## CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

## **Petition No. 318/TT/2020**

Subject : Petition for truing-up of transmission tariff of 2014-19

period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period for two assets under "Transmission system associated with common system associated with Coastal Energen Private Limited and Ind-Bharat Power (Madras) Limited LTOA generation projects in

Tuticorin area Part-B" in Southern Region.

Date of Hearing : 8.6.2021

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.

& 18 Others

Parties present : Shri B. Vinodh Kanna, Advocate, TANGEDCO

Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL Shri D. K. Biswal, PGCIL

Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL Ms. R. Ramalakshmi, TANGEDCO Mr. R. Srinivasan, 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 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period in respect of the following assets under "Transmission system associated with common system associated with Coastal Energen Private Limited and Ind-Bharat Power (Madras) Limited LTOA generation projects in Tuticorin area Part-B" in Southern Region.

**Asset-1**: 400 kV Salem Pooling Station (Dharmapuri)-Salem 400 kV D/C Quad Line along with new 765/400 kV Pooling Station at Salem (Dharmapuri) (initially charged at 400 kV) and bay extensions at Salem 400/220 kV existing Sub-station; and

- **Asset-2**: Salem Pooling Station-Madhugiri Pooling Station 765 kV S/C Line (initially charged at 400 kV) along with associated Bays & equipment at Salem Pooling Station and Madhugiri Pooling Station and 400 kV 63 MVAR Line Reactor at Madhugiri end only of the Salem Pooling Station-Madhugiri 765 kV S/C Line (initially charged at 400 kV)
- b. Asset-1 and Asset-2 were put into commercial operation on 23.10.2016 and 1.11.2018 respectively.
- c. Transmission tariff from the date of commercial operation to 31.3.2019 of Asset-1 and Asset-2 was determined vide order dated 21.11.2017 in Petition No. 71/TT/2017 and order dated 1.11.2019 in Petition No. 367/TT/2018, respectively.
- d. The Commission in order dated 21.11.2017 in Petition No. 71/TT/2017 restricted IDC of Asset-1 on account of time over-run and directed the Petitioner to submit valid documentary evidence related to time over-run stating that the same will be reviewed during the truing-up of tariff of 2014-19 period.
- e. The Commission in order dated 1.11.2019 in Petition No. 367/TT/2018 restricted IEDC of Asset-2 as a percentage (5%) of abstract cost, against which Appeal DFR No. 2419 of 2019 has been filed with APTEL.
- f. The estimated completion cost is more than RCE-I and the Petitioner has submitted RCE-II.
- g. 400 kV Salem Pooling Station (Dharmapuri)-Salem 400 kV D/C Quad Line along with new 765/400 kV Pooling Station at Salem (Dharmapuri) (initially charged at 400 kV) and bay extensions at Salem 400/220 kV existing Sub-station was declared under commercial operation on 23.10.2016. While the transmission line was ready for commissioning in August 2014, the same could not be put into commercial operation due to non-availability of further connectivity at Salem PS. Detailed justification regarding the same has been provided in the petition along with all relevant documents.
- 3. In response to a query of the Commission, the Petitioner submitted that Asset-1 was ready in August, 2014. However, it is claiming the COD of Asset-1 as 23.10.2016, and relevant documents regarding COD have been submitted, as it could not be put to use as the downstream assets were not ready in August, 2014. But the Commission in order dated 21.11.2017 in Petition No. 71/TT/2017 did not condone the delay from August, 2014 to October, 2016 and all the related documents have been produced with the instant petition.
- 4. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO prayed for grant of time to file reply and submitted that the instant transmission assets are part of the common power evacuation system of 2 IPPs i.e. Coastal Energen Private Limited and Ind-Bharat Power (Madras) Limited. Based on the LTA granted to these IPPs, the instant transmission scheme was executed. The Commission vide order dated 29.7.2016 in Petition No. 127/TT/2014 directed that these 2 IPPs shall share the transmission charges on fifty-fifty basis for the instant transmission assets till the dedicated transmission line upto the Tuticorin Pooling Station are constructed and declared under commercial operation and

put to regular use by the concerned generating station. The Petitioner should bring on record the details of COD of each generating unit of the IPPs and matching of COD of the instant transmission assets with that of the generating station/ units. Therefore, the Petitioner must recover the transmission charges from the IPPs from the date of deemed COD till the date of relinquishment of LTA by the IPPs.

- 5. The Commission observed that the Petitioner had the option of claiming the COD of Asset-1 when it was ready (as claimed by the Petitioner) in August, 2014 or when its COD was matched with the COD of the upstream assets in October, 2016. The Commission observed that the Petitioner having taken the decision to match the COD of Asset-1 with the upstream assets, cannot claim the time period from August, 2014 to October, 2016 as the time over-run attributable to the developers of the downstream and seek condonation of the same. The Commission further observed that if the Petitioner had claimed the COD of Asset-1 in August, 2014 alongwith all the supporting documents and if the same was approved by the Commission, then the transmission charges of Asset-1 for the period from August, 2014 to October, 2016 would have to be paid by the developers of the upstream assets, who should have been made party to the present proceedings.
- 6. The Commission allowed the request of learned counsel for TANGEDCO to file its reply, by 24.6.2021 and the Petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 1.7.2021. The Commission further directed the parties to adhere to the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.
- 7. The Petition shall be listed for hearing on the limited issue of COD of Asset-1 in due course for which a separate notice will be issued.

By order of the Commission

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