

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 48/TT/2016

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for i) 1 no. of OPGW link 21.003 kms under central sector ii) 1 no. of OPGW link 17.03 kms under WBSETCL Sector and iii) 7 no.s of OPGW link under DVC Sector 196.81 kms iv) 2 no. of OPGW link 278.641 kms under Central Sector v) 2 no. of OPGW link 35.044 kms under WBSETCL Sector and vi) 1 no. of OPGW link under DVC Sector 0.08 kms under project fiber optical communication in lieu of existing Unified Load Dispatch and Communication (ULDC) Microwave Links in Eastern Region.

Date of Hearing : 5.7.2016.

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : NTPC Limited and 10 others

Parties present : Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative for the petitioner submitted that :-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of tariff for the fiber optic communication system in lieu of existing Unified Load Dispatch and Communication (ULDC) Microwave Links in Eastern Region;



b) The digital microwave system is being replaced by optic fibers in lieu of existing ULDC microwave links in Eastern Region;

c) As per the Investment Approval dated 8.2.2011, the project is scheduled to be commissioned within 30 months from the date of Investment Approval i.e. 1.9.2013 against which the Asset I, II and III were commissioned on 1.10.2014 and Asset IV, V and VI were commissioned on 20.4.2015. Accordingly, there was a time over-run of 13 to 20 months;

d) The delay was mainly on account of severe ROW problem at several location during installation of OPGW cable and non-availability of PTW/Shut down from grid operators. Further, WBSETCL delayed the approval for carrying out OPGW replacement works in their line.

e) The petitioner requested to condone the delay and approve the tariff.

2. None appeared on behalf of the respondents.

3. In response to a query of the Commission, the representative of petitioner submitted that the instant assets are not leased out for any third party and they are leased only for RLDC lines. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit an affidavit affirming that the lines are not leased out and no other income is earned from the instant asset. He further submitted that no tariff has claimed for replaced microwave links.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the following information, on affidavit by 25.7.2016 with a copy to the respondents:-

(i) Detailed justification of delay, time over run and chronology of the activities along with documentary proof as per the format given below:

Asset	Activity	Period of activity				Reason(s) for delay & reference to supporting document(s)
		Planned		Achieved		
		From	To	From	To	



(ii) Segregated apportioned approved cost for the assets and basis of apportionment.

(iii) How are the assets being used?

(iv) Whether communication signal has been established?

(v) Certificate of RLDC in support of commercial use of the assets covered in the petition;

(vi) Reconcile the financial figures of Auditor's Certificate with Form-6 in case of Asset - 4, 5 and 6. In Asset-5, the Auditor's Certificate, which mentions the breakup of capital cost among IDC & IEDC is not available;

(vii) Documents in support of date of drawl and Interest Rate for SBI (2014-15) deployed as per Form-9C. If there is any default in the interest payment of any loan, with complete details.

(viii) In case of Asset-4, 5 and 6, reconcile the gross amount of each loan in Form-9C with the amount shown in IDC calculation sheets, submitted in the respective assets.

(ix) In case of Assets - 1, 2 and 3, computation of interest during construction (IDC), for the following periods:-

- i. From the date of infusion of debt fund up to Scheduled COD as per Regulation 11(A) of 2014 Tariff Regulation,
- ii. From Scheduled COD to Actual COD of the Asset;

Further, while submitting the un-discharged liability portion of IDC/IEDC, clarify whether it has been included in the projected additional capital expenditure claimed, in case of all the assets.

(x) Clarify whether entire liability pertaining to initial spares has been discharged as on COD, if no, year wise detail of discharging of the same, separately for all the assets. Also, if these initial spares are already included in the additional capitalization.

(xi) Form-15 (actual cash expenditure) in respect of all the Assets.



5. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the actual O&M data for 2014-15 on affidavit by 25.7.2016.

6. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 5.8.2016 with an advance copy to the petitioner who shall file its rejoinder, if any by 12.8.2016. The Commission further observed that no extension of time shall be granted. In case no information is filed within the due date, the matter shall be considered based on the available records.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)

