

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 228/GT/2013

Subject : Petition for approval of generation tariff of Parbati Hydroelectric Project, Stage-III (520 MW) for the period from 24.3.2014 to 31.3.2014

Date of hearing : **5.1.2016**

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

Petitioner : NHPC Limited

Respondents : Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. & 13 Others

Parties present : Shri A.K Pandey, NHPC
Shri Naresh Bansal, NHPC
Shri S.K Agarwal, NHPC
Shri Piyush Kumar, NHPC
Shri Jitendra Kumar Jha, NHPC
Shri R.B Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri S. K Agarwal, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms
Shri G.L Verma, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms
Ms. Neelam, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms

Record of Proceedings

This petition has been filed by the petitioner NHPC Ltd, for approval of tariff of Parbati Hydroelectric Project, Stage-III (520 MW) (the generating station) for the period from 24.3.2014 to 31.3.2014, based on the provisions of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.

2. During the hearing, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the Revised Cost Estimate (RCE) has been sent to MOP, Govt. of India for approval. Meanwhile, the Board approval is being processed and the same will be filed as it is finalized. Further, the representative of the petitioner prayed for grant of two weeks time to file rejoinder in the petition.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent, BRPL submitted as under:

- (i) There is an increase in the actual capital expenditure as against the expenditure approved on account of the increase in Establishment expenses and Interest during Construction and the same has resulted in cost overrun of the project.
- (ii) The project was to be scheduled to be completed in 51 months, but additional 40 months for Units I to III and 43 months for Unit-IV has been incurred by the petitioner for completion of the project. The reasons of time-overrun are general in nature and the factors responsible for the same are fully attributable to the petitioner. Moreover, these reasons are not covered within the ambit of the Appellate Tribunal judgment dated 27.4.2011 in Appeal No. 72 of 2010.



- (iii) The petitioner has submitted one set of hydrology data to CEA to seek the Techno-Economic Clearance (TEC) of the project and immediately after construction of the project approached CEA with another set of hydrology data to revise Design Energy (DE). The revised DE claimed by the petitioner cannot be considered as the DE set out in Techno-Economic Clearance of the Authority may be considered for the purpose of tariff.
- (iv) Reply filed in the matter may be considered.

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

- (i) There has been time overrun of 43 months and the cost overrun of 10% is in respect of works awarded to M/s. BHEL which is on the lower side of the sanctioned cost.
- (ii) Proper details with regard to time overrun along with proper justification have already been submitted.
- (iii) Reasons for revision of DE of the generating station as claimed may be considered till the commissioning of the Parbati-II generating station.

5. The Commission after hearing the parties directed the petitioner to submit the following additional information on affidavit, with advance copy to respondents as detailed under:

- (i) Approval of Revised Cost Estimate by MOP, GOI;
- (ii) Board approval for RCE along with copy of agenda note;
- (iii) Report of capital cost vetted by designated independent agency (M/s. Aquagreen Engineering Management Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi);
- (iv) Actual capital expenditure as on actual COD of respective units duly certified by Auditor and reconciliation of the cost with balance sheet shall be established;
- (v) Amended petition with actual cost on CODs of the station, reasons of time overrun and cost overrun, detailed calculation of IDC and IEDC etc. with editable soft copy for determination of tariff;
- (vi) Details of infirm power;
- (vii) Relevant station balance sheets with schedules/ notes.

6. The above information shall be filed by the petitioner on or before 5.2.2016 with an advanced copy to the respondents who shall file their replies if any by 15.2.2016 and the petitioner shall file its rejoinder, if any by 22.2.2016. No extension of time shall be granted for any reason whatsoever. In case the additional information/ reply/ rejoinder is not filed within the said due date, the matter shall be decided based on available records.

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

By Order of the Commission

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

