

BEFORE THE GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

GANDHINAGAR

Suo-Motu Order No. 06 of 2020

Removal of difficulty in the matter of:

“Order No. 3 of 2020 dated 08.05.2020 for Tariff framework for procurement of power by distribution licensees and others from Solar Energy Projects and other commercial issues for the State of Gujarat.”

CORAM

Shri Anand Kumar, Chairman

Shri P. J. Thakkar, Member

Date: 05.08.2020

Order

1. The Commission vide Order No. 03 of 2020 Dated 08.05.2020, decided the Tariff Framework, General Principles and Other Considerations for Solar Power Projects for the prospective period after due consultation process with the stakeholders.
2. GUVNL vide Letter No.GM/IPP/423 dated 25.06.2020 submitted that they have received requests from Solar Project Developers for signing of PPAs under the Policy for Development of Small Scale distributed Solar Project-2019. The Policy provides 12 months' time period, from the date of signing of PPAs for commissioning of distributed Solar projects and PPAs cannot be signed without mentioning of Tariff. Looking to the said difficulty in implementing the Commission's order, GUVNL requested to modify the relevant para of Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020 dated 08.05.2020 suitably and in line with the Government of Gujarat Policy for Development of Small Scale distributed Solar Project-2019 dated 06.03.2019.
3. The power to remove difficulties is conferred upon the Commission to remove trivial difficulties in implementing its order effectively without making a change in the substance. In addition to above, the said power to remove difficulty can only be exercised to the extent necessary only for giving effect to a particular provision. The need arises because at the time of passing an order, it may not be possible to foresee all the difficulties which might arise in its working.

4. Accordingly, the Commission has published draft Suo-Motu Order on the Commission’s website www.gercin.org in downloadable format on 30th June, 2020, and Public Notices were also published in two Gujarati and one English newspapers, inviting comments from stakeholders by 15th July, 2020 on the draft Order on removal of difficulties in Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020 dated 08th May, 2020. Several stakeholders have submitted their comments and list of such stakeholders is attached as **Annexure-I**.
5. Further, the Commission has published notice for Virtual Public Hearing (Through Video Conference) on the Commission’s website www.gercin.org on 22nd July, 2020, which was scheduled on 31st July, 2020 and also informed to the stakeholders through mail from whom comments on the Draft Suo-Motu Order were received. List of stakeholders who presented their views during Virtual Public Hearing (Through Video Conference) is attached as **Annexure-II**.
6. The main comments and views expressed by the stakeholders through their written submissions/oral submission during virtual Public hearing and the Commission’s views thereon have been summarized in the following paragraphs.
7. Wherever possible, the comments and suggestions have been summarised clause-wise, along with the Commission’s analysis and ruling on the same. However, in some cases, due to overlapping of the issues/comments, two clauses have been combined in order to minimise repetition.
8. In para 4 of Draft Suo-Motu Order, it was proposed that:

Following para of Solar Tariff Order 03 of 2020;

“3.1 Tariff Framework

.....

The average tariff, available as on 1st April (as discovered in the Competitive Bidding by GUVNL during previous six months October-March and adopted by the Commission) shall be applicable for the project commissioned during April-September. Similarly, the average tariff, available as on 1st October (as discovered in the Competitive Bidding by GUVNL during previous six months April-September and adopted by the Commission) shall be applicable for the project commissioned during

October-March.

.....
.....”

Shall be substituted by following para;

“3.1 Tariff Framework

.....
.....
.....

The average tariff, available as on 1st April (as discovered in the Competitive Bidding by GUVNL during previous six months October-March and adopted by the Commission) shall be applicable for the projects commissioned under PPAs signed during April-September. Similarly, the average tariff, available as on 1st October (as discovered in the Competitive Bidding by GUVNL during previous six months April-September and adopted by the Commission) shall be applicable for the projects commissioned under PPAs signed during October-March.

.....
.....”

Commission’s Ruling:

As no comment has been received on this para, the Commission decides to substitute the para of Clause 3.1 of Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020 as proposed in the Draft Suo-Motu Order with minor modification to provide more clarity, as under;

“3.1 Tariff Framework

.....
.....
.....

The average tariff, available as on 1st April (as discovered in the Competitive Bidding by GUVNL during previous six months October-March and adopted by the Commission) shall be applicable for the projects to be commissioned under PPAs signed during April-September. Similarly, the average tariff, available as on 1st October (as discovered in the Competitive Bidding by GUVNL during previous six months April-September and adopted by the Commission) shall be applicable for the projects to be commissioned under PPAs signed during October-March.

.....
.....”

9. In para 5(i) of Draft Suo-Motu Order, it was proposed to substitute the Clause 3.2(c) of Solar Tariff Order 03 of 2020 as under;

Existing Clause:

“3.2(c) Useful life of Plant

The Useful Life for the Solar Power Projects to be commissioned during the new Control Period shall be considered as 25 years.”

Substituted by:

“3.2(c) Useful life of Plant

The Useful Life for the Solar Power Projects to be commissioned under PPAs signed during the new Control Period shall be considered as 25 years.”

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

TPL submitted that the Useful life of the Plant is always related to the Commissioning of the plant independent of date of PPA. Further, it is also not consistent with the provisions of the GoG Solar Power Policy, 2015 which is applicable for projects installed and commissioned during the Operative Period of the Policy and not the PPA signing date. In this background, clause 3.2 (c) should be retained as it is without any amendment

Commission’s Ruling:

The Commission take a note of submission. To provide more clarity, the Commission decides to modify proposed clause as under;

“3.2(c) Useful life of Plant

The Useful Life for the Solar Power Projects to be commissioned under PPAs signed during the new Control Period shall be considered as 25 years from their date of commissioning.”

10. In para 5(ii) of Draft Suo-Motu Order, it was proposed to substitute the Clause 3.2(e) of Solar Tariff Order 03 of 2020 as under;

Existing Clause:

“3.2(e) Eligibility Criteria

The Solar power projects commissioned and PPAs signed during the new control period will be eligible to sell power to distribution licensees of Gujarat at the tariff approved by the Commission under this Tariff framework.”

Substituted by:*“3.2(e) Eligibility Criteria*

The Solar power projects to be commissioned under PPAs signed during the new control period will be eligible to sell power to distribution licensees of Gujarat at the tariff approved by the Commission under this Tariff framework.”

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

TPL submitted that, as per the GoG Solar Power Policy, 2015 projects installed and commissioned during the Operative Period of the Policy are entitled for the benefit under the said Policy. Further, as per the proposed amendment, there may be incident where PPA is signed during fag end of the Control Period and commissioning takes place after completion of the Control Period. As per the proposed amendment, even such projects will also be considered as eligible in contradiction of the Solar Power Policy, 2015. In this background, Clause 3.2 (e) may be suitably amended so as to ensure that only the projects commissioned during the new Control Period is eligible under this tariff framework

Commission’s Ruling:

Solar Power Generators have to enter into the Power Purchase Agreement with the distribution licensee to whom it want to sell electricity prior to commissioning of Solar Power Plants. The Scheduled Commercial Operation Date is defined at Clause 5.11 of the Policy for Development of Small Scale Distributed Solar Projects – 2019, is reproduced as under;

“SCOD” or “Scheduled Commercial Operation Date” shall mean the date as to be declared by the developer in the PPA, on or before which the Solar Project of the developer shall be commissioned and such date shall not exceed 12 (twelve) months from the date of execution of the PPA.”

Moreover, As mentioned at para 2 above, GUVNL stated that they have received requests from Solar Project Developers for signing of PPAs under the Policy for Development of Small Scale distributed Solar Project-2019. The Policy provides 12 months’ time period, from the date of signing of PPAs for commissioning of distributed Solar projects and PPAs cannot be signed without mentioning of Tariff.

Looking to the above, to provide regulatory certainty and to ensure optimum Renewable Energy Procurement by distribution licensee to achieve targets of RPO set by the Commission, it is necessary to clarify that the Solar Power Projects to be commissioned under PPAs signed during the new control period will be eligible to

sell power to distribution licensees. If we consider commissioning of the project for eligibility for sell of power to distribution licensee, it may happen that One year out of Three years control period may be without any power purchase tie-up from RE sources. Hence, the Commission do not consider the submission of TPL.

The Commission decides to substitute the Clause 3.2(e) of Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020 as proposed in para 5(ii) of Draft Suo-Motu Order, as under;

“3.2(e) Eligibility Criteria

The Solar power projects to be commissioned under PPAs signed during the new control period will be eligible to sell power to distribution licensees of Gujarat at the tariff approved by the Commission under this Tariff framework.”

11. In para 5(iii) of Draft Suo-Motu Order, it was proposed to substitute the Clause 3.10(ii) of Solar Tariff Order 03 of 2020 as under;

Existing Clause:

3.10(ii) For the Solar Power Projects set up by MSME (Manufacturing) Enterprise above 50% of its contracted demand, 100% of Cross-Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Surcharge as applicable to normal Open-Access Consumers shall be applicable.

Substituted by:

3.10(ii) For the Solar Power Projects set up by MSME (Manufacturing) Enterprise above 50% of its contracted demand in case of third party sale, 100% of Cross-Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Surcharge as applicable to normal Open-Access Consumers shall be applicable.

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

Some of the stakeholders submitted that Cross Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Surcharge should be removed in case of Captive and Third Party sale.

Commission’s Ruling:

The Commission has issued draft Suo-Motu Order and invited objections/suggestions to remove difficulties in implementing its order effectively without making a change in the substance. The need arises because at the time of passing an order, it may not be possible to foresee all the difficulties which might arise in its working. The Commission while issuing Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020, dealt with suggestions/objections received from stakeholder regarding applicability of Cross Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Surcharge. Hence, the Commission do not find any merit to reopen it. The Commission has proposed only minor modification in existing

Clause 3.10(ii) of Solar Tariff Order No.03 of 2020, to provide more clarity and to remove difficulties in implementing it.

The Commission decides to substitute the Clause 3.10(ii) of Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020 as proposed in para 5(iii) of Draft Suo-Motu Order, as under;

“3.10(ii) For the Solar Power Projects set up by MSME (Manufacturing) Enterprise above 50% of its contracted demand in case of third party sale, 100% of Cross-Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Surcharge as applicable to normal Open-Access Consumers shall be applicable.”

Additional Points suggested by Stakeholder:

12. Clarification of Clause 3.5 Security Deposit

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

One stakeholder requested to modify Clause 3.5 (Security Deposit) suitably so that the solar projects awarded under tariff based competitive bidding route as per the Guidelines issued by MoP dated 03.08.2017 shall be excluded to furnish Security Deposit to GETCO.

Commission’s Ruling:

The Commission has issued draft Suo-Motu Order and invited objections/suggestions to remove difficulties in implementing its order effectively without making a change in the substance. The Commission while issuing Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020, dealt with suggestions/objections received from stakeholder regarding Security Deposit.

Further, this clause is also in line with the Clause 13 of Solar Policy-2015 reproduced as under;

“13.1 In case, Obligated Entities decide to procure solar power from the Solar Project Developers and sign Power Purchase Agreement, the Developer shall be required to provide Bank Guarantee@ INR 25 lakhs per MW for MW scale and proportionate amounts for kW scale projects at the time of signing of Power Purchase Agreement with Obligated Entities. The bank guarantee shall be refunded, if the developers achieve commercial operation within time period mentioned in Power Purchase Agreement. In case the Developer fails to achieve commercial operation as specified in the Power Purchase Agreement, the bank guarantee shall be forfeited.

13.2 In every case, whether Obligated Entity is procuring or not procuring solar power, SPGs shall submit security deposit of INR 5 lakhs per MW to STU/DisCom for ensuring speedy and timely completion of evacuation facility by SPG failing which bank guarantee may be forfeited.”

Hence, the Commission do not find any merit to reopen it.

Hence, Commission decides there is no need of further clarification.

13. Clarification of Clause 3.8(i)

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

One stakeholder requested for modification in Clause 3.8(i) to provide more clarity with respect to applicability of banking of energy in case of captive consumption (Generation and consumption are at same location or at different locations) as under;

i. Solar projects not registered under REC Mechanism and the consumer does not take benefit of the renewable attribute

For such projects, the adjustment of the Solar energy generation shall be allowed within the consumer's billing cycle. The entire Solar energy generation of such consumer shall be utilized for meeting the RPO of that Distribution Licensee.

Banking of energy shall be allowed to consumer having distance or co-located solar power plant, within one billing cycle of the consumer, wherein set off may be given against energy consumed at any time of the billing cycle. However, peak charges shall be applicable for consumption during peak hours.

.....
.....

Commission's Ruling:

The suggested modification create more confusion and implementation issues. It will restrict facility of banking of energy limited to those consumer having distance or co-located solar power plant only.

Hence, Commission decides there is no need of further clarification.

14. Clarification of applicability of Surplus Injection Compensation as provided in Clause 3.8(ii) and 3.8(iii).

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

PGVCL submitted that, as per the Clause No: 3.8 (ii), the consumer who takes benefit of RE attributes for its own RPO, the applicable Surplus Injection Compensation (SIC) rate is Rs. 1.75/Unit. Whereas as per clause- 3.8(iii), if the benefits of RE attribute is not given to Distribution Licensee (means consumer takes benefit of RE attributes for

its own RPO), the applicable Surplus Injection Compensation (SIC) rate is Rs. 1.50/Unit. Thus, there is infirmity in applicability of Surplus Injection Compensation rate for consumer who do not give RE attribute to DISCOM but takes benefit of RE attributes for its own RPO.

In view of above, it is required to be clarified in the order for applicability of SIC for consumers who do not give benefits of RE attributes to DISCOMs but utilize the same for their own RPO requirement

Commission’s Ruling:

Clause 3.8(ii) and 3.8(iii) are reproduced as under;

“ii. Solar Power Projects not registered under REC Mechanism and the consumer takes the benefit of the renewable attribute to meet their own RPO.

.....
In the event of any surplus solar energy not consumed as per energy accounting based on 15-minute time block, such excess electricity shall be compensated by the concerned Distribution Licensee at the rate Rs.1.75 per unit or the rate, if any, specified by the Commission for Surplus Injection Compensation (SIC) from time to time for whole life of the Solar power projects.

Such surplus energy compensated by the Distribution Licensee shall be utilized for meeting the RPO of that Distribution Licensee.

iii. Solar Power Projects registered under REC Mechanism and the Solar Power Projects not registered under REC Mechanism but benefit of the renewable attribute is not given to distribution licensee.

.....
In the event of any surplus Solar energy not consumed as per energy accounting based on 15-minute time block, such excess electricity shall be compensated by the concerned Distribution Licensee at the rate Rs.1.50 per unit or the rate, if any, specified by the Commission for Surplus Injection Compensation (SIC) from time to time for whole life of the Solar Power Projects.”

In para 3 of Clause 3.8(ii) it is mentioned that “*Such surplus energy compensated by the Distribution Licensee shall be utilized for meeting the RPO of that Distribution Licensee.*”, whereas such provision is not available in Clause 3.8(iii). Hence, it is very much clear that whenever distribution licensees purchase such surplus energy and utilize it toward fulfilment of their RPO obligations, such excess electricity shall be compensated by the concerned Distribution Licensee at the rate Rs.1.75 per unit.

Hence, Commission decides there is no need of further clarification.

15. Clarification of applicability of Transmission/ Wheeling Charge and Losses as provided in Clause 3.9

i) Clause 3.9(ii) Transmission Charges and Losses

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

Some of the stakeholders suggested that transmission charges and losses should not be levied in case of Third Party sale within the Distribution Licensee. One stakeholder suggested that transmission charges should be on quantity of power transmitted and not on capacity of plant.

Commission's Ruling:

Clause 3.9(ii) is reproduced as under;

“ii. Transmission Charges and Losses

Solar Power Project setup for captive use /Third party sale/Registered under REC, transmission charges and losses as applicable to normal Open-Access Consumers shall be applicable.”

The Commission has issued draft Suo-Motu Order and invited objections/suggestions to remove difficulties in implementing its order effectively without making a change in the substance. The Commission while issuing Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020, dealt with suggestions/objections received from stakeholder regarding applicability of Transmission Charges and Losses. Hence, the Commission do not find any merit to reopen it.

Hence, Commission decides there is no need of further clarification.

ii) Clause 3.9(iv) Wheeling at Two or More Locations

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

PGVCL submitted that, there is infirmity in the provision of Clause 3.9 (iv) and its title with regard to applicability of additional Rs. 0.05/Unit for wheeling of energy for more than one locations. As per the clause, additional charge of Rs. 0.05/unit is applicable for wheeling at more than two locations whereas as per title, additional charges is applicable for wheeling at two or more locations. Accordingly, it is required to modify the clause 3.9 (iv).

Commission’s Ruling:

Clause 3.9(iv) is reproduced as under;

iv. Wheeling at Two or More Locations

If a Solar Power Generator owner desires to wheel electricity to more than two locations, he shall pay INR 0.05 per unit on energy fed into the grid to distribution licensee in whose area power is consumed in addition to the abovementioned transmission charges and losses, as applicable.

The Commission considers the submission of PGVCL and decides to correct and modify the Clause 3.9(iv) of Solar Tariff Order 03 of 2020 to remove ambiguity as under;

“iv. Wheeling at Two or More Locations

If a Solar Power Generator owner desires to wheel electricity to two or more locations, he shall pay INR 0.05 per unit on energy fed into the grid to distribution licensee in whose area power is consumed in addition to the abovementioned transmission charges and losses, as applicable.”

16. Clarification of Capacity of Plant

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

One stakeholder suggested that not to put cap on DC capacity and one stakeholder ask to clarify capacity of installation, is it AC or DC?

Commission’s Ruling:

Para 2.5.3 of Solar Tariff Order No.03 of 2020 is reproduced as under;

“2.5.3. Commission’s Ruling

Looking to the present status of Solar PV installations and its impact on grid and other electricity consumers, the Commission decides to continue present arrangement of cap of 50% installation for consumers other than MSME (Manufacturing) Enterprises and in order to make exiting Regulation aligned to State Government Policy for MSME (Manufacturing) Enterprises, they are allowed to install Solar PV system above 50% of its sanctioned load/ contract demand subject to 15-minute settlement mechanism.

As far as Capacity of Solar PV plant installation is concerned, the Commission has already defined the “Plant Capacity” in the Order no. 3 of 2015 issued on 17th August,

2015, it is reproduced as under;

“..... The Commission therefore decides to retain the definition of the capacity of the solar plant as the cumulated rated capacity of the photovoltaic modules at Standard Testing Conditions (STC). Moreover a tolerance of $\pm 3\%$ is retained due to design and module constraints.”

.....”

The Commission has issued draft Suo-Motu Order and invited objections/suggestions to remove difficulties in implementing its order effectively without making a change in the substance. The Commission while issuing Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020, dealt with suggestions/objections received from stakeholder regarding capacity of plant. Hence, the Commission do not find any merit to reopen it.

Hence, Commission decides there is no need of further clarification.

17. Issue related to Extension of Date of Implementation of Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020.

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

Some of the stakeholders requested to extend the date of implementation of Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020 dated 8th May, 2020 up to 31st December, 2020 instead of date of Order i.e. 8th May, 2020, looking to the COVID-19 scenario.

Commission’s Ruling:

The Commission had issued draft Tariff Framework for Solar projects based on dynamic tariff on 4th February 2020. Further, the hearing on the matter was scheduled and concluded on 7th March 2020. It was expected that new solar projects commissioned thereafter will be covered under new framework. Moreover, The Commission has issued draft Suo-Motu Order and invited objections/suggestions to remove difficulties in implementing its order effectively without making a change in the substance.

Hence, Commission decides there is no need of further clarification.

18. Relaxation to Desalination Plants from certain provisions of Solar Tariff Order No. 03 of 2020.

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

Shri Reby Thomas Elsan on behalf of 1) Dwarka Sea Water Desalination Pvt. Limited, 2) Gir Somnath Desalination Pvt. Limited, 3) Kutch Sea Water Desalination Pvt. Limited, 4) Bhavnagar Desalination Pvt. Limited, submitted that Provisions of GoG Policy for "Desalination Plants within Integrated power generation units in the State of Gujarat", issued vide G.R. No. SLR-11-2018-1602-B1 dated 15.05.2019 and amendment dated 19.07.2019 should be incorporated as listed below in Solar Tariff Order;

1. Capacity allowed 400% of CD
2. Banking for one month billing cycle
3. Purchase of surplus energy by GUVNL at the rate of competitive bidding of last six months.

And also requested to exempt them from applicability of Cross Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Surcharge.

Commission's Ruling:

The Commission has issued draft Suo-Motu Order and invited objections/suggestions to remove difficulties in implementing its order effectively without making a change in the substance. It is submitted by the objector that he has also filed petition seeking review of Order No. 03 of 2020 issued on 8th May, 2020.

The Commission decides that the issues raised by the objector shall be dealt at the time of proceeding of the petition shortly. Hence, there is no need of further clarification at this stage.

19. Issue related to Incentives received by distribution licensee from MNRE

Suggestions from Stakeholders:

Federation of Renewable & Consumers of Energy submitted that incentive received by Distribution licensees from MNRE under PMKUSUM Scheme (under Component - A: Setting up of 10,000 MW of Decentralized Ground Mounted Grid Connected Solar Power plants of individual plant size up-to 2 MW) shall be Reimbursed to Farmers who installed solar power projects.;

Commission's Ruling:

The Commission has issued draft Suo-Motu Order and invited objections/suggestions to remove difficulties in implementing its order effectively without making a change in the substance.

Hence, Commission decides there is no need of further clarification.

20. We Order accordingly.

Sd/-

(P. J. THAKKAR)
Member

Sd/-

(ANAND KUMAR)
Chairman

Place: Gandhinagar

Date: 05.08.2020

Annexure - I: List of Stakeholders who submitted their views on the Discussion Paper

Sr. No.	Name of Stakeholders
1	Paschim Gujarat Vij Company Ltd.
2	Rajkot Chamber of Commerce and Industries
3	Bahuchar Energy, Survey No. 502, Navaghanshyamgadh
4	Ronak Energy, Survey No. 521, Navaghanshyamgadh
5	Raj Energy, Survey No. 521, Navaghanshyamgadh
6	Dhavdi Energy, Survey No. 521, Navaghanshyamgadh
7	Pari Energy, Morbi
8	Madhuvan Green Energy, Morbi
9	Comandant Solar Energy Pvt.Ltd, Morbi
10	Creanza Solar Energy Pvt.Ltd, Morbi
11	Orinda Power Energy, Survey no.23, Dudhai
12	Pawansut Power Energy, Survey No.79, Dudhai
13	Enwatech Engineers, Ahmedabad
14	Aditya Power Corporation
15	Madhu Silica, Vartej, Bhavnagar
16	Likhiya Green Energy, Chanchpar, Morbi
17	Rojmala Green Energy, Chanchpar, Morbi
18	Sunbright Power
19	Satyam Power
20	Satyam Energy, Jam Dudhai, Jamnagar
21	Shivam Energy, Jam Dudhai, Jamnagar
22	Sundaram Energy, Jam Dudhai, Jamnagar
23	Duva Green Energy, Morbi
24	Goldi Solar Pvt. Ltd., Surat
25	Shree Cement Ltd, Bangurnagar, Rajsthan
26	Dwarka Sea Water Desalination Pvt. Ltd.,
27	Gir Somnath Desalination Pvt. Ltd.,
28	Kutch Sea Water Desalination Pvt. Ltd.,

Sr. No.	Name of Stakeholders
29	Bhavnagar Desalination Pvt. Ltd.,
30	Federation of Renewable & Consumers of Energy
31	Torrent Power Ltd
32	Aditya Birla Renewables Limited

Annexure - II: List of stakeholders who presented their views during Virtual Public Hearing (Through Video Conference)

Sr. No.	Name of Stakeholders
1	Paschim Gujarat Vij Company Ltd.
2	Rajkot Chamber of Commerce and Industries
3	Comandant Solar Energy Pvt.Ltd, Morbi
4	Creanza Solar Energy Pvt.Ltd, Morbi
5	Madhu Silica, Vartej, Bhavnagar
6	Rojmala Green Energy, Chanchpar, Morbi
7	Goldi Solar Pvt. Ltd., Surat
8	Shree Cement Ltd, Bangurnagar, Rajsthan
9	Dwarka Sea Water Desalination Pvt. Ltd.,
10	Gir Somnath Desalination Pvt. Ltd.,
11	Kutch Sea Water Desalination Pvt. Ltd.,
12	Bhavnagar Desalination Pvt. Ltd.,
13	Torrent Power Ltd
14	Aditya Birla Renewables Limited
15	Chamber of Commerce and Industries, Kutch
16	Sisam Ceramics Pvt. Limited
17	Ambit Energy Pvt. Limited
18	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Ltd.
19	BEE Electric Power Pvt. Limited