

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission  
New Delhi**

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Petition No. 334/2010**

Subject : Approval under Regulation 86 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999, for transmission tariff for ATS of Kopli-Khandong (Additional Transmission Gohpur-Itanagar (ATGI) in North Eastern Region for the period 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014

Date of Hearing : 29/9/2011

Coram : Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson  
Shri. S. Jayaraman, Member  
Shri. V.S. Verma, Member  
Shri. M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner : PGCIL, New Delhi

Respondents : ASEB & others.

Parties present : Shri. S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri. J. Mazumdar, PGCIL  
Shri. M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri. Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL  
Shri. K. Goswami, APDCL

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the petition has been filed seeking approval of additional capital expenditure of ₹ 377.20 lakh on account of commissioning of 10 MVA ICT at Nirjuli Sub-station, protection works due to landslides at Haflong Sub-station and installation of Isolators, to be incurred during the period 2010-11 and 2013-14. It was also submitted that there is a proposal for de-capitalization of ₹ 80.64 lakh on account of de-capitalisation of 10 MVA ICT at "Nirjuli" Sub-station and old Isolators, during the period 2010-11 and 2013-14.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that 10 MVA ICT-I at Nirjuli failed on 27.5.2008 while feeding fault in 33 kV feeder. The transformer was in commercial operation since 20.10.1991 and has completed about 17 years of service life. There was continuous stress on the transformer for about a year due to frequent faults in the 33 kV feeders. There were 246 number of transformer trippings during April, 2007 and May, 2008 due to fault in 33 kV feeders. The matter was

taken up with the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM), M/s Bharat Bijlee who expressed their inability to repair the transformer due to non-availability of adequate facility at their works. Since, there was urgency to restore the supply as the transformer feeds power to the capital of Arunachal Pradesh, it was decided to procure a new 10 MVA, 132/33kV Transformer.

3. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the failure of the transformer was mainly due to a number of faults in 33 kV SEB feeder, which was beyond the control of the petitioner and requested to allow the expenditure for replacement of this transformer as additional capital expenditure.

4. Replying to a query of the Commission whether any investigation was carried out by CEA or any other agency, the representative of the petitioner submitted that a Committee consisting of the representative from POWERGRID and manufacturer studied the problems and the minutes of meeting between the petitioner and the OEM has been submitted to the Commission.

5. Replying to another query of the Commission as to the number of faults that the transformer can withstand, the representative of the petitioner submitted that normally there are one or two faults during a year, but in the instant case, there were 246 faults in 13 months.

6. Replying to a further query of the Commission as to how the petitioner would protect its equipments from the fault of other agencies, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the protection system has been provided to protect the transformer from external faults. It was also submitted that the protection settings were decided at RPC level.

7. Replying to a query of the Commission regarding self insurance reserves the representative of the petitioner submitted that such failures of equipments are not covered in the insurance.

8. The representative of the respondent, Assam Power Distribution Company Ltd., submitted that in the 6th NERPC meeting it was decided that all the technical and commercial matters regarding failure of this ICT would be settled bilaterally between the petitioner and Arunachal Pradesh. The representative of the respondent requested not to allow the additional capital expenditure on account of replacement of the transformer.

9. The petitioner was directed to submit the following information by 20.10.2010:-

- a) Detailed investigation report which clearly establishes / proves that the failure of transformer was due to faults in the downstream 33 kV feeder.
- b) Details of the self insurance policy including the events which are covered in the policy.

- c) Details of protection system installed for the subject transformer and the OEM recommendation for protections to be installed for the transformer, alongwith the relevant portion of the transformer manual.
- d) Details of fault withstand capability of the transformer as per OEM specifications.
- e) Details of the steps taken by the petitioner for protecting its equipment, like transformers etc. from the external faults like, the faults in the system of State utilities.
- f) The reasons for not protecting the subject transformer from the faults in the 33 kV feeders?

11. Subject to the above, order in the petition has been reserved.

Sd/-

(T. Rout)  
Joint Chief (Law)

