

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 200/TT/2018**

**Subject** : Truing up of transmission tariff of 2009-14 tariff block and determination of tariff for 2014-19 tariff block of 4 assets under NRTSS in Northern Region.

**Date of Hearing** : 24.1.2019

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

**Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India (PGCIL)

**Respondents** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited  
& 16 Ors

**Parties present:** Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate BRPL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Niranjana, PGCIL  
Shri Abhay Choudhary, PGCIL  
Shri Nitish Kumar, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The instant petition is filed by PGCIL for truing up of tariff of the 2009-14 tariff block and determination of tariff of 2014-19 tariff block of Asset-I: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Jaipur South; Asset-II : 400 kV Bhiwani Jind TL along with associated bays plus 1 nos. 500 MVA, 400/220 kV ICT-I and associated bays at Jind Sub-station; Asset-III: 400/220 kV 500 MVA ICT-II along with associated 400/220 kV bays at Jind Sub-station and one 220 kV Line bays and Asset-IV: 1 no. of 400 kV, 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Jind Sub-station along with associated bays of the transmission system under NRTSS in Northern Region. The representative of the petitioner submitted that tariff for the 2009-14 period for Assets I and II was approved vide order dated 26.2.2016 in Petition No. 32/TT/2013 and for Asset III and IV vide order dated 29.2.2016 in Petition No. 110/TT/2013.



2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that Asset-I and II were not part of the scope of the work covered under the investment approval dated 17.3.2010. These assets have been incorporated in the Revised Cost Estimate (RCE) dated 31.3.2017. The petitioner should clarify the same. He submitted that the 2x50 MVAR Line Reactors on both the circuits have been retained and used as Bus reactor at Jaipur (Bassi) on alleged recommendations by CEA on the ground of over-voltage conditions. Learned counsel submitted that the use of line reactor as bus reactor cannot be considered to be in regular use without the availability of the envisaged transmission line. He submitted that initial spares for the instant assets may be allowed asset wise and as per the ceiling norms specified in Regulation 8 of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. He also raised the issue of time and cost over-run in case of the instant assets.

3. The representative for the petitioner submitted that Assets-I and II are part of the NRTSS transmission system and they are included in the Investment Approval. As regards Asset-III, he submitted that 500 MVA ICT was installed in place of 350 MVA ICTs at the cost of 350 MVA ICTs, as the 350 MVA ICTs failed the short circuit test and the difference in cost is borne by BHEL. As per the directions of the Commission in order dated 29.2.2016, the petitioner has submitted the justification for the time over-run of 10 months in case of Assets-III and IV.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to clarify on affidavit that the difference in the cost of 315 MVAR and 500 MVAR is borne by BHEL. The Commission also directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with an advance copy to the Respondents by 18.2.2019:

- a) The justification in support of delay in placing the award of work and quantify the delay in placing of award for supply in terms of the reasons attributable to the land acquisition as directed in order dated 29.2.2016 in Petition No. 110/TT/2013
- b) Current status and details of assets covered under various petitions (as per broad scope of work under Northern Regional Transmission Strengthening Scheme);
- c) Year-wise break-up of initial spares discharged during various periods;
- d) As per RCE submitted at the time of truing up, there is an increase in capital expenditure of ₹1418.40 lakh from FR cost of ₹20681.83 lakh to RCE cost of ₹22100.23 lakh, submit revised tariff Form-5 on the basis of RCE and explain, on which particulars the amount of ₹1418.40 lakh has been incurred (as per Form-5).



5. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 1.3.2019 with an advance copy to the petitioner who shall file their rejoinder, if any, by 11.3.2019. 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 next date of hearing will be intimated to the parties in due course of time.

By order of the Commission

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

