

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF THE
MUMBAI DISTRIBUTION NETWORK ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (M-DNAC)

Date :- 18 February, 2020 at 12.30 Hrs.

Venue :- MERC, 12th Floor Conference Hall

Present :- Shri. Dineshchandra Saboo, Member (External)
 Shri. Prafulla Varhade, Member (Commission's Officer)
 Shri. Dilip Dumbre, Member (Ombudsman's Officer)
 Shri. Rakesh Guhagarkar, Member (Commission's Officer)

Licensee's representatives:

Shri Sunil Joglekar -Tata Power
Smt Swati Mehendale – Tata Power
Shri Girish Pednekar – Tata Power.
Shri Kishor Patil – AEML
Shri. Vivek Mishra – AEML
Shri Pravin G. Phokmare – AEML
Shri. Rakesh Raj – AEML
Shri Sonu Karekar – AEML
Shri Ganesh Balasubramanian- AEML

Discussions held

A letter dated 15 January, 2020 had been received from STU regarding Grid connectivity to M/s. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. (BPCL) and M/s. Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd. (HPCL). In its letter, STU informed that Tata Power has submitted a Grid Connectivity Application to STU for meeting power demand of 200 MW of M/s. BPC L at Mahul, Mumbai. Also, another Grid Connectivity Application has been received from M/s. HPCL for power demand of 140 MW at Mahul, Mumbai. As informed in the letter, STU had obtained feasibility for the Grid Connectivity from three Transmission Licensees viz. AEML-T, MSETCL and TPC-T. After survey and load flow study, STU made a comparison of various connectivity options based on line length, ROW and Source Substation. STU further stated that since these schemes are consumer funded schemes and these consumers are located in Mumbai, these proposals are being referred to Mumbai Distribution Network Assessment Committee (M-DNAC) for further consideration.

On 18 February, 2020, a meeting of M-DNAC was held in the Commission's Office in presence of representatives of STU, TPC and AEML to discuss the letter received from STU.

At the meeting, STU representative briefly explained the proposals received by it and informed as under:

1. Both HPCL and BPCL are the existing consumers of TPC-D and these consumers are seeking extension of load at higher voltage level as a result of which grid connectivity has been sought.
2. The schemes are to be funded by the consumers.
3. STU had requested the Transmission Licensees to share the cost towards creating infrastructure for providing the grid connectivity, however, the Licensees didn't share the cost to STU.
4. STU's intention is to provide the least cost option to the consumers, hence the proposals are referred to M-DNAC for their consideration.
5. The Licensees are once again requested to furnish the cost towards creating infrastructure which would enable STU to decide the grid connectivity option in least cost manner.

Representative for TPC stated that:

1. Till today, STU has been approving grid connectivity to AEML-D and TPC-D without approaching M-DNAC. It is not clear as to under which Rule or Regulation, STU has approached M-DNAC with these cases. STU should provide the clarity on the same, after which further discussions could be held in these matters.
2. No regulation/procedure requires evaluation of capital expenditure by STU while approving the grid connectivity. STU's limited role is to verify the technical feasibility for the grid connectivity.
3. If the consumer is ready to bear the entire cost towards the grid connectivity and there is no impact on Transmission or Distribution ARR, then the consumer has to be given the right of selecting the Distribution Licensee of his choice.

Representative of AEML stated that it appears that STU has assumed that the consumers are ready to bear the infrastructure cost and there is no rule /regulation under which the consumer can be mandated to bear the infrastructure cost.

The Committee's observations are as under:

1. As per the Order dated 12 June, 2017 in Case No. 182 of 2014, the role and responsibility of M-DNAC is as under:

“135.6 The Institutional Mechanism shall evaluate and decide proposals from the Distribution Licensees on applications of Levels 3 to 5 in areas or locations in Scenario (d).

135.7 The Licensees shall submit monthly reports to the Institutional Mechanism regarding new connections released at Levels 1 and 2 in Scenario 53 (d), and upload them on their websites.The Committee shall report to the Commission any connection found to be of Level 3 and above but released as being under Level 1 or 2.

135.8 Each Licensee shall also provide details of applications being considered by it for new connections at Levels 3 to 5 in areas identified by it as falling in Scenarios 53(a) to (c), with a copy to the other Licensee, for the Institutional Mechanism to confirm that the area categorisation by the Licensee is correct. If it is not disputed by the other Licensee, the Institutional Mechanism shall dispose of the reference accordingly.”

Hence, the present proposals referred by STU does not fall under the role/responsibility of M-DNAC as per Case No. 182 of 2014. Further, deciding the least cost Transmission Licensee for grid connectivity purpose is not within the purview of M-DNAC. Hence, CE (STU) may take necessary action as per the prevailing grid connectivity Regulations/procedures.

Sd/-
Shri. Dineshchandra Saboo,
Member (External)

Sd/-
Shri Prafulla Varhade,
Member (Commission's Officer)

Sd/-
Shri. Dilip Dumbre,
Member (Ombudsman's Officer)

Sd/-
Shri. Rakesh Guhagarkar,
Member Convener (Commission's Officer)