

Record of Proceedings dated 04.08.2018

O. P. No. 34 of 2015

&

I. A. No. 17 of 2015

&

I. A. No. 17 of 2017

&

I. A. No. 18 of 2017

Indian Wind Power Association vs NEDCAP, APCPDCL & APTRANSCO

Petition seeking issuance of regulation for determination of RE Tariff based on CERC terms and conditions for tariff determination from renewable sources regulation dated 16.09.2009 for procurement of wind energy by distribution licensee.

I. A. No. 17 of 2015 seeking to implead the petitioners as party / respondents in I. A. No. 17 of 2015

I. A. No. 17 of 2017 seeking the petitioners in I. A. No. 17 of 2015 to amend the title in I. A. No. 17 of 2015 and substitute new parties as respondents in it.

I. A. No. 18 of 2017 seeking to amend the title to the original petition by substituting the respondents No. 4 to 6 in place of respondents No. 1 to 3.

Sri. Deepak Chowdhary, Induslaw Advocates for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the Respondents along with Ms. Pravalika, Advocate and Smt. Rajeshwari, Asst. General Manager for impleading petitioners are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner is an association and it had filed the present petition, seeking determination of renewable tariff regulation and based on such regulation tariff duly following the CERC Regulations. The association has also filed an interlocutory application to amend the title to the main petition.

The representative of the respondents while supporting the plea of the petitioner, stated that they have filed an application to implead themselves as respondents and later filed another I. A. for amendment of the official respondents in the implead application. The counsel for the respondents had no objection to the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner.

The Commission sought to know whether the association is having any project in the State of Telangana. The counsel for the petitioner emphasized that the petitioner is only an association. The Commission observed that as a last chance

Commission has circulated a paper on wind generic tariff and giving an opportunity to all wind generators. The counsel for the petitioner has stated that the association supports the initiative of wind generic tariff. He also requested for ordering amendment of the title as pleaded in all the I. As.

The Commission observed that as the Commission initiated the generic tariff determination and scheduled the matter for public hearing on 07.08.2018, there is no requirement of continuing the present proceedings and therefore, the same is closed.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 35 of 2015
And
I. A. No. 19 of 2017

M/s Axis Wind Energy Limited & 6 others vs GoAP & 6 others

Petition seeking framing guidelines determining evacuation policy and wheeling charges for captive generation or sale to third parties.

I. A. seeking amendment the title shown in the petition by deleting Respondents No. 5 & 6 and adding Respondents No. 8 to 10.

Smt. Rajeshwari, Asst. General Manager for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the Respondents along with MS. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The representative of the petitioner stated that the petitioner is a wind generating company and it had filed the present petition, seeking framing guidelines for evacuation policy and exemption of wheeling charges for captive and third party sale of wind generation. The petitioner had also filed an interlocutory application to amend the title to the main petition. The counsel for the respondents had no objection to the submissions made by the representative of the petitioner.

The Commission is in the process of fixing the wind generic tariff. The Commission is of the view that the approvals of the TSREDCO will not have an impact on the said tariff. The MOUs will not be helpful in any manner. Responding to the prayer of the petitioner, it was conveyed that generic tariff will take care of wheeling charges etc. The petitioner can also offer its comments and suggestions on the discussion paper.

The Commission observed that as the Commission initiated the generic tariff determination and scheduled the matter for public hearing on 07.08.2018, there is no requirement of continuing the present proceedings and therefore, the same is closed.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 86 of 2015

Indian Wind Power Association Vs. TSTRANSCO, TSDISCOMS & TGNREDCL

Petition filed for re-fixation of several factors that form part of the tariff

Smt. Rajeshwari, Asst. General Manager for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the Respondents along with MS. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The representative of the petitioner stated that the petitioner is an association and it had filed the present petition, seeking determination of wind generic tariff and parameters applicable to Telangana. The counsel for the respondents had no objection to the submissions made by the representative of the petitioner.

The Commission is in the process of fixing the wind generic tariff. The Commission is of the view that the approvals of the TSREDCO will not have an impact on the said tariff. The MOUs will not be helpful in any manner. Responding to the prayer of the petitioner, it was conveyed that generic tariff will take care of wheeling charges etc. The petitioner can also offer its comments and suggestions on the discussion paper.

The Commission observed that as the Commission initiated the generic tariff determination and scheduled the matter for public hearing on 07.08.2018, there is no requirement of continuing the present proceedings and therefore, the same is closed.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No 87 of 2015
&

I. A. No. 30 of 2015

Wind independent Power Producers Association & another Vs TSDISCOMS

Petition filed seeking determination of tariff for wind energy projects beyond 31.03.2015.

Application filed for amendment of the title of the original petition.

Sri. P. Soma Sekhara Naidu, Advocate representing Sri. P. Vikram, Advocate for the petitioners and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondents along with Ms. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that he is yet to receive a vakalat on behalf of the petitioners and therefore requests time for filing vakalat. The Commission observed that the parties ought to have appeared as association has no role as they do not own any project. The petitioners had also filed an interlocutory application to amend the title to the main petition.

The counsel for the respondents had no objection to the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner.

The Commission sought to know whether the association is having any project in the State of Telangana. The counsel for the petitioner emphasized that the petitioner is only an association. The Commission observed that as a last chance Commission has circulated a paper on wind generic tariff and giving an opportunity to all wind generators. He also requested for ordering amendment of the title as pleaded in the I. A.

The Commission observed that as the Commission initiated the generic tariff determination and scheduled the matter for public hearing on 07.08.2018, there is no requirement of continuing the present proceedings and therefore, the same is closed.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 2 of 2018

M/s. RSR Power Private Limited Vs. TSREDCO, TSDISCOMs & TSTRANSCO

Petition filed seeking determination of the tariff by notifying the regulation for renewable energy projects in the State of Telangana.

Sri. Deepak Chowdary, Advocate for Induslaw for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondents along with Ms. Pravalika, Advocate are present.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner had established 20 MW wind project and developed after signing with NEDCAP. There is no wind tariff fixed by the Commission at present. All internal arrangements have been made ready but external connectivity is not yet completed as issues are pending with TRANSCO. The Commission has enquired with TSREDCO as to why they were not liaising with TRANSCO and DISCOMs having given approvals to the developers. The TSREDCO should take the responsibility of following up with TRANSCO and DISCOMs regarding connectivity issues. If such responsibility is not taken, they need not give approvals as they are burdensome with fees and charges to be paid by developers.

When the counsel for petitioner has raised the issue of cost incurred in establishing the project, the Commission has pointed out that the cost estimate does not matter as generic tariff is proposed to be decided by the Commission. It is the view of the Commission that the TRANSCO should address and ease the difficulties of developer regarding the issues of connectivity. In case of issues are not getting resolved the developer can approach the Commission afresh.

The fixing of generic tariff by the Commission does not mean that the Commission will direct the DISCOMs to enter into PPAs. The standing counsel for the DISCOMs was directed to address the stand of TRANSCO on the issues of connectivity. When the counsel for the petitioner has raised that the feasibility has come long back but due to bifurcation of the State, nothing further has happened, the Commission has directed the DISCOM to give details in the counter. The case stands closed.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 3 of 2018

M/s. Siemens Gamesa Renewable Power Private Limited Vs. TSREDCO,
TSDISCOMs & TSTRANSCO

Petition filed seeking determination of the tariff by notifying the regulation for renewable energy projects in the State of Telangana.

Sri. Deepak Chowdary, Advocate for Induslaw for the petitioner, Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondents along with Ms. Pravalika, Advocate and Sri. L.S.V. Prasad, General Manager for TSREDCO are present.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner had established 20 MW wind project and developed after signing with NEDCAP. There is no wind tariff fixed by the Commission at present. All internal arrangements have been made ready but external connectivity is not yet completed as issues are pending with TRANSCO. The Commission has enquired with TSREDCO as to why they were not liaising with TRANSCO and DISCOMs having given approvals to the developers. The TSREDCO should take the responsibility of following up with TRANSCO and DISCOMs regarding connectivity issues. If such responsibility is not taken, they need not give approvals as they are burdensome with fees and charges to be paid by developers.

When the counsel for petitioner has raised the issue of cost incurred in establishing the project, the Commission has pointed out that the cost estimate does not matter as generic tariff is proposed to be decided by the Commission. It is the view of the Commission that the TRANSCO should address and ease the difficulties of developer regarding the issues of connectivity. In case of issues are not getting resolved the developer can approach the Commission afresh.

The fixing of generic tariff by the Commission does not mean that the Commission will direct the DISCOMs to enter into PPAs. The standing counsel for the DISCOMs was directed to address the stand of TRANSCO on the issues of connectivity. When the counsel for the petitioner has raised that the feasibility has come long back but due to bifurcation of the State, nothing further has happened, the Commission has directed the DISCOM to give details in the counter. The case stands closed.

Sd/-
Chairman