

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 27/TT/2016

- Subject : Determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for Asset I: Ranchi - WR Pooling Station (Sipat) 765 kV S/C line and Asset II: 765 KV 3x80 MVAR Bus Reactor I along with associated bays at Ranchi 765 KV S/S under Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Stations and Network for NR , Import by NR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER and Common scheme for network for WR and Import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER in Eastern Region.
- Date of hearing : 22.3.2016
- 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 : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & 22 others
- Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri Anshul Garg, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for Asset I: Ranchi - WR Pooling Station (Sipat) 765 kV S/C line and Asset II: 765 KV 3x80 MVAR Bus Reactor I along with associated bays at Ranchi 765 KV S/S under Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Stations and Network for NR , Import by NR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER and Common scheme for network for WR and Import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER in Eastern Region.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that provisional tariff for the instant assets was allowed vide order dated 23.6.2014 in Petition No. 46/TT/2014 under the 2009 Tariff Regulations as the assets were anticipated to be commissioned during 2009-14 tariff period and requested the Commission to continue with the same.

3. None appeared on behalf of the respondents.



4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit, with an advance copy to respondents by 29.4.2016:-

- a) Revised Cost Estimate for Asset-I.
- b) RPC approval for Bus Reactor/Line Reactor or copy of DPP, if RPC approval is not there.
- c) RPC approval indicates 40% compensation with this Line Reactor at Ranchi sub-station. Has this compensation been provided?
- d) Petitioner has claimed Switchable Line Reactor bay at Ranchi (New) S/s in Form-2 whereas no bay at Sipat sub-station has been claimed. Petitioner to clarify.
- e) CEA certificate under Regulation 43 of CEA (Measures Related to Safety & Electricity Supply) Regulations, 2010.
- f) Details of time overrun and chronology of the activities along with documentary evidence in regard to delay of 19 to 21 months as per the format given below:

| Asset | Activity | Period of activity | | | | Reason(s) for delay along with reference to supporting document |
|-------|----------|--------------------|----|----------|----|---|
| | | Planned | | Achieved | | |
| | | From | To | From | To | |
| | | | | | | |

- g) Revised Tariff Forms for Asset-I, as Forms - 6, 7, 7A, 8, 9C and 10A are not reconciling with its Auditor's Certificate. Also, submit Form-5B (Details of element wise cost of the Project), Form-9 (Details of allocation of corporate loans) and Form-15 (Actual cash expenditure) for both the assets.
- h) Reconcile Form-13 (Break-up of Initial Spares) of Asset-II with its auditor's certificate.
- i) Documents in support of Date of Drawl, Interest Rate, Exchange Rates (for both the assets) and Repayment Schedule for IFC-A (31419-00). If there is any default in the interest payment on any loan mentioned at Form-9C (for both the assets), petitioner is required to provide the details;
- j) Clarification as to whether the un-discharged liability portion of IDC/IEDC has been included in the projected additional capitalisation claimed.
- k) Clarification whether entire liability pertaining to initial spares has been discharged as on COD, if no, year wise detail of discharging of the same, among the Sub station and transmission line separately. Also, if the un-discharged liability of initial spares as on COD is already adjusted in the additional capitalization.

5. The Commission further directed the petitioner to file the above said information within the specified time. In case, the information is not filed within the said date, the matter shall be decided based on available records.



6. The Commission directed that the provisional tariff allowed vide order dated 23.6.2014 shall continue till the disposal of this petition

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

By Order of the Commission

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

