

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Record of Proceedings

Petition No. 150/TT/2013

Subject : Petition for re-determination of transmission tariff for Pole-1 of +/-500 kV, 2500 MW Ballia-Bhiwadi HVDC Bi-Pole including HVDC transmission line under Transmission System associated with Barh Generation Project (3x660 MW) in Northern Region

Date of hearing : 8.8.2013

Coram : Shri V.S.Verma, Member
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)

Respondent : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd. & 16 others

Parties present : Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri U.K. Tyagi, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate for BRPL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL
Shri Mahendra Pal, NDMC

The present petition has been filed for re-determination of transmission tariff for Ballia- Bhiwadi HVDC Bi-Pole, under Regulation 6(1) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. Tariff has already been determined for the assets under Petition No. 315/2010.

2. The representative of PSPCL, Respondent No. 7, submitted as under:-

- a) Memorandum dated 23.1.2012 giving approval for Revised Cost Estimate (RCE) shows that it is an in-house approval, whereas the initial investment approval was accorded by the Government of India. No

justification has been provided in the Memorandum dated 23.1.2012 for revising the cost. Hence, item-wise details regarding revision should be given by the petitioner;

- b) The petitioner has not stated how apportionment has been done for Pole-I and Pole-II of the HVDC link as bulk of the capital cost has been shown with Pole-I;
- c) As per the RCE, the transmission project was to bring Kahalgaon Power to Barh Sub-station by LILO of the Kahalgaon Patna lines at Barh and then to transmit the power from Barh to Balia through the Barh-Balia D/C line. This power was then to be transmitted to Bhiwadi through the HVDC Balia-Bhiwadi line. As per the investment approval, these assets were to be commissioned in the same time frame. However, actual loading of the Barh-Balia line took place in August 2011 whereas LILO of one circuit of Kahalgaon-Patna line at Barh was commissioned in October 2009. Since the circuit-2 was loaded in August, 2011, the claim of date of commercial operation from October, 2009, the date of completion of LILO of Circuit-I, is not justified;
- d) The petitioner has commissioned the Pole-I on 1.9.2010 and Pole-II in July 2012. Thus, for the period from 1.9.2010 up to 30.6.2012, the line was operating with only Pole-I. There is no justification for claiming O&M charges of both the poles when the petition is only for one pole;
- e) The affidavit verifying the petition bear the name of an officer other than the one who has signed it as deponent.

3. The learned counsel for BRPL, Respondent No. 12, submitted as under:-

- a) The petitioner at the outset states that it is seeking re-determination of tariff. The Commission after determining tariff becomes functus officio, and hence there is no question of re-determination. Hence, the petitioner should state clearly whether it is still seeking re-determination or it is a truing up petition;
- b) The claim of the petitioner for ₹406.9 lakh towards initial spares is more than the amount permissible under Regulation 8 of the 2009 Regulations. The petitioner has not submitted break-up of cost of initial

spares for the line and terminal as there are different norms for transmission line (0.75%) and HVDC terminal (2.5%);

- c) Earth electrode being part of terminal equipment, separate O&M expenses cannot be allowed for electrodes;
- d) O&M claimed in the petition is different from the O&M allowed by the Commission in order dated 14.3.2012 in Petition No. 315/2010;
- e) O&M for one pole under the instant petition has been claimed by the petitioner with reference to the cost of HVDC Talcher-Kolar, which is a bi-pole but the instant case being of one pole only, comparable cost should be taken as the basis for calculation.

4. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the cost of earth electrode was not included in Pole-II as well as Pole-I and has, therefore, been added in the instant petition. He further submitted that Pole-II is being used for return path to save life of earth electrode, which is used only when one pole is out.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit justification for increase in capital cost, on affidavit, with advance copy to respondents/beneficiaries, by 23.8.2013. The Commission further directed the petitioner to remove the anomaly pointed out by the representative of PSPCL. PSPCL will file reply with copy to the petitioner, by 30.8.2013. Rejoinder, if any, shall be filed within a week thereafter.

6. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By the order of the Commission,

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)