Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi

Petition No. 35/Tt/2019

Subject: Approval of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for 1x500 MVA, 400/220/33 kV ICT along with associated bays at Trichy Sub-station under System Strengthening-XX” in Southern Region.

Date of Hearing: 11.2.2020

Coram: Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member

Petitioner: Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)

Respondents: Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. (KPTCL) & 17 Ors.

Parties present: Shri Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANTRANSCO
Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for 1x500 MVA, 400/220/33 kV ICT along with associated bays at Trichy Sub-station under System Strengthening-XX” in Southern Region. He sought approval of COD of the asset in terms of proviso (ii) to Regulation 4(3) of 2014 Tariff Regulations with effect from 10.6.2017 as the downstream assets under the scope of TANTRANSCO were not ready. He submitted that the time over-run of 4 months in case of instant asset is not attributable to the petitioner and reasons for the time over-run has been submitted in the petition and requested to condone the same. The estimated completion cost is within Revised Cost Estimate (RCE). He further submitted that all the information required for determination of tariff has been submitted and requested to allow tariff as prayed in the petition.

2. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with advance copy to the beneficiaries by 23.3.2020:

   a) Details of reasons for time over-run and correspondence exchanged, if any, chronology of the time over-run along with documents in the following format:-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.no</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Period of activity</th>
<th>Time over-run in days</th>
<th>Reason (s) for time over-run</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Justification for increase in cost from FR of ₹1990.84 lakh to ₹2455.82 lakh as per RCE.

c) There is mismatch between the revised loan amount submitted in Form 9C and in the cost as on COD submitted in Auditor certificate and forms. Clarify the same.

d) Revised Form 6 reconciled with the Auditor certificate.

3. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

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