

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 124/TT/2018

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 of 220 kV Kishanganga-Amargarh D/C line on M/C tower under “Transmission system associated with Kishenganga HEP”

Date of Hearing : 23.10.2018

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. (RRVPL) and 18 others

Parties present : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL
Shri S. K. Niranjani, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for 220 kV Kishanganga-Amargarh D/C line on M/C tower under “Transmission system associated with Kishenganga HEP”. He submitted that as per the Investment Approval dated 2.2.2015, the instant asset was scheduled to be put into commercial operation on 1.7.2017 and it was anticipated to be put into commercial operation on 1.3.2018 at the time of filing of the petition. However, the instant asset was back charged on 25.2.2017 from the Amargarh end as the generation of Kishenganga HEP of NHPC was not available. He further requested to approve the COD of the instant asset under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations as it is prevented from putting the instant assets into service due to non-readiness of generation of NHPC. He submitted that power is flowing through the line since May, 2018. He also requested to grant AFC under Regulation 7(7) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations for inclusion in the PoC charges.

2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that power from Kishanganga is not allotted to Delhi and hence the transmission charges for the instant asset may not be loaded on



Delhi. He submitted that there is cost over-run of 594% in case of the “Preliminary investigation, right of way, forest clearances, PTCC, general civil works” and the petitioner should be directed to explain the reasons for the same in detail. He also submitted that initial spares may be allowed only in accordance with the norms specified in the 2014 Tariff Regulations. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the cost over-run is due to increase in land and crop compensation, increase in the line length, etc. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit a detailed response to the issues raised by BRPL.

3. The Commission observed that it would like to hear NHPC before approving the COD of the instant assets under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations and grant of AFC for inclusion in the PoC computation and directed NHPC file its reply in the matter.

4. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit by 15.11.2018 with an advance copy to the respondents:-

- (i) Schematic diagram of the instant asset, mentioning Amargarh end (Delina, PDD J&K) also. Clearly distinguish the lengths of Multi circuit and Double circuit in the diagram.
- (ii) CMD Certificate as required under Grid Code for the asset.
- (iii) The details of reason for the assets covered in the instant petition for time over-run and chronology of the time over-run along with documentary evidence in the following format:

Asset	Activity	Period of Activity				Reason(s) for delay
		Planned		Achieved		
		From	To	From	To	

5. The Commission also directed NHPC and other respondents to file its reply in the matter by 20.11.2018 and the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 30.11.2018. The Commission further directed the parties to comply with the above directions within the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

6. The date of final hearing will be intimated to the parties in due course of time.

By order of the Commission

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

