

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 189/TT/2021

Subject : Petition for determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 period for two assets under “Phase-I- Unified Real Time Dynamic State Measurement (URTDSM)”.

Date of Hearing : 2.11.2021

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I.S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P. K. Singh, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Limited and 17 Others

Parties present : Ms. Poorva Saigal, Advocate, MPPTCL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri D.K. Biswal, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Amit Yadav, PGCIL
Shri Vincent D’Souza, MPPTCL

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. The representative of the Petitioner made the following submissions:
 - a. The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period for Asset-1: URTDSM Systems (PDCs & its associated parts) supplied and installed at NERLDC and SLDCs of Assam, Meghalaya and Tripura and PMUs along with 51 PMUs & its associated items (in 14 stations) and Asset-2: URTDSM System (Control Center Equipment, PMU’s and associated equipment’s) integrated and commissioned at WRLDC, Mumbai & SLDCs of Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat under “Phase-I- Unified Real Time Dynamic State Measurement (URTDSM)”.
 - b. Asset-1 and Asset-2 were put under commercial operation on 1.1.2020 and 31.5.2019 with a time over-run of 45 months and 37 months respectively. The time over-run was on account of wide area measurement, non-availability of testing



labs for PMUs as per the latest standards, space constraint in the sub-stations and non-availability of basic infrastructure or work permission for connection at various state utility sub-stations and generating stations and the same has been explained in detail in the petition along with relevant documents. Various RoW issues such as strikes and bandhs also occurred resulting in time over-run of Asset-1 along with delay in handing over of the premises in Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Sikkim and Mizoram. Similarly, in case of Asset-2, there was time over-run in handing over of premises of SLDC buildings etc.

c. The scheme was approved vide IA dated 21.1.2014. The scheme was discussed and agreed in the Joint SCM of all the five regions held on 5.3.2012. It was further agreed in the WRPC and NERPC meetings. Members of the Regional Standing Committee on Power System Planning agreed that the scheme has to be implemented as a System Strengthening Scheme and the cost shall be added in the National pool account to be shared by all DICs under the PoC mechanism. The regulatory approval for the instant assets was granted by the Commission vide order dated 6.9.2013 in Petition No. 129/MP/2012.

d. The Ministry of Power sanctioned 70% of project cost as grant from PSDF (Power Systems Development Fund) with the condition that no tariff shall be claimed by the Petitioner for the portion of the scheme funded from PSDF. The remaining 30% of the capital cost is claimed as its equity and as such no Interest on Loan is claimed.

e. Initial spares claimed are more than the norms specified in the 2019 Tariff Regulations and it is prayed to allow the same by invoking the provision of 'power to relax' considering the need to stabilize the National Grid.

f. Information has been submitted vide affidavit dated 23.9.2021 wherein tariff has been revised considering the equipment under IT head claiming the depreciation as 15%.

g. No reply has been received from any of the Respondents.

3. Learned counsel for MPPTCL prayed for a week's time to file reply in the matter.

4. In response to the Commission's query regarding infusion of equity of 30%, the Petitioner submitted that the idea behind treating grant from PSDF as debt is envisaged from the order dated 6.9.2013 in Petition No. 129/MP/2012 wherein BRPL and BSES had suggested that 70% of the funding for the scheme should be met through PSDF. The projects are funded through debt and equity in the ratio of 70:30. PGCIL has contributed for the equity of 30% of the project cost and the debt portion is funded from PSDF.

5. The Commission observed that the Government stipulates the terms and conditions while approving grant and those terms and conditions are considered by the Commission while determining the tariff. In the absence of any such terms and conditions, the Commission's Regulations are applicable.



6. The Commission allowed the request of MPPTCL to file its reply by 26.11.2021 with an advance copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, by 10.12.2021. The Commission observed that due date of filing the pleadings should be strictly adhered to and no extension of time shall be granted.

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

By order of the Commission

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

