CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

Petition No. 57/TT/2017

Subject	:	Determination of transmission tariff from for Asset-I: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Sonepat Sub-station extension, Asset-II: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Order in Petition No. 55/TT/2017, 56/TT/2017, 57/TT/2017 and 69/TT/2017 Page 2 of 10 400/220 kV Jaipur (South) Sub- station extension, Asset-III: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Bassi Sub-station extension, Asset-IV: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Manesar Sub-station extension, Asset-V: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Panchkula Sub-station extension, Asset-VI: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VI: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor At 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor At 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor At 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor At 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor At 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor At 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor At 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIII: 125 MVAR Bus Reactor At 400/220 kV Kaithal Sub-station extension, Asset-VIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
Date of Hearing	:	3.8.2017
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
Respondents	:	Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and 16 others
Parties present	:	Shri S.K. Niranjan, PGCIL Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL Shri B. Dash, PGCIL Shri V.P. Rastogi, PGCIL Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the PGCIL submitted that all the assets, except Asset IV has been commissioned and Asset-IV is anticipated to be commissioned on 31.8.2017. He further submitted that all information sought vide order dated 12.6.2017 have been submitted. The information pertaining to Asset IV will be submitted as soon as it is

ROP in Petition No. 57/TT/2017

commissioned. He also submitted that rejoinder to the reply of BRPL has been submitted vide affidavit dated 8.5.2017. He further submitted that RCE is yet to be approved by the Board of the petitioner company and the same shall be filed upon its approval.

2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that there is cost over-run in case of all 7 assets. As such, RCE, if any submitted, should contain the proper justification for cost enhancement.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with an advance copy to the respondents by 31.8.2017:-

- a) Actual COD along with RLDC certificate and Auditor's Certificate for Asset-IV and reason for delay in commissioning of the asset.
- b) Documentary proof of Rate of Interest for Proposed Loan 2016-17 (7.55%) and Proposed Loan 2016-17 (7.97%).
- c) Approved Revised Cost Estimate (RCE), if any, and submit corresponding revised Form-5B (Details of element wise cost of the Project) for all the Assets of the project.
- d) Computation of interest during construction (IDC) on cash basis for all the Assets from:-
 - i) the date of infusion of debt fund up to SCOD
 - ii) SCOD to actual COD of the Asset;
- e) The date of drawl of each loan for the purpose of IDC calculation. Further, while submitting the un-discharged liability portion of IDC and IEDC, clarify whether it has been included in the projected add-cap claimed, in case of all the assets.
- f) Clarify whether entire liability pertaining to initial spares has been discharged as on COD, if no, year wise detail of discharging of the same.

4. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the IDC working sheet's editable soft copy in Excel format with links.

5. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 11.9.2017 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 22.9.2017. The Commission directed the parties to comply with the directions within the specified timeline and further observed that no extension of time shall be granted.



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

By order of the Commission

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

