

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 297/TT/2013

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff from DOCO to 31.3.2014 for a section of 400 kV (Quad) S/C Parbati-Koldam transmission line (CKT-II) starting from LILO point of Parbati-III HEP to LILO point of Parbati pooling station (DOCO:1.8.2013) in Northern Region for tariff block 2009-14

Date of Hearing : 26.3.2015

Coram : Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Petitioner : Parbati Koldam Transmission Company Ltd.

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd and 18 Others.

Parties present : Shri Aman Trivedi, PKTCL
Shri Lokendra Singh, PKTCL
Shri Anil Raawal, PKTCL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for LILO point of Parbati-III HEP to LILO point of Parbati Pooling station of the 400 kV (Quad) S/C Parbati-II Koldam transmission line (CKT-II);
 - b) As per the Investment Approval (IA) dated 26.12.2005 the project was scheduled to be commissioned within 36 months, i.e. by 1.1.2009. The instant asset was commissioned on 1.8.2013. There is a time over-run of 55 months in commissioning of the project;
 - c) The completion cost of the instant asset is ₹1475.23 lakh against apportioned approved cost of ₹829.61 lakh and there is a cost over-run of ₹648.62 lakh.
 - d) The provisional tariff for the instant asset was allowed vide order dated 16.12.2013; and
 - e) The reply to the queries sought were filed vide affidavit dated 15.9.2014.
2. The Commission observed that the petitioner should have taken care while preparing the cost estimates at the time of FR filed and should have also taken



into consideration the terrain at the time of FR.

3. In response to a query, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the cost over-run is due to the payment of increased amount towards forest compensation. He further submitted that higher cost was not estimated at the time of FR. In response to another query, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the cost incurred upto 31.3.2014 has already been furnished.
4. The Commission also observed that the present petition is being considered for grant of final tariff for the period ending 31.3.2014 and after issue of the order in the petition the petitioner will be required to file a true up petition based on the actual expenditure incurred as on 31.3.2014. Since the audited cost incurred upto 31.3.2014 is available by now, the Commission directed the petitioner to update its claim in the petition, based on the actual audited cost. The Commission observed that this would curtail the time required for dealing with the true up petitions.
5. None appeared on behalf of the respondents
6. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit by 30.4.2015 with a copy to the respondents:-
 - a) The computation of the IDC on cash basis (along with soft copy in excel format) and IEDC capitalized on cash basis for the asset. Penalty paid in case of default in the payment of interest, if any;
 - b) The year wise details of liability discharged, corresponding to initial spares procured up to cut off date;
 - c) Clarify whether entire amount of IDC and IEDC has been paid prior to DOCO;
 - d) Detailed breakup of IDC and IEDC capitalized among the elements (i.e. Building, civil work, Sub-station, Transmission Line, PLCC and etc) of the respective assets covered in the instant petition; and
 - e) Year wise applicable tax rate (MAT Rate/Corporate Tax Rate) as per relevant Finance Act during 2009-14 period.
7. The Commission further directed that due date of filing the information should be complied with and information received after the due date shall not be considered while passing the order.

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

By order of the Commission

-S/d-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

