

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 115/TT/2017

Subject : Truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for Asset-I:- combined assets of 1500 MVA 765/400/33 kV, ICT-I, ICT-II, ICT-III and ICT-IV along with associated bays at Jhatikara 765/400 kV New Sub-station, Asset-II:- Combined assets of 1500 MVA 765/400 /33 kV, ICT-I and ICT-II along with associated bays at Meerut Sub-station, Asset-III:-Associated bays for LILO of both ckts of 400 kV D/C Bamnoli-Mundka/Bawana at Jhatikara 765/400 kV New Sub-station, Asset-IV:- One no 765 kV line bay for 765 kV Agra-Jhatikara line including 765 kV 240 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor as Bus Reactor Operation mode at 765/400 kV Jhatikara (New) Sub-station, Asset-V:- Associated line bays for (765 kV S/C Agra-Jhatikra transmission line) at Agra Sub-station, Asset-VI:- One no. 765 kV line bay for 765 kV Agra-Meerut line along with 765 KV 240 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor under Bus Reactor operation mode at 765/400/220 KV Meerut Sub-station, Asset-VII:- Associated Line bays for 765 kV S/C Agra-Meerut transmission line at Agra Sub-station, Asset-VIII:- 765 kV 240 MVAR Bus Reactor along with associated bays at 765/400/220 kV Meerut Sub-station, Asset-IX:- 765 KV 240 MVAR Bus Reactor along with associated bays at 765/400/220 KV Jhatikara Sub-station, Asset-X:- Associated bays at Jhatikara for 765 kV Jhatikara-Bhiwani Line under 765 KV system for Central part of Northern Grid Part-II.

Date of Hearing : 25.7.2017

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



ROP in Petition No. 115/TT/2017

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and 16 others

Parties present : Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for true-up of the transmission tariff of the 2009-14 period and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 period of the transmission assets under 765 kV system for Central Part of Northern Grid Part-II. The tariff for the 2009-14 tariff period for the instant assets was allowed in Petition Nos. 100/TT/2012, 201/TT/2012 and 37/TT/2013 vide orders dated 20.1.2015, 6.5.2015 and 18.3.2016 respectively.
- b) Subsequently, the petitioner filed Review Petition No. 6/RP/2016 against order dated 20.1.2015 in Petition No. 100/TT/2012 wherein time over-run of 8 months and 12 months in commissioning of Assets I and II was disallowed. The Commission vide order dated 15.9.2016 condoned the time over-run, however, review of shifting of COD of Asset II was disallowed. Accordingly, in the instant petition, the IDC and IEDC of 8 months and 12 months in case of Assets I and II is capitalized and COD of Asset II has been considered as per the Commission's order dated 20.1.2015.
- c) The petitioner filed Review Petition No. 14/RP/2016 against order dated 6.5.2015 in Petition No. 201/TT/2012 seeking approval of COD of Assets IV and VI as 1.10.2012 and 1.2.2013 respectively. However, the Commission vide order dated 29.6.2016 disallowed the review. Accordingly, the COD of Asset IV and VI approved by the Commission vide order dated 6.5.2015 is considered in the instant petition.

2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that actual IDC expenditure upto COD only should be considered for the purpose of computation of tariff and the IDC accrued and disbursed after COD should not be considered. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner has claimed the IDC expenditure after COD as additional capital



expenditure and it should not be allowed as additional capital expenditure. The initial spares claimed by the petitioner are beyond the ceiling limits specified under Regulation 8 of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. The Commission in its order dated 18.3.2016 in Petition No. 37/TT/2013 observed that the information submitted by the petitioner does not clearly show that the bus reactors at Meerut were able to mitigate the issue of high voltage. The petitioner in the instant petition has filed some data at 400 kV level but nothing has been mentioned about the voltage profile at 765 kV level. The Commission directed the petitioner to clarify the issues raised by BRPL, including the voltage profile at Meerut Sub-station in its rejoinder, with a copy to BRPL.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with an advance copy to the respondents by 18.8.2017:-

- a) Form-5 B i.e. "Details of element wise cost of Project" as per investment approval.
- b) Calculations for Weighted Average life of combined asset.
- c) Document in support of interest rates and/or repayment schedules (as per Form 13 in case of tariff period 2009-14 and Form 9-c in case of tariff period 2014-19) of "IFC" loan deployed for Asset I, II, V, VIII and IX. If there is any default in interest payment on loan, provide the details.

4. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 1.9.2017 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 11.9.2017. The Commission further observed that no extension of time shall be granted and directed the parties to comply within the directions within the said timeline.

5. The matter is listed for final hearing on 12.9.2017

By order of the Commission

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

