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Abstract: In Indian deregulated market scenario redispachting of the generating units is made through frequency linked pricing signal known as Unscheduled Interchange(UI). Central Electricity Regulation Commission (CERC-India) is responsible for deciding the UI rates for unscheduled interchange interstate transmission of electricity. In this paper a Maiden attempt has been made to perceive the effect of UI rate declared by CERC in different years on frequency linked Price Based Automatic Generation Control (PBAGC) of participating generators and profit earned by them. This article also covers the case of sudden loss of large generation to see whether the PBAGC can handle such event or not.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Power systems allover the world have to make provisions for achieving a balance between realtime demand and supply. Generally in developed countries power markets have concept like control area and area control error which measure the instananeous frequency deviation and net excess flow out of a control area due to deviation in scheduled interchange named as load frequency control. This task also become more challenging in present deregulated electricity market. Several load frequency control strategies based on roubest, optimal and intelligent approach have been developed by power system engineers suitable to deregualted envirnoment. Details of various load frequency control strategies in deregualted market have been found from Refs. [1-11].

Frequency linked real time pricing scheme is other approach of load frequency control in restructured electricity market. Researchers have presented the Frequency linked price based control service in deregulated electricity market [12-17].

In Indian deregulated electricity market scenario, where huge generation shortage is there automatic load frequency control concept is incompatibile. But in India a break-through occurred during 2002, with the implementation of the three part Availability Based Tariff (ABT) at the regional level. ABT has dramatally improve the grid frequency profile and also the third component of this tariff so called Unscheduled Interchange (UI), a frequency linked pricing which provides the manual secondary generation control for the Indian electricity grid [18].

Automated frequency linked pricing schemes suitable for Indian deregulated electricity market can be found from Refs. [17, 19-24].

The objective of this paper is to analyze the impact of different UI rate through Price Based Automatic Generation Control (PBAGC) scheme on participating generators. The rest of the article is structured as follows. Section II presents an overview about ABT and UI mechanism prevailing in India. Section III describes about the price based automatic generation control scheme. In section IV, mathematical model for the PBAGC scheme is presented. While in section V equation of steady state frequency error for PBAGC scheme has been derived. Section VI consider the simulation studies and result analysis for selected test system with various cases. Finally, section VII carries the main conclusions of the study.

II. ABT & UI MECHANISM

The term Availability Based Tariff particularly in the Indian context, stands for a rational three part tariff structure for power supply from generating stations, on a contracted basis. In India ABT is implemented in the starting from mid-2002 at regional level. The first part of ABT is being a fixed component which is linked to the availability of generating stations, second part is a variable component linked to the energy charges for scheduled interchange and third part is an unscheduled interchange to account for deviations from schedule. This third part (UI) has frequency linked pricing as per Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. As and when there are deviations from schedule, this third component of ABT comes into picture. Deviations from schedule are determined in 15 minutes time blocks through special metering and are priced according to the system condition prevailing at that time [25, 26].

In UI based generation control mechanism, all generating stations can self-dispatch, based on frequency actuated UI rate signal available at any wall socket. The station operator has only to compare his own variable cost and current pool price based on UI curve, to decide whether the generation should be increased or decreased to achieve new equilibrium [27]. This mechanism also offers opportunity to participants (load) to exchange as and when available surplus energy at a price determined by prevailing frequency conditions. Utilities can deviate from their schedules, as long as the deviation does not cause a
transmission constraint or a grid contingency. However in case of contingency, the schedule can be revised by system operator [28]. The shape of UI price vs. frequency curve has been a subject of much debate among the sector participants. The UI rate therefore needs to be re-adjusted whenever the energy costs of generation in the country get revised. At regular interval UI curve has been modified under the regulation ordered by CERC since it was introduced in year2002 [29].

In the year 2009 UI price was set between 49.2 Hz and 50.3 Hz. The minimum price was zero Rs. /Mwh at 50.3 Hz and maximum price was 7,350 Rs. /Mwh at 49.2 Hz. Each 0.02 Hz step is equivalent to 120 Rs. /Mwh in the 50.3-49.5 Hz frequency range and to 170 Rs. /Mwh in the 49.5-49.2 Hz frequency range [30].

In the year 2012, as per CERC regulation UI price was set between 49.48 and 50.20Hz. The minimum price is zero Rs. /Mwh at 50.20 Hz and maximum price is 9000 Rs. /Mwh at 49.48 Hz. Each 0.02 Hz step is equivalent to 165 Rs. /Mwh in the 50.2-50.00 Hz frequency range, 285 Rs. /Mwh in 50.00- 49.80 Hz frequency range and 281.20 Rs. /Mwh in 49.80 - 49.48 Hz frequency range [31]. In the year 2013, UI price was proposed to between 49.94 and 50.05Hz [32].

Recently for the year 2014, UI price has been set between 49.69 to 50.05Hz. The minimum price is zero Rs. /Mwh at 50.05 Hz and maximum price is 8240.4 Rs. /Mwh at 49.69 Hz. Each 0.01 Hz step is equivalent to 356.00Rs./Mwh in the 50.05-50.00 Hz frequency range and 208.00 Rs. /Mwh in the 50.00-49.69Hz frequency range [33].

**III. PRICE BASED AUTOMATIC GENERATION CONTROL MECHANISM**

After the implementation of ABT in Indian electricity sector, the generation units are expected to respond to UI price signal in real-time but they respond to the UI price signal manually, often resulting in a delayed response which leads to deterioration of frequency profile and hence affect the performance of the grid. This section explains a price based automatic generation control mechanism ensuring that generators respond to the UI price signal automatically and in a desirable manner. First time in the year 2004 Tyagi and Srivastava [19] presented an automatic generation control scheme based in UI price. According to this control primary control remains same that of conventional but secondary automatic control uses UI price signal. As per this control each generator individually monitors the UI price \( \rho \) and compares with its marginal cost \( \gamma \). Then generated error signal is given to the integral controller which further changes the governor setting to change the input power and hence readjust the frequency to its nominal value. But this scheme suffers from the drawback that when load is as per schedule then also it results in UI among generators at nominal frequency. Then authors in Ref. [21] have proposed modified PBAGC scheme which overcomes the above mentioned drawback.

![Fig. 3: Modified price based automatic generation control mechanism [21]](image)

The basic principle of modified control is illustrated in Fig.3. According to this scheme each generator individually monitors the UI price \( \rho \) and compares with its marginal cost \( \gamma \) and derives an error signal. Then this error signal is fed to GCE logic block. Output of which can be termed as generation control error (GCE) signal and further it is fed to an integral controller block. A positive GCE signal indicates that the generator will profit by increasing generation level while negative GCE signal indicates that Generator will profit by decreasing the generation level [21]. Detail logic of GCE block is given in equations 9-19. In this paper modified PBAGC scheme has been used to see the impact of different UI rate on frequency control and profit earned by participating generators.

**IV. MATHEMATICAL MODEL**

It is assumed that generators of single area are generating power at their scheduled value and
frequency of the grid is at its scheduled frequency 50Hz.
Now, for any case when step load change of P Mw occurs in the system, it results in deviation Δf in the supply frequency.

\[ S1(f) = Δf + f^0 \text{ Hz} \quad (1) \]

At this frequency signal S1 (f) corresponding UI price signal S2 (p) can be calculated as per UI rate v/s frequency regulation issued by CERC of given year. Equations (2) to (6) shows calculation of UI price signal for the UI rate issued by CERC in the year 2012.

If \( S1(f) > 50.2 \text{ Hz} \) \quad (2)

\[ S2(p) = 0 \text{ Rs.}/\text{Mwh} \]
If \( 50.0 \text{Hz} < S1(f) \leq 50.2 \text{Hz} \) \quad (3)

\[ S2(p) = 8250 \times (S1(f)) \text{ Rs.}/\text{Mwh} \]
If \( 49.8 \text{Hz} < S1(f) \leq 50.0 \text{Hz} \) \quad (4)

\[ S2(p) = 1650 + 14250 \times (50.0 - S1(f)) \text{ Rs.}/\text{Mwh} \]
If \( 49.48 \text{Hz} < S1(f) \leq 49.8 \text{Hz} \) \quad (5)

\[ S2(p) = 4500 + 14062.5 \times (49.8 - S1(f)) \text{ Rs.}/\text{Mwh} \]
If \( S1(f) \leq 49.48 \text{Hz} \) \quad (6)

\[ S2(p) = 9000 \text{ Rs.}/\text{Mwh} \]

Now, this obtained UI price signal S2 (p) is compared with an incremental cost signal S4 (γ) of generator, which generates signal S5 (gce).

The incremental cost signal of each generator S4 (γ) is given by following equation

\[ S4(γ) = 2 \times c \times S3(P_g) + b \text{ Rs.}/\text{Mwh} \quad (7) \]

S3 (P_g) is given by following equation.

\[ S3(P_g) = P_g^0 + ΔP_g\text{MW} \quad (8) \]

Further, S2 (p) and S4 (γ) signal is compared with following logic to generate Generation Control Error (GCE), S5 (gce) Rs. /Mwh.

If \( S4(γ) > P^0 \); \quad (9)

No, then go to (15) other wise

If \( S2(p) \geq S4(γ) \); \quad (10)

No, then go to (12) other wise

\[ S5(gce) = S2(p) - S4(γ) \quad (11) \]

If \( S2(p) < P^0 \); \quad (12)

No, then go to (14) other wise

\[ S5(gce) = S2(p) - P^0 \quad (13) \]

\[ S5(gce) = 0 \quad (14) \]

If \( S2(p) < S4(γ) \); \quad (15)

No, then go to (17) other wise

\[ S5(gce) = S2(p) - S4(γ) \quad (16) \]

If \( S2(p) < P^0 \); \quad (17)

No, then go to (19) other wise

\[ S5(gce) = S2(p) - P^0 \quad (18) \]

\[ S5(gce) = 0 \quad (19) \]

V. STEADY STATE FREQUENCY ERROR EQUATION

For S5 (gce) signal from equation number (11) and (16) steady state frequency error equation is given by following relation

\[ Δf = - \frac{P}{1 + \frac{1}{M_s + D} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{K_i K_i}{s + \frac{1}{R_i}}\right)} \text{Hz} \quad (20) \]

\[ Δf^{ss} = \lim_{s \to 0} [S(Δf(s))] = - \frac{P x S}{M_s^2 + D s + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{S x K_i R_i}{s + \frac{1}{R_i}}\right)} \text{Hz} \quad (21) \]

\[ Δf^{ss} = - \frac{P}{M_s + D + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{K_i K_i}{s + \frac{1}{R_i}}} \text{Hz} \quad (23) \]

\[ Δf^{ss} = \lim_{s \to 0} [S(Δf(s))] = - \frac{P x S}{M_s^2 + D s + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{S x K_i R_i}{s + \frac{1}{R_i}}\right)} \text{Hz} \quad (24) \]

\[ Δf^{ss} = 0 \text{Hz} \quad (25) \]

VI. SIMULATION & RESULT ANALYSIS

\[ \Delta f(s) = - \frac{P}{1 + \frac{1}{M_s + D} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{K_i K_i}{s + \frac{1}{R_i}}\right)} \text{Hz} \quad (20) \]

\[ \Delta f^{ss} = \lim_{s \to 0} [S(Δf(s))] = - \frac{P x S}{M_s^2 + D s + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{S x K_i R_i}{s + \frac{1}{R_i}}\right)} \text{Hz} \quad (21) \]

\[ \Delta f^{ss} = - \frac{P}{M_s + D + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{K_i K_i}{s + \frac{1}{R_i}}} \text{Hz} \quad (23) \]

\[ \Delta f^{ss} = \lim_{s \to 0} [S(Δf(s))] = - \frac{P x S}{M_s^2 + D s + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{S x K_i R_i}{s + \frac{1}{R_i}}\right)} \text{Hz} \quad (24) \]

\[ \Delta f^{ss} = 0 \text{Hz} \quad (25) \]

Fig. 4: Price based model for system under study

- The modified PBAGC scheme described in above has been simulated and tested using an isolated area system having a capacity of 5000 MW supplied by four generating stations. The detailed schematic of four generators single area with UI based secondary control is as shown in Fig. 4. The necessary relevant data is given in Appendix. All models are created using MATLAB/SIMULINK.
To verify the impact of UI rate, four different cases have been considered as 1) system marginal cost more than nominal UI rate, 2) system marginal cost less than nominal UI rate, 3) system marginal more or less than nominal UI rate and 4) consider loss of large generation at peak load condition for UI rate 2012.

**Case 1:**

- Fig. 5(a) Freq. v/s Time (UI rate, 2013)
- Fig. 5(b) Freq. v/s Time (UI rate, 2012)
- Fig. 5(c) Freq. v/s Time (UI rate, 2009)

When system marginal cost of single area four generator system is 1850 Rs. /Mwh (more than any of the three year’s nominal UI rate), all generators of the given system receive the positive S5 (gce) = S2(ρ) - S4(γ) error signal, resulting in steady state frequency error. Also this error depends on slope of UI curve. As the slope of curve increases, steady state frequency error decreases. Slope of UI curve of year 2014 is very large compared to curve for year 2012 and 2009 hence for it, frequency error is very less. Fig. 5(a), 5(b), 5(c) shows the response of frequency/time for case 1 with different UI rate.

- Fig. 6(a) Δ Pg v/s Time (UI rate, 2014)
- Fig. 6(b) Δ Pg v/s Time (UI rate, 2012)
- Fig. 6(c) Δ Pg v/s Time (UI rate, 2009)

Simulation results for change in generation for each UI rate is as shown in Fig. 6(a), 6(b), 6(c). It can be observed from all the above figures that, as generator one is running at its full capacity, it does not increase its generation while generators two and three are partly loaded and hence, shares the maximum increment in load as per their economic scheduling criteria. Also, generator four is the costliest generator so increment of its generation is least, proves that UI based secondary control regulates the merit order dispatch of generator too.

**Case 2:**

- Fig. 7(a) UI v/s Time (UI rate, 2014)
- Fig. 7(b) UI v/s Time (UI rate, 2012)
- Fig. 7(c) UI v/s Time (UI rate, 2009)

Fig. 7(a), 7(b), 7(c) shows the response of settled value of UI rate after step load disturbance for case 1 with different UI rates.

- Fig. 8(a) Freq. v/s Time (UI rate, 2014)
- Fig. 8(b) Freq. v/s Time (UI rate, 2012)
- Fig. 8(c) Freq. v/s Time (UI rate, 2009)

When system marginal cost of single area four generator system is 1500 Rs./Mwh (less than any of the three year’s nominal UI rate), all generators of the given system receive the positive S5 (gce) = S7(α) - σ₀
error signal, resulting in zero steady state frequency error. Fig. 8(a), 8(b), 8(c) shows the response of frequency v/s time for case 2 with three different UI rate.

For ΔPg:
ΔPg1, ΔPg2, ΔPg3, ΔPg4

Fig. 9(a), 9(b), 9(c) shows the response for change in generation of all the four generators for different UI rates. It can be seen from all the above response that generator one and two are partly loaded hence they share the maximum increment in load as per their economic scheduling criteria while generator three and four contribute to few amount of generation being a costliest generators following a merit order dispatch automatically.

For ΔPg:
ΔPg1, ΔPg2, ΔPg3, ΔPg4

Fig. 10(a), 10(b) and 10(c) shows the response of settled value of UI rate after step load disturbance for case 2 with different UI rates.

• Case 3:
When system marginal cost of single area four generators is 1650Rs./Mwh, it equals to nominal UI rate for the year 2012, hence a step load change, gives a steady state frequency error, while for the years 2009 and 2014, the system marginal cost 1650 Rs./Mwh is less than their respective nominal UI rates, so step load change in these two cases give a zero steady state frequency error.

Fig. 11(a), 11(b), 11(c) shows the response of frequency v/s time for case 3 with three different UI rate.

• Case 4:

Additionally, with system under consideration when working on its peak load condition, a loss of 400 Mw power generation has been simulated for UI rate of
year 2012. This can be simulated as sudden increase in load of 400 Mw. In this case generator one, two and three are running at their full capacity and generator four has only 300 Mw surplus capacity to respond to change in load. Generator four responds to initial fall in frequency by increasing its generation up to 300Mw (Fig. 12(c)) and thereby running at its full capacity. Still there is 100 Mw gap between generation and demand, which could be further met by load reduction due to load frequency response. Fig. 12(d) shows the change in net load change ΔPth. Where, ΔPth = ΔPd + D*Δf. Also, frequency error (Fig. 12(a)) is found to be -1.00 Hz which mainly depends upon load frequency component D. As the steady state frequency error is very high and beyond unacceptable limit, system operator has to take emergency measures to restore the frequency back to within permissible range. So, system operator can seek for on the spot energy integration options like distributed generation, captive power etc.

**Profit Earned by Generators:**

Profits earned by participating generators for various cases with different UI rates have been mentioned in Table 4.1, Table 4.2 and Table 4.3. Observation of above tables conclude that through frequency linked unscheduled interchange component of ABT, generators can earn profit by re-dispatching power in real time at their most economic point. When system marginal cost is less than nominal UI rate profit earned by generators depend on value of nominal UI rate. Higher the value of nominal UI rate more is the profit earned by generator. Also, when the system marginal cost is more than nominal UI rate, profit earned by generators depends on settled value of UI rate.

**VII. CONCLUSIONS**

The effect of different UI rates on participating generators in frequency linked PBAGC scheme has been studied through three different case of system marginal cost. From this analysis it has been accomplished that the frequency linked PBAGC may or may not drive the frequency error to zero but depends on cost co-efficient of participating generators, slope of the UI curve and value of system marginal cost. It has been also proved that this scheme handle the sudden loss of large generation. Profit earned by the participating generators depends on UI rate values at existing frequency. Also, in future by considering the optimized controller gain of integral controllers, UI exchange for different cases can be further analyzed.
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NOMENCLATURES

\( f^o \) Nominal supply frequency in Hz  
\( \Delta f \) Change in supply frequency  
\( c \) Incremental cost co-efficient of generating unit in Rs. /Mw.h.  
\( b \) Incremental cost co-efficient of generating unit in Rs. /Mw.h.  
\( P^g \) Scheduled generation of generator in Mw  
\( \Delta P^g \) Change in generation  
\( \rho^0 \) UI rate at nominal frequency 50 Hz in Rs./Mw (1780Rs. /Mwh-(2014), 1650 Rs. /Mwh - (2012) and 1800 Rs /Mwh - (2009))  
\( P \) Step load in Mw.  
\( K_U \) Slope of UI curve, value corresponds to UI price \( \rho^0 \) in Hz. Rs. / Mwh  
\( D \) Damping co-efficient in Mw/Hz.  
\( M \) System inertia in Mw. sec. /Hz.  
\( R_i \) Speed regulation in Hz./Mw  
\( k_i \) Integral controller gain of \( i^{th} \) generating unit  
\( \gamma_i \) Marginal cost of \( i^{th} \) generating unit Rs./Mw

APPENDIX

1: System Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area capacity (Mw)</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M(Mw-a/Hz) )</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D(Mw/Hz) )</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F'(Hz) )</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta P_d(Mw) )</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_l=R_g=R_f= R_d (pu) )</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{g1}=T_{g2}=T_{d1}=T_{d2}(sec) )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{d3}=T_{d4}=T_{d5}(sec) )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: Generator Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Generators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity(Mw)</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h ) (Rs./Mwh)</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c ) (Rs./Mw.h)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: Generator Scheduling for Various System Marginal cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Marginal Cost (Rs./Mw)</th>
<th>Gen. 1 ( (P^g_1)^0 )</th>
<th>Gen. 2 ( (P^g_2)^0 )</th>
<th>Gen. 3 ( (P^g_3)^0 )</th>
<th>Gen. 4 ( (P^g_4)^0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>1416.66</td>
<td>0312.50</td>
<td>0000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1166.66</td>
<td>0833.33</td>
<td>0000.00</td>
<td>0000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1416.67</td>
<td>1083.33</td>
<td>0062.50</td>
<td>0000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2560</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>0700.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.1: UI rate as per CERC regulation 2012 and system marginal cost 1850 Rs./MWh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in (seconds)</th>
<th>Avg. Freq. in (Hz)</th>
<th>Change in (UI) (Rs./MWh)</th>
<th>Average change in gen. (MW)</th>
<th>Profit in (Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-900</td>
<td>49.9947</td>
<td>1889.0</td>
<td>0 50.9477 41.5696 6.9491</td>
<td>24067.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1800</td>
<td>49.9952</td>
<td>1880.0</td>
<td>0 50.0282 41.6595 6.6268</td>
<td>23521.2 19586.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-2700</td>
<td>49.9952</td>
<td>1880.6</td>
<td>0 50.0292 41.6595 6.6268</td>
<td>23521.2 19586.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701-3600</td>
<td>49.9952</td>
<td>1880.6</td>
<td>0 50.0292 41.6595 6.6268</td>
<td>23521.2 19586.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 0 94631.4 78396.1 12632.0

### Table 4.2: UI rate as per CERC regulation 2014 and system marginal cost 1500 Rs./MWh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in (seconds)</th>
<th>Avg. Freq. in (Hz)</th>
<th>Change in (UI) (Rs./MWh)</th>
<th>Average change in gen. (MW)</th>
<th>Profit in (Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-900</td>
<td>49.9997</td>
<td>1786.0</td>
<td>0 51.2103 43.5058 4.9749</td>
<td>25596.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1800</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1786.0</td>
<td>0 51.2596 44.7047 6.3747</td>
<td>24200.5 19160.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-2700</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1786.0</td>
<td>0 51.2596 44.7047 6.3747</td>
<td>24200.5 19160.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701-3600</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1786.0</td>
<td>0 51.2596 44.7047 6.3747</td>
<td>24200.5 19160.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 87311.2 81522.1 8767.8 4440.7

### Table 4.3: UI rate as per CERC regulation 2014 and system marginal cost 1500 Rs./MWh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in (seconds)</th>
<th>Avg. Freq. in (Hz)</th>
<th>Change in (UI) (Rs./MWh)</th>
<th>Average change in gen. (MW)</th>
<th>Profit in (Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-900</td>
<td>49.9988</td>
<td>1656.0</td>
<td>0 49.6288 44.1384 5.0451</td>
<td>20546.3 12873.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1800</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1656.0</td>
<td>0 49.7962 44.2633 4.9790</td>
<td>20540.9 12858.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-2700</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1656.0</td>
<td>0 49.7962 44.2633 4.9790</td>
<td>20540.9 12858.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701-3600</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1656.0</td>
<td>0 49.7962 44.2633 4.9790</td>
<td>20540.9 12858.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 82169.1 73049.1 8267.2 1645.3

### Table 4.4: UI rate as per CERC regulation 2014 and system marginal cost 1650 Rs./MWh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in (seconds)</th>
<th>Avg. Freq. in (Hz)</th>
<th>Change in (UI) (Rs./MWh)</th>
<th>Average change in gen. (MW)</th>
<th>Profit in (Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-900</td>
<td>49.9997</td>
<td>1871.0</td>
<td>0 49.6414 43.5087 5.9059</td>
<td>23219.7 20351.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1800</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1871.0</td>
<td>0 50.0926 43.8310 5.6354</td>
<td>22541.7 19723.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-2700</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1871.0</td>
<td>0 50.0926 43.8310 5.6354</td>
<td>22541.7 19723.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701-3600</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1871.0</td>
<td>0 50.0926 43.8310 5.6354</td>
<td>22541.7 19723.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 90844.8 79523.1 10369.7 981.4

### Table 4.5: UI rate as per CERC regulation 2014 and system marginal cost 1650 Rs./MWh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in (seconds)</th>
<th>Avg. Freq. in (Hz)</th>
<th>Change in (UI) (Rs./MWh)</th>
<th>Average change in gen. (MW)</th>
<th>Profit in (Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-900</td>
<td>49.9997</td>
<td>1786.4</td>
<td>0 34.3429 34.3429 28.5936 2.6844</td>
<td>15337.5 12769.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1800</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1786.0</td>
<td>0 34.3798 34.3798 28.6498 2.5907</td>
<td>15299.0 12749.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-2700</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1786.0</td>
<td>0 34.3798 34.3798 28.6498 2.5907</td>
<td>15299.0 12749.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701-3600</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1786.0</td>
<td>0 34.3798 34.3798 28.6498 2.5907</td>
<td>15299.0 12749.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 61234.5 61234.5 551017.4 4657.4

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in (seconds)</th>
<th>Avg. Freq. in (Hz)</th>
<th>Change in UI (Rs./Mwh)</th>
<th>Average change in gen. (MW)</th>
<th>Profit (Rs.)</th>
<th>( \Delta P_g1 )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_g2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_g3 )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_g4 )</th>
<th>Gen1</th>
<th>Gen2</th>
<th>Gen3</th>
<th>Gen4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-900</td>
<td>49.9988</td>
<td>1677.2</td>
<td>34.8302 34.8290 28.4730</td>
<td>1.6726</td>
<td>14604.3</td>
<td>14603.8</td>
<td>11938.7</td>
<td>701.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1800</td>
<td>49.9985</td>
<td>1670.9</td>
<td>34.8906 34.8892 28.5447</td>
<td>1.5286</td>
<td>14574.5</td>
<td>14574.0</td>
<td>11923.8</td>
<td>638.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-2700</td>
<td>49.9985</td>
<td>1670.9</td>
<td>34.8906 34.8892 28.5447</td>
<td>1.5286</td>
<td>14574.5</td>
<td>14574.0</td>
<td>11923.8</td>
<td>638.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701-3600</td>
<td>49.9985</td>
<td>1670.9</td>
<td>34.8906 34.8892 28.5447</td>
<td>1.5286</td>
<td>14574.5</td>
<td>14574.0</td>
<td>11923.8</td>
<td>638.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58328.3</td>
<td>58325.8</td>
<td>47710.1</td>
<td>2616.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UI rate as per CERC regulation 2009 and system marginal cost 1650 Rs. /Mwh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in (seconds)</th>
<th>Avg. Freq. in (Hz)</th>
<th>Change in UI (Rs./Mwh)</th>
<th>Average change in gen. (MW)</th>
<th>Profit (Rs.)</th>
<th>( \Delta P_g1 )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_g2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_g3 )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_g4 )</th>
<th>Gen1</th>
<th>Gen2</th>
<th>Gen3</th>
<th>Gen4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-900</td>
<td>49.9989</td>
<td>1806.5</td>
<td>35.0144 35.0144 29.0880</td>
<td>0.7719</td>
<td>23219.7</td>
<td>20351.2</td>
<td>2762.0</td>
<td>386.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1800</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1800.0</td>
<td>35.1487 35.1487 29.2906</td>
<td>0.4119</td>
<td>22541.7</td>
<td>19723.9</td>
<td>2535.9</td>
<td>198.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-2700</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1800.0</td>
<td>35.1487 35.1487 29.2906</td>
<td>0.4119</td>
<td>22541.7</td>
<td>19723.9</td>
<td>2535.9</td>
<td>198.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701-3600</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>1800.0</td>
<td>35.1487 35.1487 29.2906</td>
<td>0.4119</td>
<td>22541.7</td>
<td>19723.9</td>
<td>2535.9</td>
<td>198.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90844.8</td>
<td>79523.1</td>
<td>10369.7</td>
<td>981.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>