

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 185/TT/2014

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff of **Asset 1** : Aurangabad (MSETCL)-Aurangabad (PG) 400 kV D/C (Quad) Line (Ckt#1) and shifting of 400 kV D/C Akola-Aurangabad (MSETCL) line to Aurangabad (PG) along with associated bays at both ends. **Asset 2**: Aurangabad (MSETCL) - Aurangabad (PG) 400 kV D/C Akola- Aurangabad (MSETCL) line to Aurangabad (PG) along with associated bays at both ends. **Asset-3**: 240 MVAR Switchable Line reactor for 765 kV Seoni- Wardha Ckt#1 at Seoni Sub-station, **Asset-4**: 240 MVAR Switchable Line reactor for 765 kV Seoni- Wardha ckt#2 at Seoni- Wardha Ckt#2 at Seoni Sub-station. **Asset-5**: 400 kV D/C Vapi-Kala transmission line WR1 portion from AP 38- AP 44-AP45A/0 (Part of 400 kV D/C Navsari- Boisar transmission line), **Asset-6**: 80 MVAR Line reactor for 400 kV D/C Wardha-Aurangabad transmission line Ckt#1 to be charged as bus reactor 1 at 400/220 kV Wardha Sub-station, **Asset-7**: 80 MVAR Line reactor for 400 kV D/C Wardha- Aurangabad transmission line Ckt#2 to be charged as bus reactor 1 at 400/220 kV Wardha Sub-station under transmission system associated with Mundra Ultra Mega Power Project (UMPP) in Western Region for 2014-19 tariff period.

Date of Hearing : 6.4.2016

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited and 7 others

Parties present : Shri A. M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Shri Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL
Shri Piyush Awasthi, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Subhash C Taneja, PGCIL
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL



Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff of assets under transmission system associated with Mundra Ultra Mega Power Project (UMPP) in Western Region for 2014-19 tariff period.
- b) As per the investment approval dated 15.10.2008, the instant assets were scheduled to be commissioned on 1.11.2012. The Assets- 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were commissioned on 30.4.2014, 29.4.2014, 2.5.2014, 1.4.2014 and 1.4.2014, respectively, and there is time over-run in case of all the assets. He submitted that the time over-run in case of Asset-1 & 2 is due to change in scope of work and RoW issues. The scope of 400 kV D/C (Quad) Aurangabad (PG)-Aurangabad (MSETCL) has been deleted in the earlier contract and subsequently the line was clubbed with 400 kV D/C (twin) Akola (MSETCL)-Aurangabad (PG) line on multi-circuit towers due to constraint of bays at Aurangabad (MSETCL). The new package was awarded on March 2012, i.e. delay of 1.5 years. In this regard, he has also submitted the colour SLD. He further submitted that the transmission line from Sipat-2 supplementary got terminated at Aurangabad MSETCL as MSETCL has no bay for further expansion. Accordingly, the petitioner is creating their own bay for strong interconnection. Further, in case of Assets-3, 4 and 5, the time over-run is due to delay in funding from World Bank and forest clearance. He requested to condone the time over-run as it is beyond its control.
- c) There is cost over-run in case of Asset-1 and Asset-2. The completion cost is within the approved apportioned cost in case of Assets-3, 4 and 5.
- d) Assets - 6 and 7 are not yet commissioned.

2. The Commission observed that tariff for Assets-1 to 5 will be determined in this petition as Assets 6 and 7 have not been commissioned. The Commission directed the petitioner to file a separate petition as soon as Assets 6 and 7 are commissioned and to exclude the AFC granted for Assets 6 and 7, vide order dated 24.9.2014, from the PoC computation, if not already done.

3. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the following on affidavit with an advance copy to the beneficiaries by 14.4.2016:-

- a) Revised scope of work for the project;
- b) Documentary evidence for Asset-5 in the chronological order;
- c) RCE along with the approved apportioned cost for all the assets;
- d) The amount of balance and retention payment yet to be made along with the details of the contract for which payment has been retained along with the amount retained.



- e) Certificate issued by RLDC as per Regulation 5 (2) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations in support of trial operation or commercial operation date for the assets, if applicable.
- f) Detailed computation of O&M Expenses worked out as per Form-2 of Asset-5.
- g) Asset-wise details of actual IDC and IEDC on cash basis upto scheduled COD and from scheduled COD to anticipated/actual COD for the asset.
- h) Details of FERV gain/loss upto scheduled COD and from scheduled COD to anticipated/actual COD for the asset.
- i) Initial spares discharged on cash basis upto COD and to be discharged post COD for Asset 4 and 5.

4. The Commission further directed the respondents to file reply by 21.4.2016, 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/-
V. Sreenivas
Dy. Chief (Law)

