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Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
         Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
         Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : North Bihar State Power Distribution Company Limited and 6 others

Parties present : Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
                 Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
                 Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
                 Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for Shifting of 50 MVAR Line Reactor from Rengali to Baripada end under Transmission System Associated With Teesta (Stage-V) HEP in Eastern Region for the 2014-19 tariff period;

b) As per RCE dated 17.9.2008, the commissioning schedule of the project was 1.1.2009, against which the subject asset was commissioned on 1.3.2014, after
a delay of 62 months;

c) The total estimated completion cost is ₹205.68 lakh against the apportioned approved cost of ₹258.85 lakh. There is no cost over-run;

d) He further requested to grant AFC for the instant asset as provided under Regulation 7(7) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations for inclusion in the PoC charges.

2. In response to a query of the Commission regarding the petitioner’s claim for tariff for two tariff periods i.e. 2009-14 and 2014-19 in the instant period, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant asset was commissioned on 1.3.2014 and tariff for only one month is claimed in the 2009-14 tariff period. He submitted that the 2009 Tariff Regulations provides for filing a combined petition for truing up of the tariff allowed in the 2009-14 tariff period and tariff for the 2014-19 tariff period. Accordingly, the present petition may be considered as a truing up petition and tariff for both 2009-14 and 2014-19 tariff periods may be allowed, as tariff is claimed only for one month in the 2009-14 tariff period. The petitioner further submitted that separate tariff forms have been submitted for the 2009-14 and 2014-19 tariff periods. In response to another query, the representative of the petitioner submitted that a new foundation was laid in the existing sub-station at Baripada for installation of the instant Reactor.

3. The Commission after taking into consideration the submissions made by the representative of the petitioner agreed to consider the petitioner’s prayer of approval of tariff for both 2009-14 and 2014-19 tariff periods in the instant petition to avoid multiplicity of petitions and to save the precious time of the petitioner as well the Commission.

4. The Commission observed that the instant reactor was to be shifted from Rengali to Baripada to control the overvoltage at Baripada end, however it took 62 months for shifting the reactor and whether shifting of the reactor after such a long delay would serve any purpose. The Commission further observed how the overvoltage was controlled during this period at Baripada end.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit before 11.2.2015 with a copy to all the respondents:-

   a) Minutes of Meeting of the 114th TCC where Shifting of 50 MVAR Line Reactor of Rengali - Baripada line from Rengali to Baripada end to control over voltage at Baripada was agreed;

   b) Details of time overrun and chronology of the activities as per the format given below:-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Period of activity</th>
<th>Reason(s) for delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned From To</td>
<td>Achieved From To</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Data in respect of benchmarking of capital cost for Reactor as per the Commission's order dated 27.4.2010 and 16.6.2010;
d) Use of vacated reactor bays at Rengali Sub-station;
e) Original FR cost and its components;
f) A copy of the detailed note of meeting of the Board of Directors in which RCE was approved and justification for seeking approval of RCE;
g) Details of shifting of the Reactor along with the reasons for five year’s delay in shifting;
h) Explain how voltage at Baripada was controlled during the period of delay of 62 months? Voltage profile at Baripada for one year before the installation of reactor and after installation;
i) As the shutdown was to be given by RLDC, efforts made by the petitioner to get shutdown may be given. When reactor was removed from Rengali and when it reached at Baripada. Whether O&M Expenses were charged during the intervening period?
j) The following details of the reactor and associated bays at Rengali and Baripada before and after shifting of reactor from Rengali Sub-station to Baripada Sub-Station:-
   i. Whether there was any reactor bay in place at Baripada Sub-station before shifting of reactor from Rengali? If yes, the details of Reactor and reactor bay at Baripada Sub-station where reactor has been replaced.
   ii. The petition under which the petitioner has claimed tariff for the period 2009-14 and 2014-19 in respect of reactor at Rengali and reactor bay vacated at Rengali. Same information in respect of reactor and associated bays at Baripada Sub-station.

6. The petitioner's prayer for allowing tariff under Regulation 7(7) of 2014 Tariff Regulations shall be considered after receipt of the above said information.

By order of the Commission

(T. Rout)
Chief Legal