

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 494/TT/2019

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for two assets under Fiber Optic Communication System for Central Sector Sub-stations and Generating Stations in Southern Region
- Date of Hearing** : 29.6.2020
- Coram** : Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I.S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
- Respondents** : TANGEDCO and 17 Ors.
- Parties present** : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri A K Verma, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri V P Rastogi, 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 from COD to 31.3.2019 of Asset 1: OPGW Fibre Links (98.484 km) Hoody-Yelahanka LILO Point of Nelamangala-Hoody, Hoody-HSR(KPTCL), Peenya-NRS-Hebbal (KPTCL), Hoody HAL (KPTCL), LILO of Pondy-Sriperambadur to SV Chatram (TANTRANSCO), LILO of Neyveli TS-11-Neyveli TS-1 to NNTPS, Salem (PG)-Salem (TNEB), Sriperambadur (PG)-Sriperambadur (TNEB); and Asset 2: Salem PS (Dharmapuri) Madhugiri (Tumkur) OPGW Link (246.197 km) under Fiber Optic Communication System for Central Sector Sub-stations and Generating Stations in Southern Region.



3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the investment approval for the project was accorded on 29.5.2012 at an estimated cost of ₹17416 lakh including IDC of ₹974 lakh. The RCE of the project was approved on 28.12.2017 at an estimated cost of ₹19474 lakh including IDC of ₹1233 lakh. He submitted that as per the investment approval, the schedule for completion was 30 months from the date of investment approval. Therefore, the scheduled COD of the assets was 28.11.2014. However, the Asset-1 was put under commercial operation on 28.3.2018 and the Asset-2 on 19.3.2019.

4. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the time over-run in case of the instant assets was due to the time over-run in case of the associated transmission line, which was due to RoW issues and court cases. The detailed justification for the time over-run has been submitted in the petition. He submitted that the time over-run in case of the associated transmission line has already been condoned by the Commission. In response to a query of the Commission, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that there is no cost over-run in case of the instant assets. However, there is cost variation and it is mainly due to variation in equipment cost and decrease in IDC and IEDC cost. The reasons for cost variation have been submitted in the petition. He further submitted that none of the respondents have filed reply to the petition and requested to allow tariff as prayed in the petition.

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

By order of the Commission

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

