

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 138/TT/2020

Subject : Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period for one asset under “Transmission System associated with Rapp 7 and 8 Part-A”.

Date of Hearing : 28.7.2020

Coram : Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & 16 Others

Parties present : Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through video conference.

2. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period in respect of Rapp– Kota 400 kV D/C line (part of Rapp-Jaipur(South) 400kV D/C line with one ckt LILoed at Kota) along with associated bay at Kota(DOCO 03.08.2017)under “Transmission System associated with Rapp 7 and 8 Part-A”. The tariff of the instant assets was earlier allowed for 2014-19 period vide order dated 19.9.2018 in Petition No. 206/TT/2017 and Corrigendum order dated 5.11.2018 in Petition No. 206/TT/2017. The admitted capital cost of the asset as on COD was ₹7115.65 lakh and add-cap was ₹2078.8 lakh. The cost as on COD has been considered as ₹7113.98 lakh. The estimated completion cost claimed in the true up petition is ₹7997.24 lakh as on 31.3.2019. IDC/IEDC of ₹206.65 lakh had been disallowed by the Commission on account of time over-run and the same has been considered while calculating the capital cost. In the previous order, excess Initial Spares of ₹46.36 lakh was disallowed by the Commission as on COD. In the instant petition, excess Initial Spares have been re-calculated. The change in Initial Spares is on



account of the fact that earlier PLCC Spares were considered as part of sub-station and now both have been claimed separately. The information sought in the Technical Validation letter and rejoinder to the reply of BRPL have been submitted.

3. On a specific query of the Commission as to whether the Petitioner is filing a separate petition for PLCC or the same is part of this petition, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that PLCC is a part of this petition.

4. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that he has filed reply to the petition. He submitted that the subject asset was created for evacuation of power from Rapp 7 & Rapp 8 with unit size 700 MW each. He submitted that RAPP-C (Units-5 and 6) is connected to Kankroli through 400 kV D/C line and to Kota through 400 kV S/C line and that there were operational difficulties in evacuation of power from RAPP-C due to high voltage issues compelling the opening of one circuit of RAPP-Kankroli 400 kV D/C line many times. Further, tripping of Kota line led to oscillations while evacuating power from RAPP-5 and 6. This information clearly indicates the low load on these transmission lines resulting into generation of high capacitive reactance in these lines which in turn leads to high voltage condition. Allowing the instant line would further create low load condition and accordingly the Commission need to look into this before allowing the tariff. The transmission line has been bunched at both ends which clearly shows that it is a temporary measure. The grant of tariff for a temporary measure cannot be done as per Regulation 6(1) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. Besides this, learned counsel for BRPL submitted that while determining tariff in the present case, his reply may be considered on other issues.

5. In response, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the asset was discussed and agreed in the 30th Standing Committee Meeting on Transmission System planning of the Northern Region held on 19.12.2011 and further in 22nd Meeting of TCC and 25th meeting of NRPC held on 23.2.2012 and 24.2.2012 and the Investment Approval was accorded for the instant asset. He further submitted that all the reasons for considering the instant asset have already been dealt by the Commission in its order dated 19.9.2018 in Petition No. 206/TT/2017.

6. The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit, by 27.8.2020 with advance copy to the Respondents:-

- i. There has been a reduction in the total additional capital expenditure in the year 2017-18 & 2018-19 from ₹2078.8 lakh admitted in the previous order to actual additional capital expenditure of ₹889.63 lakh claimed in the current petition. Justification for the same may be provided.
- ii. The figures pertaining to balance and retention payment in the additional capital expenditure details/liability flow statement received vide the Technical Validation reply do not match with Form 7. The same may be justified/reconciled.



iii. There is a mismatch in additional capitalization expenditure claimed in 2018-19 in para 8.0 of the current petition (₹489.14 lakh) vis-a-vis Form 7 (₹ 482.77 lakh). The same may be justified/ reconciled.

iv. The status of RAPP-Jaipur line along with relevant documents, if any.

7. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to submit the above information within the specified time and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

8. Subject to above, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

