

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
New Delhi

Petition No. 208/TT/2020

- Subject** : Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 tariff period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 tariff period for four assets under Transmission System associated with System Strengthening-XVII in Southern Region
- Date of Hearing** : 22.6.2021
- Coram** : Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Pravas Kumar Singh, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
- Respondents** : Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. & 16 Others
- Parties Present** : Shri B. Vinodh Kanna, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri D. K. Biswal, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL
Ms. R. Ramalakshmi, TANGEDCO
Dr. R. Kathiravan, TANGEDCO

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. The representative of the Petitioner made the following submissions:
- a. The instant petition is filed for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 tariff period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 tariff period for the following assets under the captioned Transmission System in Southern Region:
- Asset-I:** Narendra (New Kudgi)-Narendra (Existing) 400 kV D/C Quad Transmission Line along with associated bays and equipment at Narendra (New Kudgi) Sub-station and Narendra (Existing) Sub-station;
- Asset-II:** One circuit of Narendra (New Kudgi)-Kolhapur (New) 765 kV D/C Transmission Line (initially charged at 400 kV) and extension of Kolhapur (New) Sub-station along with associated bays at Narendra (New Kudgi) and Kolhapur (New);



Asset-III: Second circuit of Kolhapur (New Kudgi)-Kolhapur (New) 765 kV D/C Transmission Line (initially charged at 400 kV) along with associated bays and equipment at Narendra (New Kudgi) and Kolhapur (New); and

Asset-IV: LILO of 400 kV D/C Kolhapur-Mapusa at 400 kV Kolhapur GIS (New) along with associated bays and 125 MVAR Bus Reactor along with associated bays at 400 kV Kolhapur GIS (New).

- b. The tariff of Asset-I, Asset-II and Asset-III for 2014-19 period was allowed by the Commission vide order dated 26.5.2016 in Petition No. 61/TT/2015 and tariff of Asset-IV for 2014-19 period was allowed vide order dated 25.5.2016 in Petition No. 283/TT/2015;
- c. The Commission vide order dated 26.5.2016 in Petition No. 61/TT/2015 had condoned the entire time over-run in case of Asset-I, Asset-II and Asset-III whereas vide order dated 25.5.2016 in Petition No. 283/TT/2015, the Commission had partially condoned the time over-run in case of Asset-IV and accordingly, restricted IDC and IEDC for Asset-IV which has been applied in this petition also;
- d. Detailed justification on the following aspects in respect of the transmission assets has been submitted in the petition:
 - Capital cost as on COD, FR cost, Additional Capital Expenditure (ACE) during 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 periods and total estimated completion cost is within FR cost allowed by the Commission vide the above said orders;
 - Actual cost as on 31.3.2019 claimed for 2014-19 period and actual ACE incurred from 2015-16 to 2018-19 periods;
 - Excess initial spares deducted from capital cost for tariff computation; and
 - ACE claimed in 2019-24 period in case of Asset-II and Asset-IV.
- e. Reply to the Technical Validation letter was filed vide affidavit dated 27.11.2020; and

3. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO made the following submissions:

- a. Petitioner has claimed ACE beyond cut-off date for 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21 periods for Asset-I, Asset-II and Asset-III. The Commission in order in Petition No. 61/TT/2015 had directed the Petitioner to submit the details and reasons. The information submitted now by the Petitioner in response to the same is not clear and is contradictory;
- b. Petitioner has particularly included ACE that is incurred towards tree compensation with respect to transmission line in case of Asset-I which is directly in contradiction with Form-5 submitted by the Petitioner vide affidavit dated 27.11.2020;
- c. The unjust claim of ACE may be disallowed as the Petitioner has failed to furnish the details of deferred works after the cut-off date during 2018-19 and 2019-24 periods for the transmission assets;



- d. The Commission vide order dated 26.5.2016 in Petition No. 61/TT/2015 had deducted the excess initial spares in case of Asset-II and Asset-III for sub-station. The Petitioner's claim of excess initial spares in case of Asset-II is not justified and it may be disallowed as the same is claimed on the basis of APTEL's judgment dated 14.9.2019 in Appeal No. 74/2017 which is not applicable in this matter;
 - e. The arguments extended by TANGEDCO in earlier petitions pertaining to sharing of transmission charges may be considered in this petition also; and
 - f. Requested to grant one week's time to upload and place on record the reply in the matter.
4. The Commission permitted Respondents including TANGEDCO to submit/ upload their reply by 1.7.2021 and directed the Petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 8.7.2021 and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.
5. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

