

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.158/TT/2018

Subject : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from anticipated COD to 31.3.2019 for Assets under “Augmentation of Transformers in Northern Region-Part B” in Northern Region under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.

Date of hearing : 23.4.2019

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondent : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (RRVPLN) and 16 others.

Parties present : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Ashwin Ramanathan, Advocate, HPPTCL
Shri Anand K. Ganesan, Advocate, HPPTCL
Shri S. K. Niranjana, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of transmission tariff for Asset 1: 400/220 kV, 3 X 105 MVA ICT alongwith associated bays at Hamirpur Sub-station, Asset 2: 220 kV, 2 Nos Line Bays at Hamirpur Sub-station, Asset 3: 220 kV, 2 Nos Line bays at Jallandhar Sub-station and Asset 4: 1 X 500 MVA, 400/220 kV ICT-IV at GIS Gurgaon Sub-station under “Augmentation of Transformers in Northern Region-Part B” in Northern Region. He sought approval of COD of Assets-I, II and III under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations as 30.3.2019, 30.3.2019 and 24.3.2019 respectively as the downstream assets of HPPTCL and PSPCL/PSTCL are not ready. He submitted that CEA certificates for Assets I, II and III and RLDC certificate for charging of Assets II and III along with CMD certificate has been filed. However, Asset I was charged on 28.3.2019 and RLDC certificate for the same is yet to be issued. He also sought two weeks’ time to file Auditor certificates along with revised tariff forms. He submitted that Asset-IV was put into commercial operation on 31.12.2017.



2. The representative of petitioner submitted that there is a time over-run of 20 to 24 months and reasons for time over-run has been submitted. He submitted that time over-run in case of Asset-IV was due to delay on the part of the contractors. The cost of the instant assets is within the RCE.

3. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that Assets-I, II and III are not put into use as the downstream assets are not ready and there is lack of coordination on the part of the petitioner with HPPTCL and PSPCL. He submitted that it has filed reply in matter and the same may be considered. In response, the petitioner submitted that rejoinder has been filed to the said reply vide affidavit dated 27.7.2018.

4. The learned counsel for HPPTCL sought two weeks' time to file reply in the matter.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the following information, on affidavit, by 13.5.2019, with advance copy to the respondents:

- (a) At para 4.1 of the petition, it is stated that scope of the work covered under the project includes "Hamirpur (3 x 500 MVA, 400/220 kV transformer alongwith 2 nos. of 220. KV line Bays). However, as per IA the corresponding approved work is "Hamirpur (3 x 105 MVA, 400/220 kV transformer alongwith 2 nos. of 220 KV line Bays). Clarify this discrepancy in detail, alongwith supporting documents, if any.
- (b) As per 30th SCM, 22nd TCC and 25th NRPC meetings held on 19.12.2011, 23.2.2012 and 24.2.2012, respectively the discussed and agreed scope of the project includes "3 x 105 MVA at Samba Sub-station". However, as per the IA the corresponding approved work is "1 x 315 MVA, 400/220 kV transformer". Clarify this discrepancy in detail alongwith supporting documents, if any.
- (c) It has been stated that date of IA is 16.5.2014. However, the IA of the project was accorded by the board of PGCIL in its 300th meeting held on 27.3.2014. Accordingly, the date of IA should be 27.3.2014. Clarify this discrepancy.
- (d) In the "Statement showing IDC Discharged upto DOCO" enclosed at page - 64 of the petition, various loans has been stated as to be carrying "Floating" rate of interest, however the petitioner has not furnished details of applicable rate of interest prevailed upto COD. The petitioner shall furnish following additional details with respect to each loan: i) Amount drawn & applicable rate of interest on date of drawl; ii) Date-wise details of changes in rate of interest upto COD; iii) Date-wise details of repayment, if any, as per terms of contract;
- (e) As per "Statement showing IDC Discharged upto DOCO" enclosed at page - 64 of the petition the amount of loan considered for calculation of IDC upto COD of Asset-4 is ₹2531.96 lakh. However, as per Form-13 the net outstanding loan as on COD of Asset-4 is `2492.96 lakh and cumulative repayment as on COD is "nil". Clarify the same. Further, revise the respective tariff forms, in view of corrections, if any.
- (f) Form-4A in respect of all the assets.
- (g) There is time over-run of in case of Assets-I, II, III and Asset-IV. The reason for delay as per format given below:-

Srl. No	Activity	Schedule		Actual		Remarks, if any
		From	To	From	To	
1.	LOA					
2.	Supplies					
3.	Foundation					
4.	Tower erection					
5.	Stringing					
6.	Testing and COD					

- (h) The revised tariff forms in case of Assets-I, II and III on the basis of the actual COD.
- (i) The status of downstream lines.

5. The Commission directed respondents to file reply in the matter by 20.5.2019 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 27.5.2019.

6. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

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

