

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

4th Floor, ChanderlokBuilding ,36, Janpath, New Delhi- 110001

Ph: 23753942 Fax-23753923

Ref: Docket No. 001/TT/2011

(Now petition no. 160/2011)

Date: 24.08.2011

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

Subject: Approval for determination of Transmission Tariff for assets under “ERSS-II” in Eastern Region for 2009-14 period

Sir,

Please refer to your petition on the subject mentioned above, and this Commission’s earlier letter dated 14.7.2011. In this connection, I request you to furnish the following further information on affidavit, with an advance copy to the respondents/ beneficiaries, latest by 08.09.2011

- (i) 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.
- (ii) Actual DOCO of the Assets.
- (iii) Reason and justification for delay separately for commissioning of new bus reactors at Purnea and Siliguri as the reason for delay given is same but the anticipated DOCO is different . If delay was due to supply of reactors because of dispute then the schedule for supply of reactors after dispute resolution should be same and therefore, DOCO should also be same.
- (iv) Reason and Justification for delay in reactor shifting work in light of the fact that the delay in supply of reactors could have caused delay in commissioning of new reactors, not in the shifting of reactors.
- (v) In Form 5 C of the petition, the award date of reactors is mentioned as Oct,08 but in petition it is mentioned as March,10.Clarification in this regard.
- (vi) Details of activities planned and actually carried out, separately, for each of the assets in the petition, along with time duration of the activities, reason for delay in particular activity and responsible agency for the delay in the activity, so as to justify the delay in commissioning of the particular asset.
- (vii) Details of liquidated damages etc. recovered/ to be recovered from the supplier due to delay in supply.

- (viii) Justification of condoning the delay in commissioning of new reactors in light of the fact that the delay in supply of reactors was due to dispute between supplier and petitioner, which was a bilateral contractual matter and beneficiaries should not be burdened with IDC for the delay period.
- (ix) Reason and justification for lower estimated completion cost as compared to apportioned approved cost in each asset.

2. Further action in this matter will be taken as per Regulation 87 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations 1999 on receipt of the above information/ clarification.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-
(P.K.Sinha)
Assistant Chief (Legal)