

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 343/TT/2022

Subject : Petition revision/determination of tariff for the 2019-24 tariff period for Bhadrawati (Chandrapur) HVDC back-to-back Station (2x500 MW) in Southern Region and Western Region.

Date of Hearing : 12.1.2023

Coram : Shri I.S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P. K. Singh, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Limited and 23 Others

Parties present : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Neha Garg, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Surbhi Gupta, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri D.K. Biswal, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri Amit Yadav, PGCIL
Shri Anindya Khare, MPPMCL

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. The learned counsel for the Petitioner made the following submissions:
 - a. The instant petition has been filed for revision/ determination of tariff for 2019-24 period for Bhadrawati (Chandrapur) HVDC back-to-back Station (2x500 MW) in Southern Region and Western Region.
 - b. The petition was heard in detail on 1.12.2022. Rejoinders to the replies filed by TANGEDCO and MPPMCL have been filed vide affidavits dated 29.12.2022.
 - d. Sought time to upload the Compilation Note in the matter.
3. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO made the following submissions:



- a. The Petitioner should bring on record the intended benefits to be derived from instant assets and cost benefit analysis on account of upgradation of HVDC equipment.
 - b. Since the beneficiaries bear the transmission charges, the Petitioner should consult the beneficiaries and obtain their approval for ACE in case of replacement of assets.
 - c. The Petitioner has not enclosed the CEA report and, therefore, may be asked to file the same.
 - d. The Petitioner may be asked to conduct revised study in the matter, as in the CTU report, the Narendra-Pune line has not been considered. Therefore, to take a judicious view regarding optimum requirement of system upgradation, fresh studies need to be conducted.
 - e. The Petitioner may be directed to discuss the technical issues in an RPC meeting.
4. In response, learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the average utilization of assets is 75% in the last 6 months. Further, on the last date of hearing the Commission has already noted that no regulatory approval is required in the matter as it is not a new scheme. Further, no approval is needed when the ACE is on account of replacement of equipment on account of obsolescence of technology.
5. After hearing the learned counsels of the parties, Commission permitted the Petitioner, TANGEDCO and MPPMCL to upload the Compilation Note/Written Submission by 27.1.2023. The Commission further directed the parties to adhere to the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time will be granted.
6. Subject to above, the Commission reserved order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

