

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 249/TT/2020

Subject	:	Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 period for two assets under "Wardha-Hyderabad 765 kV link" in Southern Region
Date of Hearing	:	10.8.2020
Coram	:	Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson Shri I. S. Jha, Member Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Petitioner	:	Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
Respondents	:	Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Ltd (Formerly Tamil Nadu Electricity Board -TNEB) and 18 Others
Parties present	:	Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL Shri B. Dash, PGCIL Dr. R. Kathiravan, TANGEDCO Smt. R. Ramalakshmi, TANGEDCO

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 the tariff of the 2014-19 period and determination of the tariff of the 2019-24 period in respect of the following assets under "Wardha-Hyderabad 765 kV link" in Southern Region.

Asset-I: Wardha–Nizamabad 765 kV D/C line along with associated bays, Nizamabad–Dichpalli 400 kV D/C line along with associated bays, Establishment of 765/400 kV GIS at Nizamabad with 2x1500 MVA transformers, 1x240 MVar Bus Reactor, 2x240 MVar Switchable Line Reactors along with associated bays, Extension of 765/400 kV Wardha Sub-station with 2x240 MVar Switchable Line Reactors along with associated bays and Extension of Dichpalli 400 kV Sub-station of TSTRANSCO,

Asset-II: Hyderabad (Maheshwaram)-Nizamabad 765 kV D/C Line and 2 nos. 765 kV bays along with 1 no. 240 MVAR switchable line reactor each at Hyderabad



(Maheshwaram) and Nizamabad Sub-station each for both circuits of Hyderabad-Nizamabad 765 kV D/C Line

3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that both the assets were put into commercial operation in the 2014-19 tariff period. He submitted that the tariff for Asset-I was approved by the Commission vide order dated 29.11.2017 in Petition No. 39/TT/2017 and the tariff for Asset-II was approved vide order dated 20.9.2018 in Petition No. 208/TT/2017. He submitted that as on 31.3.2019, the total cost allowed for both the assets in the respective orders was within the FR apportioned approved cost and hence there is no cost over-run in case of subject assets. He submitted that the cost claimed in the instant petition is lesser than the cost allowed in the earlier orders and the reasons for cost variation are submitted in the petition. He further submitted that Review Petition No. 49/RP/2018 was filed against order dated 20.9.2018 in Petition No. 208/TT/2017, wherein IDC amounting ₹548.89 lakh was disallowed by the Commission due to computational difference. The Commission, vide order dated 7.2.2019, in Petition No.49/RP/2018 had granted a liberty to the Petitioner to present relevant documents to consider allowing IDC at the time of truing-up of the tariff. Accordingly, details of cash IDC statement and the weighted average rate of interest have been provided along with proof of interest. He submitted that 50% expenditure towards OPGW has been transferred to telecom business and the same has been adjusted in the Auditor's certificate as well. The initial spares are claimed as per the APTEL judgment dated 14.9.2019 in Appeal No. 74 of 2017 and it is within the ceiling as provided in the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He also submitted that the information sought in the TV (technical validation) letter, along with liability statement, Form 5 and other details have been filed.

4. The learned counsel for TANGEDCO sought time to file reply to the Petition.

5. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit, by 2.9.2020, with advance copy to the Respondents:

- i. Details and explanation as O&M expenses claimed for truing up of tariff for 2014-19 period and tariff determination for 2019-24 period do not match with the calculations.
- ii. Form-10B for both the assets.
- iii. Justification of drawl date of IDC for loans later than that of actual COD.
- iv. Details and explanation as the total IDC and IDC discharged claimed in IDC Statement do not match with the calculations.

6. The Commission further directed TANGEDCO, to file its reply by 15.9.2020 and the Petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 23.9.2020.

7. The Commission further directed the parties to adhere to the above specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/
(V. Sreenivas)
Deputy Chief (Law)

