

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi**

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

Petition No.: 136/TT/2011

Date of Hearing: 28.11.2011

Subject: Approval under Regulation 86 of CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations 1999 and CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations 2009 for determination of Transmission Tariff for ICT III at Raipur Sub-station along with bay extension (Anticipated DOCO 1.7.2011) under WRSS VI scheme for tariff block 2009-14 period in Western Region.

Petitioner: Power Grid Corporation of India Limited, Gurgaon

Respondents: Chattisgarh State Electricity Board, Raipur

Parties present: Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri Sudhir Agarwal, PGCIL

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The representative of the petitioner submitted that transmission tariff is prayed for the ICT-III at Raipur Sub-station along with the bay extension under WRSS-VI scheme in Western Region. The Investment approval for the ICT was granted in February 2008 with a time line of 33 months and was scheduled to be commissioned in November 2010. However, the ICT was commissioned in July 2011, resulting in a delay of 7 months.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that in order to enhance the reliability and availability, it was decided by the petitioner, to validate the design of 315 MVA Auto transformer for short circuit conditions once for each manufacturer including M/s AREVA, which was given award for supply and erection of 315 MVA Autotransformer at Raipur Sub-station. The test facilities for Short Circuit Test are not available in India and the testing was done in KEMA, Netherland. The Autotransformer failed in short circuit test and it required detailed investigation of failure after transporting the same back to India and suitable modifications and re-testing at KEMA resulting in further delay. The petitioner diverted another short circuit tested Autotransformer from Gaya Sub-station to Raipur Sub-station to avoid any further delay.

3. Replying to a query of the Commission, the representative of the petitioner submitted that there is provision for claiming Liquidated Damages (LD) in the

agreement with AREVA. He further submitted that the LD realized from AREVA would be adjusted in the capital cost. The representative of the petitioner requested to condone the time over-run in commissioning of the asset.

4. None appeared on behalf of the respondents.
5. Order in the petition was reserved.

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)
14.12.2011