

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Record of Proceedings

Petition No. 81/TT/2012

- Subject** : Approval under Regulation 86 of CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 for determination of Transmission Tariff for 1 no. 400kV 63 MVAR Line Reactor at Cochin (DOCO 1.1.2012) for the period from DOCO to 31.3.2014 under Kudankulam ATS in SR for tariff block 2009-14.
- Date of Hearing** : 26.11.2013
- Coram** : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A. K. Singhal, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
- Respondents** : Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (TNEB) and others
- Parties Present** : Shri M. M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL
Shri B. K. Sahoo, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri A. M. Pavgi, PGCIL

The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

- (a) The petition has been filed for approval of transmission tariff for 1 no. 400kV 63 MVAR Line Reactor at Cochin under Kudankulam ATS in SR for tariff block 2009-14;
- (b) As per the Investment Approval dated 25.5.2005, the instant asset was scheduled to be commissioned within 42 months from the date of Investment Approval, i.e. by 1.12.2008. However, the asset was commissioned on 1.1.2012 after a delay of 37 months;
- (c) The instant asset is a part of the Kudankulam Transmission System and it is linked to the readiness of the Kudankulam generating station. As the generation of Kudankulam power plant is yet to commence, the instant asset



has been commissioned on 1.1.2012 as its commissioning could not be delayed any further. The delay may be condoned as it is not within its control.

2. The Commission observed that the instant asset, the line reactor, has not been mentioned in the Investment Approval. The representative of the petitioner clarified that the line reactor is being used as a Bus reactor.
3. In response to the Commission's query as to how the 63 MVAR line reactor could be commissioned without the corresponding transmission line, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the reactor is used as a Bus reactor for controlling the voltage. He also submitted that this decision was taken in the interest of the grid.
4. In response to another query of the Commission whether its Board's approval was taken for using the line reactor as a Bus reactor, the representative of the petitioner submitted that revised cost estimates has already been approved and it will be submitted.
5. None of the respondents were present.
6. The Commission directed the petitioner to clarify on affidavit whether the instant reactor is a line reactor or a bus reactor and the reasons for change. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the approvals obtained for change in the usage of the reactor, before 20.12.2013, with a copy to the respondents.
7. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By the order of the Commission,

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

