

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 711/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 “Expansion and Replacement of existing SCADA/EMS System at SLDCs’ of Northern Region (NR ULDC Phase-II)”.
Date of Hearing	:	1.8.2022
Coram	:	Shri I.S. Jha, Member Shri Arun Goyal, Member Shri P.K. Singh, Member
Petitioner	:	Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Respondents	:	Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & 16 Others
Parties present	:	Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL Shri D.K. Biswal, PGCIL Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. The representative of the Petitioner has made the following submissions:
 - a. The instant petition has been filed for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period for **Asset-I:** New EMS/SCADA at SLDCs of UPPTCL, RRVPNL, DTL, HVPNL, BBMB, PSPTCL, HPSEBL and J&K, PDD; and **Asset-II:** New EMS/SCADA at SLDCs of UPPTCL and J&K, PDD under “Expansion and Replacement of existing SCADA/EMS System at SLDCs of Northern Region (NR ULDC Phase-II)” in Northern Region:
 - b. Assets-I and II were put under commercial operation on 31.12.2015 and 30.11.2016 respectively.
 - c. Transmission tariff with respect to Asset-I was determined for 2014-19 tariff period vide order dated 15.12.2017 in Petition No. 144/TT/2016 and for Asset-II vide order dated 11.4.2019 in Petition No.243/TT/2018.



d. The Commission vide order dated 15.12.2017 in Petition No. 144/TT/2016 condoned the time over-run in case of Asset-I from the SCOD i.e. 6.11.2014 up to 28.10.2015 and granted liberty to the Petitioner to submit documents to show when the additional work sought by the SLDCs was completed to verify time over-run from 29.10.2015 to 31.12.2015. Though the RLDC certificate was received prior to 31.12.2015, Asset-I was not declared under commercial operation as the Petitioner was trying to match the COD of Assets-I and II. Therefore, the time over-run in case of Asset-I may be condoned.

e. The Commission vide order dated 11.4.2019 in Petition No.243/TT/2018 condoned the time over-run in case of Asset-II from 5.11.2014 to 17.10.2016 and granted liberty to the Petitioner to submit documents to show when the additional work sought by the SLDCs was completed to verify time over-run from 18.10.2016 to the date of actual COD. Justification for the delay has been submitted along with the petition and further elaborated in the rejoinder to the reply of UPPCL. The time over-run is mainly on account of shifting of UPPTCL control room from Shakti Bhawan to Gomti Nagar in Lucknow for which a new LoA was to be issued. Time over-run in case of J&K PDD was on account of law & order and flood situation in the state of J&K. The time over-run in case of Asset-II may also be condoned.

f. There is a minor mismatch in the admitted and claimed cost for Asset-I, which is on account of reclaiming the IDC and IEDC disallowed earlier.

g. Initial Spares have not been claimed and there is no ACE during the 2019-24 tariff period. Liability flow statement has been submitted for the 2014-19 tariff period along with the reply to the Technical Validation letter.

h. Communication equipment including SCADA are to be considered as IT equipment as per Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) (First Amendment) Regulations, 2015 and as such depreciation has been claimed accordingly. Depreciation for IT equipment is @15% but in the original petition it was inadvertently claimed @6.33%. The said error has now been rectified through an additional affidavit.

i. Auditor's certificate along with bifurcation of SCADA/EMS RTU and Auxiliary Power Supply system has also been submitted.

j. As the billing of the instant assets has been done State wise, they are not combined.

k. Rejoinder to the reply of UPPCL has also been filed vide affidavit dated 22.9.2021.

l. As per the directions of the Commission during hearing on 24.9.2021, a revised "Memo of Parties" was submitted vide affidavit dated 8.10.2021



thereby impleading UPPTCL. However, no reply has been received from UPPTCL.

3. The Commission observed that it would like to have the reply of UPPTCL especially on the Petitioner's contention that the time over-run in case of Asset-II is due to UPPTCL. Therefore, Commission directed the Respondents, including UPPTCL, to file their reply by 16.8.2022 on affidavit, with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file rejoinder, if any by 23.8.2022. The Commission further observed that if no reply and rejoinder are received within the specified time, the matter will be decided on the basis of the information already on record and no extension of time shall be granted.

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

By order of the Commission

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

