

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 105/TT/2020

Subject : Petition for determination of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period in respect of four assets under Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme XXXIV in Northern Region.

Date of Hearing : 19.8.2020

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd. and 17 Others

Parties present : Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Ved Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Anil Jain, UPPCL
Shri Manoj Singh, UPPCL
Shri Sanjay Srivastav, UPPCL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through video conference.

2. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period in respect of the following four assets under Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme XXXIV in Northern Region.

Asset I: LILO of Agra-Bharatpur 220 kV S/C Line at Agra Sub-station along with line bays;

Asset II: 1X315 MVA 400/220 kV ICT (Shifted from Ballabgarh Sub-station) along with ICT bays at Agra Sub-station;



Asset-III: 01X 315 MVA, 400/220 kV ICT along with associated bays at Kaithal Substation (Spare ICT from Ballabgarh); and

Asset-IV: 02 nos. 220 kV bays at Kaithal Sub-station.

3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that Assets I, II, and III were put into commercial operation on 7.2.2019, 26.6.2017, and 4.11.2017 respectively. He submitted that the Petitioner has sought approval of COD of Asset IV as 24.11.2017 under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations, as the associated downstream transmission system under the scope of HVVPNL is not ready. He submitted that RCE and cost variation details are filed along with the petition. He submitted that the time over-run in Asset-I was due to ROW issues. In the case of Asset-III and Asset-IV time over-run was due to non-availability of the downstream system. He submitted that the 315 MVA ICT at Agra Sub-station (Asset-II) and 315 MVA ICT at Kaithal Sub-station (Asset-III) in the instant petition have been shifted from Ballabgarh Sub-station (parts of old project, namely, Rihand Transmission System). He further submitted that Asset-II and Asset-III have been de-capitalized in Ballabgarh Sub-station and re-capitalised in Agra and Kaithal respectively. He submitted that in place of the shifted ICTs i.e. Asset-II and Asset-III from Ballabgarh sub-station, 500 MVA ICTs have been installed at Ballabgarh sub-station under augmentation scheme. He submitted that the Petitioner has claimed transmission tariff for the shifted ICTs (Asset-II and Asset-III) in addition to carrying cost along with associated cost. The transmission tariff has been claimed based on the earlier orders in Petition Nos. 255/TT/2018 and 116/TT/2017 which were filed for augmentation at Ballabgarh sub-station.

4. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that BRPL has filed its reply to the petition. He sought two weeks' time to file a rejoinder to the reply of BRPL as well as details regarding de-capitalisation, re-capitalisation and revised calculations. He requested to condone the time over-run in case of instant assets and allow the tariff as prayed in the petition.

5. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that there is cost over-run in case of all the transmission assets. He pointed out that approval of the RCE has not been accorded by the Board of Directors of the Petitioner company and it is not clear whether the competent authority has been delegated expressly the power to approve the RCE. He submitted that there is no provision to claim accrual IDC under Regulation 14(1) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He submitted that a separate application should be filed for seeking the approval of COD under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff regulations. He submitted that the period between the date of de-capitalization and date of re-capitalization is not mentioned by the Petitioner and the same is required to be submitted. The Petitioner's request to condone the time over-run due to ROW issues should not be allowed since ROW is not an uncontrollable factor under the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He further submitted that the life of refurbished assets is not mentioned by



the Petitioner and the same is required to be submitted. He also submitted that the income tax relating transmission business only should be considered and not to the whole business of the Petitioner company.

6. The representative of the UPPCL submitted that the Petitioner's claim is in order except the time over-run in case of the assets and they adopted the submissions of BRPL in respect of time over-run.

7. In response to a query of the Commission regarding the ROW issues, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the detailed chronology of events is submitted along with supporting documentary evidence explaining the ROW issues in the petition.

8. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit, by 7.9.2020, with an advance copy to the Respondents.

- i) Asset-wise and year-wise initial spares discharge statement for Asset-I, Asset-II, Asset-III, and Asset-IV.
- ii) Detailed IDC computation statement for Asset-IV.
- iii) Clarification regarding the mismatch of details of Asset-I mentioned in the subject of the petition and the table submitted in the scope of work.
- iv) Auditor certificate of Asset-IV along with the corresponding forms.
- v) Total cost claimed for Asset-I is not matching with the cost in the Auditor certificate. The Petitioner needs to clarify the same.
- vi) Details of de-capitalisation and re-capitalisation of assets under Rihand Transmission System.
- vii) Revised tariff forms as applicable.

9. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to file rejoinder by 4.9.2020, if any, and to adhere to the above-specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

10. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(V. Sreenivas)
Deputy Chief (Law)

