

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 107/TT/2017

Subject: Petition for truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 period and determination of tariff for 2014-19 period in respect of four assets under transmission system association with Parbati-III HEP in Northern Region.

Date of Hearing : 15.3.2018

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, 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 & 18 Others.

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V.P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner has made the following submissions:-

- (a) The instant petition is filed for truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for combined assets Asset-1: 400 kV D/C Parbati Pooling Point-Amritsar line alongwith associates bays and Asset-2 : 80 MVAR bus reactor at Parbati Pooling Point alongwith associated bays under transmission system associated with Parbati-III in Northern Region and final and truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for Asset-3 : LILO of 2nd ckt of Parbati-II-Koldam T/L at Pooling station and LILO at Parbati-III (Portion c-d), Asset-4 : LILO of 2nd ckt of Parbati-II-Koldam T/L at Pooling Station alongwith associated bays and LILO of Parbati-III (Portion e-f).



- (b) Transmission tariff for Assets-I, II and III was claimed in Petition No. 91/TT/2012. However, tariff was allowed vide order dated 26.5.2015 in Petition No. 91/TT/2012 for Assets I and III and tariff for Asset II was not allowed as the Koldam Switchyard was not ready. Tariff for Asset IV was allowed in Petition No. 411/TT/2014.
- (c) The petitioner preferred Review Petition No. 19/RP/2015 against order dated 26.5.2015 in Petition No. 91/TT/2012 as there exists no strategic linkage of LILO with Koldam Power and the requirement of LILO was originated for evacuation of power from Parbati-III HEP. The Commission partly allowed the review vide order dated 7.9.2016 and directed the petitioner to submit the details of the cost of the portion of the transmission line of Asset II as on 1.9.2013.
- (d) Final tariff and truing up of transmission tariff for Asset-II with COD as 1.9.2013 and truing up of Assets I, III and IV is claimed in present petition.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that additional capitalization incurred after the cut-off date is on account of undischarged liability towards final payment/ withheld payment due to contractual exigencies for works executed within the cut-off date and the justification for the same is given in Form-9 and requested to allow the additional capital expenditure.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that tariff for Asset II should be borne by NHPC as the line is not used by the NR beneficiaries and it may be included in the PoC charges with effect from the date the line is put into regular service.

4. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the line is being used for start-up power and the issues relating to evacuation of power have already been considered in Petition No. 91/TT/2012 as well as in Review Petition 19/RP/2015 based on which the COD of the line was allowed.

5. After hearing the submissions of the parties, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

