

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 310/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 subject assets under “Transmission System for Phase-1 Generation projects in Orissa Part-B” in Western 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 : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd.
& 10 Others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through video conference.

2. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 period in respect of following assets under “Transmission System for Phase-1 Generation projects in Orissa Part-B” in Western Region:-

A-1:765/400 kV, 1500 MVA ICT-1 along with associated bays at Jabalpur Pooling Sub-station (New)

A-2: 400 kV D/C (Quad) Jabalpur Pooling S/S (New) – Jabalpur (Existing) Sub-station T/L along with associated bays

A-3: 400 kV 125 MVAR Bus Reactor -1 with associated bays at Jabalpur 765/400 kV Pooling Sub-station



A-4: 765 kV 3*80 MVAR Bus Reactor-2 with associated bays at Jabalpur 765/400 kV Pooling Sub-station

B1: 1500 MVA, 765/400 kV ICT-2 with one spare unit at Jabalpur 765/400 kV Pooling Sub-station

B2: 3X80 MVAR, 765 kV Line Reactor to be used as Bus Reactor at Jabalpur Pooling Sub-station for Dharamjaygarh ckt.#1

B3: 765 kV, 3*110 MVA, Bus Reactor-1 at Dharamjaygarh Sub-station along with associated bays and LILO of 765 kV S/C Ranchi - WR Pooling Sub-station (near Sipat) T/L at Dharamjaygarh

B4: 765kV, 3*110 MVAR Bus Reactor-2 at Dharamjaygarh Sub-station along with associated bays

B5: Circuit-1 of 765 kV D/C Jharsuguda PS – Dharamjaygarh (near Korba) Line

B6: Circuit-2 of 765 kV D/C Jharsuguda Pooling Station – Dharamjaygarh (near Korba) Line

C1: 400 kV 125 MVAR (3 Ph) Bus Reactor -2 with associated bays at Jabalpur 765/400 kV Pooling Sub-station

C2: 765 kV 3X80 MVAR Bus Reactor-1 with associated bays at Jabalpur Pooling Sub-station

C3: 765kV, 3x80 MVAR Line Reactor and associated 765 kV, 1 no. bay for Dharamjaygarh Ckt#2 (Interim Contingency as Bus Reactor) at 765/400 kV Jabalpur Pooling Sub-station

D: 765 kV D/C Dharamjaygarh–Jabalpur PS T/L and 2*330 MVAR Switchable Line Reactors with associated bays at Dharamjaygarh Sub-station and line bays at Dharamjaygarh Sub-station

3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the Commission vide order dated 7.9.2017 in Petition 86/TT/2017 approved the tariff for Assets-A1 to A4, which were put into commercial operation during the 2009-14 tariff period. He submitted that a delay of 2 months in case of Asset A-4 was condoned by the Commission. The Commission vide order dated 26.4.2016 in Petition No. 244/TT/2014, approved the tariff for Assets-B1 to B6, which were put into commercial operation in the 2014-19 tariff period. In case of Asset-B1, the time over-run of 1 month and 17 days was condoned, while the time over-run in case of Assets-B3 and B4 was not condoned, whereas delays of 3 months and 17 days, 7 months and 16 days and 7 months and 17 days were condoned in case of Assets-B2, B5 and B6 respectively. He also submitted that Assets-C1 to C3, which were put into commercial operation in the 2014-19 tariff period, the tariff was approved vide order dated 28.4.2016 in Petition No. 409/TT/2014. In case of Assets-C1 and C2, the time over-run was partly condoned. The tariff for Asset D was approved by the Commission vide order dated 26.5.2016 in Petition No. 266/TT/2015



and the entire delay of 21 months and 17 days was condoned. The representative of the Petitioner prayed for condonation of delay of 11 months 15 days in case of Asset-C3 as in the case Asset D. He further submitted that the capital cost claimed in the instant petition is within the apportioned approved cost. He submitted that the Initial spares for assets put into commercial operation during different tariff periods are within the ceiling limit prescribed by the respective tariff regulations, and in accordance with the judgment of the APTEL dated 14.9.2019 in Appeal No. 74 of 2017. He also submitted that the information sought in the Technical Validation letter has been submitted and the rejoinder to the reply of MPPMCL has been filed.

4. In response to a query of the Commission regarding the time over-run in case of Asset-C3, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that re-routing to avoid biosphere reserve and protected forest area, detailed survey and finalization of route alignment, forest approval from Ministry of Environment and Forest and severe RoW issues are the reasons for delay and requested to condone the time over-run.

5. In response to another query regarding combining the assets on completion of the project with regard to initial spares, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the claim of initial spares is in accordance with the judgment of the APTEL dated 14.9.2019 in Appeal No. 74 of 2017. He further submitted that initial spares have to be computed on overall project basis only when the claim exceeds the ceiling limit for each asset. The Commission further observed that the Petitioner can only claim element-wise initial spares till it combines the assets and the APTEL judgment comes into effect only when the assets are combined.

6. The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit, by 26.8.2020, with an advance copy to the Respondents: -

- i. Element-wise details of initial spares along with the corresponding tariff period, CoD and ceiling limit, as calculated by the Petitioner.
- ii. Year wise discharge of Initial Spares for Assets A-1, A-2, A-3 and A-4.

7. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to submit the information within 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)

