

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 149/TT/2017

Subject : Truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block of loop-out of 220 kV Jalandhar-Hamirpur line at Hamirpur under the Strengthening scheme in Northern Region.

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

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited and 16 others

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

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed for truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 period in respect loop-out of 220 kV Jalandhar-Hamirpur line at Hamirpur under the Strengthening Scheme in Northern Region.

2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted as under:-

- (a) The initial spares claimed by the petitioner are beyond the ceiling limits specified under Regulation 13 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. Accordingly, the excess initial spares amounting to ₹6.99 lakh is liable to be rejected.
- (b) Accrual IDC has been claimed under additional capital expenditure for the tariff period 2014-15 under Regulation 14(1) of 2014 Tariff Regulations. IDC should be allowed only when it relates to 'work' under un-discharged liability and not under fund management system. The petitioner has claimed the IDC expenditure after COD as additional capital expenditure and it should not be allowed as additional capital expenditure.



3. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that accrual IDC is not considered while calculating the tariff as the same was discharged upto COD. The accrual IDC has been taken out of COD expenditure and added in respective the years add-cap when it has been discharged.

4. The Commission observed that the petitioner has submitted that the Auditor certificate is prepared on cash basis and actual expenditure incurred up to COD is included in COD cost and that the Initial Spare is also included in the COD cost. However, it is indicated that the amount of Initial Spare of ₹17.75 lakh to be paid during 2015-16 and it is a contradiction. The Commission further observed that IDC of ₹0.94 lakh claimed to be discharged during 2014-15 in the "Statement showing IDC Discharged up to COD" is not in conformity with the statement submitted under para 11.1 and directed the petitioner to clarify the same.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit by 10.4.2018 with an advance copy to the respondents:

(a) Copy of Revised Cost Estimate (RCE);

(b) Form-5B i.e. "Details of Element-wise cost of Project" as per RCE.

6. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 27.4.2018 with an copy to the petitioner who shall file its rejoinder, if any, by 10.5.2018. The parties are directed to comply with the above directions within the specified timeline.

7. The Commission also directed to list the petition for hearing on 24.5.2018.

By order of the Commission

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

