

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 54/TT/2020

- Subject** : Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period in respect of 3 Assets under work associated with Common Transmission System for Phase-II Generation Project in Odisha in Eastern Region.
- Date of Hearing** : 19.5.2020
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
- Petitioner** : Powergrid Corporation of India Limited
- Respondents** : Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Ltd.
& 7 Others
- Parties present** : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period in respect of Asset-I: LILO of both Circuits of 400 kV D/C Rourkela-Raigrah (02nd Line) alongwith 04 Nos of 400 kV Line bays at Jharsuguda (Sundargarh) Sub-station, Asset II: Split Bus arrangement at 400 kV Bus at Jharsuguda (Sundargarh) Sub-station and Asset III: 02 Nos of 400 kV Line bays for termination of OPGC (IB TPS)-Jharsuguda 400 kV D/C line (Under TBCB) at Jharsuguda (Sundargarh). He submitted that the instant assets were put into commercial operation in 2014-19 tariff period and tariff for the 2014-19 tariff period was determined vide order dated 14.2.2019 in Petition No. 59/TT/2018. He submitted that the capital cost allowed by the Commission earlier as on COD was ₹14845.73 lakh, whereas, the amount claimed in the true up petition is ₹15058.31 lakh. He submitted that the capital cost of the spares discharged was not included in the capital cost as on COD earlier. Now in the instant petition, the same has been corrected by adding back the capital cost as on COD. He further submitted that the additional capital expenditure of ₹6730 lakh allowed



in the previous order is lesser than the actual additional capital expenditure of ₹6659 lakh and stated that there is no cost over-run.

2. In response to a query of the Commission on whether the entire scope of the Investment Approval dated on 2.4.2016 is covered in this petition and whether all the assets under the scope have achieved COD, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the entire scope has not been completed yet and the remaining assets will be put into commercial operation in the 2019-24 period. In response to another query regarding the Liquidated Damages (LD), the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the contracts have not been closed yet and the details of the LD will be submitted after the closure of the contracts.

3. The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit, by 29.5.2020 with an advance copy to the Respondents:-

- (i) Form 5 and Form 13 for all assets.
- (ii) Reasons for mismatch in the total IDC mentioned in the previous order (₹13.23 lakh) and in the cash IDC statement (₹13.43 lakh) of Asset II.

4. The Commission also directed the Petitioner to submit the above information within the specified time and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

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

By order of the Commission

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

