

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 42/TT/2013

Subject : Determination of Transmission Tariff of 2 Nos. 400 kV line bays along with 2 Nos. 80 MVAR Switchable line reactors at 400 kV Siliguri S/S and 2 Nos. 400 kV line bays at Bongaigaon S/S under transmission schemes for enabling import of NER/ER surplus power by NR in ER from anticipated DOCO to 31.3.2014 for tariff block 2009-14 period..

Date of Hearing : 25.2.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B.Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Smt. Neerja Mathur, Member, Ex-officio

Petitioner : PGCIL

Respondents: : Haryana Power Purchase Centre and 16 others

Parties present : Mrs. Seema Gupta, PGCIL
Shri A.M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL,
Mrs. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL,
Shri P. Saraswath, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted that:-

- a) This petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 2 Nos. 400 kV line bays along with 2 Nos. 80 MVAR Switchable line reactors at 400 kV Siliguri Sub-station and 2 Nos. 400 kV line bays at Bongaigaon Sub-station;
- b) The 400/220 kV line Bongaigaon-Siliguri is being developed M/s.



Sterlite Ltd. and the bays at both the ends are within the scope of the petitioner. As per Investment Approval dated 19.9.2011 the asset was scheduled to be commissioned within 18 months from the date of IA i.e. 19.3.2013 say 1.4.2013 and the elements covered in the petition were commissioned on 1.4.2013 and 1.6.2013 and hence there is delay of 2 months;

- c) The bays at Siliguri and Bongaigaon ends, which are under the scope of the petitioner, were commissioned without the line, which falls under the scope of M/s. Sterlite Ltd. and hence requested to approve the date of commercial operation as 1.4.2013 and 1.6.2013 as provided under Regulation 3(12)(c) of 2009 Tariff Regulations. He further requested to allow 0.5% additional ROE and allow tariff as claimed.

2. The learned counsel of BRPL submitted that there is over estimation in cost of the asset to the extent of 24.8% and hence it is difficult to actually determine the cost over-run. As regards the petitioner's prayer for additional ROE, the whole project has not been completed within the timeline and hence additional return on equity should not be allowed as held by the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal of Electricity in its judgment dated 10.5.2012 in Appeal No. 155/2012, which has been adopted by the Commission in many of its orders. The initial spares claimed are more than the norms specified in the 2009 Tariff Regulations and the initial spares should be allowed as per the norms. He further submitted that approval of DOCO is not a part of the petition. The petitioner being the CTU should have coordinated with M/s. Sterlite Ltd. as provided under the Electricity Act, 2003 for simultaneous commissioning of both the bays and the lines.

3. The representative of petitioner clarified, as regards DOCO, the Commission has approved the date of commercial operation without corresponding generation in few other petitions, like in the case of Kudankulam, as provided under Regulation 3(12)(c) of 2009 Tariff Regulations and requested to approve date of commercial operation as prayed.

4. The Commission observed that like in other petitions there is over-estimation in this case as well and that the reasons given for lower completion cost is the same in all the cases. The petitioner was directed to review its process of cost estimation.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to implead M/s. Sterlite Ltd., which is laying the 400/220 kV Bongaigaon-Siliguri line, as one of the respondents as it would like to hear M/s. Sterlite Ltd. before deciding the issue of date of commercial operation.



6. The Commission directed to issues notice to M/s. Sterlite Ltd. on the issue of date of commercial operation and directed M/s. Sterlite Ltd. to file its reply before 25.3.2014. The petitioner was directed to file its rejoinder, if any, within a week thereafter.

7. The Commission directed to list the matter for further hearing on 22.4.2014.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

