

| <b>Date of Order</b> | <b>Order with Signature</b>   | <b>Office notes as action taken on order</b> |
|----------------------|---|--|
| 06-07-2021           | <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Case No. 14/2020, 15/2020 &amp; 16/2020</u></b></p> <p>Petitioner BSPHCL is represented by Shri A. K Sinha Director Technical and SECI is represented by Shri Mudit Jain, Ms. Neha, Shri M.G Ramachandran Sr. Advocate, Ms. Srishti Khindaria Advocate, Ms. Tanya Sareen Advocate.</p> <p>Hearing in the matter through video conferencing was taken up today as scheduled.</p> <p>2. During the hearing through video conferencing today, Shri M.G Ramachandran Sr. Advocate appearing on behalf of SECI has submitted that in compliance of the commission's order dated 22.06.2021 they have submitted the soft copy of reply to the queries raised by the commission and requested to condone the 4 days delay in filing the reply and also informed that the hard copy of reply is in transit and reach to the commission shortly. Commission taking into the consideration for the restriction imposed by the different State Govt. due to surge of covid-19 cases allows the prayer made by Shri M.G Ramachandran Sr. Advocate.</p> <p>Whereas during the course of hearing, commission has raised few queries on the reply submitted by the SECI. Shri A. K Sinha Director (Technical) presenting the case on behalf of petitioner tried to clarify the queries and requested the commission to adjourn matter today and sought one day time to reply the queries raised by the commission.</p> <p>3. In view of above, commission granted time with a direction that the SECI as well as BSPHCL shall submit their reply on the aforementioned issues by <b>09.07.2021</b> and directed the petitioners to furnish the following:</p> <p>1) Refer annexure-I and II; petitioner have submitted regarding calculation of anticipated requirement of solar/ Non-solar power for 10 years (FY 2021-22 to FY 2031-32). upon review and points</p> |  |

| <b>Date of Order</b> | <b>Order with Signature</b>  | <b>Office notes as action taken on order</b> |
|----------------------|--|--|
|                      | <p>discussed during hearing, commission directs the following:</p> <p>a) In revise calculation, Petitioner shall not consider 480 MW solar power and 210 MW power from Hybrid project which is not yet approved by commission.</p> <p>b) Petitioner shall include the previous backlogs of deficit in RPO trajectory for FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 in its computation.</p> <p>c) commission observe that assuming the current level (FY 2021-22) of RPO trajectory, there is a surplus solar power up to FY 2029-30, whereas surplus non-solar power up to FY 2024-25, which cannot justify the instant procurement.</p> <p>In view of above, petitioner shall furnish the name of the conventional plants whose variable cost is higher than the maximum tariffs of instant procurement and its corresponding units to be generated, so that in case of power surplus scenario, the costlier power with high variable cost shall be surrendered and further, petitioner should review the PPAs which are nearing 25 years of its competition.</p> <p>d) While calculating anticipated requirement of Non-solar power for 10 years (FY 2021-22 to FY 2031-32), petitioner has submitted that wind availability 200 MW out of 300 MW in SECI-III (already approved), 125 MW out of 300 MW in SECI-V (Petition no. 14/2020). In view of this, Petitioner is directed to consider full contracted PSA capacity in its RPO calculation.</p> <p>Further, petitioner has again at point no. i, considered 300 MW in SECI-VI (petition no. 16/2020); whereas as per instant petition it is 350 MW, clarify?</p> <p>II) Petitioner has taken average growth rate of solar RPO trajectory is 1.3% for each subsequent year and average growth rate of non-solar RPO trajectory is 0.8% for each subsequent year.</p> <p>During hearing, petitioner further narrated that the same has been taken from the working group which is set up for deciding RPO trajectory from FY 2022-23 onwards, which is not yet finalized. In view of this, Commission feels that non availability of RPO trajectory for FY 22-23 onwards does not mean to calculate based on anticipation. Therefore commission directs petitioner to consider current level (FY 2021-22) of RPO trajectory for further computation of above said anticipated requirement.</p> <p>III) At para no. 37, page-20, SECI in its reply has written that</p> |  |



