

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 3/TT/2018

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for “Bunching of Tirunelveli – Edamon section of the Tirunelveli – Muvathapuza (Cochin) 400 kV quad D/C line initially (and temporarily) at 220 kV with existing Tirunelveli – Edamon 400 kV twin D/C line (400 kV line charged at 220 kV) under Transmission System associated with Kudankulam Atomic Power Project” in Southern Region under Regulation 86 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.

Date of Hearing : 24.5.2018

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 Ltd. (PGCIL)

Respondents : Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd., (KPTCL) and 15 others

Parties present : Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the bunching of Tirunelveli-Edamon section of the Tirunelveli-Muvathapuza (Cochin) quad D/C line has been done for part utilization of the line and to enhance the power transfer capacity of existing line to meet the critical power requirements of Kerala. The phase-wise bunching of the conductor on the same tower has impact on the inductance of the line which enhances the surge impedance loading of the line. Accordingly, the instant bunching has resulted in increase in the power transfer from Tirunelveli to Edamon. Before the bunching on 21.12.2016, around 365 MW power was flowing through Tirunelveli-Edamon section of the Tirunelveli-Muvathapuza (Cochin) quad D/C line and after bunching the power flow



has increased to 532 MW. Hence, there is enhanced power of 167 MW. He submitted that from Tirunelveli-Edamon section is a multi-circuit line and two circuits are charged and they were put to use. He submitted that the section from Tirunelveli to Edamon is double circuit portion. Kerala is drawing additional power and the instant assets are being used. He also submitted that tariff is claimed for part of the asset in the interest of the beneficiaries as well as the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO submitted that there is no COD for this line and no prior approval was obtained to lay this line. He further submitted that it is also not clear for what purpose this line is laid. He submitted that both the ends of the sub-station have limited capacity and by putting more lines on the same ends of sub-stations by way of bunching the lines does not serve any purpose. The petitioner should explain the logic of flow of extra quantum of power. He submitted that the line was not envisaged, therefore, it should not be considered for grant of PoC charges.

3. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the bunching of the aforesaid lines was done after conducting relevant technical study and they can produce the relevant test reports etc.

4. The Commission directed the staff to request CEA to clarify whether bunching of the Bunching of Tirunelveli-Edamon section of the Tirunelveli-Muvathapuza (Cochin) 400 kV quad D/C line initially (and temporarily) at 220 kV with existing Tirunelveli-Edamon 400 kV twin D/C line (400 kV line charged at 220 kV) under Transmission System associated with Kudankulam Atomic Power Project enhances power flow between buses and POSCO to validate the reason for increase in 167 MW flow as claimed by the petitioner within a month.

5. The Commission also directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with an advance copy to the respondents latest by 30.6.2018:-

- a) Clarify as to why Additional Capital Expenditure is reflected in Form 7 whereas Auditor's Certificate does indicate any Additional Capital Expenditure.
- b) Form 4A with clear reconciliation of liability amount claimed in Form 7.
- c) Revised Forms 5 and 5B indicating the cost details as per original IA and RCE-I should reflect the apportioned cost as per original IA, RCE I and RCE of all the elements of the project should tally with the total cost approved in IA/RCE-I and RCE-II.
- d) Clarify whether the ADB III loan is project specific loan. The computation of IDC for ADB III loan clearly indicating the exchange rate and conversion of loan amount and IDC into INR.

6. The Commission directed the respondents to submit the reply, if any, by 16.7.2018 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 31.7.2018. The Commission further directed the parties to comply with the above directions within the specified timeline and no extension of time will be allowed.



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

By order of the Commission

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

