

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 104/TT/2019

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from DOCO to 31.3.2019 for Asset-I: Extension of Kota 400/220 kV Sub-station (POWERGRID) Shifting of 400 kV, 50 MVAR line reactor from Merta to Kota Sub-station for its use as Bus Reactor and 400 kV Bus reactor bay; Asset-II: Extension of Koteshwar 400/220 kV Sub-station (THDC) installation of 400 kV, 125 MVAR bus reactor along with associated bay at Koteshwar; Asset-III: Extension of Dehar 400/220 kV Sub-station (BBMB)-installation of 400 kV, 1x63 MVAR bus Reactor-II through a single 400 kV hybrid GIS bay and Asset-IV: Replacement of 250MVA ICT with 4x105MVA, 1-phase ICT & retrofitting of associated 400/220 kV bay equipment and protection relays at Dehar under Strengthening Scheme in Region
- Date of Hearing** : 11.02.2020
- Coram** : Shri P. K. Pujari Chairperson
Shri I.S. Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
- Respondents** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, & 16 Ors.
- Parties present** : Shri Nitish Kumar, PGCIL
Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi , PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that instant petition is filed as per the Commission's order dated 17.10.2017 in Petition No. 234/TT/2016. As per the investment approval dated 26.10.2012, the scheduled date for commercial operation of the instant assets was 14.10.2014 against which the Assets-I, II, III and IV were put into commercial operation on 1.4.2016, 22.7.2017, 13.10.2017 and 3.2.2017 respectively. Thus, there is time over-run of 18-36 months. The reasons for the time over-run are given in the petition and it is due to the reasons beyond the control of the petitioner and



requested to condone the same. He submitted that the estimated completion cost of Asset-II is more than the apportioned approved cost. However, it is within the Revised Cost Estimate. He submitted that the cost of the other three assets is within the FR approved apportioned cost and thus there is no cost over-run in case of the instant assets. He submitted that Asset-IV is a replacement of the existing BBMB asset at Dehar Sub-station and thus no existing element of the petitioner is decapitalised.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that Asset-I, i.e. the 50 MVAR Line Reactor is shifted from Merta Sub-station to Kota Sub-station and is used as a Bus Reactor. He submitted that the capital cost of Asset-I is not claimed and only the cost of shifting of the reactor and other cost is claimed in the instant petition. He requested to allow the tariff for the asset as claimed in the petition and allow de-capitalisation from the original petition and re-capitalization in the instant project at the time of truing up of the tariff of the 2014-19 tariff. He further requested to allow the carrying cost from the date of de-capitalisation to the date of re-capitalization. In response to a query of the Commission, he submitted that it was installed in Kota Sub-station on 1.4.2016 and it took 133 days for relocating the reactor.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL and BYPL submitted that there is cost over-run in case of Asset-II when compared to the FR approved apportioned cost and the petitioner has submitted the RCE, but there is no proper justification for the increase in the cost. The Bus Reactor at Kota Sub-station is not in regular use and hence it should be removed from the capital cost of the project as provided in Regulation 9(6) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He submitted that the petitioner has claimed higher initial spares for the instant assets and the initial spares may be allowed only as per the limits specified in the regulations. He also raised the issue of time over-run and submitted that the petitioner has not submitted the CPM and PERT chart. He further submitted that a detailed reply has been filed and requested to consider the same.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit by 30.3.2020 with a copy to the respondents:-

(i) Year-wise discharge of initial spares.

(ii) The reasons for time over-run along with supporting documents, if any, against each activity for the assets covered under the present petition in the format below:-



S. No	Activity	Period of activity				Time over-run in days	Reason(s) for time over-run
		Planned		Achieved			
		From	To	From	To		
	LOA						
	Supplies of Structure, equipment, etc.						
	Civil works and Erection						
	Delay due to grant of NOC by RRVPL						
	Delay due to number of Civil structures obstructing during erection of bus reactor						
	Damages observed during erection and sent back to factory for rectification						
	Delay due to non-grant shut down by BBMB						
	Testing and COD						
	Any other Activities for time over-run , if any						

(iii) Asset-wise CPM/PERT Chart on actual basis.

5. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 6.4.2020 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 13.4.2020. The Commission also directed the parties to comply with the directions within the specified timeline and further observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

6. The petition shall be listed for final hearing in due course of time for which a separate notice will be issued.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(V. Sreenivas)
Dy. Chief (Law)

