To
The Deputy General Manager,
Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,
Saudamini, Plot No. 2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon-122001

Subject: Approval of transmission tariff for assets under "Transmission System for Phase-I Generation projects in Orissa-Part B" in Western Region

Sir,

I am directed to refer to your above mentioned petition and to request you to file this petition in accordance with the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 in respect of Asset-II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX and X anticipated to be commissioned on or after 1.4.2014, and also to furnish the following information on affidavit, with advance copy to respondents/beneficiaries, latest by 30.6.2014:

i. Documentary evidence for time over-run in commissioning of Assets-II to X;

ii. DOCO letter in respect of Assets-I and III;

iii. Single Line Diagram of the assets mentioned in the instant Petition;

iv. Status of all the assets mentioned in the scheme;

v. The Actual DOCO of Assets-II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX and X;

vi. The progress of the generating stations for which this scheme was planned and their installed capacity and LTA.

vii. The reason for not furnishing date of completion in Form-5C in all the assets;

viii. The reason for considering Loop-In and Loop-Out portion of some transmission line as two different assets;

ix. Details of capital cost of the arrangement to avoid shutdown in future (The petitioner has included 12 Nos. towers for future scope, and hence it should supply details of capital cost of this arrangement, as asset not in use, i.e. provided for future use, shall not be considered for tariff. Since the explanation
given for cost variation for Asset-VII is not clear, the same may be clarified with type of tower material);

x. Reason for overestimation (in Asset-IX the cost of tower steel and conductor estimate made by the petitioner is `4595 lakh and `1668.29 lakh but the actual cost incurred for it is `915.18 lakh and `194.67. There is variation of `3679.97 lakh (80%) in Tower Steel and `1473.62 lakh (88%) in conductor);

xi. The reason for considering high cost estimates in compensating equipment at the time preparation of Feasibility Report;

xii. Explanation for the usage of the assets in terms of other assets on the substation i.e. which lines are commissioned and power flow both in Jabalpur Substation and Dharamajaygarh Sub-Station;

xiii. Data for capital cost benchmarking in accordance with the Commission's orders dated 27.4.2010 and 16.6.2010 benchmarking of capital cost of 765/400 kV Transmission Lines and Sub- Stations.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-
(Dr. P.K. Sinha)
A C (Legal)