

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 468/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 three no. of assets under "Static VAR Compensator (SVCs)" in Northern Region

Date of Hearing : 31.3.2021

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & 16 Others

Parties present : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BYPL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL
Ms. Megha Bajpeyi, BRPL

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 truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 tariff period and determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 tariff period in respect of the following assets:
Asset-I: 400/220 kV Ludhiana Sub-station: (+) 600 MVAR/ (-) 400 MVAR;
Asset-II: 400/220 kV Kankroli Sub-station: (+) 400 MVAR/(-) 300 MVAR SVC, and



Asset-III: 400/220 kV New Wanpoh Sub-station: (+) 300 MVAR / (-) 200 MVAR SVC) under "Static VAR Compensator (SVCs)" in Northern Region.

- b. Asset-I, II and III were put into commercial operation on 30.11.2016, 25.12.2016 and 30.12.2017 respectively. The tariff in respect of Asset-I, II and III was allowed by the Commission vide orders dated 28.12.2016 in Petition No. 149/TT/2016, dated 21.6.2018 in Petition No. 241/TT/2016 and dated 22.6.2018 in Petition No. 6/TT/2018 respectively.
- c. There is variation in the capital cost of Asset-I claimed in the instant petition and allowed vide order dated 28.12.2016 in Petition No. 149/TT/2016. The capital cost allowed in the said order was on anticipated COD basis and the capital cost now claimed is on actual COD basis. The Petitioner has filed RLDC, CEA and CMD certificates in support of COD of Asset-I as directed in the said order.
- d. There is time over-run of 111 days in case of Asset-I and the reasons and justifications for the same have been submitted and prayed that the time over-run may be condoned, as the delay was due to development of a new technology to be utilized for the first time in India, as time over-run on similar grounds was condoned for Asset-II.
- e. Initial Spares are claimed based on the approved Initial Spares in the previous orders. Review Petition No. 32/RP/2018 and Petition No. 33/RP/2018 were filed against the Commission's order dated 21.6.2018 in Petition No. 241/TT/2016 and order dated 22.6.2018 in Petition No. 6/TT/2018 respectively wherein the Initial Spares were restricted to 4% against the norm of 6%, which were dismissed by the Commission vide order dated 23.1.2019. Appeals (DFR Nos. 2172/2019 and 2173/2019) filed before APTEL against the order dated 23.1.2019 are pending.
- f. The information sought through Technical Validation letter has been filed vide affidavit dated 2.12.2020. Rejoinders to the replies filed by UPPCL on 25.1.2021 and BRPL on 17.3.2021, have been filed vide affidavits 2.2.2021 and 25.3.2021 respectively and additional information/clarification with regard to issues raised by BRPL have been filed vide affidavit dated 30.3.2021.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that the reasons given by the Petitioner for the time over-run in case of Asset-I are controllable events as per the 2014 Tariff Regulations and hence the time over-run may not be condoned. It is submitted that reply has been filed in the present petition making submissions on issues like Initial Spares, accrual IDC, Indian Accounting Standards and tax on transmission business. Learned counsel placed reliance on order dated 4.4.2014 in Petition No. 96/TT/2012, where this Commission rejected a similar request for condoning of time over-run on account of new technology and the order of the Commission was upheld by APTEL vide judgment dated 26.2.2015 in Appeal No. 107 of 2014. It is submitted that the time over-



run in the instant petition also does not deserve to be condoned. It is further submitted that Initial Spares need to be allowed strictly as per the existing Regulations. It is argued that a procedure needs to be devised for annual truing up by the Transmission Licensee.

4. Learned counsel for BYPL adopted the submissions made on behalf of BRPL.
5. The Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

