

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi**

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition No. 264/2009

Subject: Approval of tariff of Korba Super Thermal Power station (2100 MW) for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014.

Date of Hearing: 24.3.2011

Coram: Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson
Shri V.S.Verma, Member
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner: NTPC, New Delhi

Respondents: MPPTCL, MSEDCL, GUVNL, ED-Govt. of Goa, ED-Admn. of Daman & Diu, ED-Admn. of D& NH.

Parties present: Shri V.K.Padha, NTPC
Shri V.Ramesh, NTPC
Shri Ajay Dua, NTPC
Shri S.K.Sharma, NTPC
Shri S.Dheman, NTPC
Shri Sachin Jain, NTPC
Shri A.S.Pandey, NTPC
Shri G.K.Dua, NTPC

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the petition has been filed for approval of tariff of Korba Super Thermal Power station (2100 MW) (herein after referred to as 'the generating station') for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014, based on the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009.

2. None appeared on behalf of the respondents. The representative of the petitioner submitted that it has revised the annual fixed charges vide its affidavits dated 4.10.2010 and 11.1.2011 respectively taking into consideration the projected additional capital expenditure for the period 2010-14 and the actual additional capital expenditure for the period 2009-10. He also submitted that the additional information as directed by the Commission has been filed and copies have been served on the respondents. The representative prayed that tariff for the generating station be determined as claimed in the petition.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the information on the following, on affidavit, on or before 5.4.2011:

(a) CEA approved R&M schemes:

- (i) The actual expenditure claimed during 2009-10 is ₹1351.23 lakh on CEA approved schemes (Ref sl. no.12 of the submission filed vide affidavit dated 11.1.2011), whereas justification has been provided for assets amounting to ₹769 lakh only. The item-wise and unit-wise details of the expenditure for ₹1351.23 lakh along with references of CEA approved schemes and their estimated cost may be furnished. The difference, if any, in the actual expenditure than the CEA approved cost may also be justified.
- (ii) The expenditure claimed during 2010-11 is ₹107 lakh on CEA approved schemes (Ref sl. no.12 of the submission filed vide affidavit dated 11.1.2011), whereas justification has been provided for assets amounting to ₹65 lakh only. The item-wise and unit-wise details of the expenditure for ₹107 lakh along with references of CEA approved cost may be furnished. The difference if any, in the actual expenditure than the CEA approved cost may also be justified.
- (b) Unit-wise details of the expenditure for ₹44 crore on R&M of Stage- II (DDCMS) C&I along with the copy of CEA letter dated 14.8.2008.
- (c) Original gross block of HCFC-22 vapor compression system replaced by vapor absorption system used in air conditioning system.
- (d) Gross block of components of ESP proposed to be replaced during modification of ESPs.

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

Sd/-
(Dr. N.C.Mahapatra)
Chief Advisor (Law)