

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 361/TT/2018

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for assets covered under System Strengthening XII in Southern Region under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.
- Date of Hearing** : 24.5.2019
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
Shri I.S. Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. & 15 others
- Parties present** : Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for **Asset-I**: LILO of 400 kV SIC Neelmangla-Hoody Transmission Line at new 400/220 kV GIS Sub-station at Yelahanka with 1X 63 MVAR 420 kV Bus Reactor along with associated bays and equipment and **Asset-II**: 2X500 MVA, 400/220 kV ICTs along with associated bays and equipment at 400/220 kV Yelahanka Sub-station under System Strengthening XII in Southern Region, for 2014-19 period under the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He submitted that Asset-II has been split into two parts. He submitted that there is time over-run of 69 months in declaring commercial operation of both the assets mainly due to ROW issues and Court cases. He submitted that out of 6 no.220 kV downstream bays at Yelahanka Sub-station to be constructed by KPTCL, power flow has started in 2 nos. 220 kV downstream line bays w.e.f. 13.10.2018. He, however, submitted that 4 nos. 220 kV downstream bays are yet to be executed by KPTCL and as such the petitioner has sought approval of COD of the



instant assets under proviso (ii) to Regulation 4(3) of 2014 Tariff Regulations.

2. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO submitted that the scope as per revised cost estimate consists of transmission lines, sub-stations and reactive compensation i.e. 1X63 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV GIS Sub-station at Yelahanka. He submitted that the petitioner has claimed that the said transmission system was agreed in 26th, 27th and 28th Standing Committee meetings held on 13.6.2008, 3.3.2009 and 15.6.2009 respectively and was modified in 35th meeting of SCPSPSR held on 4.1.2013. He submitted that there is no approval in the said minutes of meeting for 1X 63 MVAR 420 kV Bus Reactor to be included in Asset-I. He further submitted that details of compensation paid for land are not available in the tariff forms. He submitted that in the present case, KPTCL has not executed the associated downstream system, therefore, the deemed commercial operation date may be declared as 1.4.2018 and actual COD be approved only on execution of downstream assets. He submitted that the transmission charges for the entire scheme covered under the instant petition should be billed to KPTCL till commissioning of all the downstream lines and bays.

3. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted the 1X63 MVAR Bus Reactor as a part of 400/220 kV Yelahanka Sub-station was agreed in 27th Standing Committee meeting and the same is also mentioned in the Annexure-II of minutes of 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st and 32nd SCM of SR dated 15.6.2009, 27.8.2009, 13.4.2010, 16.11.2010 and 8.6.2011 respectively. He further submitted that the said Annexure-II to 28th SCM of SR dated 15.6.2009 shows 1X63 MVAR Bus Reactor as part of 400/220 kV GIS Sub-station Yelahanka under subject project. He submitted that details of ROW issues and compensation paid are given in the petition. He further submitted that transmission charges of the instant assets will be borne by KPTCL from 1.4.2018 till 13.10.2018.

4. The Commission observed that it would like to hear KPTCL before approving the COD of the instant assets under Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations and directed KPTCL and all the respondents to file their reply. The Commission also directed the petitioner to submit the following details on affidavit by 21.6.2019 with an advance copy to the respondents:-

- (i) Details of time over-run and chronology of activities along with documentary evidence as per the following format

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



6.	Other activities leading to time over-run, if any					
----	---	--	--	--	--	--

5. The Commission further directed the respondents to file their reply by 1.7.2019 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 9.7.2019. The parties are directed to comply with the directions within the specified timeline and no extension of time shall be granted.

6. The petition shall be listed for hearing in due course for which separate notice will be issued.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(V. Sreenivas)
Dy. Chief (Law)

