

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 13/TT/2017

- Subject:** Determination of transmission tariff for tariff block 2014-19 for three assets under “WR-NR HVDC Interconnector for IPP Projects in Chattisgarh” in Northern and Western Region under.
- Date of Hearing:** 3.8.2017
- 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 34 others
- Parties present:** Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Niranjana, PGCIL
Shri Sanjeev Kumar Chaudhary, PGCIL
Shri Ashok Pal, PGCIL
Shri V.N Prakash, PGCIL
Shri V.P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Vishal Anand, Advocate for TPDDL
Shri Rahul Kinra, Advocate for TPDDL
Shri Sandeep Kumar, TPDDL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate for BRPL
Shri Dilip Singh, MPPMCL
Shri Manish Garg, Advocate, BYPL
Shri Shekhar Saklani, BYPL
Shri Sameer Singh, BYPL
Shri R.K. Mehta, Advocate for OPTCL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted that the present petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 period for Asset I: Pole-I of the ± 800



kV, 3000 MW Champa Pooling Station and Kurukshetra HVDC terminals alongwith ± 800 kV Champa Pooling Station Kurukshetra HVDC transmission line; Asset-2 2 Nos. 400/220 kV, 500 MVA ICTs along with associated bays at 400/220 kV GIS Sub-station at Kurukshetra and Asset 3: 8 nos. 220 kV line bays at 400/220 kV GIS Sub-station at Kurukshetra under "WR-NR HVDC interconnector for IPP projects in Chhattisgarh" in Northern Region and Western Region. There is a time over-run of 18 months in commissioning of the transmission project and reasons for the delay along with supporting documents have been filed by the petitioner. He also submitted that the instant assets are being fully utilized.

2. The learned counsel for the TPDDL submitted as under:-

(a) The TPDDL is illegally burdened with the transmission charges of the WR-NR HVDC scheme, which does not render any service to the petitioner.

(b) In the 28th meeting of the Standing Committee held on 23.2.2010, it was discussed and agreed that in the absence of any identified beneficiary the transmission charges is to be borne by respective beneficiaries from the scheduled date of commissioning of generating units.

(c) On 24.2.2010, LTA was signed by 13 generating companies with the petitioner wherein the generating companies agreed that they will share and bear the applicable transmission charges.

(d) In the meeting held on 14th and 15th April, 2010, it was agreed that initially transmission charges would be borne by IPPs and after signing of LTA by the beneficiaries, the proportionate transmission charges have to be borne by the beneficiaries. Therefore, TPDDL is not liable to pay transmission charges corresponding to 1825 MW as the LTA of 1825 MW is on the basis of firm PPA signed by various IPPs with NR constituents and for remaining 2124 MW there is no identified beneficiary. Accordingly, the transmission charges and HVDC charges for 2124 MW is to be borne by generating companies.

(e) As per the Sharing of inter-State transmission charges and losses Regulations, 2010, the generators who have obtained long term access will also fall under the definition of designated ISTS customer or DIC. Therefore, the bill for the use of the instant ISTS shall be raised by the CTU on the concerned designated ISTS customers who could also be a generator.

(f) As per the Regulation 11(4)(3)(iii) of the 2010 Sharing Regulations, if there is a PPA or any other arrangement, then the transmission charges shall be borne by such DIC in proportion to the PPA or other arrangement.



(g) It is incorrect to state that since the LTA to target region is not operationalized, the LTA customer cannot be charged with POC charges. As it is agreed that if LTA is given to target region and there is no beneficiary then it is to be charged from the generator and not from the NR beneficiaries.

(h) It is incorrect to state that Regulation 11(4)(3)(iii) is not applicable in case of Champa-Kurukshetra line, as it was agreed that transmission charges for the identified scheme would be borne by the IPPs.

(i) The transmission charges of NR beneficiaries cannot be increased and it has to be charged from the generators who do not have identified beneficiary.

3. Learned counsel for BYPL submitted that as per Regulation 11(4)(3)(i) of the 2010 Sharing Regulations, the transmission charges of the HVDC system shall be payable by DICs of the concerned region in proportion to their Approved Withdrawl and Approved Injection. As the instant HVDC transmission system is anticipated to be utilized against the LTA having firm PPA and target region, the transmission charges has to b shared by the DICs in NR. Learned counsel submitted that the Commission in its order dated 3.3.2016 in Petition No. 67/TT/2015 has held that the transmission charges of HVDC line will be recovered from the DICs of all regions and not from a particular region. Similarly, in order dated 18.3.2016 in Petition No. 184/TT/2013, the Commission held that the charges must be shared amongst all designated ISTS customers. Accordingly, the transmission charges of the instant assets should be borne by all designated ISTS customers in line with the above said orders of the Commission. The learned counsel further submitted that the transmission charges needs to be based on the usage determined through the load flow studies.

4. Learned counsel for the BRPL submitted as under:-

(a) The petitioner has not filed the TSA that it has entered with the beneficiaries.

(b) The Initial Spares should be allowed as per the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

(c) As per the Investment Approval, the entire work was expected to be completed and commissioned by 25.6.2015. There is time over-run of more than 18 months. The time over-run is attributable to the slackness of the petitioner in the project management for which the petitioner is solely responsible.

(d) The petitioner has not submitted PERT chart, CPM analysis and Detailed Project Report required for determining which activity is actually responsible for the time over-run.

(e) The petitioner has submitted that Pole I and Pole II are constructed on the same tower. It has been stated that Pole I has been constructed, but how is it that Pole II is not constructed. There is a long gap in commissioning of Pole I and II.



(f) The petitioner has not submitted how much power is flowing in Pole I inspite of a query in its reply.

(g) The petitioner should submit the Effective Tax Rate applicable and the details of the working of Effective Tax Rate.

(h) 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 decapitalised. The petitioner should submit the details of the earth wire decapitalised.

5. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that till now out of 3000 MW only 1500 MW have been commissioned and 1825 MW have been operationalised, which have firm beneficiary. The target beneficiary would be operationalised in a month's time for remaining 1500 MW of the HVDC link. He further submitted that the instant assets facilitate entire grid and provides additional flexibility to the Northern region.

6. After hearing the parties the Commission reserved the orders in the petition.

By Order of the Commission

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

