

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 31/RP/2018

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for extension of Kudankulam APP-Tirunelveli 400 kV (Quad) D/C line to Tuticorin Pooling Station alongwith associated bays at Tuticorin Pooling Station under connectivity for Kudankulam 3 & 4 (2X1000 MW) for 2014-19 tariff period.

.Date of Hearing : 18.12.2018

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. & 16 Ors

Parties present : Shri S.K. Venkatesh, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri Sitiesh Mukherjee, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Deep Rao, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Divyanshu Bhatt, Advocate, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner has filed the instant petition for review of order dated 29.6.2018 in Petition No.110/TT/2017 wherein additional RoE of 0.5% was not allowed by the Commission for extension of Kudankulam APP-Tirunelveli 400 kV (Quad) D/C line to Tuticorin Pooling Station alongwith associated bays at Tuticorin Pooling Station under Connectivity for Kudankulam 3 & 4 (2X1000 MW) though the line was completed within the timeline specified in Regulation 24(2)(i) read with Appendix-I(c) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The Commission disallowed the same observing that as the instant asset was envisaged for evacuation of power from Units 3 & 4 of Kudankulam Nuclear Power Plant but used as an interim arrangement for providing operational flexibility for Unit-1 and Unit-2 of the Kudankulam Plant. Learned counsel submitted that it is not an interim arrangement and it is a part of the entire scheme. As Units 3 and 4 were getting delayed, it was decided to change the scheme to facilitate



two termination points at Tirunelveli and Tuticorin Pooling Stations for evacuation of power from Units 1 and 2 to avoid difficulties in case of fault at one of the pooling stations and accordingly the instant was preponed. Learned counsel also referred to the CEA transmission planning criteria for providing two independent pooling stations. He submitted that not allowing additional RoE of 0.5% is an error apparent on the face of record which is required to be corrected. He submitted that as long as the scheme was approved and implemented, the Review Petitioner is entitled to additional RoE. He submitted that 2014 Tariff Regulations does not make any distinction between an interim and final arrangement and as such the Review Petitioner is entitled to additional RoE of 0.5% as COD of the instant transmission asset was done in accordance with the timeline approved in the SCM and RPC.

2. After hearing the Review Petitioner, the Commission reserved order on admissibility of the review petition.

By order of the Commission

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

