

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No. 76/TT/2012

Subject : Approval of transmission charges for Additional Special Energy Meters in Northern Region for the tariff block 2009-14 period.

Date of hearing : 23.7.2013

Coram : Shri V.S. Verma, Member
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member (E.O.)

Petitioner : PGCIL, New Delhi

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd. (UPPCL) &16 others

Parties present : Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted as follows:-

- (a) The instant petition has been filed seeking transmission charges for additional 365 Special Energy Meters (SEMs) and 81 Data Collection Devices (DCDs) acquired during 2010-11 in the Northern Region. The cost of procurement the SEMs and DCDs is ₹1.7 crore. The Commission vide order dated 12.7.2011 in Petition No. 288/2010 earlier allowed tariff for existing SEM's in Northern Region;
- (b) O&M expenses may be allowed @ 2% of the capital cost;
- (c) RPC was requested to allow the cost as a onetime reimbursement but the petitioner was advised to claim the cost through tariff. It was agreed in the 15th TCC and 16th NRPC meeting that the petitioner shall recover the

expenditure towards procurement of SEMs as per the 2009 Tariff Regulation;

2. In response to a query of the Commission, the representative of petitioner clarified that Investment Approval of the Board was not obtained even in the earlier case in Petition No. 288/2010. Further, as the expenditure involved was very small no investment approval has been obtained.
3. The representative of PSPCL submitted that the SEMs and DCDs are static electric equipment and the O&M expenses claimed by the petitioner is on a higher side and O&M expenses should be allowed only @ 1% of the capital cost. The Commission should direct the petitioner to submit a list of SEMs and DCDs installed and number of bids received.
3. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that SEMs are in the nature of equipment and they cannot be categorized as transmission asset. The SEMs are part of bays. O&M expenses are already provided for bays and there is no requirement for providing additional 2% O&M expenses for SEMs. He further submitted that the petitioner should have told the RPCs that the SEMs and DCDs are equipments and the expenditure in this regard cannot be recovered as tariff of transmission assets based on the 2009 Tariff Regulations.
4. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the Commission approved the cost of SEMs in Petition No.288/2010 as per the provisions of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.
5. The Commission directed the PSPCL to file its reply on before 2.8.2013 and the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 12.8.2013.
6. Subject to above, order in the petition was reserved.

By the order of the Commission,

Sd/-
T. Rout
Joint Chief (Law)