

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 310/TT/2019

Subject : Petition for Truing up of Transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff period and Determination of Transmission tariff for 2019-24 tariff period for 400/220 kV, 1X315 MVA Auto transformer (ICT-III) at 400/220 kV sub-station at Vapi under installation of 1X315 MVA 400/220 kV Transformer at Vapi (Powergrid) sub-station in Western Region.

Date of Hearing : 31.7.2020

Coram : Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd.

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri B.Dash, PGCIL
Shri V.Rastogi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through video conferencing.

2. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for truing up of tariff for 2014-19 tariff period and determination of tariff for 2019-24 tariff period in respect of Asset: 1x315 MVA, 400/220 kV Transformer at Vapi (Powergrid) Sub-station in Western Region.

3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the investment approval for installation of the subject asset was accorded vide letter dated 27.9.2011 at an estimated cost of ₹2118 lakh, which included IDC of ₹57 lakh (based on 2nd quarter, 2011 price level). He submitted that as per the IA, the subject asset was scheduled to be put into commercial operation within 15 months i.e. by 1.1.2013. However, the transmission asset was commissioned on 1.3.2013, with delay of 2 months. The Commission vide order dated 3.7.2014 in Petition No. 49/TT/2013 had not condoned the delay of 2 months. He also submitted that against the apportioned approved cost as per FR of ₹2118 lakh, the capital cost as on 31.3.2019 including additional capital expenditure is ₹1763.06 lakh. Therefore, there is no cost over-run as on 31.3.2019. He



further submitted that the additional capital expenditure for the period 2014-15 is ₹12.70 lakh and the cut-off date is 31.3.2016. Accordingly, additional capital expenditure claimed during 2014-15 by the Petitioner is within cut-off date. He further submitted that MPPMCL has submitted reply to the petition and PGCIL has also submitted its rejoinder to the reply of MPPMCL. He requested to grant tariff as prayed in the petition.

4. In response to a query of the Commission whether the subject asset is part of an existing scheme or otherwise, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant asset is approved as a standalone project.

5. After hearing the representative of the petitioner, the Commission reserved its order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

