

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 62/TT/2018

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff of 400 kV D/C Kishenpur-New Wanpoh Line alongwith associated bays at both ends under “Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme XVI” in Northern Region under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.

Date of Hearing : 22.1.2019

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & Ors.

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

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 400 kV D/C Kishenpur-New Wanpoh Line alongwith associated bays at both ends under “Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme XVI” in Northern Region. He submitted that scheduled commercial operation date of the asset was 1.7.2013 against which it was put into commercial operation on 31.7.2017 with a time over-run of 49 months. He submitted that time over-run was mainly due to forest clearance and right of way issues at various locations. He submitted that there was no cost over-run as per RCE-II. He submitted that all the information including the reasons for time over-run and cost variations as sought by the Commission have already been furnished vide affidavits dated 27.12.2017, 14.9.2018 and 29.10.2018. He further submitted that they have already filed rejoinders to the reply of UPPCL and BRPL vide affidavits 14.9.2018. He requested to take into consideration the reasons for time over-run and cost variations and allow the tariff as prayed for in the petition.



2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that the COD of the instant assets was 31.7.2017 against the scheduled COD of 1.7.2013. The petitioner has failed to factor the situation on site at the time of preparation of FR and it is a failure on the part of the petitioner. CPM and PERT Chart placed on record by the petitioner do not indicate exactly how much time was envisaged for a particular activity vis-à-vis time actually taken in that activity. He submitted that time over-run in the case at hand may not be allowed for the reasons that CPM and PERT chart as provided for under the Regulation has not been filed and that delay falls within the ambit of 'Controllable Factors' as provided for in Regulation 12 of 2014 Tariff Regulations. The time over-run is attributable to the petitioner. He further submitted that TSA in terms of the provisions of Regulation 3 (63) of 2014 Tariff Regulations not filed. He submitted that initial spares claimed at 1.76% for the asset being beyond the ceiling norms is liable to be restricted.
3. The representative of the petitioner submitted that each and every event and activity of time over-run and cost variation has been explained in detail with relevant documents in its rejoinder to the reply filed by the BRPL.
4. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

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

