

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 397/TT/2014

Subject : Truing up tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and determination of tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for the for Vindhyachal Stage-I Additional Transmission System in Western Region

Date of Hearing : 21.12.2015.

Coram : Shri A. S. Bakshi, Member
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd. and 7 and others

Parties present : Shri S.K. Niranjana, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri Anshul Garg, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri Piyush Awasthi, PGCIL
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri J. Mazumder, PGCIL
Shri Shashi Bhushan. PGCIL
Shri Avinash M. Pavgi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for truing up tariff of 2009-2014 tariff block and determination of tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for Vindhyachal Stage-I



Additional Transmission System in Western Region.

- b) The assets were commissioned on 1.2.1998. The admitted capital cost as on 31.3.2009 is ₹80815.03. For 2009-14 tariff period, the petitioner has sought approval of actual additional capital expenditure of ₹249.73 lakh as against approved additional capital expenditure of ₹1054.77 lakh for the 2009-14 tariff period. For 2014-19 tariff period, the petitioner has claimed projected additional capital expenditure of ₹786.97 lakh towards tower strengthening in 2014-15 and 2015-16.
- c) The additional capital expenditure claimed is well within the approved cost, however the work has spilled over from 2009-14 tariff period to 2014-19 tariff period.
- d) One of the contractor's performance was not satisfactory and the contractor was changes and hence the work spilled over from 2009-14 to 2014-19 tariff period.
2. In response to a query of the Commission regarding the reasons for delay in completion of the work, the representative of the petitioner clarified that the delay in tower strengthening works was due to contractor's non-performance and the petitioner had to cancel one of the contract and reallocate it to another contractor.
3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit if there were any commercial implications including escalation in the cost due to change in contractors. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the details and treatment of the damages recovered from that contractor, if any.
4. The Commission directed that the above information should be filed by 31.12.2015, failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.
5. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(M.M Chaudhari)
Assistant Chief(Fin)

