

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.175/GT/2013

Subject: Determination of tariff of 382.5 MW UNOSUGEN Power Plant of Torrent Power Ltd for the period from the determination of Commercial operation till 31.3.2014.

Date of hearing: 24.9.2013

Coram: Shri V.S.Verma, Member
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner: Torrent Power Ltd

Respondents: Torrent Power Ltd & 3 others

Parties present: Shri Jinal Mehta, TPL
Shri N.V Shah, TPL
Shri Deepak Dalal, TPL
Shri A.K Ghosh, TPL
Shri Vinod khanna, TPL
Shri Ajasra Gupta, MPPMCL
Shri Bharat Sharma, PTC

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, Torrent Power Ltd, for determination of tariff of 382.5 MW UNOSUGEN power Plant (Project) in terms of CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulation, 2009 (the 2009 Tariff Regulations).

2. During the hearing, the representative of the petitioner submitted as under:
 - (a) The COD of the generating station was achieved on 4.4.2013 and financing of the project has been carried out with the debt equity ratio of 70:30.
 - (b) The actual project cost worked out to `4.858 cr/MW which includes `0.61 cr/MW on account of use of R-LNG and FERV. This cost includes the capitalization of Equivalent Operating Hours in line with AS-10.
 - (c) O&M cost may be allowed in exercise of power under Regulation 44 of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.
 - (d) Reimbursement of CSR expenditure may be allowed as per directions of Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India.
 - (e) Tariff of the generating station may be determined as prayed for in the petition.
3. On being pointed out by the Commission that the expenditure claimed under CSR is to be borne by the petitioner, the representative of the petitioner clarified that the same was being claimed as per the directions of the Government of India and prayed that the necessary documents in this regard have been filed which may be considered.
4. The representative of the respondent, PTC and TPL submitted that they have no comments to make in the matter.

5. The representative of the respondent, MPPMCL submitted as under:
 - (i) The cost of the project is too high and the petitioner may be requested to submit the ICB documents to ascertain as to whether the bidding process has been undertaken properly.
 - (ii) Time to file reply may be granted.
6. In response to the above, the representative of the petitioner clarified that the detailed justification as regards the capital cost of the project has been submitted with documents as sought for by the Commission. Also, these documents/information submitted by the petitioner has also been served on the respondents.
7. The Commission after hearing the parties directed MPPMCL to file its reply if not done earlier, on or before 04.10.2013, with copy to the petitioner who may file its rejoinder on or before 14.10.2013. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved its order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)