

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 56/TT/2017

Coram:

**Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri A. K. Singhal, Member
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member**

Date of Order: 9.10 .2018

In the matter of:

Approval under regulation-86 of CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations'1999 and CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations' 2009 for determination of Transmission Tariff of Asset-I: 400 kV D/C (Quard) Dehradun- Abdullahpur transmission line along with associated bays at Dehradun and Abdullahpur Substation and Asset-II: 400kV D/C(Quard) Dulhasti-Kishenpur single circuit strung along with associated bays at kishenpur end under "Northern Region Strengthening Scheme – XXIV".

And in the matter of:

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
"Saudamini", Plot No.2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon -122 001

.....Petitioner

Vs

1. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd.
Vidyut Bhawan, Vidyut Mard, Jaipur – 302 005
2. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor), Ajmer Road,
Heerapura, Jaipur.
3. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor), Ajmer Road,
Heerapura, Jaipur.
4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd.
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor), Ajmer Road,
Heerapura, Jaipur.



5. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board
Vidyut Bhawan
Kumar House Complex Building li
Shimla – 171 004
6. Punjab State Electricity Board
The Mall, Patiala – 147 001
7. Haryana Power Purchase Centre
Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6
Panchkula (Haryana) 134 109
8. Power Development Deptt.
Govt. Of Jammu & Kashmir
Mini Secretariat, Jammu
9. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd.
(Formerly Uttar Pradesh State Electricity Board)
Shakti Bhawan, 14, Ashok Marg
Lucknow – 226 001
10. Delhi Transco Ltd.
Shakti Sadan, Kotla Road,
New Delhi – 110 002
11. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd,
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi.
12. BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd,
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi
13. North Delhi Power Ltd,
Power Trading & Load Dispatch Group
Cennet Building,
Adjacent To 66/11 kV Pitampura-3
Grid Building, Near PP Jewellers
Pitampura, New Delhi – 110034
14. Chandigarh Administration
Sector – 9, Chandigarh



15. Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.
Urja Bhawan
Kanwali Road
Dehradun,

16. North Central Railway
Allahabad

17. New Delhi Municipal Council
Palika Kendra, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi – 110 002

.....Respondents

Parties present : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Vivek kumar Singh, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S. S Raju, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL

ORDER

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner, Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. ("PGCIL") seeking approval of transmission tariff for Asset-I: 400 kV D/C (Quard) Dehradun- Abdullahpur transmission line along with associated bays at Dehradun and Abdullahpur Substation and Asset-II: 400kV D/C(Quard) Dulhasti-Kishenpur single circuit strung along with associated bays at kishenpur end under Northern Region Strengthening Scheme – XXIV(hereinafter referred to as "transmission system") for 2014-19 tariff period under the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as "the 2014 Tariff Regulations").



2. The petitioner has made the following prayers:-

- i) "Approve the Transmission Tariff for the tariff block 2014-19 block for the assets covered under this petition.
 - ii) Admit the capital cost as claimed in the Petition and approve the Additional Capitalisation incurred / projected to be incurred.
 - iii) Tariff may be allowed on the estimated completion cost as RCE is under approval
 - iv) Allow tariff upto 90% of the Annual Fixed Charges in accordance with clause 7 (i) of Regulation 7 CERC (Terms and Conditions of tariff) Regulations,2014 for purpose of inclusion in the PoC charges
 - v) Allow the petitioner to recover FERV on the foreign loans deployed as provided under clause 50 of the Tariff Regulations, 2014.
 - vi) Condone the delay in completion of subject assets on merit of the same being out of the control of Petitioner in line with CERC Regulations'2014 12(2)(i) "uncontrollable factors"
 - vii) Allow the petitioner to recover the shortfall or refund the excess Annual Fixed Charges, on account of Return on Equity due to change in applicable Minimum Alternate/Corporate Income Tax rate as per the Income Tax Act, 1961 (as amended from time to time) of the respective financial year directly without making any application before the Commission as provided under clause 25 of the Tariff regulations 2014.
 - viii) Approve the reimbursement of expenditure by the beneficiaries towards petition filing fee, and expenditure on publishing of notices in newspapers in terms of Regulation 52 Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014, and other expenditure (if any) in relation to the filing of petition.
 - ix) Allow the petitioner to bill and recover Licensee fee and RLDC fees and charges, separately from the respondents in terms of Regulation 52 Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014..
 - x) Allow the petitioner to bill and adjust impact on Interest on Loan due to change in Interest rate on account of floating rate of interest applicable during 2014-19 period, if any, from the respondents.
 - xi) Allow the Petitioner to bill and recover Service tax on Transmission Charges separately from the respondents, if at any time service tax on transmission is withdrawn from negative list at any time in future. Further, any taxes and duties including cess etc. imposed by any statutory/Govt/municipal authorities shall be allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries.
 - xii) Allow reimbursement of tax if any on account of the proposed implementation of GST and
- pass such other relief as Hon'ble Commission deems fit and appropriate under the circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice"



3. The Investment Approval (IA) for implementation of "Northern Region Strengthening Scheme – XXIV (NRSS-XXIV)" was accorded by the Board of Directors of the petitioner vide Memorandum dated 21.11.2011 at an estimated cost of ₹ 723.63 Crore including IDC of ₹ 42.69 crores based on 2nd Quarter, 2011 price level. Further, Revised Cost Estimate (RCE) of the instant assets was approved by the Board of Directors of the petitioner vide Memorandum dated 31.3.2017 for ₹ 882.13 Crore including an IDC of ₹ 120.91 Crore (based on October, 2016 price level).

4. The system strengthening scheme in NR was discussed and agreed in 28th SCM held on 23.02.2010 at NRPC, New Delhi which is to be implemented by the petitioner as a regional strengthening scheme (NRSS-XXIV). The details of the transmission elements covered under the transmission system are broadly as follows:-

Transmission Lines:

- (i) Dehradun- Abdullapur 400kV D/C Quad line
- (ii) Dulhasti – Kishenpur 400 kV D/C Quad line- single circuit strung

Sub-Stations:

- (i) Extension of 400/220 kV Substation at Dehradun, Abdullapur and Kishenpur
- (ii) Extension of Balia 400/220 kV Substation – 2x63 MVAR, 400 kV line reactors on Barh-Balia 400 KV D/C line (one on each circuit)

Note: One spare 400KV Bay at Dulhasti HEP switchyard of NHPC would be used for termination of the line at Dulhasti end.

5. Initially, Petitioner had filed the petition for two assets, however vide affidavit dated 13.7.2018, Asset-I was split into Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b). The details of the transmission elements covered under the instant transmission system and the



petitions under which they are covered along with the current status of assets of the present petition, submitted by the petitioner, is mentioned below:-

Sl. No.	Name of Asset (revised/ current status)	COD status	Petition No
1	Two nos of 63 MVAR 400kV Line Reactor Balia (PG) Sub-station (Extn)	01.02.2014	31/TT/2014
2	Asset-I(a) :-400kV Circuit-I, of Dehradun-Abdullapur D/C(Quad) line along with associated bays at both ends	31.03.2018 (Actual)	Current petition
3	Asset-I(b) :-400kV Circuit-II, of Dehradun-Abdullapur D/C(Quad) line along with associated bays at both ends	01.04.2018 (Actual)	
4	Asset-II :- 400kV D/C(Quad) Dulhasti-Kishenpur single circuit strung along with associated bays at kishenpur end	23.01.2018 (Proposed)	

6. The transmission system was scheduled to be commissioned within 36 months from the date of Investment Approval i.e. 21.11.2011 in a progressive manner. Accordingly the scheduled date of commissioning of the transmission system was 20.11.2014 (SCOD). The Petitioner vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018 submitted commissioning status of the instant assets and the delay in the commissioning thereof, which is as under :

Asset	Scheduled Date of Completion (SCOD)	Actual COD	Delay
Asset I(a)	20.11.2014	31.03.2018	40 months 11 days
Asset I(b)		01.04.2018	40 months 12 days
Asset II		23.01.2018*	38 months 3 days

*Proposed COD

7. The tariff was approved for the years 2017-18 and 2018-19 for inclusion in PoC charges as per first proviso to Regulation 7(7) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations vide order dated 12.06.2017.



8. The details of the transmission charges claimed by the petitioner are as under:-

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I (a)	
	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Depreciation	2.00	760.37
Interest on Loan	1.66	611.06
Return on Equity	2.23	846.81
Interest on Working Capital	0.15	57.84
O&M Expenses	0.52	199.17
Total	6.56	2475.25

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I(b)	Asset-II	
	2018-19	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Depreciation	767.71	551.95	2949.60
Interest on Loan	625.77	613.72	3136.20
Return on Equity	855.02	618.79	3311.13
Interest on Working Capital	58.90	39.69	209.21
O&M Expenses	245.56	27.43	148.43
Total	2552.96	1851.58	9754.57

9. The details of the interest on working capital claimed by the Petitioner are as under:-

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I (a)	
	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Maintenance Spares	29.02	29.88
O&M expenses	16.12	16.60
Receivables	406.68	412.54
Total	451.82	459.01
Interest	0.15	57.84
Rate of Interest	12.60%	12.60%

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I(b)	Asset-II	
	2018-19	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Maintenance Spares	36.83	21.56	22.26
O&M expenses	20.46	11.98	12.37
Receivables	425.49	1616.87	1625.76
Total	482.79	1650.40	1660.40
Interest	58.90	39.69	209.21
Rate of Interest	12.20%	12.60%	12.60%



10. The petitioner has served the petition on the respondents and notice of this application has been published in the newspapers in accordance with Section 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as the Act). No comments or objections have been received from the general public in response to them. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), Respondent No 12, has filed reply vide affidavit dated 28.04.2017. BRPL has raised issue of Auditor certificate, Cost Over-run, TSA, Delay reason, CPM, PERT, DPR initial spare, Optical Ground wire(OPGW), effective tax rate, CMD certificate, wage revision, reimbursement of expenditure towards filing fee, license fee etc. The petitioner has filed rejoinder dated 08.05.2017 to the reply of BRPL. The objections raised by the respondents and the clarifications given by the petitioner are addressed in the relevant paragraphs of this order.

11. BRPL has submitted that one of the agencies may be asked to represent the interest of consumer in the instant petition, as the representation and participation in the proceedings is integral part of hearing in terms of Section 94(3) of the Electricity Act, 2003. In response, the petitioner has submitted that there is no need to appoint any agency as the petitioner has provided a copy of the petition to the beneficiaries and published notices in newspapers inviting comments of general public. We have considered the submissions of the BRPL and the petitioner. As sufficient opportunity is given to the general public by inviting comments from general public as provided under Section 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003, we are of the view that there is no further need to implead an outside agency in the matter.



Commercial Operation Date (COD)

12. The petitioner has claimed date of commercial operation of Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b) as 31.03.2018 and 01.04.2018 respectively vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018 and in support, the petitioner has submitted RLDC charging certificate, CEA clearance certificate and CMD certificate for both the assets. Taking into consideration the RLDC certificate, CEA certificate and CMD certificate, the COD of the Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b) is approved as 31.03.2018 and 01.04.2018 respectively.

13. The petitioner vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018 has submitted that Asset-II i.e “400kV D/C(Quad) Dulhasti-Kishenpur single circuit strung along with associated bays at kishenpur end” was charged on 21.01.2018 on rated voltage of 400 kV and with approximately 260 MW Load flow. However, due to lean period (winter season) water flow / water availability in Chenab River was low and sufficient head of water was not available at Dhulhasti Power Station of NHPC. Therefore the load flow in the line remained only for 6-9 hours and continuous power flow for 24 hours could not be established. The Generation was scheduled by NRLDC in the morning and evening peak hours only. Since the power flow of 24 hours could not be established, the petitioner has prayed to the Commission to approve the COD of Asset-II as 23.01.2018 in accordance with the proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

14. As per Regulation 4 (3) (ii)

“in case a transmission system or an element thereof is prevented from regular service for reasons not attributable to the transmission licensee or its supplier or its contractors but is on account of the delay in commissioning of the concerned generating station or in commissioning of the upstream or downstream transmission system, the transmission licensee shall approach the Commission through an appropriate application for approval of the date of commercial operation of such transmission system or an element thereof.”



We find that this is not a fit case for invocation of Proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) as the generating station of NHPC was already operational. In support of COD of Asset-II, the petitioner has submitted NRLDC letter dated 05.03.2018 with first time charging date as 21.01.2018, indicating intermittent power flow during trial run period. The petitioner has also submitted the CMD certificate vide affidavit dated 20.08.2018 certifying that the transmission line, sub-station and communication system conform to the relevant Grid Standard and Grid Code and are capable of operation to their full capacity with effect from 20.01.2018 as required under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2016. Further, in view of the constraints in generation scheduling, only intermittent power flow could be established in Asset-II. Thus, in our opinion, when all the conditions for commercial operation are being met, only because of generation scheduling constraints the petitioner cannot be denied the leverage of declaration of Commercial Operation of Asset-II. Considering these facts, we therefore, approve the Commercial Operation Date as 23.01.2018 under regulation 4(3) of 2014 Tariff Regulations. Accordingly, the allowed COD of the instant assets and the delay in the commissioning thereof, is as under:

Asset	Scheduled Date of Completion (SCOD)	Actual COD	Delay
Asset I(a)	20.11.2014	31.03.2018	40 months 11 days
Asset I(b)		01.04.2018	40 months 12 days
Asset II		23.01.2018	38 months 3 days

Capital Cost

15. The Capital Cost from COD to 31.03.2019 has been dealt as per clause (1), (2) and 10 (1) of Regulation 9 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The petitioner vide



affidavit dated 13.07.2018 has submitted the Auditor Certificate dated 20.06.2018 and 29.06.2018 along with revised tariff forms for Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b) respectively and management certificate dated 16.04.2018 along with its revised tariff forms for Assets-II. The details of approved apportioned cost, revised approved apportioned cost, capital cost as on COD and estimated additional capital expenditure incurred or projected to be incurred during 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20 along with estimated completion cost for the instant assets, as claimed by the petitioner are as under:-

(₹ in lakh)

Asset	Apportioned Approved Cost (FR)	Apportioned Approved Cost (As per RCE)	Cost as on COD	Estimated additional capital expenditure			Total Estimated Completion Cost
				2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
I(a)	8764.87	14793.39	14266.67	-	441.14	198.74	14906.55
I(b)	9660.77	14960.01	14443.76	-	441.21	198.76	15083.73
II	52901.32	57023.11	54918.68	382.13	1964.37	1964.36	59229.54

16. We have considered the submissions of the petitioner and it is observed that the estimated completion costs, in case of all the assets, are more than their respective apportioned approved costs and revised apportioned approved costs (as per RCE) i.e. there is cost over-run in all the instant assets.

17. The capital cost of the transmission assets admitted as on COD have been worked out in the subsequent paragraphs taking into consideration the cost over-run, time over-run, IEDC, IDC and initial spares allowed for the instant assets.



Cost Over-Run/Variation

18. The petitioner vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018 has submitted the reasons of cost over-run and cost variation along with Form-5 with detailed item-wise cost variation. The brief of the reasons of cost over-run in the instant assets as stated by the petitioner are as follows:

Asset-I(a) & Asset-I(b)

19. In case of Asset-I(a), against the total apportioned approved cost of the asset ₹ 8764.87 Lakh, the estimated completion cost of the asset is ₹ 14906.55 Lakh. Hence there is cost over-run of ₹ 6141.68 Lakh. Also, in case of Asset-I(b), against the total apportioned approved cost of ₹ 9660.77 Lakh, the estimated completion cost is ₹ 15083.73 Lakh. Hence there is cost over-run of ₹ 5422.96 Lakh.

20. This cost over-run is due to increase in length of the transmission line from 72 KM to 89.373 KM which resulted in increase in cost of preliminary investigation, right of way, forest clearance, PTCC, general civil works, tower steel, conductor, insulator, hardware fittings etc. Also, IDC & IEDC costs have increased due to delay in commissioning of the assets.

Asset-II

21. Against the total apportioned approved cost of ₹ 52901.32 Lakh, the estimated completion cost is ₹ 59229.54 lakh. Hence there is cost over-run of ₹ 6328.22 lakh. This cost over-run is due to increase in cost of preliminary investigation, right of way, forest clearance, PTCC, general civil works, tower



steel, conductor, insulator, hardware fittings etc. Also, IDC & IEDC costs have been increased due to delay in commissioning of the asset.

22. There is increase/decrease in award cost received in competitive bidding compared to initial estimates (FR cost). For procurement, open competitive bidding route is followed and by providing equal opportunity to all eligible firms, lowest possible market prices for required product/services is obtained and contracts are awarded on the basis of lowest evaluated eligible bidder. The best competitive bid prices against tenders may happen to be lower or higher than the cost estimate depending upon prevailing market conditions.

23. BRPL has submitted that no cost overrun be allowed in the instant assets without furnishing proper and justified reasons. Subsequent to this, the petitioner had submitted RCE and has also submitted that RCE-II is under approval and will be submitted after approval of the same.

24. We have considered the submissions made by the Petitioner & BRPL and based on the reasons submitted by the petitioner, the cost overrun is allowed. However, the estimated completion costs are restricted to revised approved apportioned cost (as per RCE) and will be reviewed at the time of truing-up on submission of RCE-II, if any.

Time over-run

25. As per para 14 above, it is seen that there is delay in respect of commissioning of all the assets. BRPL submitted that time over-run may not be allowed and accordingly IDC/IEDC during the period of time over-run may not be permitted. The petitioner, vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018, has submitted the



PERT Chart & CPM Analysis and delay justification. Justification offered by the petitioner in this connection and the acceptability thereof are discussed in the succeeding paragraphs.

Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b)

26. With regard to delay in commissioning of Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b), the petitioner has submitted that delay is mainly on account of RoW issues and delay in obtaining forest clearances from Shivalik forest division and Kalsi forest division.

27. The brief of the time over-run issues submitted by the petitioner are as under:-

A. RoW issue:-

- a. The said transmission line is traversing through districts of western UP, Uttarakhand and Haryana. The implementation of the transmission line was hampered by the persistent ROW issues at various locations. The ROW issues involved demand of exorbitant amount of crop compensation, land compensation, construction of structures/buildings in Right of way of line, man handling of gang workers, etc. Further, wherever possible, persuasive measures were adopted to pacify the land owners/ villagers agitating against the line construction. However, at certain locations verbal persuasions did not suffice and eventually the help and assistance of District administration, Police department was sought to mitigate the ROW issues. There was stiff resistance from villagers in all the districts of western UP and Uttarakhand which affected the construction of 400KV Dehradun-Abdullapur line. Petitioner approached district administration at various levels but matter could not be resolved. After a series of meetings and deliberations with administrative officials and Kisan Unions, the work was completed.
- b. To mitigate the above incidents, the Petitioner wrote many Letters, conducted various meetings & discussions etc. The Petitioner had written Letters to ADM-Dehradun, SDM-Dehradun, DM-Saharanpur, ADM-Behat, DC-Yamuna Nagar, Sub-DC Bilaspur, SHO-Chhachhroli, SHO-Thana, SSP-Saharanpur, SDM-Vikas



nagar etc. Also, various meetings were conducted and matters were discussed with Principal Secretary-UP, Commissioner-Saharanpur, etc. These events occurred from 14.06.2012 to 28.03.2018. This led to a time delay of 69 months which was out of control of the Petitioner.

B. Forest Clearances:-

- a. **Shivalik Forest Division Saharanpur (UP) (34.18 Ha):-** The Investment approval by POWERGRID Board was accorded on 21.11.11. The first letter was written on 13.01.2012 for seeking permission to carry out survey work to know the extent of forest area affected and the final clearance (Stage-II) from government was received on 26.04.2016. Thus the total time taken in obtaining forest clearance is 51 months.
- b. **Kalsi Forest Division, Kalsi (UK) (51.3958 Ha):-** The Investment approval by POWERGRID Board was accorded on 21.11.11. The first letter was written on 05.01.2012 for seeking permission to carry out survey work to know the extent of forest area affected and the final clearance (Government order) from Uttarakhand Govt. was received on 22.12.2014. Thus the total time taken in obtaining forest clearance is 47 months.

Asset-II

28. With regard to Asset-II, the petitioner has submitted that delay is mainly on account of RoW issues, delay in obtaining Forest clearances, court cases, law & order situation encountered during the construction of the Line.

29. The brief of the time over-run issues submitted by the petitioner are as under:-

A. RoW issue:-

- a. The said transmission line is traversing through various districts of Jammu. The implementation of the transmission line was hampered by persistent ROW issues at various locations. The ROW issues involved demand of exorbitant amount of crop compensation, land compensation, construction of structures/buildings in Right of Way of line, man handling of gang workers, etc. Further, wherever possible, persuasive measures were adopted to pacify the land owners/ villagers agitating against the line construction. However, at certain locations verbal persuasions did not suffice and eventually the help and assistance of District administration, Police department was sought to mitigate the ROW issues. There was severe RoW problem at udhampur, doda, chenani, thatri, batote and Dugga.



b. To mitigate the above incidents, the Petitioner wrote many Letters to DC-Udhampur, DC-Doa, Tehsildar-Doda & Thathri, Naib Tehsildar-Batote, Shri Mohd Ashraf, Chief Engineer-Batote, Asstt. Commissioner-Udhampur, Tehsildar-Dugga, Tehsildar-Chenani, SDM-Assar, SDM-Thathri, Tehsildar-Phigsco etc. These events occurred from Oct'12 to Dec'17. This lead to time delay of 62 months which was out of control of the Petitioner.

B. Forest Clearances:-

There was Reserved and Protected Forest area of 89.24 Ha. in Batote, Bhaderwah, Kishtwar, Jammu, Ramnagar and Udhampur. The first indent was submitted on 22.02.2012 and after complying all due process of forest clearance, the final clearance from J&K Government was received on 24.02.2015 and Tree cutting approval was granted in Nov'15. Thus the total time taken in obtaining forest clearance is 45 months.

C. Court case at location in Tipri Village:-

The said Line was passing through Village Tipri Tehsil Thathri and a court Case OWP No. 1360/2012 was filed on 18.09.2012 before the High Court of Jammu & Kashmir at Jammu by Zamidaran of Village Tipri for changing the line route of Dhulhasti - Kishanpur Line. The said court case has been resolved on 09.09.2017.

D. Court case at location no. 207/0:-

It is submitted that Shri khemraj R/O Katwalt Tehsil Chenani District, Udhampur obstructed the work since beginning and at last filed a court case on 18.08.2015 against the petitioner. The said court case has been resolved on 04.09.2017.

E. Other reasons:-

The other factors which also lead to time delay are Law and order situation in Kashmir Valley, tense situation and violent protests in Kashmir region, State Administration/ Police concentrated on Kashmir Region. Hence, proper & sufficient support for solving ROW issues and Land acquisition was not available since July'16. Further heavy snowfall from Dec to Feb, devastating floods in Sept'14 and continuous rains resulted in landslides and blocking of roads which hampered the progress of work. The petitioner has also submitted newspaper cuttings for the same.



30. The respondent, BRPL vide affidavit dated 28.4.2017 has submitted that the petitioner is well conversant with the problems of this nature which are encountered day-in and day-out during the construction of the transmission project. The petitioner is responsible for lack of proper planning and co-ordination for which the petitioner has statutory responsibility under section 38(2) of the EA, 2003.

31. We have considered the submissions of the petitioner and pursued documents on record regarding time over-run. There is a time overrun of 40 months 11 days and 40 months 12 days in commissioning of the Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b) respectively. The petitioner was facing continuous ROW problems from 14.06.2012 to 28.03.2018. The petitioner took almost 69 months 14 days to resolve the ROW issues. We are of the view that delay due to ROW issue was beyond the control of the petitioner. Therefore, the total time delay of both the assets i.e. Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b) is condoned. The time delay due to forest clearance from Shivalik forest division and Kalsi forest division is subsumed in the delay due to RoW problems.

32. In case of Asset-II, there is a time over-run of 38 months 3 days. The petitioner was facing continuous ROW problems from 17.10.2012 to 06.12.2017. Further there was a court case in Tipri village and in location No.-207/0 which was resolved on 09.09.2017 and 04.09.2017 respectively. The petitioner took almost 61 months 18 days to resolve the ROW issues. We are of the view that delay due to ROW issue was beyond the control of the. Therefore, the time over-run of 38 months 3 days in commissioning of the Asset-II is condoned. As such, the time



over-run on account of other factors is not dealt in this order since the entire delay has been condoned on account of ROW.

Interest During Construction (IDC)

33. The petitioner vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018 has submitted the information related to IDC for Asset-I(a) & Asset-I(b) and not for Asset-II. The petitioner has claimed IDC of ₹ 1649.17 lakh, ₹ 1350.44 and ₹ 9979.13 lakh in respect for Asset-I(a), Asset-I(b) and Asset-II respectively. Further, the petitioner has submitted the IDC statement showing discharge of IDC liability as on COD and thereafter for Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b). The IDC has been worked out on cash basis up to COD on the basis of the loan details given in Form-9C for Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b). It is submitted that petitioner has not made any default in the payment of interest.

34. The petitioner has not submitted the discharge details of IDC in case of Asset-II. In the absence of the discharge details of Asset-II, entire IDC has been allowed as on COD and the petitioner is directed to submit information of the discharge of IDC details at the time of truing-up.

35. Following assumptions have been made to work out the IDC on cash basis as on COD in the instant case:

- A. Rate of Interest for all the SBI loans having floating rate of interests has been considered as 7.85% i.e. for loans of SBI (Oct 13 - Dec 13), SBI 10000 – 2400, SBI 10000 – 1610, SBI 10000 - 2400 (Q4), SBI (2016-17) (Q4) and SBI (2017-2018) Q1.
- B. Dates of drawl of all the SBI loans have been considered as mid of the respective quarters to simplify the IDC working.



36. The IDC considered as on COD for the purpose of tariff determination is as below:-

(₹ In Lakh)

Interest During Construction (IDC)							
Asset	Claimed as on COD as per the respective Auditor's Certificate	Discharged up to COD (as claimed)	Allowed/ Worked out on Cash Basis as on COD	Balance IDC discharged during FY 2017-18 (as claimed)	Allowed IDC discharged during FY 2017-18	Balance IDC discharged during FY 2018-19 (as claimed)	Allowed IDC discharged during FY 2017-18
I (a)	1649.16	1463.06	1036.59	0.00	0.00	186.10	168.39
I (b)	1350.44	1089.36	1089.36	0.00	0.00	261.08	261.08
II	9979.13	9979.13	9979.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

37. The balance portion of IDC discharged after COD has been considered in additional capital expenditure. The allowed/capitalized IDC shall be reviewed at the time of truing up, on submission of details regarding Interest rates of loans and interest payment schedule HDFC loan.

Incidental Expenditure During Construction (IEDC)

38. The petitioner has claimed IEDC as ₹ 475.05 lakhs, ₹ 480.13 lakh and ₹ 1969.42 lakh in respect of Asset-I(a), Asset-I(b) and Asset-II respectively. The petitioner has claimed IEDC as on COD, which is within the percentage on hard cost as indicated in the abstract cost estimate. In the instant petition, 5% of hard cost is indicated as IEDC in the abstract cost estimate. Hence the entire IEDC claimed by the petitioner is allowed to be capitalized.

Initial spares

39. Regulation 13(d) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations specifies ceiling norms for capitalization of initial spares in respect of transmission system. The petitioner



vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018 has submitted year-wise initial spare discharge details for all the instant assets.

40. The excess initial spares worked out for transmission line and sub-station (brown-field) for each of the instant assets is given below:

(₹ In Lakh)

Computation of Initial Spares					
Particulars	Total Capital Cost (Plant and machinery cost) up to Cut-off date	Initial Spares Claimed against Capital Cost	Ceiling Limit as per Regulation, 2014	Initial Spares worked out	Excess Initial Spares claimed
Substation – I (a)	585.25	48.15	6.00%	34.28	13.87
Substation – I (b)	718.11	67.00	6.00%	41.56	25.44
Substation – II	306.89	33.58	6.00%	17.45	16.13

41. The Excess Initial Spares as worked out above has been deducted from Additional Capital Expenditure of FY 2018-19 in all the instant assets. The allowed Initial Spares would be reviewed at the time of true-up on the submission of Auditor's Certificate verifying capital cost up to 31.03.2019.

42. Following is the allowed capital cost as on COD after taking into consideration the allowable IDC, IEDC and initial spare for the computation of tariff for the instant assets:-

(₹ In Lakh)

Asset	Capital cost as per CA Cft. as on COD	Less: Total IDC claimed	Add: IDC allowed on cash basis as on COD	Less: Excess Initial spares as on COD	Capital Cost as on COD considered for Tariff
I (a)	14266.67	1649.16	1036.59	0.00	13654.10
I (b)	14443.76	1350.44	1089.36	0.00	14182.68
II	54918.68	9979.13	9979.13	0.00	54918.68



Additional Capital Expenditure (ACE)

43. The cut-off date for the instant transmission assets is 31.3.2021.

44. The Additional Capitalization has been dealt as per clause (1) of Regulation 14 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The petitioner has claimed ACE as per Auditor certificate dated 20.06.2018 and 29.06.2018 for Asset-I(a) and Asset-I(b) respectively and management certificate dated 16.04.2018 for Asset-II. In addition, the petitioner has also claimed the discharge of IDC liability for 2018-19 in respect of Asset I(a) and Asset-I(b) as ACE.

45. The ACE claimed by the petitioner and allowed up to 31.03.2019 is summarized in the table below:-

(₹ In Lakh)

Asset	2017-18			2018-19			Capital cost as on 31.03.2019
	Claimed Add cap	Less: Excess I.S/ Add: Allowed IDC	Add cap Allowed	Claimed Add cap	Less: Excess I.S/ Add: Allowed IDC	Add cap Allowed	
I (a)	0.00	0.00	0.00	441.14	168.39* - 13.87#	595.66	14249.76
I (b)	0.00	0.00	0.00	441.21	261.08* - 25.44#	676.85	14859.53
II	382.13	0.00	382.13	1964.37	-16.13# - 225.94@	1722.30	57023.11

@ Additional Capital Expenditure has been restricted as per the revised apportioned approved cost.

* Allowed IDC

Excess initial spares

46. In case of Asset-II, the estimated completion cost as on 31.03.2019 has been restricted to its revised apportioned approved cost after deducting ₹ 225.94 lakhs from the Additional Capitalization of FY 2018-19. The Estimated completion cost of each asset would be reviewed at the time of true-up.

47. The capital cost considered for the purpose of computation of tariff is as follows:-



(₹ In Lakh)

Asset	Expenditure up to COD	2017-18	2018-19	Total Estimated Completion Cost up to 31.3.2019
Asset-I(a)	13654.10	0.00	595.66	14249.76
Asset-I(b)	14182.68	0.00	676.85	14859.53
Asset-II	54918.68	382.13	1722.30	57023.11

Debt-Equity Ratio

48. As per clause 1 and 5 of Regulation 19 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations, Debt: Equity has been allowed. The details of debt:equity ratio in respect of the instant assets as on the date of commercial operation and as on 31.3.2019 are as under:-

(₹ In Lakh)

Asset-I (a)				
Particular	Capital cost as on COD		Capital cost as on 31.3.2019	
	Amount	%	Amount	%
Debt	9557.87	70.00	9974.83	70.00
Equity	4096.23	30.00	4274.93	30.00
Total	13654.10	100.00	14249.76	100.00

(₹ In Lakh)

Asset-I(b)				
Particular	Capital cost as on COD		Capital cost as on 31.3.2019	
	Amount	%	Amount	%
Debt	9927.88	70.00	10401.67	70.00
Equity	4254.80	30.00	4457.86	30.00
Total	14182.68	100.00	14859.53	100.00

(₹ In Lakh)

Asset-II				
Particular	Capital cost as on COD		Capital cost as on 31.3.2019	
	Amount	%	Amount	%
Debt	38443.08	70.00	39916.18	70.00
Equity	16475.60	30.00	17106.93	30.00
Total	54918.68	100.00	57023.11	100.00

Return on Equity

49. ROE has been worked out as per clause (1) and (2) of Regulation 24 and



clause (2) of Regulation 25 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The petitioner has submitted that it is liable to pay income tax at MAT rate, the RoE has been calculated @ 19.610% after grossing up the RoE with MAT rate of 20.961% as provided under Regulation 25(2)(i) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. As per Regulation 25(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations, the grossed up rate of RoE at the end of the financial year shall be trued up based on actual tax paid together with any additional tax demand including interest thereon duly adjusted for any refund of tax including interest received from the IT authorities pertaining to the 2014-19 period on actual gross income of any financial year.

50. BRPL submitted that the petitioner has not mentioned the effective tax rate for each year of tariff period for all the assets. The petitioner may be directed to furnish details in the working of effective tax rate along with tax audit report for financial year 2014-15 and the reasons for opting MAT. Since, the petitioner is entitled for Tax Holiday for new transmission project, the petitioner may be directed to supply the information from the date the petitioner intends to claim the benefits of section 80 IA of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

51. We have considered the submissions made by the petitioner and respondent. Regulation 24 read with Regulation 25 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations provides for grossing up of return on equity with the effective tax rate for the purpose of return on equity. It further provides that in case the generating company or transmission licensee is paying Minimum Alternative Tax (MAT), the MAT rate including surcharge and cess will be considered for the grossing up of return on equity. Accordingly, the MAT rate applicable during 2013-14 has been considered for the purpose of return on equity, which shall be trued up with actual



tax rate in accordance with Regulation 25 (3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

Accordingly, the RoE allowed is as follows:-

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I (a)	
	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Opening Equity	4096.23	4096.23
Addition due to Additional Capitalization	0.00	178.70
Closing Equity	4096.23	4274.93
Average Equity	4096.23	4185.58
Return on Equity (Base Rate)	15.50%	15.50%
MAT rate for the Financial year 2013-14	20.961%	20.961%
Rate of Return on Equity (Pre-tax)	19.610%	19.610%
Return on Equity (Pre-tax)	2.20	820.79

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I(b)	Asset-II	
	2018-19	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Opening Equity	4254.80	16475.60	16590.24
Addition due to Additional Capitalization	203.06	114.64	516.69
Closing Equity	4457.86	16590.24	17106.93
Average Equity	4356.33	16532.92	16848.58
Return on Equity (Base Rate)	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%
MAT rate for the Financial year 2013-14	20.961%	20.961%	20.961%
Rate of Return on Equity (Pre-tax)	19.610%	19.610%	19.610%
Return on Equity (Pre-tax)	854.28	604.01	3304.01

Interest on loan (IOL)

52. IOL has been dealt as per Regulation 26 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. IOL has been worked out as under:-

- (i) Gross amount of loan, repayment of instalments and rate of interest on actual average loan have been considered as per the petition;
- (ii) The yearly repayment for the tariff period 2014-19 has been considered to be equal to the depreciation allowed for that year; and



(iii) Weighted average rate of interest on actual average loan worked out as per (i) above is applied on the notional average loan during the year to arrive at the interest on loan.

53. The petitioner has submitted that it be allowed to bill and adjust impact on Interest on Loan due to change in interest due to floating rate of interest applicable, if any, from the respondents. The interest on loan has been calculated on the basis of rate prevailing as on the tariff date of commercial operation. Any change in rate of interest subsequent to the tariff date of commercial operation will be considered at the time of truing-up.

54. Based on above, details of IOL calculated are as follows:-

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I (a)	
	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Gross Normative Loan	9557.87	9557.87
Cumulative Repayment upto previous Year	0.00	1.98
Net Loan-Opening	9557.87	9555.89
Addition due to Additional Capitalization	0.00	416.96
Repayment during the year	1.98	737.01
Net Loan-Closing	9555.89	9235.84
Average Loan	9556.88	9395.87
Weighted Average Rate of Interest on Loan	6.280%	6.304%
Interest on Loan	1.64	592.27

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I(b)	Asset-II	
	2018-19	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Gross Normative Loan	9927.88	38443.08	38710.57
Cumulative Repayment upto previous Year	0.00	0.00	538.76
Net Loan-Opening	9927.88	38443.08	38171.81
Addition due to Additional Capitalization	473.80	267.49	1205.61
Repayment during the year	767.04	538.76	2943.66
Net Loan-Closing	9634.63	38171.81	36433.76
Average Loan	9781.25	38307.44	37302.78
Weighted Average Rate of Interest on Loan	6.392%	8.396%	8.392%
Interest on Loan	625.22	599.17	3130.29



Depreciation

55. Depreciation has been dealt as per Regulation 27 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. As such, depreciation has been calculated annually based on Straight Line Method at the rates specified in Appendix-II to the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

56. Details of the depreciation allowed are as under:-

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I (a)	
	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Opening Gross Block	13654.10	13654.10
Additional Capital expenditure	0.00	595.66
Closing Gross Block	13654.10	14249.76
Average Gross Block	13654.10	13951.93
Rate of Depreciation	5.282%	5.282%
Depreciable Value	12288.69	12556.73
Remaining Depreciable Value	12288.69	12554.76
Depreciation	1.98	737.01

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I(b)	Asset-II	
	2018-19	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Opening Gross Block	14182.68	54918.68	55300.81
Additional Capital expenditure	676.85	382.13	1722.30
Closing Gross Block	14859.53	55300.81	57023.11
Average Gross Block	14521.11	55109.75	56161.96
Rate of Depreciation	5.282%	5.248%	5.241%
Depreciable Value	13068.99	48737.93	49507.02
Remaining Depreciable Value	13068.99	48737.93	48968.25
Depreciation	767.04	538.76	2943.66

Operation and Maintenance Expenses (O&M Expenses)

57. The petitioner vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018 has claimed the O&M Expenses for 2014-19 period.

58. The O&M Expenses have been allowed as per Regulation 29(4)(a) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations, which is as under:-



(₹ In Lakh)		
Asset	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Asset-I(a)	0.18	68.71
Asset-I(b)	0.00	245.56
Asset-II	24.98	138.51

59. The O&M Expenses allowed above, would be reviewed at the time of truing-up.

60. The petitioner has submitted that O&M Expenses for the tariff period 2014-19 had been arrived at on the basis of normalized actual O&M Expenses during the period 2008-09 to 2012-13. The petitioner has further submitted that the wage revision of the employees is due during 2014-19 and actual impact of wage hike effective from a future date has not been factored in fixation of the normative O&M rates specified for the tariff block 2014-19. The petitioner has submitted that it would approach the Commission for suitable revision in norms for O&M Expenses for claiming the impact of wage hike from 01.01.2017 onwards.

61. BRPL has submitted that any increase in the employee cost due to wage revision must be taken care by increasing the productivity levels of the petitioner company and the beneficiaries should not be burdened over and above the provisions in the 2014 Tariff Regulations. In response petitioner submitted that wage revision of the employees of the petitioner company is due w.e.f. 1.1.2017 and actual impact of wage hike which will be effective from a future date has also not been factored in fixation of the normative O&M rates prescribed for the tariff block 2014-19. The scheme of wage revision applicable to CPSUs being binding on the petitioner, the petitioner reserves the right to approach the Hon'ble Commission for suitable revision in the norms for O&M expenditure for claiming

the impact of wage hike from 01.01.2017 onwards.

62. The O&M Expenses have been worked out as per the norms specified in the 2014 Tariff Regulations. As regards the impact of wage revision, any application filed by the petitioner in this regard will be dealt with in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

Interest on Working Capital (IWC)

63. IWC has been worked out as per clause 1(c) and clause (3) of Regulation 28 and Clause 5 of Regulation 3 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The components of the working capital and the petitioner's entitlement to interest thereon are discussed hereunder:-

(i) Maintenance spares

Regulation 28 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations provides for maintenance spares @ 15% per annum of the O&M expenses. The value of maintenance spares has accordingly been worked out.

(ii) O & M expenses

Operation and maintenance expenses have been considered for one month as a component of working capital. This has been considered in the working capital.

(iii) Receivables

Receivables as a component of working capital will be equivalent to two months fixed cost. In the tariff being allowed, receivables have been worked out on the basis of 2 months' transmission charges.

(iv) Rate of interest on working capital

As per proviso 3 of Regulation 28 of the 2014 Tariff Regulation, SBI Base Rate Plus 350 bps as on 1.04.2017 (i.e.12.60%) for Asset-I(a) & Asset-II and SBI Base Rate Plus 350 bps as on 1.04.2018 (i.e.12.20%) for Asset-I(b) has been considered for the instant assets, as the rate of interest on working capital.

64. Accordingly, the interest on working capital is summarized as under:-



(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I (a)	
	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Maintenance Spares	9.98	10.31
O & M expenses	5.54	5.73
Receivables	373.37	378.07
Total	388.89	394.11
Interest	0.13	49.66

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I(b)	Asset-II	
	2018-19	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Maintenance Spares	36.83	20.11	20.78
O & M expenses	20.46	11.17	11.54
Receivables	425.16	1615.27	1620.79
Total	482.46	1,646.55	1,653.11
Interest	58.86	38.65	208.29

Annual Transmission charges

65. In view of the above, the annual transmission charges being allowed for the instant assets are summarized hereunder:-

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I (a)	
	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Depreciation	1.98	737.01
Interest on Loan	1.64	592.27
Return on Equity	2.20	820.79
Interest on Working Capital	0.13	49.66
O&M Expenses	0.18	68.71
Total	6.14	2268.44

(₹ In Lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I(b)	Asset-II	
	2018-19	2017-18 (pro-rata)	2018-19
Depreciation	767.04	538.76	2943.66
Interest on Loan	625.22	599.17	3130.29
Return on Equity	854.28	604.01	3304.01
Interest on Working Capital	58.86	38.65	208.29
O&M Expenses	245.56	24.98	138.51
Total	2550.95	1805.57	9724.76



66. The petitioner has submitted that the claim for transmission charges and other charges is exclusive of incentive, late payment surcharge, FERV, any statutory taxes, levies, duties, cess, filing fees, license fee, RLDC fees and charges or any other kind of impositions etc. The same if imposed shall be borne and additionally paid by the respondents. The petitioner is entitled to FERV as provided under Regulation 50 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations and the petitioner can make other claims as per the 2014 Tariff Regulation.

Annuity Payment

67. The petitioner vide affidavit dated 13.07.2018 submitted that an estimated amount of ₹ 2516.93 lakh is payable to landowner as annuity for next 24 years as per letter issued by Chief Conservator of Forest, Lucknow, Dt. 13.06.2017 and the said amount is not included in the capital cost and detailed calculation is given with the auditor certificate dated 20.06.2018. The petitioner has prayed to allow recovering the lease rent on annual basis directly from the beneficiaries.

68. The petitioner is liable to make annuity payment as per letter issued by Chief Conservator of Forest, Lucknow, Dated 13.06.2017. The reimbursement of annuity payments is allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries directly. The petitioner shall directly claim the payments from the beneficiaries along with the proof of payments. The petitioner is directed to file details of annuity payment done in 2014-19 period at the time of truing-up of 2014-19 period.

Filing Fee and Publication Expenses

69. The petitioner has sought reimbursement of fee paid by it for filing the petition and publication expenses, in terms of Regulation 52 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. BRPL has submitted that filing fee and other expenses may not be



allowed. The petitioner shall be entitled for reimbursement of the filing fees and publication expenses in connection with the present petition, directly from the beneficiaries on pro-rata basis in accordance with clause (1) of Regulation 52 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

Licence Fee and RLDC Fees and Charges

70. The petitioner has requested to allow the petitioner to bill and recover License fee and RLDC fees and charges, separately from the respondents. The petitioner shall be entitled for reimbursement of licence fee and RLDC fees and charges in accordance with Clause (2)(b) and (2)(a) respectively of Regulation 52 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

FERV

71. The petitioner has sought to recover FERV on foreign loans deployed under Regulation 50 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The petitioner shall be entitled to recover the FERV as provided under Regulations 50 and 51 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

Goods and Services Tax

72. The petitioner has prayed for reimbursement of tax, if any, on account of proposed implementation of GST. The petitioner has submitted that the Commission should allow to recover GST from the beneficiaries, if imposed on transmission charges under the proposed GST when implemented by Government of India. GST is not levied on transmission service at present and we are of the view that petitioner's prayer is premature.



Sharing of Transmission Charges

73. BRPL has submitted that the petitioner has not furnished the Transmission Service Agreement (TSA) and as per Regulation 3(63) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations, the petitioner is required to submit the TSA. BRPL has submitted that the discussions in the RPC meetings cited by the petitioner can at best be taken note and cannot be treated as the TSA". In response, the petitioner in its rejoinder has submitted that as per clause 8 of Model TSA, signing of TSA is not mandatory. Further petitioner vide affidavit dated 27.08.2018 have submitted complete copy of TSA signed by BRPL on 19.8.2011 along with Schedule-II uploaded on petitioner website. The petitioner has also submitted that the tariff for the instant assets should be shared by the beneficiaries as per Regulation 43 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

74. We have considered the submissions of the petitioner and BRPL. The transmission charges allowed in this order shall be recovered on monthly basis in accordance with Regulation 43 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The billing, collection and disbursement of the transmission charges approved shall be governed by the provisions of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission(Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2010, as amended from time to time.

75. This order disposes of Petition No. 56/TT/2017.

Sd/-
(M.K. Iyer)
Member

Sd/-
(A.K. Singhal)
Member

Sd/-
(P.K.Pujari)
Chairperson

