CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

Petition No. 163/TT/2016

Subject: Truing up of transmission tariff of 2009-14 period and determination

of tariff of 2014-19 for LILO of 1st Circuit of 400 kV D/C Nathpa Jhakri-Nalagarh (Triple Snowbird) line at Rampur under transmission

system associated with Rampur HEP in Northern Region.

Date of Hearing : 5.10.2016

Coram: Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Dr. M.K. lyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (16 others)

Parties present: Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL

Shri M. M. Mondal, PGCIL Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL

Shri S.K. Agarwal, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms Shri A.P. Sinha, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms Shri S.P. Das, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms

Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed for approval for truing up transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 of LILO of 1st Circuit of 400 kV D/C Nathpa Jhakri-Nalagarh (Triple Snowbird) line at Rampur under transmission system associated with Rampur HEP in Northern Region under the Terms and Conditions of Tariff Regulations, 2009 and 2014. The instant was commissioned on 1.3.2014. The representative of the petitioner submitted that as directed in order dated 25.8.15 in Petition No. 288/TT/2013, the reasons for increase in the cost of the asset and the details of IDC, IEDC are submitted in the instant truing up petition. He submitted that the RCE submitted may be considered.

2. In response to a query regarding two and half times increase in the cost of the asset, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the line is executed in a difficult hilly terrain, which was not envisaged in the FR stage and it led to increase in cost. He also submitted that the cost increase is due to the price variation and the same may be allowed.



- 3. The learned counsel BRPL submitted that the Commission was not convinced with the reasons submitted by the petitioner for the cost over-run and hence it was not approved in Petition No.288/TT/2013. He submitted that the line is only 2.6 km and still there is a huge variation in cost and it should not be allowed. The additional capital expenditure of ₹25 lakh already allowed only be considered and the petitioner's claim for ₹173.46 may not be allowed. He also submitted that the petitioner has not submitted the details of IDC and IEDC discharged. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the details of IDC and IEDC and cost of over-run are already submitted in the petition.
- 4. The learned counsel for the Rajasthan Discoms submitted that reply to the petition has already been filed. The representative of the petitioner sought time to file rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondents.
- 5. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the following additional information on affidavit, by 14.10.2016, with advance copy to the respondents:
 - a) Reconciliation of form 5D with RCE. Details of apportionment of cost for various assets under project scope.
 - b) An undertaking mentioning the actual equity infused for the total capital cost as on COD is not less than 30% of the total cost submitted in the petition.
 - c) Details of un-discharged liability.
 - d) Auditor certified details of capital cost on cash basis as on COD along with liability flow statement duly reconciled with capital cost as per books of account and yearwise IDC and IEDC discharged on cash basis from COD and beyond.
- 6. The Commission further directed the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 28.10.2016. The Commission further observed that no extension of time shall be granted and in case, no information is submitted within the due date, the matter shall be considered based on the available records.
- 7. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-V. Sreenivas Dy. Chief (Law)

