

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 89/TT/2012

- Subject : Determination of transmission tariff from anticipated DOCO to 31.3.2014 for (a) assets 2X500 MVA ICTs at Jaipur-South (anticipated DOCO 1.6.2012) (b) 2X315 MVA ICTs at Sohwal (anticipated DOCO 1.7.2012) and (c) Combined tariff of LILO of 400 kV D/C Agra-Jaipur line at Jaipur-South (anticipated DOCO 1.7.2012) & LILO of 400 kV D/C Balia-Lucknow line at Sohwal (anticipated DOCO 1.7.2012) under Northern Regional transmission strengthening Scheme in NR for tariff block 2009-14 period.
- Date of Hearing : 4.3.2014
- Coram : Shri Gireesh B.Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Smt. Neerja Mathur, Member, Ex-Officio
- Petitioner : PGCIL
- Respondents : RRVPL and 16 others
- Parties present : Shri A.M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL,
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL,
Smt. Seema Gupta, PGCIL
Shri P. Saraswath, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted that the petition is filed for determination of transmission tariff for two ICTs at Sohawal, two ICTs at Jaipur, LILO of Agra-Jaipur and LILO of Balia-Lucknow. As per the Investment Approval dated 17.3.2010, the instant assets were to be commissioned within 32 months from the date of Investment Approval, i.e. 1.12.2012. All the assets, except LILO of Balia-Lucknow at



Sohawal were completed in time, where there was a delay of two months. The reasons for delay were submitted vide affidavit dated 9.1.2014. Revised tariff forms as per the actual date of commercial operation are already submitted. Reply has been filed by AVVNL, JVVNL, PSPCL and UPPCL and rejoinder for the replies have been filed.

2. The representative of the petitioner also submitted that there was a typographical error in Form 5B pertaining to LILO of Agra-Jaipur and LILO of Balia-Lucknow and hence revised Form 5B has been submitted. She requested to approve the tariff on the basis of the Management Certificate filed on the basis of the actual date of commercial operation.

3. The learned counsel for the BRPL submitted that the petition was filed by the petitioner on 27.2.2012 as per Regulation 5 of the 2009 tariff Regulation, according to which a transmission tariff petition can be filed for completed assets or assets projected to be completed within six months from the date of application. Accordingly, the assets should have been commissioned before 27.8.2012 however the sub-station at Jaipur and LILO Balia-Lucknow came up on 1.2.2013, after 11 months. As the assets came up after more than 6 months, the petitioner may be directed to revise the petition. He further submitted that the petitioner's prayer for additional return on equity of 0.5% may not be allowed.

4. The representative of the petitioner clarified that usually petitions are filed before six months of anticipated commissioning and in some cases the commissioning is delayed due to RoW problems and other reasons beyond its control. In such cases the revised tariff forms and Management Certificate are filed. Similarly, in the instant case revised tariff forms and Management Certificate have been filed and Auditor's certificate shall be filed at the time of the truing up. The representative of the petitioner submitted that additional return on equity is not claimed in the revised tariff forms.

5. The Commission observed that the total estimated completion cost in case of LILO of 400 kV D/C Agra-Jaipur Line at Jaipur-South & LILO of 400 kV D/c Balia-Lucknow Line at Sohawal is more than the apportioned approved cost. The Commission directed the petitioner to file asset-wise revised cost estimates approved by its Board. The Commission further directed the petitioner to file Management Certificate, in future, certified by its statutory auditor.

6. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the asset-wise revised cost estimates approved by its Board before 31.3.2014.



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

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

