

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
4th Floor, Chanderlok Building, 36, Janpath, New Delhi- 110001
Ph: 23753942 Fax-23753923

Ref: Docket No. 26/TT/2011

Date: 30.09.2011

To
The Deputy General Manager (Commercial),
Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,
Saudamini, Plot No. 2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon-122001

Subject: Approval for transmission tariff for Combined assets for (1) 400 kV D/C Mundra- Bachchau (Triple Snowbird) Transmission Line along with associated bays at Bachchau Sub-Station (Extension) and 400 kV D/C Bachau- Ranchodpura T/L with associated bays at Bachau and Ranchodpura S/S, 400 kV D/C Mundra- Limbdi T/L (Triple Snowbird) with associated bays at Limbdi S/S, under ATS for Mundra (4000 MW) UMPP for the period from DOCO to 31.03.2014

Sir,

I am directed to refer to your petition on the subject mentioned above, filed in this Commission on 7.9.2011 and to request you to furnish following information on affidavit, with advance copy to the respondents/ beneficiaries, latest by 14.10.2011:

- (i) Detailed justification for claiming additional RoE under para 10.3 of the petition, as the assets are getting commissioned after a period of 30 months from the date of investment approval, the completion time mentioned in Appendix – II of the Tariff Regulations, 2009.
- (ii) Detailed justification for claiming higher initial spares, as there is no provision in the 2009 regulations for claiming initial spares during the period of conceptualization.
- (iii) The OEM's recommendations for initial spares for transmission lines and sub-stations.
- (iv) The increase in no. of tension towers due to RoW problem and also the increase in length of the line in km and detailed justification with documentary evidence for increase in cost of tower steel by 40.6% as mentioned in Form – 5 B at Page 44 of your petition.
- (v) Detailed justification with documentary evidence for increase in cost and length of earth wire by 33.8% in Form – 5 B at Page 44 of your petition in the light of the fact that in spite of increase in length of line, the cost of conductor has reduced from the FR cost, whereas the earth wire and phase conductors are made of the same material except in the case of OPWG.

- (vi) Detailed justification with documentary evidence for increase in cost of “Hardware Fittings” by 34.8 %, “Switchgear, (CT,PT, Circuit breaker, isolators etc” by 35.6%, “Bus Bars, conductors/ insulators” by 132.8%, “Structure for Switchyard” by 104%, item-wise increase in cost of the “Auxiliary System” by 84% in Form – 5 B at Page 44 of your petition.
- (vii) Detailed justification with documentary evidence for increase in cost under the head “Preliminary investigation, Right of the way, forest clearance, PTCC, general civil works, compensation etc.” by 204.9 % in Form – 5 B at Page 48 of your petition.
- (viii) Detailed justification with documentary evidence for increase in cost under head “Tower Steel” by 40.6 % and the increase in number of towers, change in length of transmission line, if any, on account of RoW problem. Also explain the decrease in cost of conductor and increase in cost of earth wire when both are made of same material except for OPWG in Form – 5 B at Page 48 of your petition.
- (ix) Detailed justification with documentary evidence for increase in cost by 23.5% under the head “Insulators”, 12.8% under the head “Hardware fittings”, 68.2% under the head “Misc. For civil works”, 71.7% under the head “ Switchgear, (CT, PT, Circuit Breaker, Isolators etc.), 68.2% under the head “ Bus bars, Conductors/ insulators”, 40.4% under “Structure for Switchyard” and 77.9 % under the head “Auxiliary System” along with the component-wise break-up under auxiliary system, in Form 5B at page No. 48-49 of your petition along with the documentary evidence.
- (x) Detailed explanation with documentary evidence for increase in cost by 318 % under the Compensating Equipment (Reactor, SVCs etc),” in Form 5-B at Page 49” of your petition along with the documentary evidence and also the reasons for passing the increase in cost due to non shifting of reactors from Seoni, on the beneficiaries when this was a business decision of the petitioner company in which the beneficiaries have no say.
- (xi) Detailed break-up of Final/ Retention payments, PV works completed but to be billed latter etc. as per Regulation 9 (1) of Tariff Regulations
- (xii) Data for capital cost bench marking in accordance with the Commission’s orders dated 27.04.2010 and 16.06.2010 regarding benchmarking of capital cost of 765/400 kV Transmission Lines and Sub-Stations.
- (xiii) Status of DOCO for the assets covered in the petition. If there is a change in anticipated DOCO, revised CA/ Management certificate and funding pattern as per revised DOCO may be submitted.
- (xiv) Revised CA/ Management Certificate for Asset-3 for break-up of cost up to 1.1.2012/ anticipated notional DOCO.

Yours faithfully,

(P.K.Sinha)
Assistant Chief (Legal)