CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 95/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 (i) LILO of 400kV D/C Vindhyachal-Jabalpur Ckt 3&4 TL at Sasan (Ant. DOCO: 1.3.2012), (ii) 765 kV S/C Sasan-Satna Ckt-1 TL (initially charged at 400 kV level) along with associated bays at Satna (under contingency plan for power evacuation of NTPC-VSTPP#4 Generation project (Ant. DOCO: 1.3.2012), (iii) 765 kV S/C Satna-Bina Ckt#1 TL (initially charged at 400 kV level) along with associated bays at Satna (under contingency plan for power evacuation of NTPC-VSTPP#4 Generation project) (Ant. DOCO: 1.3.2012), (iv) 765 kV S/C Satna-Bina Ckt#1 TL (initially charged at 400 kV level) along with associated bays at Satna & Bina S/S (under contingency plan for power evacuation of NTPC-VSTPP#4 generation project) (Ant. DOCO: 1.3.2012), (iv) 765 kV S/C Bina-Indore TL (initially charged at 400 kV level) along with associated bays at Bina S/S (Bypassing Indore (new-POWERGRID) SS (under contingency plan for power evacuation of NTPC-VSTPC#4 Generation Project) (Ant. DOCO: 1.4.2012) and (v) 400 D/C (quad) Indore (new)-Indore (MPPTCL) TL along with associated bays at Indore (MPPTCL) SS Bypassing Indore (New POWERGRID) SS for interconnection with Bina-Indore Line {under contingency plan for power evacuation of NTPC-VSTPP#4 Generation Project) associated with Sasan UMPP TS in Western Region for tariff block 2009-14 period.
Date of Hearing	:	27.3.2014
Coram	:	Shri Gireesh B.Pradhan, Chairperson Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Petitioner	:	PGCIL
Respondents	:	Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Company Ltd. and 24 others
		Parties present : Ms. Sangeet Edwards, PGCIL Shri R. V. M. M. Rao, PGCIL

Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL Shri T. P. S. Bawa, PSPCL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted as follows:-

a. The instant petition covers Asset-I:LILO of 400kV D/C Vindhyachal-Jabalpur Ckt 3&4 TL at Sasan, Asset-II:765 kV S/C Sasan-Satna Ckt-1 TL, Asset-III:765 kV S/C Satna-Bina Ckt#1 TL, Asset-IV: 765 kV S/C Bina-Indore TL, Asset-V:400 D/C (quad) Indore (new)-Indore (MPPTCL) TL along with associated bays at Indore (MPPTCL) SS. Asset-V has been commissioned in two parts, one bay at Indore was commissioned on 1.4.2012 and the second bay was commissioned on 1.7.2013. The first bay at Indore is treated at Asset-V and the second bay is treated at Asset-VI;

b. As per the Investment Approval (I.A.) dated 10.12.2008, the instant assets are to be commissioned within 48 months from the date of IA, i.e. by 1.1.2013. All assets, except Asset-VI, were commissioned within the scheduled date of commercial operation. Asset-VI was commissioned on 1.7.2013, after a delay of 6 months.

c. It was agreed in the WRPC to utilise some of the transmission elements of Sasan UMPP TS as an interim arrangement to evacuate power from Vindhyachal IV generation project. It was agreed in the 33rd and 35th SCM by the beneficiaries to share the transmission charges of above interim arrangement till commissioning of Vindhyachal-IV transmission system along with the cost of additional equipment.

d. The 765 kV S/C Satna-Bina Ckt#1 TL was initially charged at 400 kV level and upgraded to 765 kV. The 765 kV S/C Bina-Indore TL with bays at Bina Substation was initially charged at 400 kV level, bypassing Indore Pooling Station under contingency plan for evacuation of power from Vindhyachal-IV;

e. Revised Management Certificate as per actual date of commercial operation and date of commercial operation letters have been submitted;

f. Asset-VI was delayed due to non-readiness of Indore Pooling Station and the time over-run of six months may be condoned; and

g. Rejoinder to the reply of PSPCL would be filed.

2. The representative of PSPCL submitted as follows:-

a. The petitioner has mixed the contingency plan for evacuation of power from Vindhyachal-IV and the transmission system for evacuation of power from Sasan UMPP,

b. In Petition No. 86/TT/2012, the petitioner submitted that a 400 kV D/C line from Vindhyachal-IV and a 400 kV D/C line from Sasan generating station was taken to Vindhyachal Pooling Station bunched together and from there a 765 kV line was taken to Satna. In the present petition, the petitioner is presenting a different picture;

c. The petitioner should clearly state when the 765 kV S/C Satna-Bina Ckt#1 TL and 765 kV S/C Bina-Indore TL were charged at 400 kV level and when they were upgraded to 765 kV level. The petitioner should also state how the cost of 765 kV line reactor and circuit breaker at Sasan were accounted for;

d. The petitioner should clarify how the Sasan-Satna line was commissioned without the Line Reactor at Sasan end; and

e. The petitioner should look at various elements of a project as one and they should not be dealt as separate entities.

3. In response, the representative of the petitioner clarified as under:-

a. All the assets covered in the instant petition fall under the Sasan UMPP evacuation system. There was problem of land acquisition of Indore Pooling Station and hence a contingency plan was drawn to evacuate Vindhyachal-IV power by bypassing Vindhyachal Pooling Station, which came up in July, 2012. The power from Vindhyachal Power Station was received in Sasan switchyard, by LILOing the Vindhyachal-Jabalpur TL. One ICT within the scope of Sasan was commissioned and the lines from Vindhyachal-IV to Sasan and Sasan to Satna were commissioned on 1.1.2013 as agreed in the SCM of WR; and

b. The Sasan-Satna line was commissioned at 765 level on 1.1.2013 as per the original scheme. The Satna-Bina line was first charged at 400 kV level on 1.2.2012 and upgraded to 765 kV level on 1.10.2012. The Bina-Indore line was charged at 400 kV level on 1.4.2012 and later upgraded to 765 kV level on 1.7.2013. This arrangement is per the decisions take in the SCM of WR.

4. The representative of PSPCL requested the Commission to direct the petitioner to file revised petition because of the deviations from the original scheme. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the Revised Management Certificate has been filed as per the actual date of commercial operation and the elements were commissioned as per agreed in the SCM of WR and hence there is no requirement to file revised petition.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit before 20.4.2013, with a copy to all the respondents:-

a. Loan Agreement for foreign loan – IBRD V.

b. Supporting documents i.e. proof of exchange rate and interest rate for IBRD V for Asset-V as on the date of commercial operation.

b. The reasons for procuring an additional reactor, which was stated in its affidavit dated 19.9.2013.

c. File a detailed rejoinder clarifying all the issues raised by PSPCL.

6. The Commission also directed the staff of the Commission to cross-check the issues raised by the respondent.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-(T. Rout) Chief Legal