

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. TT/295/2013

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff for assets associated with Vindhyaachal IV and Rihand III (1000 MW) Generation Project (Group-3) in Western and Northern Regions for tariff block 2009-14

Date of Hearing : 26.8.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Co. Ltd. and 24 others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri P.V. Nath, PGCIL
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Ms. Seema Gupta, PGCIL
Ms. Swapnil Verma, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

- (a) As per Investment Approval dated 17.3.2010, the project is scheduled to be completed within 32 months from the date of investment approval i.e. by



1.12.2012. Asset-I, i.e., 765 kV Satna- Gwalior Ckt.-I with associated bays at Gwalior and Satna Sub-stations and line reactor was put under commercial operation on 1.3.2014, after a delay of 15 months and Asset-II, i.e., 765 kV D/C Rihand III- Vindhyachal pooling station transmission line, was put under commercial operation on 6.7.2014. Asset III is yet to be commissioned. Management certificate and revised tariff forms and DOCO letter for Asset I has been filed vide affidavit dated 4.6.2014;

- (b) The petitioner has submitted reasons for delay in the commissioning of the assets, vide affidavit dated 31.5.2014. The delay in the commissioning of Asset I was mainly due to forest clearance. In this case, forest clearance has taken two years whereas it normally takes 300 days. The delay is for reasons beyond the control of the petitioner. The petitioner requests to allow the tariff after condoning the delay;
- (c) There is cost variation. In case of Asset I, the cost has reduced on account of reduction in line length. Regarding other assets, details of cost variation will be filed separately;
- (d) Replies of BRPL and PSPCL have been received and rejoinder will be filed.

2. Learned counsel for BRPL, Respondent No. 20, submitted that there is considerable time over-run and cost over-run in Asset I and Asset II. He submitted that since problems like forest clearance, land acquisition and ROW problems are encountered during the construction of transmission lines, the petitioner cannot say it could not factor them while taking investment approval. This being so, IDC and IEDC during the period of delay should be borne by the petitioner.

3. The representative of PSPCL, Respondent No. 14, submitted as under:-

- (a) The full utilization of a scheme with two S/C lines is possible only when both the lines are commissioned. With only one S/C line getting commissioned and the second S/C line getting delayed, as in the instant case, the beneficiaries are not getting the full benefit of the investment made for the line;
- (b) In Form 5C, the column "Name/ No. of Construction/ service package", only the No. of construction/ service package has been given without the name of respective element. This being so, it is not possible to assess the element/ equipment concerned. He requested to know the name/ details of each of the elements along with the number;

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit on affidavit, with advance copy to all the beneficiaries, Form 5 C with name/ details of each of the elements along with the number of construction/ service package, by 24.9.2014.

5. The Commission further directed the petitioner to file a separate petition for Asset II and Asset III, commissioned or to be commissioned in the new tariff period, along with respective Management certificates, revised tariff forms and DOCO letters for Asset II and Asset III, and details of their cost variation.

6. In case the information as para at 4 above is not received by 24.9.2014, the Commission shall be at liberty to issue order without taking into consideration the submission made by the petitioner subsequently.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)

