

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 37/TT/2011

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff for Transmission system associated with evacuation of power from Karcham Wangtoo Hydro Electric Project

Date of Hearing : 13.11.2014

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

Petitioner : Jaypee Powergrid Limited (JPL)

Respondents : Jaypee Karcham Hydro Corporation Ltd & 7 others

Parties present : Shri Vishal Gupta, Advocate, JPL
Shri Sanjiv Goel, JPL
Shri Kapil Ahuja, JPL
Shri Ashish Gupta, JPL
Shri Vinay Sharma, JPL
Shri M.G. Ramachandran, Advocate, JPGL

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted as follows:-

- a. The instant petition covers two assets, i.e. Asset I: Karcham-Abdullapur LILO of 400 kV DC Baspa-Naptha-Jhakri Transmission Line and Asset II: Karcham-Abdullapur 400 kV DC Quad Transmission Line (except LILO);
- b. Transmission licence was granted on 1.10.2007. The line was constructed for evacuation of power from three generation projects. Two generation projects have not come up;
- c. Provisional tariff was allowed vide order dated 14.6.2012;



- d. The assets were scheduled to be commissioned on 1.9.2011. However, Asset I was commissioned on 1.6.2011 and Asset II on 1.4.2012. There is time over-run of 7 months in case of Asset II. The delay was due to court cases, ROW issues, and adverse weather conditions. The details for time over-run was submitted vide affidavit 20.12.2013;
- e. Prayer for grant of additional ROE of 0.5% has been made;
- f. The particulars sought by the Commission have already been submitted. IDC and IEDC has been claimed for the period from December, 2010 to 1.4.2012; and
- g. There is a cost over-run of ₹25.29 crore, which includes IEDC and IDC. The cost over-run is due to increase in forest compensation and crop compensation.

2. In response to a query of the Commission, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that all the IDC and IEDC claimed pertains to the period before the date of commercial operation but it includes the IDC and IEDC paid after the date of commercial operation.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to furnish the following information on affidavit with a copy to the respondents by 5.12.2014:-

- a. Revised Cost Estimates (RCE) approved by its Board and the justifications for cost over-run in case of Asset-1;
- b. The reasons for claiming IDC and IEDC after the date of commercial operation and the reasons for increase in IDC and IEDC;
- c. The details of the financing charges claimed for all the loans and their supporting documents;
- d. The allocation of Gross Loan and its deployment between Asset I and Asset II in Form 6, Form 13 and Form 14 and Form 14A;
- e. The affidavit dated 25.9.2014 pertains only to Asset II and therefore the petitioner is to submit Revised Auditor certificates indicating element wise (i.e. land, building, transmission line, sub-station, PLCC wise) allocation w.r.t.
 - i. Allocation of cost other than IEDC and IDC for Asset I (i.e. LILO portion)
 - ii. Allocation of both IEDC and IDC cost for Asset I and Asset II
 - iii. Allocation of liabilities & Retention money for Asset I and Asset II

- f. Auditor's certificates should indicate the actual initial spares included in the capital cost of Asset I and Asset II;
 - g. The additional capital expenditure for Asset II (except LILLO) indicated in Form 9 for 2012-13 is ₹1572.69 lakh. But, as per the liability flow statement submitted vide affidavit dated 25.9.2014 (Annexure 5A & 5B), the actual payments made during 2012-13 for Asset II is ₹1474.44 lakh. Petitioner should reconcile the difference and clarify the actual claim of additional capital expenditure considered for 2012-13;
 - h. Comments on PSPCL's submissions especially regarding payment of transmission charges by NR constituents for the transmission system for evacuation of KWHEP/System strengthening.
3. The Commission further directed the CTU to submit the following information on affidavit by 5.12.2014, with a copy to the petitioner and all the respondents:-
- a. The premise under which Karcham-Abdullapur line was converted from a dedicated line to ISTS,
 - b. Which other generators were given access on the subject transmission line?
 - c. Whether BPTA was signed with these generators? What is the status of these generators? When it was known that they are not coming, justification for planning the line with Quad Conductor and whether in near future, power of some other generators would flow through this line?
4. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved by the Commission.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

