

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 61/TT/2015**

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff of Asset-I: Narendra (New, Kudgi)-Narendra (Existing) 400kV D/C Quad TL along with New 765/400kV GIS Sub-station at Narendra (New, Kudgi) and Bay extensions at Narendra (Existing) and Asset-II: Narendra (New, Kudgi)-Kolhapur (New) 765kV D/C TL and associated bays at Narendra (New, Kudgi) and Kolhapur (New) under Transmission System associated with System Strengthening-XVII in Southern Regional Grid" in Southern Region for 2014-19 tariff block.

Date of Hearing : 6.4.2016

Coram : Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Ltd. and 16 others

Parties present: Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri M. M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL  
Shri Subash C Taneja, PGCIL  
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of tariff of Asset-I: Narendra (New, Kudgi) - Narendra (Existing) 400 kV D/C Quad TL along with New 765/400 kV GIS Sub-station at Narendra (New, Kudgi) and Bay extensions at Narendra (Existing) and Asset-II: Narendra (New, Kudgi) - Kolhapur (New) 765 kV D/C TL and associated bays at Narendra (New, Kudgi) and Kolhapur (New) under Transmission System associated with System Strengthening-XVII in Southern Regional Grid" in Southern Region for 2014-19 tariff block.
- b) As per the investment approval dated 2.7.2012, the instant assets were scheduled to be commissioned on 26.3.2015. However, Asset 1 was



commissioned on 11.12.2015 and Asset 2 was split into two parts and commissioned on 19.11.2015 and 11.12.2015. There is a time over-run of nine, eight and nine months in commissioning of Assets 1, 2a and 2b.

2. The learned counsel of TANGEDCO has submitted that reply to the petition has been filed vide affidavit dated 11.12.2015. He also submitted that the assets have not been commissioned within 180 days of issuance of POC order and hence the AFC granted for inclusion in the PoC should be excluded. He further submitted that the additional ROE of 0.5% claimed by the petitioner should be allowed only if the instant assets are completed within the timeline specified in the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the technical reasons for splitting Asset 2 into two parts and whether it was envisaged in the Investment Approval of the instant project, whether it was discussed in any of the RPC meetings and whether the beneficiaries have been taken into confidence regarding the splitting of assets, alongwith documentary proof. The representative of the petitioner sought a week time to file the information.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit all the information sought vide order dated 15.4.2015 and the following information on affidavit with an advance copy to the beneficiaries by 25.4.2016:-

- i. IEDC and IDC on cash basis up to SCOD and from SCOD to actual COD
- ii. Single Line Diagram of all the assets.

5. The Commission also directed the petitioner to submit the rejoinder to the reply filed by TANGEDCO and PEL Power Ltd. The Commission further directed the respondents to file their reply by 2.5.2016 failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-  
V. Sreenivas  
Dy. Chief (Law)

