

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

4th Floor, Chanderlok Building, 36 Janpath, New Delhi- 110001

Ph: 23753942 Fax-23753923

Petition No. 112/TT/2013

Date: 25.10.2013

To
The Deputy General Manager,
Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,
Saudamini, Plot No. 2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon-122001

Subject : Determination of Transmission Tariff of Assets (09 Nos.) under Transmission System for Phase-I Generation projects in Orissa –Part-A in Eastern Region for tariff block 2009-14 period

Sir,

I am directed to refer to Commission's earlier letter dated 10.6.2013 on the subject mentioned above, seeking certain information by 10.7.2013 (copy enclosed) and to state that reply is still awaited. I request you to **furnish the aforesaid information along with the following further information** on affidavit, with advance copy to the beneficiaries, latest by 8.11.2013:-

- a) Actual DOCO Letters of all the assets already commissioned;
- b) Copy of FR and copy of the letter of award in respect of the assets covered under the petition along with a tabular statement clearly indicating the reference (page no. and paragraph no.) of the documents being submitted to clearly establish reasons and extent of cost over-run;
- c) The FR cost estimate taken for the assets are found to be very high compared to the estimate provided by PGCIL in its affidavit to the Commission in Petition No: 233/2009 which also covered the assets under current petition. In the light of above explain the above variation with documentary evidence of indices used for preparation of FR. The variation in cost can be explained asset wise in the table overleaf:-

Sl. No.	Particulars of Assets	Cost as per estimates submitted in 233/2009 at price level of 3Q 2009	Investment approval at price level of 1Q 2010	Apportioned Completion Cost	Reasons

The detailed information in respect of Asset-I, may be submitted as estimated completion cost is almost 100% more than the original FR cost.

- d) Data for capital cost benchmarking in accordance with Commission's orders dated 27.4.2010 and 16.6.2010 for benchmarking of capital cost of 765/400 kV Transmission Lines and Sub-stations;
- e) Whether at the time of bidding for this scheme, other tender/bids were also invited by the petitioner for 765 kV transmission system & whether due to bunching of projects bid rates were higher than expected/anticipated cost?
- f) How substation cost of Angul is apportioned to various assets?

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-
(P.K. Sinha)
Assistant Chief (Legal)