CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

Petition No. 247/TT/2020

Subject	:	Petition for determination of tariff of (1) 400 kV K.V. Kota Suryapet-1 & 2 feeders for the period 2016-17 to 2018-19, (2) Part of PGCIL 400 kV VJA-NLR line (Nunna-Manubolu) to the extent of 18.405 km (Part of Nunna-Manubolu Ckt-3 from Loc.No:532/15 to Loc. Nunna SS + Part of VTPS Manubolu Ckt from Loc.532/16 to Loc. VTPS) for 2015-16 to 2018-19.	
Date of Hearing	:	25.11.2021	

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

- Petitioner : Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Ltd.
- **Respondents** : Transmission Corporation of Telangana Ltd. & Anr.
- Parties present:Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, APTRANSCO
Shri P. Suryachandram, APTRANSCO
Ms. P. Jyotsnana Rani, APTRANSCO
Shri B.N. Surya Narayan Rao, APTRANSCO

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. Learned counsel of the Petitioner made the following submissions:

a. Instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for financial year 2015-16 to 2018-19 in respect of the following assets:

Asset-I: K.V. Kota-Suryapeta-I;

Asset-II: K.V. Kota-Suryapeta-II; and

Asset-III: VTPS-Nunna-I.

b. Asset-I and Asset-II have been certified by SRPC as ISTS lines and they were declared under commercial operation on 20.10.2016. Information sought by

the Commission through Record of Proceedings dated 13.7.2020 has already been submitted vide affidavit dated 24.7.2020.

c. As regards Asset-III, there was difficulty in completion of 400 kV transmission line of PGCIL from Nunna Sub-station to Manubolu sub-station due to RoW issues. On the request of PGCIL, the said line was terminated by LILO of 400 kV VTPS-Nunna TMDC Line-1 of APTRANSCO at Manubolu sub-station. PGCIL was allowed tariff for its portion of the transmission line and the tariff has been included in the PoC computation. For the portion of line owned by AP TRANSCO, which is carrying ISTS power, no tariff is being received by AP TRANSCO since 2016. SRPC has refused to certify Asset-III as ISTS line as the power flow in it is 49%. The portion of the transmission line owned by AP TRANSCO is in use and is carrying ISTS power but not getting any tariff for it. Hence, the Petitioner has filed the instant petition for grant of tariff of only AP TRANSCO portion of the transmission line as the tariff for it.

d. APERC has observed that the portion of the transmission line owned by AP TRANSCO is not an intra-State line and as such APERC cannot determine tariff for it.

e. Section 2(36) of the Electricity Act, 2003 states that part of a transmission line carrying inter-State power is to be considered as ISTS. The said Section clearly states that "inter-state transmission system" includes the conveyance of electricity across the territory of an intervening State as well as conveyance within the State which is incidental to such inter-State transmission of electricity and also includes the transmission of electricity within the territory of a State on a system built, owned, operated, maintained or controlled by Central Transmission Utility (CTU). PGCIL, CEA as well as SRPC have said that Asset-III is being used for conveyance of electricity to S1 and S2 regions of Southern Region. Further, power flow in the instant transmission line is totally controlled by CTU and scheduling of electricity is done by SRLDC and that the line portions on the left and right side of the LILO belong to AP TRANSCO.

f. PGCIL approached the Petitioner as PGCIL was facing problem with its own lines and to overcome the issues, LILO was constructed and the Petitioner has entered into commercial agreement with PGCIL.

g. AP DISCOMS are not paying any transmission charges for Asset-III as it is used for carrying inter-State power.

h. The matter to consider the portion of 400 kV VTPS-Nunna Circuit-I owned by APTRANSCO as ISTS line was discussed in the 44th and 45th SPRC Commercial Sub-Committee meetings on 29.5.2020 and 28.8.2020 respectively. The same issue was also deliberated in the special meeting held on 25.9.2020 but no decision could be arrived at. i. PGCIL's portion of transmission line cannot transfer power without AP TRANSCO portion. Therefore, when PGCIL portion has been considered as ISTS, the portion of the transmission line owned by AP TRANSCO should also be considered as ISTS.

3. In response to a query of the Commission, learned counsel for the Petitioner informed that approximately 18 km of the instant line is not covered under the ARR filed by AP TRANSCO. PGCIL has already clarified before the Commission that 400 kV VTPS-Nunna TMDC Line-1 of APTRANSCO at Manubolu Sub-station is a part of Southern Region Strengthening Scheme and is being used for transfer of ISTS power by PGCIL. PGCIL could not use its lines for transfer of power due to RoW issues and, therefore, 400 kV VTPS-Nunna TMDC Line-1 of APTRANSCO at Manubolu Sub-station was approved by CEA and SRPC.

4. In response to another query of the Commission as to whether Asset-III is covered in the ARR of APTRANSCO, the representative of APTRANSCO submitted that Asset-III is not included in the ARR.

5. Learned counsel for APTRANSCO urged the Commission to exercise its power under Regulation 55 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations to determine tariff for Asset-III as it is carrying ISTS power.

6. The representative of PGCIL submitted that PGCIL has already filed its reply to the petition and the same may be considered by the Commission.

7. The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit an affidavit whether the tariff for the subject line has been included in the ARR of APTRANSCO by 8.12.2021. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to comply with above direction within the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

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

By order of the Commission

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