

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 85/TT/2019

- Subject** : Approval of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for Asset-I: +1-200 MVAR STATCOM at 400/220 kV Nalagarh Sub-station and Asset-II: +1-300 MVAR STATCOM at 400 kV Lucknow Sub-station under "Provision of STATCOM at Nalagarh & Lucknow in Northern region".
- 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 Corporation Ltd. & Ors.
- Parties present** : Shri A.K Verma, PGCIL
Shri Nitish Kumar, PGCIL
Shri V.P Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Amit Kumar Jain, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for Asset-I: +1-200 MVAR STATCOM at 400/220 kV Nalagarh Sub-station and Asset-II: +1-300 MVAR STATCOM at 400 kV Lucknow Sub-station under "Provision of STATCOM at Nalagarh & Lucknow in Northern region". He further submitted that scheduled COD for the subject assets was 28.2.2019 against which Asset-I was put into commercial operation on 31.3.2019. He further submitted that the Asset-II has not yet been executed and the same is anticipated to be put into commercial operation in 2019-24 tariff period. Accordingly, a separate petition will be filed for the same. There is a time over-run of 1 month with respect to Asset- I and it was mainly due to unexpected heavy rainfall in Nalagrah which adversely affected the progress of civil works, supply and erection work for the installation of STATCOM at Nalagrah Sub-station. He submitted that the estimated completion cost is within the approved apportioned FR cost. He requested to grant tariff in accordance with Regulation 7(7) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations for inclusion in the computation of POC charges.

2. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that the petitioner has not filed Transmission Service Agreement and Auditor's certificate with respect to assets covered in the instant petition. He further submitted that the initial spares claimed by



the petitioner are under the 'Brown Field Category' but the same are beyond their ceiling limits prescribed under Regulation 13 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations and may be allowed as per the prescribed ceiling limit. He also requested to consider the issue of cost over-run, additional capitalization, IDC and effective tax rate raised in its reply.

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

a) Details of time over-run and chronology of activities along with documentary evidence as per the format given below:

Asset	Activity	Period of activity				Time over-run	Reason(s) for time over-run
		Planned		Achieved			
		From	To	From	To		
	LOA						
	Supplies (Structure, equipment's, etc.)						
	Civil works & Erection						
	Testing & commissioning						
	Any other Activities for time over-run , if any						

- b) Present/Actual status of COD of asset covered in the instant petition.
- c) IDC statement for Asset-I.
- d) Year wise discharge of initial spares.
- e) Revised tariff forms in case of actual COD.

4. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 30.3.2020 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 6.4.2020. The Commission directed the parties to comply within the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

5. The matter shall be listed for hearing in due course for which a separate notice shall be issued to the parties.

By order of the Commission

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

