

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 125/TT/2016**

Subject: Determination of transmission tariff for fibre optic communication system in lieu of existing Unified Load Despatch and Communication (ULDC) Microwave links being Asset-1: Central Sector portion (2186.339 km) and Asset-2: BBMB portion (208.438 km) totaling to 2394.777 km in Northern Region for tariff block 2014-19.

Date of Hearing : 17.1.2017

Coram : 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 17 others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri K.K. Jain, PGCIL  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Manoj Kumar Sharma, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition covers the fibre optic communication system of Central Sector portion of 2186.339 km and BBMB portion of 208.438 km in Northern Region. He submitted that the instant assets were scheduled to be commissioned in September 2014. However, the same were commissioned on 1.4.2016 resulting in delay of 18 months. He submitted that the instant links were to be installed on Kashipur-Bareilly and Kashipur-Roorkee transmission lines and delay in execution of these lines led to time over-run in case of the instant assets. He submitted that time over-run in case of the transmission lines is



due to delay in obtaining forest clearance, RoW issues, non-availability of shutdown and foggy conditions.

2. The representative of the petitioner further submitted that rejoinder to the reply of BRPL was filed vide affidavit dated 2.12.2016 and has also filed the information sought vide order dated 6.10.2016. The completion cost of the instant assets is within the FR cost and requested to condone the time over-run of 18 months.

3. Learned counsel for the BRPL, Respondent No. 12 submitted that the capital cost of the instant asset has been over-estimated. He submitted that petitioner has not submitted DPR, PERT and CPM analysis which are necessary for examination of time over-run. The TSA as per provisions of Regulation 3(63) of 2014 Regulations has not been submitted. With the installation of OPGW fiber optic cable, the earth wire in the existing EHV transmission lines would become redundant and it is required to be de-capitalised. The petitioner has not mentioned how the dark fibres (spare) are going to be utilized and has not submitted the details of revenue realized from the spare fibres. He submitted that out of 24 links only 6 links are used and hence tariff should be allowed only for 6 links.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the following information, on affidavit by 16.2.2017 with a copy to the respondents:-

- a) Detailed Project Report
- b) CPM Analysis
- c) Pert Chart and Bar Chart
- d) Book value and written down value of OPGW
- e) TSA, if any
- f) Clarify how the remaining 18 links are to be used by the beneficiaries.
- g) Clarify whether some dark fibres (spare) are also available in OPGW and if so, how these are to be utilized.

5. The Commission further directed the respondents to file their reply by 28.2.2017 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 10.3.2017. The Commission further observed that no extension of time shall be granted.



6. The petition shall be listed for further hearing on 21.3.2017.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-  
(T. Rout)  
Chief (Law)

