

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Record of Proceedings

Petition No. 79/TT/2012

Subject : Petition for approval of tariff for Asset I: 400 kV Gurgaon-Manesar (quad) line along with associated bays; Asset II: 500 MVA 400/220 kV ICT I & II at Manesar along with bays associated with Northern Region System Strengthening-XIII (NRSS-XIII) of Northern Region for tariff block 2009-14 period

Date of hearing : 30.7.2013

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

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

Respondent : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & 16 others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri U.K. Tyagi, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL

The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

- (a) The present petition has been filed for determination of tariff for 400 kV Gurgaon-Manesar (quad) line along with associated bays, and 500 MVA 400/220 kV ICT I & II at Manesar along with bays associated with NRSS-XIII for tariff block 2009-14 period;
- (b) Investment approval for the transmission project was accorded by Board of Directors of PGCIL on 16.2.2009 and the project was scheduled to be completed within 33 months from the date of investment approval, i.e., by 1.12.2011. As against that, 400 kV D/C Gurgaon- Manesar (quad) transmission line was commissioned on

- 1.9.2012 after a delay of nine months, ICT I at Manesar was commissioned on 1.6.2012 after a delay of six months and ICT II at Manesar was commissioned on 1.8.2012 after a delay of eight months;
- (c) The delay of six to nine months in the commissioning of assets is due to severe ROW problems, problems in acquisition of land for Manesar Sub-station, and delay in grant of forest clearance in about forty-five locations. Detailed justification for delay has been given by the petitioner in its affidavit dated 8.11.2012. The delay in both the cases may be condoned as it is not attributable to the petitioner;
 - (d) Higher initial spares for GIS Sub-station as claimed in the petition may be allowed.

2. The representative of PSPCL, Respondent No. 6, submitted as under:-

- (a) In cases involving commissioning of transmission lines and ICTs, the transmission lines must be commissioned first and then the ICTs, as without commissioning of lines, ICTs cannot be utilized. In the present case, the petitioner needs to explain why ICTs have been commissioned before the 400 kV D/C Gurgaon-Manesar line. It is also not clear as to whether the petitioner has commissioned all the bays mentioned in the petition, and also whether these bays have been loaded. Moreover, it is the responsibility of the petitioner as central transmission utility (CTU), to co-ordinate with the state transmission utilities. In the present case, the status of Manesar-Neemrana line is not clear;
- (b) Since the petitioner is commissioning GIS sub-stations all across the country, it should standardize the spares for the GIS Sub-stations and maintain a pool of spares, instead of claiming higher percentage of initial spares in every case. Higher initial spares should not be allowed in this case;
- (c) Capital cost of ₹8926 lakh claimed by the petitioner is very high raising the presumption that it is a multi-circuit line. The petitioner should clearly state whether it is a multi-circuit line, and in case it is a multi-circuit line, the petitioner should not book in the instant petition full cost of tower portion which shall be utilized in future for other lines;

(d) There is huge overestimation of the cost by the petitioner at the time of filing the petition. As a result of this, overall completion cost is within the apportioned approved cost in spite of time over-run;

(e) Detailed reply will be filed by the petitioner within fifteen days.

3. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the Gurgaon-Manesar line was commissioned on 1.9.2012 whereas Manesar-Neemrana line covered in Petition No. 69/TT/2012 was commissioned on 1.6.2012. ICT-I at Manesar was commissioned to match with the commissioning of Manesar-Neemrana line and there was no lack of co-ordination with State Transmission Utilities. He further submitted that detailed rejoinder will be filed only after PSPCL submits its reply.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit PERT chart, clearly indicating the critical activities and the delay in regard to the same, on affidavit, by 19.8.2013. The Commission also directed the petitioner to explore the possibility of standardization of spares in respect of GIS sub-stations. PSPCL shall file its reply by 26.8.2013. Rejoinder, if any, shall be filed within one week thereafter.

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

By the order of the Commission,

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