

**JOINT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR  
THE STATE OF GOA AND UNION TERRITORIES  
GURGAON**

Coram\*  
Dr. V. K. Garg, Chairperson  
Petition No.....39/ 2011

**In the matter of**

Petition for determination of tariff for 1.0 MW Power from Roof top PV & Small Solar Power Generation Programme (RPSSGP) for supply to the Puducherry Utility.

**And in the matter of**

M/s Saheli Export Pvt. Limited, Chennai.  
Petitioner

...

**And**

1. Electricity Department, Puducherry
  2. Renewable Energy Agency Puducherry (REAP)
- ...Respondents

**Present**

For the Petitioner

1. Shri P. Ramesh, Manager Commercial Services
2. Shri Vinod Kumar, Advocate Petitioner.
3. Shri K. Narayanan, Representative.

For the Respondents

1. Shri K. Mathivanan, Superintending Engineer, EDP
2. Shri T.Chanemougam, Executive Engineer, EDP

**ORDER**

24.04.2012

M/s Saheli Export Pvt. Ltd. (Petitioner) filed Petition No. 39/2011 before this Commission for determination of tariff for 1.0 MW solar power project under Roof Top PV and Small Solar Power Generation Programme. The Petition was dismissed by this Commission vide order dated 02.01.2012. Feeling aggrieved by the order of this Commission Petitioner filed appeal No. 22 of 2012 before Hon'ble APTEL, Delhi. The Hon'ble APTEL vide judgment dated 29.03.2012 allowed the appeal and directed this Commission to determine the tariff. Consequent upon judgment of the Hon'ble APTEL dated 29.03.2012 the Petition No. 39 of 2011 has been restored.

Contd....

(2)

The Respondent No.1 i.e., Electricity Department, Puducherry filed an affidavit enclosing therewith a copy of draft PPA to be signed between M/s Saheli Export Pvt. Ltd. and Electricity Department Puducherry for Supply and Purchase of Power from the said solar project.

The Commission observed the following:

- Pages 72-77 of the Petition are not readable.
- Efficiency of panel/ degradation over the years does not come out of the report submitted by the Petitioner.
- Treatment of Revenue from CDM is not indicated.
- Petitioner has chosen a technology without comparing it with the other available technology and the relative operative advantages from that.
- Initialled PPA has not been submitted. Both the parties agreed to submit the same before Public Hearing.
- Project Proponent submitted that 1.45 MU per annum will be provided. In case agreed MU is not provided, how the matter will be treated by the Licensee. A detailed submission is required in this regard.
- The Petitioner is required to file the proof of land acquisition as on the date of Public Hearing to avoid non- availability of land for the project later on.
- The Respondent/ Licensee stated that the reasonability of rates for the purchase of renewable energy including Solar PV to meet the RPO would be established by the tendered rates of procurement available in the public domain.

Above information to be made available before Public Hearing at Puducherry on 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2012

Sd/-

**(Dr. V.K. Garg)**  
**Chairperson**

**Member (Vacant)**

\* Post of the Member is vacant. According to provision of Section 93 of the Electricity Act, no act or proceedings of the appropriate Commission shall be questioned or invalidated merely on the ground of existence of any vacancy or defect in the Constitution of the appropriate Commission. As per conduct of business regulation of the JERC "Coram is Two" but if the Member is prevented from attending the meeting of the hearing for any reason, the Hon'ble Chairperson will constitute a valid Coram.

