

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 116/TT/2014**

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff of **Asset 1**: 420 kV, 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Jabalpur sub-station, **Asset 2**: 420 kV, 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Khandawa Sub-station, **Asset 3**: 420 kV, 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Bhatapara Sub-station, **Asset 4**: 420kV, 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Raigarh Sub-station, **Asset 5**: 420kV, 80 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor at Solapur Sub-station, **Asset 6**: 420 kV, 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Aurangabad Sub-station under "Installation of reactors in Western Region" in Western Region for 2014-19 tariff period.

Date of Hearing : 6.4.2016

Coram : Shri A. S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd. and 7 others

Parties present : Shri A. M. Pavgi, PGCIL  
Shri Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL  
Shri Piyush Awasthi, PGCIL  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri Subhash C Taneja, PGCIL  
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL  
Shri Mayank Sharma, Advocate, PSPCL  
Shri Gaurav Gupta, Advocate, PSPCL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff period for above mentioned assets under "Installation of reactors in Western Region" in Western Region.
- b) As per the investment approval dated 7.8.2012, the instant assets were scheduled to be commissioned on 5.8.2014. The actual COD of Asset-1 and 2 was 1.4.2014, Asset-3 was 26.7.2014, Asset-4 was 1.8.2014, Asset-5 was



26.11.2014 and for Asset-6 was 30.4.2014 respectively. There is time over-run of 5 months and 20 days in case of Asset-5.

- c) There is cost over-run in case of Asset-2, 3 and 5. The petitioner submitted that the cost over-run is due to increase in awarded cost of switchgears, compensating equipments, control, relay and protection panels and also due to variation in cost for foundation of structures, and switchyard structures.

2. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following on affidavit with an advance copy to the beneficiaries by 14.4.2016:-

- a) Reasons for time over-run along with documentary evidence in the chronological order;
- b) Auditor's Certificate and revised tariff forms.
- c) Submit the certificate issued by RLDC for all the Assets covered in the Petition.
- d) Submit the details of IDC and IEDC upto COD on cash basis for Asset 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6.
- e) For Asset-5, the petitioner should submit the actual IDC and IEDC on cash basis till SCOD and SCOD to actual COD. Further, the petitioner should submit phasing of balance IDC to be discharged post COD.
- f) Submit the revised tariff forms with respect to the Auditor Certificate for Asset-3, 4 and 5.
- g) Submit the Auditor certificate for the Assets 4, 5 and 6.
- h) Submit asset wise initial spares discharged on cash basis upto COD and post COD.

3. The Commission observed that there is substantial difference in cost of Assets-1 and 4 even though they are of similar configuration and directed the petitioner to submit the reasons for such difference in cost along with the cost breakup with details of purchase and equipment cost for Assets-1 and 4.

4. The Commission directed the respondents to file reply by 21.4.2016, failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.

5. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-  
V. Sreenivas  
Dy. Chief (Law)

