

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

**SHRI ASHOK BASU, CHAIRMAN
SHRI K.N. SINHA, MEMBER**

Petition No.109/2000

In the matter of

Payment of fees and charges to RLDCs for undertaking load dispatch functions

And in the matter of

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

....Petitioner

Vs

1. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
2. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
3. Power Development Department, Govt. of J&K, Srinagar
4. Delhi Vidyut Board, New Delhi
5. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Jaipur
6. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
7. Chandigarh Administration, Chief Engineer and Secretary, Chandigarh
8. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Panchkula
9. Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna
10. Damodar Valley Corporation, Calcutta
11. West Bengal State Electricity Board, Calcutta
12. Grid Corporation of Orissa Ltd., Bhubaneswar
13. Power Deptt., Govt. of Sikkim, Gangtok
14. Madhya Pradesh State Electricity Board, Jabalpur
15. Maharashtra State Electricity Board, Mumbai
16. Gujarat Electricity Board, Vadodara
17. Goa Electricity Department, Panaji, Goa
18. Collector, Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Silvassa
19. Electricity Department, Admn. Of Daman & Diu, Daman
20. Andhra Pradesh Transmission Corporation Ltd., Hyderabad
21. Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd., Bangalore
22. Kerala State Electricity Board, Trivandrum
23. Tamil Nadu State Electricity Board, Chennai
24. Electricity Department, Govt. of Pondicherry, Pondicherry
25. Assam State Electricity Board, Guwahati
26. Meghalaya State Electricity Board, Shillong

- 27. Electricity Deptt., Govt. of Manipur, Imphal
 - 28. Deptt. of Power, Govt. of Mizoram, Aizwal
 - 29. Electricity Deptt., Govt. of Nagaland, Kohima
 - 30. Electricity Deptt., Govt. of Tripura, Agartala
 - 31. Deptt. of Power, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar
 - 32. Jharkhand State Electricity Board, Jharkhand
 - 33. Chhatisgarh State Electricity Board, Chhatisgarh
 - 34. Uttranchal State Electricity Board, Dehradun
-Respondents**

The following were present:

- 1. Shri R. G. Yadav ED, PGCIL
- 2. Shri Alok Roy, GM, NRLDC, PGCIL
- 3. Shri V. Mittal, AGM, PGCIL
- 4. Shri T.P.S. Bawa, SE, PSEB
- 5. Shri S. K. Mittal, RRVNPL

**ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING : 24.4.2003)**

Based on the petition by the petitioner, the Commission in its order of 22.3.2002, had, in exercise of powers conferred under sub-section (10) of Section 55 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”) approved fees and charges to be paid to the Regional Load Despatch Centres (RLDCs) by the respondents for undertaking load despatch functions for the years 1998-99 to 2003-04. The petitioner had filed a review petition (No.84/2002) seeking review of directions on certain items of fees and charges approved by the Commission. The Commission vide its order dated 18.11.2002 had allowed the application for review of the order dated 22.3.2002. Further, in view of the complexities of the issues involved, Shri G.S. Rajamani, Member, (hereinafter referred to as “the Bench”) was nominated to make appropriate recommendations for consideration of the Commission after sifting and analysis of evidence produced by the parties. The Bench finalized the report and recommendations vide order dated 7.2.2003, which was circulated among the parties

for their comments. In response to that, affidavits have been filed on behalf of the petitioner; Respondent No 8, Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (HVPN); Respondent No 11, West Bengal State Electricity Board (WBSEB); Respondent No 22, Kerala State Electricity Board (KSEB) and Respondent No 24, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (TNEB). Although no replies have been filed on behalf of PSEB and RRVPNL, their representatives were present at the hearing on 24.4.2003. They expressed their general agreement with the recommendations made by the Bench. The reservations expressed by them on any specific issue have been considered and dealt with at appropriate places.

2. Before we consider the issues on merits, we consider it appropriate to make a preliminary observation. TNEB in its affidavit has stated that it had filed an appeal before the Madras High Court against the Commission's order dated 22.3.2002, which had not been taken up for hearing by the High Court. No one was present on behalf of TNEB when the matter was heard on 24.4.2003 to apprise the Commission of the latest status of the appeal, despite notice. The representative of the petitioner also could not clarify whether or not there was any stay against the Commission's order dated 22.3.2002. Therefore, we proceeded to hear the parties on merits on the report and recommendations made by the Bench.

3. At the out set, Shri V. Mittal appearing for the petitioner brought to our notice the observations of the Commission contained in an earlier order dated 3.1.2001 in the present petition, that the work of system operations being performed by RLDCs was to

be done on no profit no loss basis as it did not involve any commercial activity. Therefore, RLDC fees and charges were in fact the reimbursement of expenses. Relying upon these observations, the representative of the petitioner argued that the whole of the actual expenses incurred by RLDCs in the course of performance of their duties as per the audited accounts needed to be reimbursed, particularly when there was no other agency to make up the loss in case the actual expenses exceeded the approved fees and charges.

4. We have carefully considered these submissions made on behalf of the petitioner. The question to be considered is whether while determining fees and charges under sub-section (10) of Section 55 of the Act, we are bound by the accounts of RLDCs audited by statutory auditors. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in West Bengal Regulatory Commission Vs CESC Ltd. (AIR 2002 SC 3588) has categorically held that the accounts of utilities, which remain unchallenged by the parties do not make them binding on the Commission. The Hon'ble Supreme Court further held that even where the accounts are genuine and are not questioned, the same may not reflect good performance of the company or may not be in the interest of the consumers. Therefore, there is an obligation on the Commission to examine the accounts, which may be genuine and unchallenged on that account. Under sub-section (10) of Section 55 of the Act, the Commission is assigned the function of determining fees and charges payable to RLDCs for undertaking load despatch functions. There is thus a corresponding duty cast upon the Commission for a judicious examination of the expenses for the purpose and we cannot allow RLDCs to claim actual expenses mechanically. Therefore, we

reject the contention of the petitioner for reimbursement of actual expenses. Now we proceed to consider the actual items of expenditure for the purpose of deciding fees and charges.

RLDC CHARGES FOR 1998-1999 AND 1999-2000

5. The petitioner has claimed reimbursement of actual expenses for the years 1998-99 and 1999-2000. The Commission in its earlier order of 22.3.2002 had directed that for these years RLDC expenses would be payable by the beneficiaries in accordance with the principles laid down in CEA's letter dated 15.7.1998. The Bench in its report did not recommend revision of charges for these years based on actuals as claimed by the petitioner. The petitioner in its affidavit has not contested the specific recommendation made by the Bench. Therefore, we do not propose to go into the issue any further. We, therefore, reiterate that for the years 1998-99 and 1999-2000, the petitioner is entitled to reimbursement of RLDC fees and charges based on CEA's letter dated 15.7.1998 as already decided.

RLDC CHARGES FOR 2000-2001 AND ONWARDS

Employee Cost

6. The Commission in its order dated 22.3.2002 had decided the employee cost for the year 2000-01 as under :

(Rs. in lakhs)	
NRLDC	266.98
WRLDC	233.18
SRLDC	233.18
ERLDC	233.18
NERLDC	179.28

7. So far as the years 2001-02 and onwards are concerned, the Commission allowed hike by applying escalation factor of 7% for subsequent years. The Bench in its report has recommended an increase of 15% in the staff strength (executive and non-executive) over the employee strength considered for the year 2000-01 for all RLDCs from 2001-02 and onwards. The recommendations in this regard made by the Bench are summarised as under :

RLDC	2000-2001				2001-2002 and onwards			
	Executi- ves	Non- Executives	Total staff	Employee cost (Rs. in Lakhs)	Executi- ves	Non- Executives	Total staff	Employee cost (Rs. in Lakhs) (with escalation)
NRLDC	35	42	77	266.98	40	48	88	326.48
WRLDC	31	36	67	233.18	36	41	77	287.38
SRLDC	31	36	67	233.18	36	41	77	287.38
ERLDC	31	36	67	233.18	36	41	77	287.38
NERLDC	23	29	52	179.28	26	33	59	217.49
Total	151	179	330	1145.8	174	204	378	1406.11

8. The petitioner in its affidavit has submitted that PIB had earlier recommended an employee strength of 1545 for RLDC operations, though RLDCs were sanctioned 804 employees before their transfer to the petitioner from CEA. It is further stated that the total number of employees deployed was reduced to 410 in 2000-01, which has been further reduced to 396 in January 2003 despite the fact that there is manifold increase in workload of RLDCs on account accretion of statutory/non-statutory functions in the recent past. In the light of these submissions, the representative of the petitioner argued that the RLDCs may be allowed reimbursement of actual expenses with the

actual strength deployed from time to time and the existing strength of 396 may be allowed to be continued.

9. The Bench had considered the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner. The Bench found that the claim for manpower was not based on any empirical or other studies. However, considering the increase in nature of work and responsibilities of RLDCs in the recent past and in particular consequent to implementation of ABT, the Bench recommended increase of 15% in the employee strength for the years 2001-02 to 2003-04 over the approved employee strength for the year 2000-01. In the affidavit filed in response to the recommendations made by the Bench, the petitioner has not supported its claim for hike in manpower strength by any study. WBSEB has submitted that the expenses on account of any activity other than that related to RLDC should be disallowed. It is further submitted that overstaffing/mismatch in strength should not be accounted for. KSEB has stated that RLDCs are over-staffed and their establishment costs are very high. TNEB has submitted that data transfer and processing is now done through computers and there is scope for reduction of employee cost. It is also stated that employee cost should be considered as basic pay plus DA. The comments offered by the concerned state utilities are too general and vague to merit any consideration. The views of TNEB that employee cost should include only expenses on account of basic pay and DA also merits summary rejection on the ground that other allowances payable to the employees are also to be accounted for. Shri T.P.S. Bawa appearing for PSEB submitted during the hearing that the increased employee strength recommended by the Bench should be given effect from 1.12.2002 when ABT was

introduced in the Northern Region. We are of the opinion that even prior to implementation of ABT certain additional jobs had to be undertaken by RLDCs though there is further increase after ABT implementation. On consideration of all these factors, we feel that the recommendation made by the Bench is just and reasonable. We, therefore, direct that the manpower strength as recommended by the Bench and reproduced in Para 7 above shall be allowed.

Corporate Office Expenses

10. The petitioner has sought reimbursement of Rs.334.96 lakh for the year 2000-01 as RLDC charges on account of corporate office expenses for coordinating RLDC activities at corporate office. The basis for apportionment of corporate office expenses chargeable to revenue as sought is stated to be based on the corporate policy, according to which these expenses should be apportioned in the same ratio as the O&M expenses of RLDCs bear to the O & M expenses of the corporation. Against this, the Commission, after taking into account total number of 17 employees (executives and non-executives) working in the System Operation Group at corporate office performing RLDC related functions, had directed that the share of corporate office expenses apportionable to RLDCs for the year 2000-01 shall be Rs.120.74 lakhs, to be shared by RLDCs in proportion to the employee cost approved for respective RLDCs. Before the Bench it was urged by the petitioner that sharing of corporate office expenses should be done as per its corporate policy. It was also submitted that in case the Commission decided to continue with allocation of corporate office expenses based on employee strength attending to RLDC related functions at corporate office, the strength of 37

persons should be considered for this purpose since personnel in groups other than System Operation Group were also performing RLDC related functions though not exclusively. The Bench had recommended that a total of not more than 30 persons should be required at the corporate office for performing RLDC related functions. Accordingly, based on the proposed strength of 30 employees, the Bench has recommended apportionment of Rs.213.07 lakh out of corporate expenses to RLDCs.

11. The petitioner in its affidavit has reiterated that allocation of corporate expenses be allowed in accordance with the corporate policy referred to earlier. TNEB has submitted that corporate office expenditure should be deducted from O & M expenses in transmission tariff.

12. We have carefully perused the recommendation made by the Bench and the contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner and the respondents. We agree with the recommendation made by the Bench. We do not find any reason to deviate there from. With the increase in the activities of RLDCs the level of coordination at corporate office level is bound to increase, which justifies allocation of higher number of corporate office personnel. The petitioner's request for allocation of expenses on account of 37 personnel from corporate office is purely ad hoc claim unsubstantiated by any reasoning. Therefore, we direct that corporate office expenses amounting to Rs. 213.07 lakh shall be apportioned among RLDCs as recommended by the Bench and recovered from the respondents accordingly. However, as directed by the Commission in its order of 22.3.2002, this amount of Rs. 213.07 lakh shall be deducted from the O & M

expenses while approving the transmission charges for the tariff period 2001-02 to 2003-04.

Communication Expenses

13. The Commission in its order dated 22.3.2002 had approved reimbursement of communication expenses of RLDCs for the year 2000-01, which were to remain fixed up to 2003-04. The reimbursement of communication expenses approved by the Commission are as given below :-

NRLDC	Rs. 56.34 lakhs
WRLDC	Rs. 65.96 lakhs
SRLDC	Rs. 50.29 lakhs
ERLDC	Rs. 46.19 lakhs
NERLDC	Rs. 22.89 lakhs
Total	Rs. 241.67 lakhs

14. The Bench did not recommend any change on this count. The petitioner in its affidavit has prayed for reimbursement of the actual communication expenses for RLDCs. We have already declined the prayer of the petitioner for reimbursement of actual audited expenses, which should include the communication expenses. However, we feel that there is a case for escalation of communication expenses for subsequent years over those of the base year of 2000-01 for the reason that implementation of ABT would necessitate increased use of communication facilities. Therefore, we direct that communication expenses shall be treated as a part of escalable expenses and escalated at the rate applicable to other expenses forming part of escalable items.

Repair & maintenance

15. The Commission in its order dated 22.3.2002 had not allowed reimbursement of Rs.17.78 lakh in respect of WRLDC as the petitioner had failed to satisfy the Commission that some of the items covered under the head “R&M charges” were not covered under any other head of expenditure. The petitioner pressed its claim for reimbursement of the amount before the Bench for which it also filed the data. The Bench has noted certain discrepancies in the data submitted by the petitioner to CEA and before the Bench. Accordingly, the Bench has not agreed to allow Rs.17.78 lakh on account of R&M charges. The petitioner in the affidavit has prayed for adoption of audited figure for the purpose of reimbursement of the amount. As we have already noticed we are not allowing reimbursement of actual expenses merely based on the audited figures. For the reasons recorded by the Bench we decline the prayer made on behalf of the petitioner for reimbursement of the amount.

Travelling expenses

16. The Commission in its order dated 22.3.2002 had directed that travelling expenses approved for the year 2000-01 would remain fixed and would not be escalated for future years till 2003-04.

17. The Bench has also not recommended any change in this regard. The Bench further observed that in case RLDC employees needed to travel outside Headquarters at the instance of any of the state utilities, the necessary expenditure should be borne by the concerned state utility on its own account. While responding to the

recommendations made by the Bench, the petitioner has prayed for reimbursement of actual travelling expenses undertaken by RLDC staff. WBSEB is opposed to the recommendation made by the Bench urging that traveling expenses be apportioned among all the state utilities in the Region if RLDC staff undertakes tour in the overall interest of the grid at the instance of any of the state utilities.

18. We have considered the submissions made on behalf of the parties. We cannot allow the petitioner to claim actual travelling expenses since it would amount to granting uncontrolled and unguided discretion to RLDCs in the matter of undertaking travelling outside the Headquarters. At the same time, because of the factors not within the control of petitioner or RLDCs, there may be increases on account of travelling expenses on account of hike in fares and other relevant factors. We have also considered recommendation made by the Bench regarding reimbursement of expenses on account of travelling undertaken by RLDC personnel at the instance of state utilities. We, however, find that the visits by RLDC staff even at the instance of state utilities are aimed at better awareness among utilities about the regulations/procedures of ABT and other regulations of the Commission specified in the interest of grid discipline. The payment by the utilities will encounter practical difficulties. We also feel that travelling expenses should be treated as part of escalable expenses and escalated for subsequent years over the base year of 2000-01 at the rate applicable to other expenses forming part of escalable items. We direct accordingly.

Rebate and interest on working capital

19. The Commission in its order dated 22.3.2003 had approved interest on working capital considering one month's receivables against two months' receivables claimed by the petitioner in the original petition. The Commission had also approved late payment surcharge of 1.5% per month, rebate of 2.5% for payment through LC and rebate of 1% on payment within one month of presentation of the bill. The petitioner submitted that rebate of 2.5% on payment through LC corresponds to interest on working capital based on 2 months' receivables. It was urged on behalf of the petitioner that in case one month's receivables were to be taken for calculation of interest on working capital, the rebate on LC should be 1% and no rebate afterwards.

20. The issue was considered by the Bench who recommended that the rebate for early payment (within one month) may not be allowed. The Bench accepted the argument of the petitioner to allow 1% rebate on payment through LC.

21. None of the parties other than TNEB has contested recommendation made by the Bench. TNEB has stated that except insurance and travelling charges, all other payments are to be made after the end of the month. Therefore, according to TNEB, there was no need at all for providing working capital.

22. We have considered the matter. In our opinion, the provision for working capital to meet day to day expenses by RLDCs is essential and, therefore, interest on working capital is to be provided for. In this respect we accept the recommendation made by the Bench.

Other Income

23. The Commission in its order dated 22.3.2002 directed that the amount of Rs. 45.98 lakh indicated by the petitioner under head "other income" should be deducted from total RLDC expenses to arrive at net RLDC charges payable for 2000-01. It was further ordered that the "other income" in the base year of 2000-01 should be escalated to arrive at "other income" in future years. The petitioner contended that amount of Rs.45.98 lakh under the head "other income" deducted by the Commission in accordance with the above directions represented the amount of interest on loans repaid by the employees and prayed that this should not be deducted. The Bench has considered this issue in detail and has recommended that income from interest on employee loans should not be deducted from the expenses. The Bench further recommended that the rent recovered from the employees too should be excluded from "other income" for the purpose of calculation of expenses as no contribution had been made by the respondents on construction of staff quarters. Accordingly, the Bench recommended deduction of the following amount from the O&M expenses to arrive at net expenses for the year 2000-01 :

(Amount in Rs.)

RLDC	Other income (a)	Income from interest on employee loans (b)	Recovery of rent from employees (c)	The "other income: to be deducted from O&M expenditure (a-b-c)
NRLDC	1021581	1016581		5000
WRLDC	2061107	853265	514656	693186
SRLDC	872182	577923	60758	233501
ERLDC	391905	377807		14098
NERLDC	251057	248010		3047
Total	4597832	3073586	575414	948832

24. TNEB has objected to the recommendation of the Bench on the ground that these are employee welfare measures and the petitioner should not expect any return on such investment. TNEB has further urged that any income earned by the RLDCs should be passed on to the beneficiaries as they have to function on no profit no loss basis. It is also urged that there is no revenue loss due to staff quarters since if the quarters are not allotted to the employees, these could not be let out to outsiders and as such the opportunity to earn income is not lost.

25. The submissions made by TNEB have been considered very carefully. The advances and loans to RLDC employees are paid by the petitioner/RLDCs from their own resources and without any contribution from the respondents. It logically follows that any income by way of interest accruing on these advances and loans should be retained by them only and should not be passed on. The respondents cannot legitimately have any claim to this income. Similarly, the state utilities have not made any contribution towards construction of staff quarters allotted to RLDC employees. Therefore, by the same reasoning, the state utilities cannot have any claim on income accruing on account of rent/license fee charged from the employees. Accordingly, we accept the recommendation made by the Bench.

26. There are certain other items of expenditure, namely, power charges, depreciation, printing & stationery, insurance, etc taxes & duties, etc which had been approved by the Commission in its order dated 22.3.2002, and which are not disputed. As such, the directions of the Commission with regard to those items as contained in

the order of 22.3.2002 shall continue to apply. The escalation factor of 7% directed in the order dated 22.3.2002 shall also apply to all the escalable items, including the communication and traveling expenses, for the purpose of arriving at the fees and charges for the years subsequent to 2000-01.

Absorption of difference of up to 5%

27. The Commission in its order dated 22.3.2002 had directed as under :-

" in any of the financial year during the period ending March 2004, difference between actual expenses incurred and RLDC charges calculated as per directions contained in this order is 5% or more, in respect of any of the RLDCs, the petitioner shall submit details of the same to the Commission in the form of a petition for appropriate directions. However, the difference within the limit of 5% shall be absorbed by the concerned RLDC."

28. The petitioner has, however, submitted that reimbursement of actual audited expenses should be approved, which submission we have already turned down. However, in the context of the fact that the RLDCs are to work on the basis of "no profit no loss", we clarify that overall expenses within a range of $\pm 5\%$ of fees and charges approved by us shall be settled between RLDCs and the beneficiaries directly without any reference to the Commission. However, in case actual expenses as per the audited accounts, are beyond $\pm 5\%$ of the approved fees and charges, the excess amount may

be payable by the respondents to RLDCs or refundable to respondents by RLDC, as the case may be, subject to decision of the Commission for which the petitioner shall file an appropriate petition, with proper justification.

29. Based on the above decision, the fees and charges for the year 2000-01 and up to 2003-04 are summarised in the table annexed to this order.

**Sd/-
(K.N. SINHA)
MEMBER**

**Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRMAN**

New Delhi, dated the 8th May, 2003.

TABLE
RLDC Charges for 2000-01

Charges Approved (in Rs. Lakhs)						
	NRLDC	WRLDC	SRLDC	ERLDC	NERLDC	TOTAL
Part-1						
Escalatable Charges						
Employee Cost	266.98	233.18	233.18	233.18	179.28	1145.80
Repair & Maintenance	17.59	9.60	4.27	14.90	3.95	50.31
Power Charges	57.51	36.45	7.85	34.35	0.60	136.76
Training & Recruitment	0.35	0.58	0.61	0.07	0	1.61
Printing & Stationary	3.53	3.00	3.06	1.61	1.00	12.20
Rent	0	0	0	0	3.77	3.77
Miscellaneous Expenses	4.39	7.79	4.70	4.86	1.72	23.46
Insurance	0.04	0.10	0.21	0.14	0.04	0.53
Share of Corporate office expense	49.65	43.36	43.36	43.36	33.34	213.07
Communication Expenses	56.34	65.96	50.29	46.19	22.89	241.67
Travelling Charges	19.96	23.97	26.18	20.30	13.65	104.06
Others	7.37	19.15	15.03	6.34	5.54	53.43
Hiring of Vehicles	6.03	5.56	1.95	1.59	1.97	17.10
Less : Other Income	0.05	6.93	2.33	0.14	0.03	9.48
A. Sub-total (Escalatable Charges)	489.69	441.77	388.36	406.75	267.72	1994.29
Part-2						
Non-Escalatable Charges						
Depreciation	4.78	33.36	45.89	23.77	7.80	115.6
B. Sub-total (Non-Escalatable Charges)	4.78	33.36	45.89	23.77	7.8	115.6
C. Total(Escalatable + Non-Escalatable) Charges	494.47	475.13	434.25	430.52	275.52	2109.89
D. Interest on WC	4.57	4.40	4.02	3.98	2.55	19.52
E. Net RLDC charges (C+D)	499.04	479.53	438.27	434.50	278.07	2129.41
Working Capital (WC)	41.59	39.96	36.52	36.21	23.17	177.45
F. One time expenses	5.39	5.18	4.73	4.69	3.00	22.99
Total RLDC charges for 2000-01 (E+F)	504.43	484.71	443.00	439.19	281.07	2152.40

RLDC charges for 2001-02

	Charges Approved (in Rs. Lakhs)					
	NRLDC	WRLDC	SRLDC	ERLDC	NERLDC	TOTAL
A. Escalatable Charges *	564.59	510.77	453.62	473.29	311.72	2313.99
B. Non-escalatable Charges	4.78	33.36	45.89	23.77	7.80	115.60
C. Sub- Total (A+B)	569.37	544.13	499.51	497.06	319.52	2429.59
D. Interest on WC	5.27	5.03	4.62	4.60	2.96	22.48
Total RLDC charges for 2001-02(C+D)	574.64	549.16	504.13	501.66	322.48	2452.07
Working Capital (WC)	47.89	45.76	42.01	41.80	26.87	204.34
* includes increase in employee cost due to 15% increase in employee strength compared to 2000-01.						

RLDC charges for 2002-03

	Charges Approved (in Rs. Lakhs)					
	NRLDC	WRLDC	SRLDC	ERLDC	NERLDC	TOTAL
A. Escalatable Charges	604.11	546.52	485.37	506.42	333.54	2475.96
B. Non-escalatable Charges	4.78	33.36	45.89	23.77	7.80	115.6
C. Sub- Total (A+B)	608.89	579.88	531.26	530.19	341.34	2591.56
D. Interest on WC	5.63	5.36	4.91	4.91	3.16	23.97
Total RLDC charges for 2002-03(C+D)	614.52	585.24	536.17	535.10	344.50	2615.53
Working Capital (WC)	51.21	48.77	44.68	44.59	28.71	217.96

RLDC charges for 2003-04

	Charges Approved (in Rs. Lakhs)					
	NRLDC	WRLDC	SRLDC	ERLDC	NERLDC	TOTAL
A. Escalatable Charges	646.40	584.78	519.35	541.87	356.89	2649.29
B. Non-escalatable Charges	4.78	33.36	45.89	23.77	7.80	115.6
C. Sub- Total (A+B)	651.18	618.14	565.24	565.64	364.69	2764.89
D. Interest on WC	6.02	5.72	5.23	5.23	3.37	25.57
Total RLDC charges for 2003-04(C+D)	657.20	623.86	570.47	570.87	368.06	2790.46
Working Capital (WC)	54.77	51.99	47.54	47.57	30.67	232.54