

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 56/TT/2015

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff for Installation of 1X315 MVA 400/220 kV ICT at Bhadrawati HDVC back to back station under "Installation of transformer & procurement of spare converter transformer at Bhadrawati back to back station from COD to 31.3.2019.

Date of Hearing : 21.7.2015

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

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

Parties present : Shri A.M Pavgi, PGCIL
Shri Piyush Awasthi, PGCIL
Shri M.M Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K Venkatesan, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 1x315 MVA 400/220 kV ICT at Bhadrawati HDVC back to back station under "Installation of transformer & procurement of spare converter transformer at Bhadrawati back to back station;
- b) As per the Investment Approval (IA) dated 28.8.2013, the instant asset was scheduled to be commissioned within 24 months, i.e. by 27.8.2015 against this the asset was commissioned on 1.2.2015;
- c) The total estimated completion cost ₹2481.32 lakh exceeds the apportioned approved cost ₹1980.94 lakh. Hence, there is a cost over-run; and



d) The information sought by the Commission vide RoP dated 3.3.2015 has been submitted by the petitioner vide affidavit dated 13.7.2015.

2. None appeared on behalf of the respondents.

3. The Commission observed that despite MSETCL's submission during the 34th Meeting of Standing Committee on 9.5.2012 to delete the 220 kV bays from the scope, investment approval for the same was granted by the petitioner on 28.8.2013. The Commission desired to know as to why one 315 kV ICT is required to meet the auxiliary requirement of only 2 MVA. The representative of petitioner clarified that it is for auxiliary supply as there is no tertiary arrangement in the region.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the following information, on affidavit by 15.8.2015 with a copy to the respondents:-

- a) Trial operation certificate from RLDC and COD certificate;
- b) Revised Auditor certificate as per actual COD;
- c) Reason for cost over-run;
- d) Clarification for cost variation along-with documentary evidence in respect of items under various heads as per Form 5;
- e) Clarify the cost variation under the following heads, along with documentary evidence:
 - i. Foundation for structure: 223.36%
 - ii. Switchgear CT, PT, CB, Isolators etc. 212%
 - iii. Auxiliary system: 166.1%
- f) Status of procurement of spare convertor transformer (234 MVA, 1-phase 3-winding)- 3 nos., which has been included in the investment approval;
- g) The reason for inclusion of 220 kV bays in the scope of work despite discussion in the Standing Committee that the same be taken up as and when required by MSETCL;
- h) Explain how COD of 315 kV ICT can be allowed on account of loading in tertiary winding only and details if there is any such precedence;



- h) Status of line bays of the instant ICT and downstream system;
- i) Estimated completion cost of assets is more than approved FR cost by 25%. Explain the reasons of cost over-run;
- j) Status of line bays of the instant ICT and downstream system;
- k) Furnish element wise (i.e. land, building and civil work, TL, S/S etc) details of un-discharge liabilities as on COD and on closing of the each financial year during 2014-19 tariff block and details of year wise discharge/reversal of the same duly certified by the Auditor;
- l) Period wise and loan wise computation of interest during construction on cash basis along with editable soft copy in Excel format with links for the assets from the date of infusion of debt fund up to COD in support of the claim of the IDC amounting to ₹30.77 lakh vide auditor's certificate dated 1.6.2015;
- m) Supporting documents for **(a)** date of drawl and **(b)** interest payment date;
- n) Furnish month wise details of IEDC paid on cash basis in support of the claim of ₹109.63 lakh as per Auditor's certificate dated 1.6.2015;
- o) The capital cost figures as stated in Auditor's certificate is similar with the figures as shown in Form-4A "Statement of Capital Cost" as per Books of Accounts (Accrual Basis) for the assets. In this connection clarify whether, Form-4A has been submitted on cash basis or Auditor certificate has been submitted on accrual basis?
- p) Whether entire amount pertaining to initial spares for sub-station has been discharged upto COD, if not, submit year wise detail of payment made for the initial spares; and
- q) Submit Form-3, Form-5, Form-5A, Form-5B, Form-7, Form-7A, Form-12A, Form-13, Form-14 and Form-15.

6. The Commission further directed CEA and WRLDC to submit their comments on the COD of the instant asset.

7. The respondents were directed to file their replies by 28.8.2015 with advance copy to the petitioner who shall file its rejoinder, if any by 7.9.2015. The additional



information/replies/rejoinder shall be filed within the due date mentioned above. In case no information is filed within the due date, the matter shall be considered based on available records

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

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

