

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 22/TT/2015

Subject: Determination of transmission tariff for 765 kV D/C Wardha-Aurangabad line-2 along with bays and equipment at both ends under System Strengthening in Wardha-Aurangabad Corridor for IPP projects in Chattisgarh (IPP-G) in Western Region for tariff block 2014-19.

Date of Hearing: 6.10.2015

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

Petitioner: Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents: Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited and 7 others

Parties present: Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri Subash C. Taneja, PGCIL
Shri K.K. Jain, PGCIL
Shri A.M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Shri Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted that the scheduled date of commercial operation of the instant assets works out to 8.2.2015 and the assets were commissioned on 1.4.2015 and there is a time over-run of two months. He further submitted that tariff under Regulation 7(7) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations was allowed vide order dated 22.4.2015 for inclusion in PoC computation.

2. The Commission observed that the petitioner has claimed tariff for the combined asset of 765 kV D/C Wardha-Aurangabad line-2 along with bays and equipment at both ends under System Strengthening in Wardha-Aurangabad Corridor for IPP projects in Chattisgarh (IPP-G), but has filed five separate tariff



forms for five elements. The Commission further observed that the petitioner vide affidavit dated 29.7.2015 submitted that the assets have been commissioned on 1.4.2015 and 19.4.2015 and it is not clear which are the elements commissioned on 1.4.2015 and 19.4.2015. The Commission directed the petitioner to explain the reasons for time and cost over-run.

3. The Commission had directed the petitioner vide RoP for hearing dated 6.2.2015 to submit certain information for the purpose of final tariff. However, the information submitted by the petitioner vide affidavit dated 29.7.2015 is not adequate. The Commission warned the petitioner and once again directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with a copy to the respondents by 25.10.2015:-

- a) Actual COD;
- b) RLDC certificate for charging of instant assets;
- c) CEA certificate under Regulation 43 of CEA (Measures Related to safety & Electricity Supply) Regulations, 2010;
- d) Details of time over-run along with documentary evidence and chronology of the activities in respect of instant assets as per format below:-

Asset	Activity	Period of activity				Reason(s) for delay along with reference of documentary evidence submitted
		Planned		Achieved		
		From	To	From	To	

- e) Detailed reasons for overall cost variation and cost variation under various heads as per Form-5 i.e. preliminary investigation, RoW, forest clearance, PTCC, general civil works, compensation etc. tower steel, earthwire, isolators, hardware fittings, conductor & earthwire accessories, erection, stringing & civil works including foundation, foundation for structures, control relay and protection panels, structure for switchyard and auxiliary system;
- f) Reasons for difference in estimated cost as per FR and actual cost and justification of claim for additional RoE;



- g) Details of the bays claimed to be indicated in a Single line diagram (SLD);
- h) Details of element wise (i.e. land, building and civil work, TL and sub-station etc.) and year wise actual expenditure incurred/expected to be incurred upto 31.3.2019 along with undischarged liability corresponding to each element of the instant assets as on respective COD and at the end of each financial year duly certified by the auditors with all revised Tariff Forms as per actual COD and reasons for non-submission, in case of non-submission of any form;
- i) Details of year wise liability discharged corresponding to initial spares separately for transmission line and sub-station;
- j) RCE along with revised apportioned approved cost for all the five elements duly certified by the Company Secretary;
- k) Computation of actual IDC on cash basis along with soft copy in excel format with linkage on the basis of drawl of loan allocated to the project and the interest paid separately from the date of infusion of debt fund upto the scheduled COD and from scheduled COD to actual COD;
- l) Details of month wise IEDC incurred separately from zero date to scheduled COD and from scheduled COD to actual COD;
- m) To clarify whether entire amount of IEDC has been discharged upto COD;
- n) Detailed breakup of IDC and IEDC capitalized among the elements (i.e. Building, civil work, sub-station, transmission line, PLCC and etc) of the respective assets covered in the instant petition;
- o) Details of opening gross block as on COD as per Form-4A "Statement of Capital Cost" as per books of account (accrual basis) for all the assets indicating un-discharged liabilities included in such gross block; and
- p) Treatment of other incomes, if any.

4. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 30.10.2015 and the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 12.11.2015. The Commission also directed the petitioner and the respondents to file the information within the specified dates and observed that information received after the due date shall not be considered while passing the final order in the petition.



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

By Order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Legal)

