

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 267/TT/2018**

- Subject** : Determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for (Asset-1): Central sector portion (1646.039 kms) & (Asset-2): BBMB (2.35 km) for Establishment of Fibre Optic communication system in Northern region (1648.389 km) 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** : 9.4.2019
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member  
Shri I.S. Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd & 17 Ors
- Parties present** : Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate BRPL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Niranjana, PGCIL  
Shri V.P Rastogi, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for Asset-1: Central sector portion (1646.039 km) and Asset-2: BBMB (2.35 km) for Establishment of Fibre Optic Communication System in Northern Region (1648.389 km) under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014. He submitted that the instant petition covers 22 links in the Central Sector and 5 links under the State Sector which are under BBMB.



2. He further submitted that the instant assets were scheduled to be put into commercial operation on 26.9.2014 as per the Investment Approval dated 27.3.2012. However, the assets were put into commercial operation on 2.7.2017 and 20.1.2018 respectively. There is a time over-run of 33 to 44 months. The time over-run in case of the instant OPGW links is due to delay in COD of the associated transmission lines. The transmission lines were delayed to RoW issues, delay in forest clearance and law and order and the time over-run in case of the transmission lines was condoned. The petitioner, therefore, and requested to condone the time over-run in case of the instant OPGW links. He submitted that the completion cost of the instant assets is within approved apportioned FR cost. Accordingly, there is no cost over-run. He further sought two weeks time to file rejoinder to the reply to submissions of BRPL. The representative of the petitioner further requested to grant AFC for inclusion in the PoC computation as prayed in the affidavit date 8.4.2019.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that there is time over-run of 33 to 44 months as compare with the timeline specified in the Investment Approval for the instant assets. The petitioner has not filed the details of decapitalisation of the earth wire on the existing EHV transmission lines.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with an advance copy to the beneficiaries by 17.5.2019:-

- a. The details of the EHV transmission lines on which OPGW have been provided at the initial stage and whether the cost of OPGW was included in the cost of EHV transmission line;
- b. Whether some dark fibre (spare) is available in OPGW? If so, how they are to be utilized?
- c. Details of de-capitalization of the earth wire on the basis of book value on the existing EHV transmission lines where OPGW has been laid.

5. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 24.5.2019 and the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 31.5.2019. The Commission further directed the parties to comply with the above directions within the due date mentioned and that no extension of time shall be granted.

6. The next date of hearing will be intimated in due course of time.

By order of the Commission

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

