

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Chanderlok Building, 36, Janpath, New Delhi- 110001  
Ph: 23753942, Fax-23753923

**Petition No. 143/TT/2019**

Date: 11.9.2020

To,

Shri S.S. Raju,  
Senior General Manager (Commercial),  
Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,  
Saudamini, Plot No. 2,  
Sector-29, Gurgaon-122001

**Subject:** Approval under Regulation-86 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.

**Sir,**

With reference to the above mentioned petition, I am directed to request you to submit the following information under Regulation 87(2) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999, on an affidavit, with an advance copy to the respondents latest by 22.9.2020:

- (i) The SLD clearly indicating OPGW links connected with Neelamangala, Hoody and Yelahanka Sub-stations.
- (ii) Indicate the tower locations where ROW issues occurred during laying of the OPGW communication link. Specify the ROW issues starting from Neelamangla Sub-station upto the tower location where the OPGW work was completed.
- (iii) Documentary evidence in support of the time envisaged for each activity at the planning stage and actual time taken by the Petitioner in chronological order. Reasons for time over-run in case of each activity along with valid documentary evidence may be furnished.
- (iv) Tariff has been claimed for Neelamangla-Yelahanka (39.006 km) OPGW Fibre Communication link of Central Sector. Clarify, whether the Petitioner is laying OPGW on existing lines. In case, OPGW is being laid on the existing lines, the details of existing lines along with length of OPGW may be submitted.

- (v) The length of LILO of Neelamangala-Hoody at Yalahanka is about 8.27 km. However, it is stated that delay in COD of the said LILO affected the COD of the instant asset which is 39.0006 km. Clarify.
- (vi) The Petitioner has submitted RLDC certificate for Neelamangala-Yalahanka LILO portion. However, the name of the asset is mentioned in the instant petition as Neelamangla-Yelahanka (39.006 km). Clarify the reasons for mismatch in the nomenclature of the assets.
- (vii) The Petitioner has submitted that time over-run in case of LILO Neelamangala-Hoody at Yalahanka has been condoned vide order dated 8.11.2019 in Petition No. 361/TT/2018. It is noted that the SCOD of the instant assets and the SCOD of the assets covered in Petition No. 361/TT/2018 do not match. The reasons for mismatch in planning of the system and how can the Petitioner match with different time schedules of commissioning of assets.
- (viii) As per the Investment Approval dated 15.2.2011, the scope of work covered is 1575 km OPGW fibre optic cable on the existing lines and 120 km underground fibre Optic cable. The Petitioner is directed to submit the line details where laying of OPGW cable was carried out and specify the Petition No. in which tariff was granted.
- (ix) Were there any RoW issues in case of OPGW cable on the existing Neelamangala-Hoody circuit-1? Was it possible to lay the OPGW cable on the Neelamangala-Hoody circuit-1 without waiting for the Neelmangala-Yelahanka-Hoody circuit where there was time over-run?
- (x) Clarify whether the contract for laying the OPGW link was awarded to only one contractor or more than one. Furnish the details of the same.

In case the above said information is not filed within the specified date, the petition shall be disposed on the basis of the information already on record.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-  
(Rajendra Kumar Tewari)  
Bench Officer