

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 195/TT/2016**

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for Asset-I: 400 kV FSC in Ballia-I and II bays at Sohawal Sub-station of 400 kV D/C Ballia- Sohawal Line, Asset-II: 2 Nos. 220 kV Line bays (Feeder-SEZ and Feeder- Dooni) at 400/220 kV Jaipur South Sub-station and Asset-III: Bays of 50 MVAR Bus reactor 2 & 3 at 400/220 kV Bassi Sub-station under Northern Regional Transmission Strengthening Scheme in Northern Region.

Date of Hearing : 17.11.2016.

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and 16 others

Parties present : Shri V.P. Rastogi, PGCIL  
S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri Gaurav Gupta, PSPCL

**Record of Proceedings**

The learned counsel of BRPL vide letter dated 11.11.2016 made a request for a short adjournment on account of some personal difficulty. The Commission taking into consideration the request of learned counsel of BRPL directed to list the matter on 6.12.2016.

2. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the following information, on affidavit by 30.11.2016 with a copy to the respondents:-



- a. In case of Asset III the cost as on COD in the petition has been shown as ₹607.46 lakh and expenditure from COD to 31.3.2016 has been shown as Zero (0). While as per form- 7 the cost as on COD is ₹597.71 lakh and expenditure from COD to 31.3.2016 has been shown as ₹9.75 lakh. Clarify the discrepancy;
- b. As per trail operation certificate of NRLDC, Asset-II is charged under no load condition. Status of feeders associated with 2 nos. 220 kV line bays at 400/220 kV Jaipur South Sub-station covered under Asset-II;
- c. The Asset-I and LILO of Balia-Lucknow line at new Sohawal Sub-station were together approved by Board of Directors of Powergrid vide investment approval dated 17.3.2010. The schedule completion of the whole project was within 32 months from the IA. However, it has been submitted that Asset-I is delayed because FSC could only be removed after commissioning of LILO of Balia-Lucknow line. Clarify, when Asset-I and LILO of Balia-Lucknow line both were approved to be commissioned within 32 months from IA, than why it has taken 38 months and 26 days for the commissioning?;
- d. Reasons for delay along with proper justification for all the assets as per format given below:-

Asset	Activity	Period of Activity		Reason(s) for delay alongwith reference of documentary evidence submitted
		Planned	Achieved	

- e. The estimated completion cost of all the three assets is on lower side, in case of Asset I, the completion cost is 25% of the apportioned cost for Asset II the completion cost is about 80% of apportioned cost, the reason and justification for the same;
- f) Auditor's certificate of expenditure for the Asset-I must be in the form of element wise segregation of capital cost and segregation of IDC and IEDC included thereon as on date of commercial operation;
- g) Details, If there is any default in interest payment on loan;
- h) Form-4 A "Statement of Capital Cost" as per books of accounts (accrual basis) for all the assets. Amount of capital liabilities in gross block should also be indicated;



- i) Computation of interest during construction for the assets for the following periods:-
  - (i) From the date of infusion of debt fund up to scheduled COD/actual COD as per Regulation 11 (A) (1) of 2014 Tariff Regulation.
  - (ii) If there is any delay in completion of the asset/s, from scheduled COD to actual COD of the asset/s.
- j) Details of incidental expenditure incurred (IEDC) during the period of delay in commissioning of the assets (i.e. from Scheduled COD to actual COD/anticipated COD) along with the liquidated damages recovered or recoverable, if any;
- k) Form-9 (Details of allocation of corporate loans to various transmission elements) in respect of all the assets; and
- l) Reasons for abnormal difference in apportioned cost and completion cost in case of Asset-l.

3. The petitioner is also directed to submit editable soft copy (excel format) of information sought in Point No. (j) with links by 30.11.2016.

By order of the Commission

-sd-  
(T. Rout)  
Chief (Law)

