

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 13/MP/2011**

**Coram: Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson  
Shri S. Jayaraman, Member  
Shri V.S. Verma, Member**

**Date of Hearing: 26.4.2011**

**Date of Order: 23.3.2012**

**In the matter of:**

Miscellaneous petition under Regulation 24 of CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations 1999 seeking approval for procurement of two ERS-Substations for North-Eastern Region beneficiaries.

**And**

**In the matter of:**

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., Gurgaon

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs**

1. Assam State Electricity Board, Assam
2. Meghalaya State Electricity Board, Shillong
3. Government of Arunachal Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh
4. Power & Electricity Deptt., Aizwal
5. Electricity Department, Imphal
6. Department of Power, Nagaland
7. Tripura State Electricity Corporation Limited, Tripura

**...Respondents**

**The following were present:**

1. Shri R.K. Arora, PGCIL
2. Shri B Vamsi, PGCIL



## ORDER

This miscellaneous petition has been filed by PGCIL under Regulation 24 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 seeking regulatory approval for procurement of two Emergency Restoration System (ERS) sub-stations, one 400 kV & one 132 kV voltage level, for Northern-Eastern Region beneficiaries (hereinafter referred to as "transmission asset") and determination of tariff in terms Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as "2009 regulations").

2. The petitioner has submitted that it operates, at present, 14 sub-stations with 11 transformers totaling 1345 MVA and the sub-stations maintained and operated by the petitioner in North-Eastern Region (NER) by 2012-13 would be 20 involving 26 power transformers with a transmission capacity of 2235 MVA. The petitioner has sought approval to procure 2 ERS-sub-stations for NER from UI pool account of Power System Development Fund.

3. The petitioner has submitted that the issue of procurement of ERS sub-stations was taken up in the 9th TCC and 9th NERPC meeting held on 11th and 12th August, 2010 and the petitioner's proposal for procurement of 2 ERS sub-stations under UI pool account was agreed by the TCC.

4. The petitioner has submitted that the ERS sub-stations envisaged for NER would cater to emergency restoration of sub-station facilities including temporary replacement of 315 MVA 400/220 kV transformer and 30 MVA



132/133 kV transformer in a short time till permanent arrangement is made. The petitioner has further submitted that mobile sub-stations are used in a number of countries like USA, Spain, Saudi Arabia, etc. The cost of 2 ERS sub-stations has been estimated to be ₹ 13570 lakh and the actual cost of ERS shall be determined based on the competitive bidding process.

5. The matter was heard on 26.4.2011. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the surplus UI pool account of the Power System Development Fund (PSDF) should be allowed to be utilised for procurement of 2 ERS sub-stations. The Commission clarified that the petitioner should approach the Managing Committee of the Fund for expenditure sanction as per the procedure laid down in the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Power System Development Fund) Regulations, 2010 for this purpose. The representative of the petitioner requested to consider the instant petition for regulatory approval for procurement of the ERS sub-stations. The petitioner was permitted to file an amended petition for seeking regulatory approval to the proposal.

6. The petitioner has not filed amended petition for seeking regulatory approval to the proposal. The petitioner, in its affidavit dated 9.12.2011, has submitted that the issue of procurement of ERS sub-stations was discussed in the 11th NERPC, wherein it was observed that the procurement of ERS sub-stations was not covered under PSDF. The petitioner has further submitted that it was agreed to consider procurement of ERS sub-stations in the 12th



plan schemes, which are in the process of finalization and hence requested more time for filing amended petition.

7. The petition was filed in February, 2011 and is pending for more than a year now. The petitioner is yet to file the amended petition as permitted during the hearing on 26.4.2011. In our view, no useful purpose will be served to keep the petition pending.

8. The petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Commission after obtaining the consent of the beneficiaries for procurement of two ERS sub-stations.

Sd/-

**(V.S. Verma)**  
**Member**

Sd/-

**(S. Jayaraman)**  
**Member**

Sd/-

**(Dr. Pramod Deo)**  
**Chairperson**

