

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Coram:**

1. **Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
2. **Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**
3. **Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Member**
4. **Shri A.H. Jung, Member**

**Petition No.11/2005**

**In the matter of**

Approval of provisional transmission tariff for Fixed and Thyristor Controlled Series Compensation for 400 kV D/C Raipur-Rourkela Transmission Line at Raipur in Western Region for the period from 1.11.2004 to 31.3.2009.

**And in the matter of**

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

**....Petitioner**

Vs

1. Madhya Pradesh State Electricity Board, Jabalpur
  2. Maharashtra State Electricity Board, Mumbai
  3. Gujarat Electricity Board, Vadodara
  4. Electricity Department, Govt of Goa, Panaji, Goa
  5. Electricity Department, Admn. Of Daman & Diu, Daman
  6. Electricity Department, Admn. of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Silvassa
  7. Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Raipur
- ....Respondents**

**The following were present**

1. Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL
2. Shri R.T. Agarwal, AGM (Fin), PGCIL
3. Shri M.M. Mandal, PGCIL
4. Shri A.V.S. Ramesh, PGCIL
5. Shri Subir Sen, PGCIL
6. Shri C. Kannan, PGCIL
7. Shri U.K. Tyagi, PGCIL
8. Shri Arvind Manglik, PGCIL
9. Shri D. Khandelwal, MPSEB

**ORDER**  
**(DATE OF HEARING : 29.3.2005)**

Heard Shri Prashant Sharma for the petitioner and Shri D. Khandelwal for MPSEB. None was present on behalf of other respondents.

2. The petitioner shall file the clarifications on following issues raised at the hearing:
  - (a) Benefits accrued or likely to accrue in future as a result of commissioning of Fixed Series Compensation and Thyristor Controlled Series Compensation and whether the same benefits can be achieved by considering any other alternative.
  - (b) Reasons for excluding the beneficiaries in Eastern Region for sharing of transmission charges, though the compensation is provided on 400 kV Raipur-Rourkela D/C Line, an inter-regional transmission line between Eastern and Western Regions.
  - (c) Reasons for increase in estimated completion cost vis-à-vis the original approved cost.
  - (d) Reasons for estimating Engineering and Administrative Expenses” @ 8.75% though, earlier the Central Government while according investment approval used to consider these expenses @ 5%.
  - (e) Justification in support of claim for O&M expenses @ 1.5% of the capital cost.
  - (f) Reasons for high value of initial spares; 3.38% of the estimated completion cost.
  - (g) Package-wise break-up of original cost estimates at the time of inviting competitive bids and the estimated completion cost.

3. The representative of the petitioner undertook to file the necessary details within two weeks.

4. Subject to above, order on provisional charges claimed in the petition is reserved.

**Sd/-**  
**(A.H. JUNG)**  
**MEMBER**

**Sd/-**  
**(BHANU BHUSHAN)**  
**MEMBER**

**Sd/-**  
**(K.N. SINHA)**  
**MEMBER**

**Sd/-**  
**(ASHOK BASU)**  
**CHAIRMAN**

**New Delhi dated the 4<sup>th</sup> April 2005**