

**Before**

## **UTTARAKHAND ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**Petition No. 29 of 2021 (Suo Moto)**

**In the matter of:**

Suo-Moto Order on methodology for payment of transmission charges for using dedicated transmission line of M/s Greenko Budhil HEP by Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd., for supply of power from SHPs of Himachal Pradesh till 30.09.2021 based on the minutes of meeting held on 15.01.2021 among Himachal Pradesh Power Transmission Corporation, Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd., M/s Greenko Budhil Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd. and Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.

**CORAM**

<b>Shri D.P. Gairola</b>	<b>Member (Law)-Chairman(I/c)</b>
<b>Shri M.K. Jain</b>	<b>Member (Technical)</b>

**Date of Order: June 30, 2021**

This Order relates to the Suo-moto proceedings initiated by the Commission in the matter of fixation of transmission charges based on the minutes of Meeting held on 15.01.2021 amongst Himachal Pradesh Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "HPPTCL"), Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "HPSEBL"), M/s Greenko and Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "UPCL") for selection of one of the alternatives suggested by the Commission vide its Order dated 04.12.2020 in Petition no. 31 of 2020 for recovery of transmission charges by M/s Greenko from HPPTCL and HPSEBL for utilisation of 220 kV S/C dedicated transmission line of M/s Greenko Budhil Hydro Electric Project (hereinafter referred to as "M/s Greenko") for evacuation of power from Generating Stations operating in Ravi Basin, Himachal Pradesh by connecting 2x315 MVA, 400/220/33 kV GIS Pooling Station at Lahal, Himachal Pradesh to 220 kV side of S/S at Budhil HEP through a 220 kV S/C Transmission Line from Lahal to Budhil as an interim arrangement.

## 1. Background

- 1.1 HPPTCL and HPSEBL had filed a Petition before the Commission under Section 64(5) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking determination of Terms of Use for utilisation of 220 kV S/C dedicated Transmission Line of M/s Greenko for evacuation power from Generating Stations operating in Ravi Basin, Himachal Pradesh viz. SHPs of upto 26 MW by connecting 2x315 MVA, 400/220/33 kV GIS Pooling Sub-station at Lahal, Himachal Pradesh to 220 kV side of S/S at Budhil HEP through a 220 kV S/C Transmission Line from Lahal to Budhil as an interim arrangement.
- 1.2 The Commission had heard the parties and vide its Order dated 04.12.2020 suggested two alternatives that could be exercised by the concerned parties based on mutual agreement of the concerned parties and inform the Commission within one month of the date of the Order. The relevant extract of the Order dated 04.12.2020 is as follows:

*“In the absence of availability of actual capital cost pertaining to dedicated transmission line and also in the absence of any reference/benchmark cost, the Commission is of the view that one of the following two alternatives can be exercised by the concerned parties, i.e. the Petitioners, M/s Greenko and UPCL based on the mutual agreement of the parties concerned and submit the same to the Commission within one month of the date of the Order:*

### ***Alternative A***

*M/s Greenko shall charge from the Petitioners for the usage of its dedicated transmission line based on the Annual Revenue Requirement (ARR)/Annual Transmission charges (ATC) determined by HPERC for HPPTCL vide its Tariff Orders based on actual per MW per day usage basis corresponding to daily declared capacity till the interim arrangement is effective, i.e. upto 30.09.2021.*

### ***Alternative B***

*The Commission observed that 400 kV D/C line from Lahal Sub-station to PGCIL’s 400 kV Chamera Sub-station is expected to be commissioned in the third quarter of 2021 and once the line is completed, undoubtedly dedicated transmission line of Budhil HEP will help to evacuate the power of the Petitioners in case of n-1 contingency and accordingly, 400 kV D/C line from Lahal Sub-station to Chamera Sub-station will serve as an alternate line to evacuate, power of Budhil HEP in the event of outage of the existing dedicated transmission line of Budhil HEP.*

*Accordingly, interim arrangement may be allowed provided that in case of n-1*

*contingency, the Petitioner(s) shall permit Budhil HEP to evacuate its power through 400 kV D/C line from Lahal Sub-station to Chamera Sub-station till the useful life of the plant, free of cost."*

1.3 In compliance to the Commission's said Order, an online meeting was held on 15.01.2021 between HPPTCL, HPSEBL, M/s Greenko and UPCL wherein both alternative suggested by the Commission were discussed in detail. The deliberations of the parties are as follows:

- a) UPCL submitted that they have no objection to the proposal that after commissioning of Lahal-Chamera-III line the parties can utilise each other's network for n-1 contingency subject to the payment of approved charges (POC/State Transmission charges applicable for the utilised infrastructure) for the power permitted to be evacuated on each other's network. However, till the said commissioning, as UPCL is bearing the inter-state open access transmission charges for long term it would be fair and just that the parties should share the PoC charges in proportion to the maximum capacity of power evacuated on monthly basis by the parties. UPCL also stated that it is paying PoC charges for utilising the said asset on monthly basis and, hence, all the components involved should be mutually shared in case HPSEBL/HPPTCL is also utilising the asset. Although this will still not make recovery of the cost of the asset but only of the cost of utilisation, but it would be fair and just criteria in absence of availability of the cost of the line.
- b) HPSEPL suggested that the charges as stated by the Commission under Alternative-A should be applicable and is acceptable to HPSEBL.
- c) HPPTCL confirmed that Alternative-A as mentioned by the Commission in the Order dated 04.12.2020 is acceptable to them.
- d) M/s Greenko mentioned that UPCL is the custodian of the asset and it supports the contentions of UPCL.

1.4 Further, during the meeting it was decided to approach the Commission for appropriate directions in the matter since the methodology suggested by UPCL in the meeting is different from the alternative suggested by the Commission vide its Order dated 04.12.2020 for recovery of transmission charges by M/s Greenko from HPPTCL/HPSEBL for using its dedicated transmission line for the purpose of evacuation of power from generating plants situated in Himachal Pradesh.

1.5 Accordingly, HPPTCL vide its e-mail dated 17.03.2021 forwarded a copy of Minutes of Meeting held on 15.01.2021 to the Commission seeking appropriate direction in the matter.

## **2. Commission's view and directions**

2.1 The Commission vide its Order dated 04.12.2020 while specifying the terms and conditions for utilisation of 220 kV S/C dedicated transmission line of M/s Greenko for evacuation of power from generating stations operating in Ravi Basin, Himachal Pradesh had suggested two alternatives, as mentioned under Para 1.2 above of this Order, for recovery of transmission charges by M/s Greenko from HPPTCL/HPBSEL for using dedicated transmission line of Budhil HEP.

2.2 The Commission has gone through the minutes of meeting held on 15.01.2021 among HPPTCL, HPSEBL, M/s Greenko and UPCL and observed that Alternative-A is acceptable to HPPTCL and HPSEBL. On the contrary, UPCL has suggested a new alternative wherein M/s Greenko and HPPTCL/HPSEBL can utilise each other transmission network in case of n-1 contingency subject to the payment of approved charges. Furthermore, UPCL also stated that apart from the transmission charges, PoC charges should also be shared by the concerning parties in proportion to the maximum capacity of power evacuated on monthly basis by the parties. UPCL also stated that it is paying PoC charges for utilising the transmission line on monthly basis and, hence, all the components involved should be mutually shared in case HPPTCL/HPSEBL is also utilising the asset.

With regard to suggestion of UPCL for sharing of PoC charges for utilising the dedicated transmission line of M/s Greenko, it is pertinent to mention that PoC charges are payable to CTU for using Inter-State Transmission System whereas UPCL's suggestion is to share PoC charges based on utilisation of dedicated transmission line of M/s Greenko. UPCL and HPSEBL are paying PoC charges based on their respective share of usage of ISTS network. However, HPPTCL/HPSEBL shall be liable to pay injection PoC charges to M/s Greenko in proportion to the power injected by them into ISTS network through M/s Greenko's line, where entire injection charges are paid by M/s Greenko. Furthermore, HPSEB cannot be asked to share the drawl charges being paid by UPCL as it would be paying the drawl charges applicable on the power drawn by it of the SHPs.

2.3 Further, it is also pertinent to mention that as per evacuation scheme finalised by CEA,

Budhil HEP has been allocated 1 no. of 220 kV GIS bay at NHPC's Chamera Hydro Power Plant. NHPC incurs the O&M expenses for the operation and maintenance of the bay allowed under CERC Regulations and raises the same to M/s Greenko. Accordingly, HPPTCL/HPSEBL shall be liable to pay the proportionate charges pertaining to the said GIS bay.

- 2.4 It is pertinent to mention that the HPSEBL has executed PPA with the SHPs situated in Himachal Pradesh only upto 30.09.2021. Accordingly, the Commission vide its Order dated 04.12.2020 had allowed the said interim arrangement only upto 30.09.2021. Further, the Commission had also decided that permission for utilisation of the proposed interim arrangement by the future beneficiary(ies) shall be allowed separately based on the Petition. The relevant extract of the said Order is as follows:

*"... Further, the Petitioners have also not mentioned about the physical progress of the 400 kV D/C Lahal to Chamera line. Accordingly, taking cognizance of the fact that HPSEBL has signed PPA with the SHPs only upto 30.09.2021 and the said 400 kV D/C line has not been commissioned till date, the Commission is of the view that the proposed interim arrangement shall continue only till 30.09.2021. Further, as far as permission for utilisation of the proposed interim arrangement by all future beneficiary(ies) on the same Terms of Use is concerned, the Commission is of the view that the matter will be dealt by the Commission separately based on the Petition, if any, filed by future beneficiary(ies)."*

- 2.5 Based on the above discussion, the Commission is of the view that Alternative-A, i.e. M/s Greenko shall charge from the Petitioners for the usage of its dedicated transmission line based on the Annual Revenue Requirement (ARR)/Annual Transmission charges (ATC) determined by HPERC for HPPTCL vide its Tariff Orders based on actual per MW per day usage basis corresponding to daily declared capacity till the interim arrangement is effective, i.e. upto 30.09.2021, suggested by the Commission vide its Order dated 04.12.2020 shall be applicable for recovery of transmission charges from HPPTCL/HPSEBL by M/s Greenko for using its dedicated transmission line for supply of power taking into consideration that HPSEBL has entered into PPA with SHPs of Himachal Pradesh for supply of electricity only upto 30.09.2021.

Further, the Commission would like to reiterate that HPPTCL/HPSEBL shall also be liable to pay injection PoC charges and GIS bay charges to M/s Greenko in proportion to

the power injected by them into ISTS network as discussed in Para 2.2 and Para 2.3 above.

3. Ordered accordingly.

**(M.K. Jain)**  
**Member (Technical)**

**(D.P. Gairola)**  
**Member (Law) - Chairman (I/c)**