

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

1. **Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
2. **Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**

**IA No. 30/2003 in
Petition No. 62/2000**

In the matter of

Tariff for Talcher TPS for the period 1.4.2000 to 31.3.2004.

And in the matter of

National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd	Petitioner
Vs		
Grid Corporation of Orissa Ltd	Respondent

The following were present:

1. Shri Amit Kapur, Advocate, NTPC
2. Shri K.K. Garg, CM(Comml.), NTPC
3. Shri M.S. Chawla, AGM(Comml.), NTPC
4. Shri V.B. Jain, GM(Comml.), NTPC
5. Shri S.K. Sharma, Sr. Manager (C), NTPC
6. Shri Sandeep Mehta, NTPC
7. Shri Balaji Dube, Sr. Law Officer, NTPC
8. Shri Visnu Sudharshan , Advocate, NTPC
9. Shri R. Mazumdar, NTPC
10. Ms. Ranjana Gupta, NTPC
11. Shri B. Arya, NTPC
12. Shri R.K. Mehta, Advocate, GRIDCO
13. Shri K.K. Panda, GRIDCO
14. Shri R. Mishra, GRIDCO
15. Shri Suman Kukret, GRIDCO
16. Shri S.K. Chowdhry, GRIDCO
17. Shri S.S. Nayak, GRIDCO

**ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING 09.09.2003)**

This application seeking clarification of the scope of the direction given in the order dated 19.6.2002 in Petition No. 62/2000 has been filed by NTPC.

2. The Commission in its order dated 19.6.2002 in Petition No. 62/2002

had directed as under:

“28. The petitioner has achieved a PLF of 61.76 % in the previous financial year and there is continuous improvement over the last five years, with one unit out. R&M is expected to be completed by November 2003 when further improvement in PLF is expected. As such we feel that a PLF of 57.5% proposed by the petitioner in its tariff proposal is unreasonable. We, therefore, order the following Target Availability and Target PLF for the purpose of payment of full fixed charges and incentive respectively for the period from 2000-01 to 2003-04:

Year	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Target Availability/Target PLF	61.76%	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%

29. We are also of the view that for the purpose of computation of PLF, the period of units under R&M shall not be reckoned and relatable fixed charges for the unit under R&M shall not be paid for and method of computation of fixed charges and incentive shall be in terms of the Commission's notification dated 26.3.2001, but with Target Availability/Target PLF indicated above.”

3. It has been submitted that on account of the Commission's order *ibid*, the respondent has disputed an amount of Rs.61.35 crore on account of relatable fixed charges for the units under R&M and has not made payment to the petitioner. The clarification has been sought in regard to exact scope of the words “relatable fixed charges for the units under R&M” appearing in para 29 of the order.

4. It is clarified that “relatable fixed charges for units under R&M” shall be the proportion of fixed charges for the capacity of units under R&M. To illustrate the

matter further, manner of calculation of fixed charges for the units under R&M is set herein below:

“Annual Fixed Charges for full capacity considering all the units = ‘AFC’
Crore.

Total capacity of the generating station = 460 MW (4x60 MW + 2x110 MW)

Capacity under R&M = 170 MW (1 Unit of 60 MW and 1 Unit of 110 MW),
and

Duration of R&M = 60 days

“Relatable fixed charges for units under R&M” shall be = Rs. AFC x
(170/460) x (60x365) Crore.

Amount of Fixed charge for available capacity payable during the period of
R&M = Rs. AFC x (460-170)/460) x (365-60)/365 Crore.

5. With the above clarification, IA No. 30/2003 stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(K.N. SINHA)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRMAN

New Delhi dated 25th September, 2003