

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 83/TT/2022

Subject : Petition for determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period for the transmission asset under “Transmission system for Ultra Mega Solar Power Park at Tumkur (Pavagada), Karnataka - Phase II (Part B)” in Southern Region.

Date of Hearing : 20.12.2022

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Tamil Nadu Generation & Distribution Corporation Limited & 18 Others

Parties present : Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Naresh Kumar, PGCIL
Shri D.K. Biswal, PGCIL
Shri Ranjeet Kumar Pandey, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the Petitioner made the following submissions:

a. The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff of the transmission asset-Tumkur (Pavagada) Pooling Station Devanahally (KPTCL) 400 kV D/C (Quad) line alongwith associated bays and equipment's at Tumkur (Pavagada) Pooling Station and Devanahally (KPTCL) under Additional ATS for Tumkur (Pavagada) under Transmission system for Ultra Mega Solar Power Park at Tumkur (Pavagada), Karnataka-Phase II (Part B) in Southern Region.

b. The transmission asset was put into commercial operation on 1.3.2021 against the SCOD of 8.3.2019. The time over-run was due to severe RoW issues and the detailed justification for time over-run has been submitted.



c. The estimated completion cost is within the RCE apportioned approved cost. The cost variation is mostly on account of compensation paid, increase in line length, increase in tower steel, etc.

d. Reply to the Technical Validation letter has been submitted.

e. Rejoinder to the reply of TANGEDCO has been filed.

f. Grant received has been adjusted and the second installment of the grant will be adjusted at the time of truing up.

g. Interim tariff may be approved in the instant case.

2. In response to a query of the Commission, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the land compensation paid has increased due to orders of the District Collector. In response to another query, he submitted that IDC claimed is lower than the approved IDC due to prudent phasing of funds by the Petitioner. The Petitioner further submitted that the transmission assets were put into commercial operation matching with the generation and there is no mismatch with the generators in the instant project.

3. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO referring to his reply made the following submissions:

a. The Petitioner has not demonstrated efficiency in controlling the RoW issues and hence as per the 2019 Regulations, the time over-run may not be condoned.

b. IDC and IEDC may not be allowed for the period of time over-run.

c. The cost escalation shows that the Petitioner has not followed the benchmark costing and prudent utility practices in cost estimation.

d. The Petitioner has failed to provide details to show that the compensation paid is as per the MoP guidelines.

e. Cost variation on account of change in type of bays from AIS to GIS is attributable solely to the Petitioner and the beneficiaries cannot be burdened on account of the same.

f. Details of generator wise/ SPD wise COD covered under Phase-II and details of bilateral billing for mismatch period have not been provided.

4. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

