s argument to treat the modified billing procedure basing upon Export statements of ABT compliant meters by EBC (Energy Billing Centre) installed latter, as “change in law” does not find strength due to presence of existing PPA which needs to be honoured. Therefore, the joint meter reading shall be

taken by OPTCL / DISCOMs and the project proponent on the first day of every month at the delivery point as per Clause 8.1 (i) of the PPA.

x x x x x x x .”

22. Further, the Commission at para 15 of its order dated 09.04.2019 passed in Case Nos. 28 & 29 of 2018, had observed as follows:

“15. In the present cases, on the issue of billing on joint meter reading, the respondent GRIDCO has submitted that they will accept the monthly energy bills based on joint meter readings, if such bills are raised by the petitioners with supporting documents. On the other hand, the petitioners have submitted that no arrangements was made for recording the joint meter readings, hence they are unable to raise bills based on the same. In view of the above, GRIDCO is directed to make necessary arrangements in consultation with OPTCL/DISCOMs and project proponent to take joint meter reading on the 1st day of the succeeding month and billing should be made by the petitioner in line with the provisions of the PPA.”

23. Further, the Commission at para 58 of its order dated 22.06.2021 passed in Case Nos. 53 & 54 of 2020, had observed as follows:

“58. On the first direction of the Commission, GRIDCO has not adhered to our order taking the plea that it will be difficult to account energy as Joint Meter Reading (JMR) data cannot be processed in the billing software which is done for all other generators. We want to point out para 15 of our order dated 09.04.2019 where the Commission had directed GRIDCO for Joint Meter Reading on their own submission that they would accept monthly energy bill based on the Joint Meter Reading. In spite of their submission during the proceeding, had they faced any difficulty for Joint Meter Reading afterwards they could have come for review of our order. But they have not done that. Rather with scant regard to the order of the Commission they on their own have convened a meeting of parties and decided a different methodology of meter reading which is contrary to our order. This action of GRIDCO is a clear cut wilful violation of our order.”

24. Now, in the present petition GRIDCO has submitted that they have made discussions with SLDC, EBC and concerned DISCOMs and it was opined that it would be difficult to account the energy for 8 nos. of solar generators considering the JMR data (Manual Data) as those cannot be processed through the billing software. Further, as per the MoU with IREDA on dated 15.04.2011, on disbursement of GBI under RPSSGP Scheme, billing for the 8 nos. of SPV projects is being done on initial-final reading reflected in the EBC Energy Export Statement of the State Energy Accounting (SEA). GRIDCO submitted that now all the solar developers under RPSSGP Scheme except M/s. Shri Mahavir Ferro Alloys Pvt. Ltd. and M/s. Vivacity Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd. have agreed and given their consent for billing on the basis of EBC Energy Export Statements as per initial and final readings. From the present submissions of

the respondent SPDs, the Commission observed that most of the SPDs have no objection for taking the meter readings on the basis of EBC Energy Export Statements as per initial and final readings towards preparation of their monthly energy bills. There is innovation in meter reading procedures in the meantime. In view of the above the Commission is of the opinion that GRIDCO may discuss with all the 8 nos. of SPDs in presence of the representatives of SLDC, EBC and concerned DISCOMS and explain the SPDs the advantage of EBC meter reading for the purpose of billing in place of JMR and accordingly amendments may be made in the PPA. The above amendments may be incorporated in the agreement and submitted to the Commission for appraisal.

15. With the above observations and directions, the case is disposed of.

Sd/-
(G. Mohapatra)
Member

Sd/-
(U. N. Behera)
Chairperson