

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Coram :**

- 1. Shri Ashok Basu, Chairperson**
- 2. Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Member**
- 3. Shri A.H. Jung, Member**

**Review Petition No. 47/2006  
in  
Petition No. 47/2005**

**In the matter of**

Review of order dated 9.5.2006 in Petition No. 47/2005, for approval of tariff in respect of Uri HE Project, for the period 1.4.2004 to 31.3.2009.

**And in the matter of**

National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Limited.

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs**

1. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala,
2. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited, Panchkula,
3. Delhi Transco Limited, New Delhi,
4. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited, Lucknow,
5. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd, Jaipur,
6. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Jaipur,
7. Power Transmission Corporation of Uttaranchal Ltd, Dehradun,
8. Jodhpur Vidyut Prasaran Vitaran Nigam Ltd, Jodhpur,
9. Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd, Ajmer,
10. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla,
11. Chief Engineer & Secretary, Engineering Department, Chandigarh,
12. Principal Secretary, Power Development Department, Srinagar.

**---Respondents**

**The following were present**

1. Shri V.N.Tripathi, NHPC
2. Shri S.D.Tripathi, NHPC
3. Shri Prashant Kaul, NHPC
4. Shri P.Kumar, NHPC
5. Shri S.K.Meena, NHPC

6. Shri R.S.Batra, NHPC
7. Shri Pradeep Pandey, NHPC.
8. Shri. Naveen Samaiya, NHPC
9. ShriPrashant Kaul, NHPC
10. Shri T.K Mohanty, NHPC
11. Shri S Sowmyanaranayanan, TNEB
12. Shri. R. Krishnasamy, TNEB

**ORDER**  
**(DATE OF HEARING : 17.8.2006)**

This review petition has been filed by the petitioner, National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Ltd, (NHPC), a generating company, for review of order dated 9.5.2006, passed by the Commission in Petition No.47/2005, determining the tariff in respect of Uri Hydroelectric Project, for the period 1.4.2004 to 31.3.2009.

2. The petitioner has contended that there are certain fundamental errors in the said order dated 9.5.2006 and accordingly has sought review. According to the petitioner the order needs to be reviewed on account of the following errors present therein:

- (a) Treatment of depreciation when it exceeds the repayment of loan,
- (b) Computation of the balance useful life of the assets for the purpose of determining depreciation
- (c) Computation of Advance Against Depreciation based on repayment of loan
- (d) Computation of O&M Expenses, incurred during 1998-99 to 2002-03.

(e) Reimbursement of filing fee and expenditure incurred on publication of notices.

3. Heard the representative of the petitioner, on admission. Admit application for review on grounds (a), (c), (d) and (e) above.

4. As regards 2(b) above, the petitioner has contended that the average useful life of the hydro-generating station should be taken as 35 years as per the prevailing practice and the balance useful life be considered accordingly for tariff purpose. It has been submitted that based on the methodology adopted by the Commission, the life of a capital asset is susceptible to change whenever there is addition/deletion of some other capital asset. According to the petitioner the methodology adopted by the Commission is erroneous as the life of the assets can never be 'variable'. The petitioner has also submitted that CEA considers the useful life of the hydro generating station as 35 years for deciding the commercial viability of a hydro scheme.

5. The weighted average useful life of a generating station is calculated based on the rate of depreciation of individual components, which varies from 5 years to 50 years. The petitioner's contention that the life of the assets can never be 'variable' is clearly contrary to the provisions of the Accounting Standards – 6, which provides that the historical cost and life of the assets can undergo changes on various accounts. Thus contention of the petitioner is not tenable. As the petitioner has not brought out any new information nor an error apparent on the

face of the order, we hold that no case has been made for reviewing this aspect. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the methodology adopted by the Commission for determination of the balance useful life of the plant, it is at liberty to approach the Commission, in a separate proceeding, if so advised.

6. The petitioner is directed to submit the details of depreciation recovered so far, in respect of all its generating stations.

7. The petitioner is directed to serve a copy of the petition on the respondents by 10.9.2006. The respondents may file their reply by 10.10.2006 with copy to the petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, latest by 25.10.2006.

8. List this petition on 14.11.2006.

Sd/-

**(A.H.JUNG)**  
**MEMBER**

Sd/-

**(BHANU BHUSHAN)**  
**MEMBER**

Sd/-

**(ASHOK BASU)**  
**CHAIRPERSON**

**New Delhi dated the 30<sup>th</sup> August 2006**