

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 30/RP/2018 in Petition No. 133/TT/2017

Subject : Petition for review of order dated 29.6.2018 in Petition No. 133/TT/2017 under section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 103 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999.

Date of Hearing : 12.2.2019

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

Petitioner : Powergrid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Limited & 16 Others.

Parties present : Shri Deep Rao, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Divyanshu Bhatt, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venketesh, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL

Record of Proceeding

Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that in the impugned order the Commission disallowed the Review Petitioner's claim for additional RoE of 0.50% observing that there is no separate time line specified for the STATCOM in 2014 Tariff Regulations. The Commission further observed that STATCOM was installed in NP Kunta Sub-station which is an existing sub-station, and hence not eligible for additional RoE of 0.5%.

2. Learned counsel submitted that the Commission erred by not taking note of the fact that the entire project was bifurcated into three phases having distinct/separate investment approvals, but the scheme was discussed and agreed as a whole in the 38th Standing Committee Meeting of Southern Region (SCM-SR) held on 7.3.2015 and was placed before the Southern Regional Power Committee (SRPC) in its 27th meeting held on 12.5.2015. He submitted that as per Investment Approval dated 3.6.2015, the ± 100 MVAR STATCOM was to be delivered along with the commissioning of the scope of work covered under Phase-II. He submitted that COD of ± 100 MVAR STATCOM was advanced and put into commercial operation on 4.6.2017 alongwith Phase-I of the transmission system for Ultra Mega Solar Park as discussed in the 38th Standing Committee Meeting on Power System Planning of SR and as discussed and agreed in the SRPC meeting held on 17.2.2018. He submitted that in the IA entire scope of Phase-I was taken together with the commissioning schedule of 12 months except the approved STATCOM which was to be delivered on a subsequent date. He submitted that though there was a different timeline for commissioning of the said STATCOM from



the rest of the scope of work under Phase-I, the overall completion timeline of 30 months specified for a 400 kV sub-station in Appendix-I of 2014 Tariff Regulations was adhered to by the Review Petitioner. The splitting of Phase-I into two timelines was done with a view to cater to the grid requirements and commissioning of various generation projects connecting to the said 400 kV Sub-station.

3. After hearing the Review Petitioner, the Commission reserved order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

sd/-

**(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)**

