

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 256/TT/2013

Subject : Determination of tariff in respect of Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Company Limited (MSETCL) owned transmission lines/system with the other states as per the Commission's order dated 14.3.2012 in Petition No. 15/SM/2012, for inclusion in the POC transmission charges in accordance with the 2009 Tariff Regulations

Date of Hearing : 25.3.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member

Petitioner : Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Company Limited

Respondent : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited & 4 others

Parties present : Shri Walke M.C., MSETCL
Shri Santosh Kumar Singh, MSETCL

Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard on 25.3.2014. The petitioner has submitted capital cost for nine inter-State transmission lines and requested the Commission to approve the Annual Fixed Costs based on the capital cost, for 2012-13 and 2013-14.

2. None appeared for the respondents.



3. The Commission directed MSETCL to submit following information on affidavit before 12.5.2014:-

- a) Capital cost, duly certified by an auditor, if available;
- b) Funding pattern of the assets, i.e. the actual debt and equity considered towards the transmission assets as on date of commercial operation;
- c) Repayment schedule and interest rates of the loan(s) availed as per Form-13 with supporting documents;
- d) Cumulative depreciation against the assets as on 31.3.2012;
- e) Details of ARR approved by the SERC for FY 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 & 2013-14, and details as per Table overleaf separately, for the respective years, containing total amount approved for the respective years:-

(FY _____) ARR _____ (₹ in lakh)		
SL. No.	LINE TYPE	Length*
		(CKt- Km)
1.	+500 kV HVDC	
2.	+800 kV HVDC	
3.	765 kV D/C	
4.	765 kV S/C	
5.	400 kV D/C	
6.	400 KV D/C Quad. Moose	
7.	400 kV S/C	
8.	220 kV D/C	
9.	220 kV S/C	
10.	132 kV D/C	
11.	132 kV S/C	
12.	66 KV	

* Total length in the State for which ARR has been approved

- f) In case norms for O&M have not been finalized by the SERC, actual audited O&M expenses for that fiscal year.



4. The Commission also directed CTU to provide latest available indicative cost for the type of lines in the above table.

5. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

