

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 116/TT/2017

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff for 5 assets under NRSS-XXXII in Northern Region for the 2014-19 tariff period.

Date of Hearing : 15.3.2018

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, 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 and 17 Others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL
Shri V.P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner has made the following submissions:-

- (a) Instant petition is filed for determination of transmission for Asset-I: 400 kV Lucknow-Kanpur (New) D/C transmission line alongwith associated bays at both end; Asset-II: Augmentation of transformation capacity at 400/220 kV Ballabgarh Sub-station by installing 500 MVA ICT-III; Asset-III: Augmentation of transformation capacity at 400/220 kV Ballabgarh Sub-station by installing 500 MVA ICT-IV; Asset-IV: Augmentation of transformation capacity by 500 MVA ICT(3rd) at 400/220 kV GIS Gurgaon; Asset-V: Extension of GIS Parbati Pooling Station with 7X105 MVA ICT alongwith associated bays and 2 Nos. 220 kV bays under NRSS XXXII in Northern Region for the period ending on 31.3.2019. Assets I, II, III and IV



were put under commercial operation on 1.6.2017, 5.6.2017, 3.7.2017 and 3.8.2017 respectively.

- (b) The COD of Asset V could not be declared due to non-commissioning of downstream system of HPPTCL which is anticipated to be commissioned by 1.4.2018. Submitted CEA certificate and first time charging certificate from RLDC for Asset V and requested to approve its COD under Regulation 4(3) of 2014 Regulations.
- (c) Assets II and III are old 315 MVA ICTs and are replaced with new 500 MVA ICTs. The old ICTs are to be de-capitalized from the original project and capitalized on its use in the new project alongwith associated costs such as transportation, erection etc. The old ICT at Kaithal Sub-station which is already diverted, commissioned and is included in Petition No. 148/TT/2017 without taking into consideration its cost and the other ICT is to be diverted to Fatehabad Sub-station. Requested that the aspect of de-capitalization and capitalization of replaced assets can be worked out at this stage or at the time of true up. Since true up tariff for de-capitalized asset for the period 2009-14 and tariff for 2014-19 (combined assets) have already been approved and the total tariff for old assets (to be capitalized and de-capitalized) remains the same for the tariff period 2014-19, requested to de-capitalize and capitalize the same during true up proceedings for 2014-19 tariff period. The tariff of the present asset be approved without taking into consideration the effect of capitalization and de-capitalization.
- (d) It be allowed to claim tariff for 315 MVA ICTs in Petition Nos. 133/TT/2015 and 189/TT/2014 as the same shall be trued up at the end of 2014-19 tariff block, beginning of tariff block 2019-24. Allow true up of replaced ICTs (315 MVA ICT III and IV at Ballabgarh) on account of de-capitalization from its original project and re-capitalization in the new projects at the end of tariff block 2014-19.

2. Learned counsel for the BRPL, Respondent No.12, has made the following submissions:-

- (a) There are material contradictions in the petition and information given by the petitioner on the issue of cost over-run in respect of Asset-I and V as Form V-A for Asset I indicates that the asset was planned to be completed by July, 2017 and the letter of awards for the works were given from February, 2015 to October, 2016. Similarly, Form 5-A for Asset V shows that supply order and erection order was given in December, 2014 to be completed by June, 2016. The date of completion of supply order as well as completion of the erection cannot be the same.



- (b) No details of cost over-run due to variation of indices in major raw material have been given for Assets I and V.
- (c) No details of time over-run in the case of Assets II, III and IV are furnished by the petitioner. Delay in relation to Assets I and V is attributable to ROW problems and non-completion of downstream system of HPPTCL respectively cannot be condoned in the absence of documentary proof including DPR, CPM analysis and PERT and Bar Charts.
- (d) The petitioner should provide the Auditor's certificate in respect of Assets-I, VI, VII and VIII, TSA in terms of Regulation 3(63) of 2014 Regulations and details of Optical Ground Wire (OPGW) in lieu of earth wire.

6. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed the petitioner to clarify the issues raised by BRPL and to submit the Revised Form 5B as per the re-apportioned RCE, on affidavit by 31.3.2018, with a copy to the respondents:-

7. The Commission directed the respondents to file their response to the above affidavit, if any, by 15.4.2018 with an advance copy to the petitioner which may file its rejoinder, if any, by 24.4.2018

8. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the information within the specified time failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.

9. Subject to the above, Commission reserved the order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

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

