

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 33/TT/2019

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for 3X110 MVAR, 765 kV Bus Reactor-I at 765/400 kV Varanasi GIS (reactor after shifting from Sasaram Sub-station) under "Transmission System for Phase-I Generation Projects in Jharkhand and West Bengal Part A2".
- Date of Hearing:** 11.2.2020
- Coram** : Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Uttar Pradesh Power Company Ltd (UPPCL) & 16 Ors.
- Parties present** : Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL and BYPL
Shri Amit Kumar Jain, PGCIL
Shri Nitish Kumar, PGCIL
Shri A.K Verma, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 of 3X110 MVAR, 765 kV Bus Reactor-I at 765/400 kV Varanasi GIS (reactor after shifting from Sasaram Sub-station) under "Transmission System for Phase-I Generation Projects in Jharkhand and West Bengal Part A2". He further submitted that the reactor in the instant petition has been shifted from Sasaram Sub-station. The reactor was originally used as Mid-Point reactor at 765/400 kV Sasaram Sub-station wherein it was executed on 1.4.2012 and was covered under Petition No.217/TT/2012 under SASAN UMPP. He further submitted that Diary No. 248/2020 has been filed for trueing up of transmission tariff for the assets originally covered in the Petition No. 217/TT/2012 for 2014-19 tariff period. He submitted that the de-cap of gross block of the shifted reactor has been done in the true-up petition i.e. Diary No. 248/2020.



2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that Form-10B filed by the petitioner in the rejoinder filed to the reply of UPPCL may be considered while determining the transmission tariff as there was an inadvertent error in details provided in Form-10B submitted alongwith the petition. He submitted that the mid-point reactor at Sasaram Sub-station was de-capitalized on 18.4.2017 and covered in true-up of 2014-19 tariff period included in petition under Diary No. 248/2020 and shifted and executed as Bus reactor at Varanasi Sub-Station w.e.f 19.4.2017. The cost of the reactor is not included in the capital cost of present asset. He submitted that as the petitioner has de-capilized the gross block of the shifted reactor in the true-up petition, no cost of the reactor has been included in the cost certificate of the instant petition. The representative of the petitioner requested the Commission to allow it to submit the calculations of the shifted reactor in the instant petition or at the time of true-up of the instant petition.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL and BYPL has submitted that the 1x330 MVAR, 765 kV Bus Reactor at Varanasi was not included in the original scope of works as given in Investment Approval. The Reactor was included in the RCE, which amounts to change in the scope of the Investment Approval. There is nothing on record to suggest that the NRPC has asked the petitioner to provide reactive compensation at Varanasi before undertaking the execution of the subject asset in the RCE dated 30.4.2017 to maintain the voltage for smooth operation of the Regional Grid. There is no improvement in the voltage level after the installation of the reactor. Further, as per Regulation 2(4)(2) of the Grid Code, NRLDC is the appropriate authority to approve the installation of the reactors and not the RPC.

4. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that in the Investment Approval only the broad scope is given and the details are usually given in the DPR. The instant reactor is clearly mentioned in the DPR and was discussed in the 41st meeting of the NRPC.

5. The Commission directed to link the instant petition with the true-up petition of 2014-19 period for the assets covered in "Transmission System associated with Sasan Ultra Mega Power".

6. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with advance copy to the beneficiaries by 23.3.2020:-

- a) As directed in order dated 14.9.2017 in Petition No. 223/TT/2016, the Petitioner to provided the details of existing line reactor at Sasaram stating whether it is switchable or non-switchable. In case it is switchable reactor, provide details of de-capitalization of associated bay equipment.



- b) The Petitioner has submitted that the time over-run in case of the subject asset is dependent on the LILO of 765 kV S/C Gaya-Fatehpur Line at Varanasi Sub-station and the Commission has already condoned the delay upto 1.4.2016 on the said LILO vide order dated 14.9.2017 in Petition no. 223/TT/2016. Clarify how the delay in the said LILO is associated and linked with instant asset and how the delay in said LILO has affected the execution of instant asset.
- c) The details of de-capitalisation including Gross Block, accumulated depreciation and Net Block in respect of shifted reactor covered under the instant petition.
- d) Auditor's certificate, tariff forms and Statement of IDC after including the above de-capitalisation details of the shifted reactor.
7. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the Petition.

By order of the Commission

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

