CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

Petition No. 61/TT/2013

Subject: Approval of Transmission tariff for 400 kV, 80 MVAR Bus Reactor

with associated bays at 400/220 kV Sikar Sub-station under "System Strengthening scheme in Northern Region for Sasan and

Mundra UMPPs" in Northern Region.

Date of Hearing: 3.3.2015

Coram: Shri A.K. Singhal, Member

Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Petitioner: Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents: Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and 16 others

Parties present: Shri M. M. Mondal, PGCIL

Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL

Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL

Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL

Shri Anshul Garg, PGCIL Ms Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL Shri S.M. Malik, PEL Power

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted as follows:-

- (a) This petition is filed by PGCIL seeking transmission tariff for transmission assets commissioned under Northern Region System Strengthening scheme, for tariff block 2009-14 period in Northern Region;
- (b) As per the Investment Approval (IA) dated 10.12.2009, the assets included in the project scope were to be commissioned within 32 months from the date of IA. Accordingly, the scheduled date of commercial operation works out to 9.8.2012, i.e. 1.9.2012;
- (c) The assets were actually commissioned on 1.9.2012 accordingly there is no delay in commissioning of the assets;

- (d) The total approved cost of the project is ₹121683 lakh including IDC of ₹5770 lakh. The apportioned cost of the instant asset is ₹1242.52 lakh. The estimated completion cost of the instant asset as on the date of commercial operation is ₹847.79 lakh and the projected additional capital expenditure is ₹193.33 lakh and ₹128.89 lakh during 2012-13 and 2013-14 respectively.
- 2. The petitioner was allowed provisional tariff vide order dated 25.3.2013.
- 3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with a copy to the respondents by 3.4.2015:
 - a. The copy of computation of the IDC (soft copy in excel format) and IEDC capitalized for the assets along with the loan agreement, applicable interest rates from time to time and interest payment schedule whether quarterly/half yearly/annually and to clarify whether entire amount of IDC has been paid prior to DOCO and if there is any default in the payment of the interest by the petitioner.
- 4. The Commission further observed that due date of filing the information should be complied with and information received after due date shall not be considered while passing the order.
- 5. Subject to this, Commission reserved the order in the petition.

By Order of the Commission

sd/-(T. Rout) Chief (Legal)