

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 482/TT/2019

Coram:

Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri Pravas Kumar Singh, Member
Shri Prakash S. Mhaske, Member, Ex-officio

Date of order : 30.04.2021

In the matter of:

Approval under Regulation 86 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations 1999 and revision of transmission tariff of the 2001-04, 2004-09, 2009-14 tariff periods, and truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 and determination of transmission tariff for 2019-24 period under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations 2019 for combined asset consisting of Asset I: 800 kV Kishenpur-Moga Transmission Line-I along with associated bays Asset II: 800 kV Kishenpur-Moga Transmission Line-II along with associated bays Asset III: 420 kV 63 MVAR Bus Reactor at Kishenpur Sub-station with associated bays and 420/220 kV, 250 MVA ICT III at Moga Sub-station with associated bays for transmission system associated with Kishenpur Moga Transmission System in the Northern Region.

And in the matter of:

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
SAUDAMINI, Plot No-2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon-122 001 (Haryana).

.....Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd.,
Vidyut Bhawan, Vidyut Marg,
Jaipur-302005 (Rajasthan)
2. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd.,
132 kV, GSS RVPNL Sub-Station Building,
Caligiri Road, Malviya Nagar,
Jaipur-302017 (Rajasthan)
3. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd.,
132 kV, GSS RVPNL Sub-Station Building,



Caligiri Road, Malviya Nagar,
Jaipur-302017 (Rajasthan)

4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd.,
132 kV, GSS RVPNL Sub-Station Building,
Caligiri Road, Malviya Nagar,
Jaipur-302017 (Rajasthan)
5. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board,
Vidyut Bhawan, Kumar House Complex Building II,
Shimla-171 004 (Himachal Pradesh)
6. Punjab State Electricity Board,
Thermal Shed Tia,
Near 22 Phatak,
Patiala-147 001 (Punjab)
7. Haryana Power Purchase Centre,
Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6,
Panchkula-134 109 (Haryana)
8. Power Development Department,
Government of Jammu & Kashmir,
Mini Secretariat, Jammu.
9. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd.,
Shakti Bhawan Extn.
14, Ashok Marg,
Lucknow - 226 001.
10. Delhi Transco Ltd.,
Shakti Sadan, Kotla Road
New Delhi-110 002.
11. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.,
B Block, Shakti Kiran , Bldg. (Near Karkadooma Court)
Karkadooma, 2nd Floor,
Delhi-110 092.
12. BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (Delhi Discom)
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi-110 019.
13. Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL)
NDPL House, Hudson Lines Kingsway Camp,
Delhi-110 009.
14. Chandigarh Administration,
Sector-9, Chandigarh.
15. Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.,



Urja Bhawan, Kanwali Road,
Dehradun (Uttarakhand).

16. North Central Railway,
Allahabad (Uttar Pradesh).

17. New Delhi Municipal Council,
Palika Kendra, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi-110 002.

...Respondent(s)

For Petitioner : Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Ved Rastogi, PGCIL

For Respondent : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BYPL
Ms. Megha Bajpeyi, BRPL

ORDER

The instant petition has been filed by Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (hereinafter referred to as “the Petitioner”) for revision of transmission tariff of the 2001-04, 2004-09, 2009-14 tariff periods and truing of the capital expenditure of the period from 1.4.2014 to 31.3.2019 under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2014 Tariff Regulations”) and for determination of tariff under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2019 Tariff Regulations”) of the period from 1.4.2019 to 31.3.2024 in respect of the following assets under transmission system associated with Kishenpur Moga Transmission System in Northern Region (hereinafter referred to as the “transmission project”):

Asset-I: 800 kV Kishenpur-Moga Transmission Line-I along with associated bays;

Asset-II: 800 kV Kishenpur-Moga Transmission Line-II along with associated bays;



Asset-III: 420 kV 63 MVAR Bus Reactor at Kishenpur Sub-station with associated bays and 420/220 kV, 250 MVA ICT III at Moga Sub-station with associated bays (hereinafter collectively referred to as “the transmission assets/Combined Asset”).

2. The Petitioner has made the following prayers in this Petition:

“1)Approve the revised Transmission Tariff for 2001-04 block, 2004-09 block and transmission tariff for 2009-14 block for the assets covered under this petition, as per para 8 above.

2)Approve the trued up Transmission Tariff for 2014-19 block and transmission tariff for 2019-24 block for the assets covered under this petition, as per para 9 and 10 above.

3)Allow the petitioner to recover the shortfall or refund the excess Annual Fixed Charges, on account of Return on Equity due to change in applicable Minimum Alternate/Corporate Income Tax rate as per the Income Tax Act, 1961 (as amended from time to time) of the respective financial year directly without making any application before the Commission as provided in Tariff regulations 2014 and tariff regulation'19 as per para 9.0 & 10 above for respective block.

Further it is submitted that deferred tax liability before 01.04.2009 shall be recoverable from the beneficiaries or long term customers /DIC as the case may be, as and when the same is materialized as per regulation 49 of 2014 and regulation 67 of 2019 tariff regulation. The petitioner may be allow to recover the deferred tax liability materialized directly without making any application before the commission as provided in the regulation.

4)Approve the reimbursement of expenditure by the beneficiaries towards petition filing fee, and expenditure on publishing of notices in newspapers in terms of Regulation 70 (1) Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019, and other expenditure (if any) in relation to the filing of petition.

5)Allow the petitioner to bill and recover Licensee fee and RLDC fees and charges, separately from the respondents in terms of Regulation 70 (3) and (4) Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019.

6)Allow the petitioner to bill and adjust impact on Interest on Loan due to change in Interest rate on account of floating rate of interest applicable during 2019-24 period, if any, from the respondents.

7)Allow the petitioner to file a separate petition before Hon'ble Commission for claiming the overall security expenses and consequential IOWC on that security expenses as mentioned at para 10.5 above.

8)Allow the petitioner to claim the capital spares at the end of tariff block as per actual.

9)Allow the Petitioner to bill and recover GST on Transmission Charges separately from the respondents, if GST on transmission is withdrawn from negative list at any time in future. Further, any taxes including GST and duties including cess etc. imposed by any statutory/Govt./municipal authorities shall be allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries.



and pass such other relief as Hon'ble Commission deems fit and appropriate under the circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice."

Background

3. The brief facts of the case are as follows:
 - a. The Investment Approval (IA) for the transmission project was accorded by Ministry of Power under its letter dated 21.5.1993 at an estimated cost of ₹41771.00 lakh including IDC of ₹200 lakh. Subsequently, the Revised Cost Estimate (RCE) for the transmission project were approved by Ministry of Power vide its letter dated 2.7.2002 at an estimated cost of ₹93848.00 lakh (including IDC of ₹31044 lakh).
 - b. The tariff was determined for the period from 1.4.2001 to 31.3.2004 vide order dated 18.5.2004 in Petition No. 43/2002 in accordance with Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2001. The Commission vide order dated 24.2.2006 in Petition No. 84/2004 filed by NTPC approved revised fixed charges for additional capitalisation for the period 1.4.2001 to 31.3.2004. Further, the tariff was revised vide order dated 8.2.2008 by way of implementation of the judgment of the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity dated 4.10.2006 in Appeal No. 135 of 2005.
 - c. The tariff was determined for the period from 1.4.2004 to 31.3.2009 vide order dated 24.2.2006 in Petition No. 84/2004 in accordance with Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2004. The tariff was revised vide order dated 14.7.2006 as there was an inadvertent clerical error in computation of interest on loan component. Further, the tariff was revised vide order dated 19.5.2008 by way of implementation of the judgment of the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity dated 4.10.2006 in Appeal No. 135 of 2005.
 - d. The tariff was determined for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014 vide order dated 6.1.2011 in Petition No. 122/2010 based on the admitted capital cost of ₹85741.12 lakh for the instant asset as on 1.4.2009 in accordance with 2009 Tariff Regulations.



- e. The tariff for the 2009-14 period was trued up and tariff for the period from 1.4.2014 to 31.3.2019 was determined vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014.
- f. The Petitioner has sought revision of transmission tariff approved for the 2001-04 and 2004-09 tariff periods on account of change in Interest on Loan (IoL) and Interest on Working Capital (IWC) to the extent of revision in IoL and in Maintenance Spares in terms of the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (hereinafter referred to as "APTEL") judgment dated 22.1.2007 and 13.6.2007 in Appeal No. 81/2005 and 139/2006 respectively. The Petitioner has also sought consequential revision of tariff allowed for the 2001-04 tariff period, 2009-14 tariff period and truing up of tariff of 2014-19 tariff period and determination of tariff for 2019-24 tariff period for transmission system associated with Kishenpur Moga Transmission System in the Northern Region.
- g. APTEL, vide judgements dated 22.1.2007 in Appeal No.81/2005 and other related Appeals, and judgement dated 13.6.2007 in Appeal No. 139/2006 pertaining to generating stations of NTPC decided on, mainly, the following issues:
- (a) Computation of interest on loan;
 - (b) Consequences of refinancing of loan;
 - (c) Depreciation as deemed repayment;
 - (d) Admissibility of depreciation up to 90% of the value of the assets;
 - (e) Consideration of maintenance of spares for working capital; and
 - (f) Depreciation of assets.
- h. The Commission and certain beneficiaries filed Appeals against the APTEL's judgments before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2007. The Appeals were admitted and initially stay was granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Subsequently, on an assurance by NTPC that the issues under Appeal would not be pressed for implementation during the pendency of the Appeals, the stay was vacated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.
- i. Based on the APTEL's judgments dated 22.1.2007 in Appeal No. 81/2005 and dated 13.6.2007 in Appeal No.139/2006, the Petitioner sought re-determination of tariff of its transmission assets for the tariff periods 2001-04 and 2004-09 in Petition No. 121/2007. The Commission after taking into consideration the pending Appeals before the Hon'ble Supreme Court



adjourned the matter sine die and directed to revive the same after the disposal of the Civil Appeals by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

- j. The Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed the said Civil Appeals filed against the APTEL's said judgments vide its judgment dated 10.4.2018 in Civil Appeal No. 5622 of 2007 along with other Civil Appeals.
- k. Consequent to the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment dated 10.4.2018 in NTPC matters, the Petition No. 121/2007 was listed for hearing on 8.1.2019. The Commission, vide order dated 18.1.2019 in Petition No. 121/2007, directed the petitioner to submit its claim separately for the assets at the time of filing of truing up of the petitions for the period 2014-19 in respect of concerned transmission assets.
- l. The instant petition was heard on 10.3.2021 and in view of APTEL's judgments dated 22.1.2007 in Appeal No. 81/2005 and dated 13.6.2007 in Appeal No.5622 of 2007 and the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 10.4.2018 in Civil Appeal No. 5622/2007, tariff is being revised. Although, period-wise tariff is being re-worked based on the Tariff Regulations applicable for the respective tariff periods, suitable assumptions at certain places, if any, are being applied which are being indicated.
- m. The transmission assets were put under commercial operation as under

Asset	COD
Asset- I	1.5.2000
Asset- II	1.2.2001
Asset- III	1.3.2000

4. The Respondents are distribution licensees and power departments, which are procuring transmission service from the Petitioner, mainly beneficiaries of the Northern Region.

5. The Petitioner has served the petition on the Respondents and notice of this petition has been published in the newspaper in accordance with Section 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003. No comments/ objections have been received from the general public in response to the aforesaid notice published in the newspaper by the Petitioner. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited (UPPCL), Respondent No. 9, has



filed its reply vide affidavit dated 6.3.2020 in which issues of depreciation, Interest on Loan (IoL) and Return on Equity has been raised. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), Respondent No. 12, has filed its reply vide affidavit dated 9.3.2021 in which it has objected to reopening of the tariff of 2001-04, 2004-09 and 2009-14 periods based on the APTEL's judgements stating that the Commission has become "functus officio". Further, BRPL has raised issues of Return on Equity (RoE), Deffered Tax Liability, recovery of tax on truing-up exercise of RoE, adoption of Indian Accounting Standard 101, applicability and recovery of GST recovery of security expenses, Interest on Working Captal (IWC) and recovery of application filing fee and the expenses. The Petitioner vide affidavits dated 16.3.2021 has filed rejoinders to the reply of UPPCL and BRPL.

6. BRPL has objected to the reopening of the tariff of the 2001-04, 2004-09 and 2009-14 periods based on the APTEL's judgements contending that the Commission had only refered to a portion of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of U.P. Power Corporation Limited Vs. National Thermal Power Corporation Limited reported in (2009) 6 SCC 235 and not the entire Judgement. The Commission may re-examine the whole issue after considering the entirety of the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and decide if the same is applicable to the facts of this case. BRPL contended that the claim to increase the tariff is permissible only when the tariff is in force and not afterwards. Further, BRPL has submitted that the Commission may revisit its order dated 6.11.2019 in Petition Nos. 288/TT/2019, 300/TT/2019, 301/TT/2019 and 305/TT/2019 in view of the facts and legal position and the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

7. In response, the Petitioner has submitted that the objection was raised by the respondent in previous orders dated 31.7.2020 in Petition No. 288/TT/2019, dated



5.3.2021 in Petition No. 290/TT/2020 and the Commission allowed the revision of tariff for 2001-04, 2004-09 and 2009-14.

8. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and BRPL. As regards the submission of BRPL contending that for revision of tariff for the earlier periods on account of judgement of APTEL and that of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Commission has become functus officio, it is observed that the Commission, by a combined order dated 6.11.2019 in Petition Nos. 288/TT/2019, 300/TT/2019, 301/TT/2019 and 305/TT/2019, has already rejected the contentions of BRPL. Relevant extract of the order dated 6.11.2019 is as under:

"11. We have examined the above contentions of the parties. It is apparent from the record that the Central Commission and other beneficiaries filed Civil Appeal No. 5622 of 2007 and batch before the Hon'ble Supreme Court against the judgment dated 22.1.2007 in Appeal No. 81 of 2005 and other related appeals and judgment dated 13.6.2007 in Appeal No. 139 of 2006 of Appellate Tribunal for Electricity. In the meantime, the Petitioner filed a Petition No. 121 of 2007 in the year 2007 for extending the benefit of judgements dated 22.1.2007 and 13.6.2007 of the Appellate Tribunal in the case of appeals filed by NTPC, on the issue of (a) Computation of Interest on Loan, (b) Consequence of Refinancing of Loan, (c) Depreciation as Deemed Repayment, (d) Admissibility of Depreciation with specific reference to the interpretation of Tariff Regulations as propounded in Appellate Tribunal's Judgments. As the said appeals against the Appellate Tribunal's Judgments were then pending adjudication before Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Commission adjourned the proceedings sine die in Petition No. 121 of 2007 vide RoP dated 12.8.2008. The relevant portion of the ROP dated 12.8.2008 is extracted hereunder:-

"4. Request made by the learned counsel was allowed by the Commission. The application was adjourned sine die. The applicant may get the application revived after decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the appeals pending"

This was done for the reason that the regulations as interpreted by Appellate Tribunal were under challenge before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 10.4.2018 dismissed Civil Appeal No. 5622 of 2007 and batch filed by the Commission and other beneficiaries. Thus, the Appellate Tribunal's Judgments attained finality. As the spirit of the regulations in question has authoritatively been interpreted in the Appellate Tribunal's Judgments, the Commission is duty bound to apply the regulations uniformly to all without any discrimination. Accordingly, on dismissal of the said appeals by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Commission disposed of Petition No. 121 of 2007 vide order dated 18.1.2019 permitting the Petitioner to submit their claims, wherever applicable, along with true up petitions for the 2014-19 period.

"6. Considering the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, we dispose of the present petition with the direction that the petitioner shall separately submit its claim in the light of the APTEL's judgments dated 22.1.2007 and 13.6.2007



alongwith the truing up petitions wherever applicable to be filed for the period 2014-19 in respect of concerned transmission assets.”

It is well settled law that an order or judgment from which review and/or appeal is allowed but not preferred by the aggrieved party attains finality. The said principle cannot be applied to the instant petitions as during the pendency of Petition No.121 of 2007, the Petitioner was not in a position to take up other legal remedies available to it under the law. Thus, we do not agree with the contentions of learned counsel for BRPL and BSPHCL that the present petitions cannot be entertained as the final orders passed therein have attained finality. In our opinion, the present matter significantly differs with the settled law wherein uniform treatment based regulations as interpreted by higher Courts is required to be given effect to without any discrimination to meet the ends of justice. For these reasons, we reject the said contentions of BRPL and BSPHCL and hold that in the facts and circumstances of this case, the general law that an order or judgment from which review and/or appeal is allowed but not preferred by the aggrieved party attains finality is not applicable here.”

9. In view of the above, the preliminary objection of BRPL is rejected. This order is issued considering the submissions made by the Petitioner vide affidavits dated 27.9.2019 and 23.7.2020, BRPL's reply vide affidavit dated 9.3.2021, UPPCL's reply vide affidavit dated 6.3.2020 and the Petitioner's rejoinder vide affidavit dated 16.3.2021 to the reply of UPPCL and BRPL.

10. The other issues raised by BRPL and UPPCL, and the clarifications given by the Petitioner are considered in the relevant portions of this order.

11. The hearing in this matter was held on 10.3.2021 and the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

12. BRPL has submitted that representation of consumer's interest and their participation in the tariff determination proceedings is an integral part of the hearing. Referring to Regulation 18 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999, BRPL has submitted that some Association, Forum or body Corporate recognized by the Commission may be asked to represent the interest of consumers during hearings of the instant petition. BRPL has further submitted that one of the said agencies may be instructed to represent the consumer's interest in the



instant case and the same is also provided for in Section 94(3) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

13. We have considered the above submissions of the BRPL. In terms of Regulation 3(6) and (8) of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Procedure for Making of Application for Determination of Tariff, Publication of Application and Other Related Matters) Regulations, 2004 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the 2004 Application Regulations’). Accordingly, the Petitioner has published Notice in the newspapers and vide affidavit dated 7.11.2019 has submitted that it has carried out the publication of the present tariff application in the newspapers dated 7.10.2019 in various languages. Further, the instant petition has been uploaded on the Petitioner’s website. The Notice published in newspaper contained a statement that the application made for determination of tariff is posted on the website of the applicant and the address of the website has also been given. The said Notice contained a statement that “suggestions or objections, if any, on the tariff proposals for determination of tariff may be filed by any person including the beneficiary in the Office of the Secretary, Central Electricity Regulatory Commission with a copy to the applicant at its Corporate Office within 30 days of publication of the notice. No suggestions/objections with regard to the present tariff petitions were received by the Commission before listing of the present petition for hearing. Though sufficient opportunity was given to the public to raise submit their comments/objections, no response has been received. Therefore, we are of the view that there is no need to engage any agency to represent the interest of consumers.

14. The Petitioner was asked to confirm, vide Technical Validation (TV) letter dated 2.7.2020, whether all the assets are currently in use and information in respect of decapitalisation. In response, the Petitioner confirmed that Asset-I and Asset-II are currently in use and there has been no decapitalisation. With regards to Asset-III i.e “420 kV 63 MVAR Bus Reactor at Kishenpur Sub-station with associated bays and



420/220 kV,250 MVA ICT III at Moga Sub-station with associated bays”, the Petitioner has submitted that there is no de-capitalization during 2014-19 and 2019-24. However, the Petitioner has submitted that 420/220 kV,250 MVA ICT III at Moga is not in use as the same was augmented to 500 MVA ICT on 1.7.2013 under project “Transmission System Associated with Augmentation of Transformation Capacity in Northern region Part-A”. Further, remaining part of Asset-III except 250 MVA ICT is in use. The Petitioner has also submitted that the Commission vide order dated 29.3.2020 in Petition No. 147/TT/2019 have decapitalised the cost of 250 MVA ICT from the cost of new 500 MVA ICT during 2009-14 period under project “Transmission System Associated with Augmentation of Transformation Capacity in Northern region Part-A” and since the de-capitalization was already done in new ICT the same has not been de-capitalized in the instant transmission system.

15. Having heard the representatives of the Petitioner and perused the material on record, we proceed to dispose of the petition.

16. The Petitioner has sought revision of the computation of the interest on loan, maintenance spares for working capital and depreciation allowed for the 2001-04 and 2004-09 period on the basis of the judgements of the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (APTEL) dated 22.1.2007 in Appeal No.81 of 2005 and 13.6.2007 in Appeal No. 139/2006. The APTEL while dealing with the issue of computation of interest on loan, in judgement dated 22.1.2007, observed that interest on loan for the period from 1.4.1998 to 31.3.2001 shall be computed only on normative loan repayment as per its judgement dated 14.11.2006 in Appeal Nos.94 and 96 of 2005. APTEL in its judgement dated 14.11.2006 set aside the Commission’s methodology of computation of loan on the actual repayment basis or normative repayment whichever is higher. The relevant portions of the judgement of 14.11.2006 is as follows:-



- “12. We have heard the arguments of the Senior Counsel(s) of appellant and respondents. We notice that the appellant has not challenged the formula for computing the annual repayment amount as provided in Appeal No. 96 of 2005 & IA No.117 of 2006 in Appeal No. 94 of 2005 para-22 of the impugned order and has only challenged the provisions at para 23 specifying that the amount of annual repayment for calculation of interest on loan is chosen higher of the normative debt and actual debt.
13. As mentioned earlier the servicing of the capital (equity or debt) is financed by the recovery of interest on debt capital and through earning of return on equity capital. The actual loan repayment has been normalized to 50% of the total capital by the formula in para 22 of the impugned order given in para 11 above. Once it has been decided and agreed that the financing plan would be based on normative debt–equity ratio of 50:50 and not the actual debt-equity ratio, the same normative basis should be adopted for recovery of cost of servicing the capital.
14. In the instant case since the normative debt-equity ratio of 50:50 has been adopted in the financing plan, the loan repayment should be computed based on normative debt. This is to ensure that whatever normative debt has been considered, tariff should ensure the recovery of the same normative debt and interest thereon.
18. In its Tariff Regulation of 2004 the Central Commission perhaps recognizing the aforesaid anomaly has dispensed with the practice of adopting higher of actual or normative repayment and has corrected the method of determination of quantum of debt repayment only on the basis of the normative debt with effect from 01.04.2004
19. In view of the above, the Central Commission is required to adopt normative debt repayment methodology for working out the interest on loan liability for the period 01.04.1998 to 31.03.2001.”

In view of the above, the interest allowed for the 2001-04 and 2004-09 periods is revised on the basis of the normative debt repayment methodology.

17. APTEL in judgement dated 13.6.2007 in Appeal No.139 of 2006 and others held that additional capital expenditure (ACE) after the date of commercial operation should also be considered for computation of maintenance spares. The relevant portion of the judgement dated 13.6.2007 is as under:

“Analysis and Decision

We are not inclined to agree with the contention of the respondents that escalation of 6% will take care of the additional capitalization. Escalation is meant to factor inflation and is allowed as per CERC Regulations whether or not additional capitalization takes place. Question before us is that: can the historical cost be frozen with the Commissioning of the station. It is quite normal and prudent to ensure earliest operation of the plant without necessarily 100% completion of plants and works, of course not at the cost of safety of the plant. Adding some of the plants and works after the commercial operation will reduce interest during construction. If technically it is possible to delay some of the plants or works, it is only prudent to do so. For example it is common to build redundancies in the plant at a little later stage. CERC’s own



regulations rightly recognized additional capitalization. It is pertinent to set out excerpts pertaining to additional capitalization from CERC (Terms & Conditions of Tariff) Regulation, 2004 Clause 18 as below:-

“Additional capitalization (1) The following capital expenditure within the original scope of work actually incurred after the date of commercial operation and up to the cut off date may be admitted by the Commission, subject to prudence check:

(i) Deferred liabilities

(ii) Works deferred for execution

(iii) Procurement of initial capital spares in the original scope of work, subject to ceiling specified in regulation 17.

(iv) Liabilities to meet award of arbitration or for compliance of the order or decree of a court; and

(v) On account of change in law.

Provided that original scope of work along with estimates of expenditure shall be submitted along with the application for provisional tariff.

Provided further that a list of the deferred liabilities and works deferred for execution shall be submitted along with the application for final tariff after the date of commercial operation of the generating station.”

It is clear from the abovementioned Clause 18 of the CERC Regulations that additional capitalization after the date of commercial operation is recognized as part of the capital expenditure. Historical cost does not literally mean that the cost on the date of the commercial operation. The term historical cost is used so as to distinguish it from ‘book value’ or ‘the replacement cost’. The cost of maintenance spares limited to 1% of the historical cost corresponds to the plant and equipment and installations which are required to be maintained. If the cost of additional equipment is not included in the historical cost, how spares for the additional equipment be procured for maintenance of the additional equipment. In this view of the matter, the CERC needs to examine afresh in the light of the aforesaid observations.”

18. In view of the above, the maintenance spares to be considered for computation of working capital for the 2001-04 and 2004-09 periods are also required to be revised taking into consideration the ACE after the date of commercial operation. It is observed that, in the instant petition, there has been an ACE of ₹517.58 lakh in case of Asset I and ₹1359.48 lakh in case of Asset II in 2001-04 period and no additional capitalization in 2004-09 period, which has necessitated a revision in maintenance spares. However, ACE on account of FERV adjustment in capital cost before 2001 and during 2001-04 period shall not be considered for calculation of maintenance spares.



19. As regards depreciation, APTEL in its judgement dated 13.6.2007 in Appeal No.139 of 2006 observed that depreciation is an expense and it cannot be deployed for deemed repayment of loan and accordingly directed the Commission to compute the outstanding loan afresh. The relevant portion of the judgement is as follows:

“Analysis and Decision

In the orders of this Tribunal dated November 14, 2006 and January 24, 2007 it has been laid down that the computation of outstanding loan will be on normative basis only (instead of normative or actual whichever is higher). In view of this there is no question of any adjustment of the depreciation amount as deemed repayment of loan.

It is to be understood that the depreciation is an expense and not an item allowed for repayment of loan. If a corporation does not borrow, it would not mean that the corporation will not be allowed any depreciation. Depreciation is an expense it represents a decline in the value of asset because of use, wear or obsolescence. The Accounting Principles Board of USA defines depreciation as under:-

“The cost of a productive facility is one of the costs of the service it renders during its useful economic life. Generally accepted accounting principles require that this cost be spread over the expected useful life of the facility in such a way as to allocate it as equitably as possible to the periods during which services are obtained from the use of the facility. This procedure is known as depreciation accounting, a system of accounting which aims to distribute the cost or other basic value of tangible capital assets, less salvage (if any), over the estimated useful life of the unit (which may be a group of assets) in a systematic and rational manner. It is a process of allocation, not of valuation”

It is well established that the depreciation is an expense and therefore, it cannot be deployed for deemed repayment of loan. In this view of the matter the CERC shall need to make a fresh computation of outstanding loan in the light of the aforesaid observations.”

20. In view of the above directions of APTEL, the outstanding loan allowed for the transmission assets for the 2001-04 and 2004-09 tariff periods is being revised in the instant order.

21. The revision of tariff allowed for 2001-04 and 2004-09 tariff periods necessitates the revision of tariff allowed for the 2009-14 period, which is also being done in the instant order. The implementation of the directions of the APTEL in case of the Petitioner had been kept pending, waiting for the outcome of the Civil Appeals filed before the Hon’ble Supreme Court. Hence, taking into consideration the facts of



the case and keeping in view the interest of the consumers, we are of the view that the beneficiaries should not be burdened with the carrying cost for the difference in the tariff allowed earlier and allowed in the instant order for the period 2001-04, 2004-09 and 2009-14 tariff periods. Therefore, the Petitioner will neither claim nor pay any carrying cost from or to the beneficiaries for the difference, if any, in the tariff allowed earlier and that being allowed in the instant order. Further, the said difference in tariff shall be recovered/ paid over a period of six months from the date of issue of this order.

Revision of Transmission Charges Allowed for the 2001-04, 2004-09 and 2009-14 Tariff Periods

2001-04 Period

22. The Commission vide order dated 18.5.2004 in Petition No. 43/2002 approved the tariff for Asset-I, Asset-II and Asset-III for the 2001-04 period, which was revised by the Commission vide order dated 8.2.2008 in Petition No. 43/2002. The revised tariff approved vide order dated 8.2.2008 is as follows:

(₹ in lakh)			
Particulars	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Asset-I			
Depreciation	1166.37	1166.37	1166.37
Interest on Loan	5022.22	4477.84	2760.38
Return on Equity	723.20	723.20	723.20
Advance against Depreciation	2082.47	744.74	0.00
Interest on Working Capital	233.97	200.68	156.27
O&M Expenses	167.13	177.15	187.78
Total	9395.35	7489.98	4994.00
Asset-II			
Depreciation	988.89	988.89	988.89
Interest on Loan	4185.47	3967.97	2706.51
Return on Equity	1237.96	1237.96	1237.96
Advance against Depreciation	1123.42	0.00	0.00
Interest on Working Capital	198.81	175.7	154.33
O&M Expenses	173.14	183.53	194.54
Total	7907.70	6554.06	5282.24



Asset-III			
Depreciation	57.55	57.55	57.55
Interest on Loan	178.93	162.76	103.33
Return on Equity	28.93	28.93	28.93
Advance against Depreciation	60.59	0	0
Interest on Working Capital	9.11	7.78	6.79
O&M Expenses	26.04	27.61	29.26
Total	361.15	284.61	225.86

23. Further, the Commission vide its order dated 24.2.2006 in Petition No. 84/2004 had approved the impact of ACE on Interest on Loan and Return on Equity as follows:

(₹ in lakh)				
Particular	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	Total
Asset-I				
Additional Capitalisation	422.42	95.16	0.00	517.58
Interest on Loan (IoL)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Return on Equity (RoE)	0.00	67.59	82.81	150.40
Total (IoL+ RoE)	0.00	67.59	82.81	150.40
Asset-II				
Additional Capitalisation	709.42	490.75	159.31	1359.48
Interest on Loan (IoL)	0.00	72.53	87.18	159.71
Return on Equity (RoE)	0.00	21.71	36.73	58.45
Total (IoL+ RoE)	0.00	94.24	123.92	218.16

It was allowed to be recovered by the Petitioner from the Respondents along with the tariff for the respective period dealt in order dated 24.2.2006 in Petition No. 84/2004.

24. The Petitioner has claimed the following revised transmission charges for the transmission assets for the 2001-04 period in the instant petition:

(₹ in lakh)			
Particulars	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Asset-I			
Depreciation	1166.37	1166.37	1166.37
Interest on Loan	5014.39	4467.32	2753.12
Return on Equity	723.20	790.79	806.01
Advance against Depreciation	2082.47	767.34	0.00
Interest on Working Capital	234.07	201.50	156.81
O&M Expenses	167.13	177.15	187.78
Total	9387.62	7570.46	5070.08
Asset-II			
Depreciation	988.89	988.89	988.89
Interest on Loan	4185.42	4045.35	2796.08
Return on Equity	1237.96	1259.67	1274.69



Advance against Depreciation	1123.79	0.00	0.00
Interest on Working Capital	199.23	176.87	155.66
O&M Expenses	173.14	183.53	194.54
Total	7908.43	6654.31	5409.86
Asset-III			
Depreciation	57.55	57.55	57.55
Interest on Loan	178.69	162.50	103.14
Return on Equity	28.93	28.93	28.93
Advance against Depreciation	60.59	0.00	0.00
Interest on Working Capital	9.11	7.77	6.78
O&M Expenses	26.04	27.61	29.26
Total	360.91	284.37	225.67

25. UPPCL has submitted that the admitted cumulative depreciation for Asset-I, Asset-II and Asset-III upto 31.3.2014 is ₹3499.11 lakh, ₹2966.67 lakh and ₹172.65 lakh respectively. The admitted IOL for Asset-I, Asset-II and Asset-III is ₹2760.38 lakh, ₹2793.69 lakh and ₹103.33 lakh respectively, against which the the Petitioner has claimed revised IoL of ₹2758.12 lakh, ₹2796.68 lakh and ₹107.14 lakh respectively. Further, UPPCL has submitted that the calculation of weighted average rate of interest considered by the Petitioner does not tally with the weighted average rate of interest specified in the body of the Petition for Assets-I, Asset-II and Asset-III. Further, no calculation has been submitted for weighted average rate of interest considered for Asset-I and Asset-III. In response, the Petitioner has submitted that weighted average rate of interest have been considered as allowed by Commission in its orders for 2001-04 period and the Petitioner has submitted the computation for IoL in the working sheets for tariff calculation.

26. We have considered the Petitioner's claim and UPPCL's submission. The tariff is allowed for the transmission assets on the basis of the following:

- a) Admitted capital cost as on 1.4.2001 vide order dated 8.2.2008 in Petition No. 43/2002 for
 - i. Asset-I: ₹43506.00 lakh after adjusting FERV difference of ₹453.33 lakh upto 2000-01



- ii. Asset-II: ₹39256.92 lakh after adjusting FERV difference of ₹5.73 lakh upto 2000-01
 - iii. Asset-III: ₹1598.49 lakh after adjusting FERV difference of ₹15.21 lakh upto 2000-01
- b) Weighted Average Rate of Interest on actual loan adopted from order dated 8.2.2008 in Petition No. 43/2002.
- c) Weighted Average Rate of Depreciation, Rate of Interest for Working Capital and O&M Expenses as per order dated 8.2.2008 in Petition No. 43/2002.
- d) There is ACE during 2001-04 period, and hence, it is pertinent to revise maintenance spares component for calculating IWC.

27. In view of the above, the revised transmission charges allowed for Asset-I, Asset-II and Asset-III for the 2001-04 tariff period is as follows:

(₹ in lakh)			
Particulars	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Asset-I			
Depreciation	1166.37	1166.37	1166.37
Interest on Loan	5014.39	4467.32	2753.12
Return on Equity	723.20	723.20	723.20
Advance against Depreciation	2082.47	767.33	0.00
Interest on Working Capital	234.07	201.50	156.81
O&M Expenses	167.13	177.15	187.78
Total	9387.61	7502.87	4987.27
Asset-II			
Depreciation	988.89	988.89	988.89
Interest on Loan	4185.42	3967.30	2703.11
Return on Equity	1237.96	1237.96	1237.96
Advance against Depreciation	1123.79	0.00	0.00
Interest on Working Capital	199.23	176.86	155.90
O&M Expenses	173.14	183.53	194.54
Total	7908.44	6554.54	5280.41
Asset-III			
Depreciation	57.55	57.55	57.55
Interest on Loan	178.70	162.51	103.15
Return on Equity	28.93	28.93	28.93
Advance against Depreciation	60.59	0.00	0.00
Interest on Working Capital	9.11	7.77	6.78
O&M Expenses	26.04	27.61	29.26



Total	360.92	284.37	225.67
--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

28. The AFC allowed earlier for 2001-04 period vide order dated 8.2.2008 in Petition No. 43/2002, the revised AFC claimed in the instant petition and AFC allowed in the instant order is as follows:

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Asset-I			
AFC approved vide order dated 8.2.2008 in Petition No. 43/2002	9395.35	7489.98	4994.00
AFC claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	9387.62	7570.46	5070.08
AFC allowed in the instant order	9387.61	7502.87	4987.27
Asset-II			
AFC approved vide order dated 8.2.2008 in Petition No. 43/2002	7907.70	6554.06	5282.24
AFC claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	7908.43	6654.31	5409.86
AFC allowed in the instant order	7908.44	6554.54	5280.41
Asset-III			
AFC approved vide order dated 8.2.2008 in Petition No. 43/2002	361.15	284.61	225.86
AFC claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	360.91	284.37	225.67
AFC allowed in the instant order	360.92	284.37	225.67

2004-09 Period

29. The Commission in order dated 19.5.2008 in Petition No. 84/2004 had approved the following transmission charges for Assets-I, Asset-II and Asset-III for the 2004-09 period:

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Asset-I					
Depreciation	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32
Interest on Loan	1741.45	1558.7	1375.96	1193.21	1023.04
Return on Equity	705.26	705.26	705.26	705.26	705.26
Advance against Depreciation	342.85	1565.00	1565.00	1565.00	1380.61
Interest on	127.88	149.43	149.95	150.68	148.66



Working Capital					
O&M Expenses	118.75	123.49	128.58	133.48	139.05
Total	4203.51	5269.20	5092.07	4914.95	4563.94
Asset-II					
Depreciation	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48
Interest on Loan	2068.13	1814.72	1588.17	1373.54	1166.91
Return on Equity	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63
Advance against Depreciation	552.91	1735.00	1735.00	1735.00	1617.71
Interest on Working Capital	134.56	153.75	153.04	152.72	150.72
O&M Expenses	121.42	126.26	131.47	136.48	142.17
Total	5014.12	5966.84	5744.79	5534.85	5214.63
Asset-III					
Depreciation	57.07	57.07	57.07	57.07	57.07
Interest on Loan	65.90	59.05	52.20	45.36	38.96
Return on Equity	25.31	25.31	25.31	25.31	25.31
Advance against Depreciation	0.00	0.00	0.49	45.41	38.81
Interest on Working Capital	6.14	6.20	6.29	7.15	7.14
O&M Expenses	56.24	58.50	60.84	63.26	65.80
Total	210.66	206.14	202.20	243.56	233.10

30. The Petitioner has claimed the following revised transmission charges for the transmission assets for the 2004-09 period in this petition:

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Asset-I					
Depreciation	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32
Interest on Loan	1742.85	1559.86	1376.85	1193.86	1023.45
Return on Equity	705.26	705.26	705.26	705.26	705.26
Advance against Depreciation	305.28	1569.24	1569.24	1569.24	1384.36
Interest on Working Capital	128.35	150.69	151.27	152.07	150.12
O&M Expenses	118.75	123.49	128.58	133.48	139.05
Total	4167.81	5275.86	5098.52	4921.23	4569.56
Asset-II					
Depreciation	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48
Interest on Loan	2072.06	1818.44	1591.70	1376.92	1170.11
Return on Equity	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63
Advance against Depreciation	501.65	1736.63	1736.63	1736.63	1619.45
Interest on Working Capital	135.62	155.84	155.25	155.06	153.19



O&M Expenses	121.42	126.26	131.47	136.48	142.17
Total	4967.87	5974.27	5752.16	5542.20	5222.04
Asset-III					
Depreciation	57.07	57.07	57.07	57.07	57.07
Interest on Loan	65.95	59.09	52.24	45.38	38.98
Return on Equity	25.31	25.31	25.31	25.31	25.31
Advance against Depreciation	0.00	0.00	0.32	45.56	38.95
Interest on Working Capital	6.14	6.20	6.28	7.16	7.15
O&M Expenses	56.24	58.50	60.84	63.26	65.80
Total	210.71	206.18	202.06	243.74	233.25

31. UPPCL has submitted that the admitted cumulative depreciation for Assets-I, Asset-II and Asset-III are ₹5386.6 lakh, ₹5087.4 lakh and ₹285.35 lakh respectively. The admitted IoL for Assets-I, Asset-II and Asset-III are ₹1023.04 lakh, ₹1266.91 lakh and ₹38.96 lakh against which the Petitioner has claimed revised IoL of ₹1023.49 lakh, ₹1279.11 lakh and ₹38.98 lakh respectively. Further, the weighted average rate of interest considered in respect of Asset-II does not tally the body of the petition and requested that the Petitioner be directed to submit the reason for inconsistency. In response, the Petitioner has submitted that weighted average rate of interest have been considered as allowed by the Commission in its orders for 2004-09 period.

32. We have considered the Petitioner's claim and UPPCL's submission. The tariff is allowed for the transmission assets on the basis of the following:

- a) Admitted capital cost as on 1.4.2004 vide order dated 19.5.2008 in Petition No. 84/2004 for:
 - i. Asset-I: ₹43625.95 lakh (after adjustment of FERV difference of ₹(-) 397.63 lakh for 2001-04 period)
 - ii. Asset-II: ₹40529.84 lakh (after adjustment of FERV difference of ₹(-) 86.56 lakh for 2001-04 period)
 - iii. Asset-III: ₹1585.33 lakh (after adjustment of FERV difference of ₹(-) 13.16 lakh for 2001-04 period)
- b) Weighted Average Rate of Interest on actual loan adopted from order dated 19.5.2008 in Petition No. 84/2004.



- c) Weighted Average Rate of Depreciation, Rate of Interest for Working Capital and O&M Expenses as per order dated 19.5.2008 in Petition No. 84/2004.
- d) As there was no ACE during 2004-09 period, there is no requirement to revise the maintenance spares component for calculating IWC.

33. In view of the above, the revised transmission charges allowed for Assets-I, Asset-II and Asset-III for the 2004-09 tariff period is as follows:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Asset-I					
Depreciation	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32	1167.32
Interest on Loan	1742.87	1559.85	1376.85	1193.85	1023.45
Return on Equity	705.26	705.26	705.26	705.26	705.26
Advance against Depreciation	305.28	1569.24	1569.24	1569.24	1384.36
Interest on Working Capital	128.35	150.69	151.27	152.07	150.12
O&M Expenses	118.75	123.49	128.58	133.48	139.05
Total	4167.82	5275.85	5098.52	4921.22	4569.56
Asset-II					
Depreciation	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48	1017.48
Interest on Loan	2063.56	1810.16	1583.57	1368.89	1162.22
Return on Equity	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63	1119.63
Advance against Depreciation	616.45	1736.63	1736.63	1736.63	1619.45
Interest on Working Capital	137.76	156.00	155.43	155.26	153.42
O&M Expenses	121.42	126.26	131.47	136.48	142.17
Total	5076.29	5966.16	5744.21	5534.37	5214.37
Asset-III					
Depreciation	57.07	57.07	57.07	57.07	57.07
Interest on Loan	65.96	59.10	52.24	45.39	38.98
Return on Equity	25.31	25.31	25.31	25.31	25.31
Advance against Depreciation	0.00	0.00	0.24	45.56	38.95
Interest on Working Capital	6.14	6.20	6.28	7.16	7.15
O&M Expenses	56.24	58.50	60.84	63.26	65.8
Total	210.72	206.18	201.99	243.75	233.25

34. The AFC allowed earlier for 2004-09 period vide order dated 19.5.2008 in Petition No. 84/2004, the revised AFC claimed in the instant petition and AFC allowed in the instant order is given below:



(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Asset-I					
AFC approved vide order dated 19.5.2008 in Petition No. 84/2004	4203.51	5269.20	5092.07	4914.95	4563.94
AFC claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	4167.81	5275.86	5098.52	4921.23	4569.56
AFC allowed in the instant order	4167.82	5275.85	5098.52	4921.22	4569.56
Asset-II					
AFC approved vide order dated 19.5.2008 in Petition No. 84/2004	5014.12	5966.84	5744.79	5534.85	5214.63
AFC claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	4967.87	5974.27	5752.16	5542.20	5222.04
AFC allowed in the instant order	5076.29	5966.16	5744.21	5534.37	5214.37
Asset-III					
AFC approved vide order dated 19.5.2008 in Petition No. 84/2004	210.66	206.14	202.20	243.56	233.10
AFC claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	210.71	206.18	202.06	243.74	233.25
AFC allowed in the instant order	210.72	206.18	201.99	243.75	233.25

2009-14 Period

35. The Commission vide order dated 6.1.2011 in Petition No. 122/2010 had approved the tariff for the transmission assets for the 2009-14 period and in order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014 had trued up the tariff allowed for the 2009-14 period that was earlier allowed in order dated 6.1.2011 and the same is as follows:

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Depreciation	4468.79	4468.79	4468.79	4468.79	936.51
Interest on Loan	1899.56	1564.30	1266.13	968.15	756.41
Return on Equity	2467.90	2558.30	2560.81	2560.81	2591.6
Interest on Working Capital	215.00	211.67	207.36	203.14	127.82
O&M Expenses	616.46	651.90	688.92	728.71	770.20
Total	9667.71	9454.96	9192.01	8929.60	5182.54



36. The Petitioner has claimed the following revised transmission charges for the transmission assets for the 2009-14 period in this petition:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Depreciation	4468.79	4468.79	4468.79	4468.79	936.51
Interest on Loan	1902.62	1567.24	1268.97	970.87	758.88
Return on Equity	2467.90	2558.30	2560.81	2560.81	2591.60
Interest on Working Capital	215.07	211.73	207.42	203.20	127.88
O&M Expenses	616.46	651.90	688.92	728.71	770.20
Total	9670.84	9457.96	9194.91	8932.37	5185.07

37. UPPCL has submitted that the admitted cumulative depreciation is ₹1811.67 lakh and the admitted IoL is ₹756.41 lakh against which the Petitioner has claimed revised IoL of ₹758.88 lakh. Further, the details of weighted average rate of interest for claim of IoL has not been submitted by the Petitioner. Further, the figure of cumulative depreciation upto 31.3.2014 is ₹36659.45 lakh against which ₹57160.21 lakh has been considered by the Petitioner. UPPCL has submitted that Petitioner should explain the discrepancies. In response, the Petitioner submitted that weighted average rate of interest has been considered as allowed by Commission in its orders for 2009-14. Further, the Cumulative depreciation as on 31.3.2014 is ₹57160.21 lakh and the Petitioner has submitted the computation in the excel sheet for tariff calculation for 2009-14 period.

38. BRPL has submitted that true up has to be done based on actual tax rate applicable to the company and based on the truing up of tariff, if the recovered tariff exceeds the tariff approved, the company shall refund to beneficiaries along with simple interest. BRPL submitted that the Transmission Licensees have been allowed huge tax benefits under the Income Tax Act, 1961 in the form of Tax Holiday for enterprises engaged in infrastructure development etc. as per Section 80 IA of the Income Tax Act as well as other benefits like the higher depreciation allowed in initial



years. Further, BRPL has submitted that the Petitioner was allowed the grossing up of RoE in the order dated 11.01.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014, but the claim for grossing up can be allowed only if the Petitioner can submit any document indicating payment of tax on its transmission business. Therefore, the Commission may revisit the order to correct any incorrect decision in accordance with the Hon'ble APTEL's Judgment dated 12.5.2015 in Appeal Nos. 129 & batch.

39. In response, the Petitioner has submitted that in accordance with Regulation 15(3) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations, ROE shall be grossed up with MAT/Corporate Income tax rate of the transmission licensee and not the tax rate of the assets or region. The tax liability of a person is determined considering total income of that person, and not different segment wise income, unless otherwise provided in the Income Tax Act. The Petitioner has further submitted that the treatment and impact of benefits under Section 80IA of the Income Tax Act and higher depreciation, availed by the Petitioner has also been explained. As regards the objection of BRPL that the Commission has not given due consideration to various aspects while determining the gross up rate for return on equity in Petition No 363/TT/2014 is not correct and there has been no error in tariff order issued by the Commission vide order dated 11.01.2016 in Petition No 363/TT/2014.

40. We have considered the Petitioner, UPPCL and BRPL's submission. The tariff is allowed for the transmission assets on the basis of the following:

- a) Admitted capital cost of ₹85741.12 lakh as on 1.4.2009;
- b) Weighted Average Rate of Interest on actual loan derived/ adopted from order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No 363/TT/2014;
- c) Weighted Average Rate of Depreciation as per order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No 363/TT/2014.

41. In view of the above, the revised transmission charges allowed for the transmission assets for the 2009-14 tariff period is as follows.



(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Depreciation	4468.79	4468.79	4468.79	4468.79	933.64
Interest on Loan	1895.81	1560.70	1262.65	964.85	753.46
Return on Equity	2467.90	2558.30	2560.81	2560.81	2591.60
Interest on Working Capital	214.92	211.60	207.29	203.07	127.70
O&M Expenses	616.46	651.90	688.92	728.71	770.20
Total	9663.88	9451.29	9188.46	8926.23	5176.60

42. The AFC allowed earlier for 2009-14 period vide order dated 6.1.2011 in Petition No. 122/2010 and subsequently vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014, the revised AFC claimed in the instant petition and AFC allowed in the instant order is given below:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
AFC approved vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No 363/TT/2014	9667.71	9454.96	9192.01	8929.60	5182.54
AFC claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	9670.84	9457.96	9194.91	8932.37	5185.07
AFC allowed in the instant order	9663.88	9451.29	9188.46	8926.23	5176.60

Truing up of Annual Fixed Charges for the 2014-19 Tariff Period

43. The details of the transmission charges claimed by the Petitioner in respect of the transmission asset is as under:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Depreciation	938.96	938.96	938.96	938.96	938.96
Interest on Loan	656.65	487.09	342.26	372.69	449.93
Return on Equity	2593.58	2605.48	2604.15	2604.15	2611.16
Interest on Working Capital	135.24	132.93	130.87	132.97	136.32
O&M Expenses	702.67	726.48	750.16	775.37	800.95
Total	5027.10	4890.94	4766.40	4824.14	4937.32

44. The details of the Interest on Working Capital (IWC) claimed by the Petitioner in respect of the transmission asset are as under:



(₹ in lakh)

Particular	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
O & M Expenses	58.56	60.54	62.51	64.61	66.75
Maintenance Spares	105.40	108.97	112.52	116.31	120.14
Receivables	837.85	815.16	794.40	804.02	822.89
Total Working Capital	1001.81	984.67	969.43	984.94	1009.78
Rate of Interest (%)	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.50
Interest on Working Capital	135.24	132.93	130.87	132.97	136.32

Capital Cost as on 1.4.2014

45. The capital cost of the existing project has been calculated in accordance with Regulation 9(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

46. The Commission vide order 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014 had allowed capital cost as on 1.4.2014 of ₹85741.12 lakh and no ACE was projected while determining tariff for the 2014-19 period for transmission asset.

47. BRPL has submitted that the Petitioner has opted for deemed cost exemption as per para D7 AA of IND AS 101 'First time Adoption' of Indian Accounting Standard which is resulting in increase of tariff. The adoption of Indian Accounting Standard is for the purposes of the Companies Act, 2013 and not for the purposes of the Tariff Regulations which provides its own procedure for computation of tariff. In response, the Petitioner vide affidavit dated 16.3.2021 has submitted that the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA), in 2015, had notified the Companies (Indian Accounting Standards (IND AS) Rules 2015, which stipulated mandatory adoption and applicability of IND AS beginning from the accounting period 2016-17 for companies having net worth more than ₹500 crore. As the Petitioner adopted IND AS from 2015-16 onwards, the Gross Block less Accumulated Depreciation as on 1.4.2015 is considered as deemed cost as on the date of transition i.e. 1st April 2015 in the books of accounts. As such, in case of assets which achieved COD before 1.4.2015, the gross block of the assets reflects gross block less accumulated depreciation as on 31.3.2015 in the books of accounts. There has been no change in the capital cost or



ACE considered for claiming transmission tariff on account of adoption of IND AS. For the purpose of computation of tariff, the actual capital cost and ACE has been claimed/ considered. Thus, there is no impact in tariff at all on account of adoption of IND AS at any point of time. The said treatment only relates to the “Gross Block amount as per Books” which is required to be reported in certain Tariff Forms (Eg: Form 4A, Form 5) as per the formats prescribed by the Commission. The Petitioner has submitted that the Original Gross Block amount as per books is required to be disclosed in the tariff forms. However, it has no impact on the tariff being claimed.

48. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and BRPL. The Commission vide order dated 24.1.2021 in Petition No. 136/TT/2020 has already dealt with the concerns of the Respondent. Thus, we do not go into the issue again. The relevant paragraph of the order are extracted as under:

“35. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and BRPL. BRPL has contended that the new accounting standards adopted would result in higher tariffs. The Petitioner in response has clarified that the new standards adopted by it would not have any impact on the tariff to be determined by the Commission. The new accounting standards have been adopted by the Petitioner as per the requirement under the Companies Act, 2013. BRPL has merely stated adoption of new accounting standards would lead to higher tariff and has not stated how it would lead to higher tariff. The tariff is determined for the transmission assets owned by the Petitioner on the basis of the applicable tariff regulations, in the instant case the 2014 Tariff Regulations and 2019 Tariff Regulations. As the tariff is determined on the basis of the tariff regulations, we are of the view that the adoption of the new accounting standards by the Petitioner would not have any impact on the tariff that is determined purely on the basis of the applicable tariff regulations.”

Additional Capital Expenditure (ACE)

49. The Petitioner has not claimed ACE during 2014-19 tariff period. The capital cost approved for the transmission assets from 1.4.2014 to 31.3.2019 is as under:

Admitted Capital Cost as on 1.4.2014	ACE	Total Capital Cost as on 31.3.2019
	2014-19	
85741.12	0.00	85741.12

(₹ in lakh)



Debt-Equity ratio

50. The debt-equity ratio has been allowed in accordance with Regulation 19(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. As per Regulation 19(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations, the debt:equity ratio allowed by the Commission for determination of tariff for the period ending on 31.3.2014 shall be considered. Accordingly, already admitted debt-equity ratio for the period ending on 31.3.2014 has been considered for the purpose of truing up of the tariff of the transmission asset for the 2014-19 tariff period. The details of the debt-equity ratio as on 1.4.2014 and 31.3.2019 of the transmission asset is as under:

Particulars	Capital Cost as on 1.4.2014 (₹ in lakh)	(%)	Total Capital Cost as on 31.3.2019 (₹ in lakh)	(%)
Debt	72525.42	84.59	72525.42	84.59
Equity	13215.70	15.41	13215.70	15.41
Total	85741.12	100.00	85741.12	100.00

Depreciation

51. UPPCL has submitted that the capital cost is ₹85741.12 lakh for the entire 2014-19 period. The COD is 1.2.2001 and 12 years have elapsed as on 1.2.2013. The remaining depreciable value is ₹19718.29 lakh in 2014-15 and the balance period of use is 21 years. Therefore, the uniform yearly amount of depreciation during the rest of the life of the asset up to 1.2.2035 will be ₹938.97 lakh. The life of the combined assets is 34 years. UPPCL has submitted that the cumulative depreciation as on 31.3.2014 considered by the Petitioner is ₹57160.21 lakh whereas as per the figures submitted in the petition the cumulative depreciation is ₹36659.45 lakh. In response, the Petitioner has submitted that the cumulative depreciation as on 31.3.2014 is ₹57160.21 lakh and the same may be referred from calculation submitted in the petition and depreciation is computed as per 2014 Tariff Regulations.



52. We have considered the submission of the Petitioner and UPPCL. The transmission asset has already completed 12 years of life as on 31.3.2012, the remaining depreciable value has been spread across the balance useful life of 22 years in accordance with Regulation 17(4) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations and Regulation 27(5) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The depreciation allowed is as under:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Depreciation					
Opening Gross Block	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12
ACE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Closing Gross Block	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12
Average Gross Block	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12
Freehold Land	320.57	320.57	320.57	320.57	320.57
Weighted average rate of Depreciation (WAROD) (%)	spreading				
Balance useful life of the asset (Year)	21	20	19	18	17
Elapsed life at the beginning of the year (Year)	13	14	15	16	17
Aggregate Depreciable Value	76878.50	76878.50	76878.50	76878.50	76878.50
Depreciation during the year	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64
Aggregate Cumulative Depreciation	58205.70	59139.34	60072.98	61006.62	61940.26
Remaining Aggregate Depreciable Value	18672.80	17739.16	16805.52	15871.88	14938.24

53. The details of depreciation approved in order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up deprecitaaion allowed in this order is shown in the table below:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Approved vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014	936.51	936.51	936.51	936.51	936.51
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	938.96	938.96	938.96	938.96	938.96
Allowed after true-up in this order	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64



Interest on Loan (IoL)

54. The Petitioner has claimed the weighted average rate of IoL, based on its actual loan portfolio and rate of interest.

55. UPPCL submitted that the capital cost is ₹85741.12 lakh and debt-equity ratio is 84.59:15.41. The debt is ₹72528.13 lakh. The cumulative depreciation as on 31.3.2014 considered by the Petitioner is ₹57160.21 lakh whereas as per the figures submitted in the Petition the cumulative depreciation is ₹36659.45 lakh. UPPCL has submitted that the Petitioner be directed to revise the IoL claimed. In response, the Petitioner has submitted that cumulative repayment as on 1.4.2014 is ₹57160.21 lakh and same can be derived from tariff calculation submitted in the petition. Further, IoL is computed as per the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

56. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and UPPCL. IoL has been calculated based on actual interest rate submitted by the Petitioner, in accordance with Regulation 26 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. Trued up IoL allowed in respect of the transmission asset is as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Gross Normative Loan	72525.42	72525.42	72525.42	72525.42	72525.42
Cumulative Repayments upto Previous Year	57272.06	58205.70	59139.34	60072.98	61006.62
Net Loan-Opening	15253.36	14319.72	13386.08	12452.44	11518.80
Additions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Repayment during the year	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64
Net Loan-Closing	14319.72	13386.08	12452.44	11518.80	10585.16
Average Loan	14786.54	13852.90	12919.26	11985.62	11051.98
Weighted Average Rate of Interest on Loan (%)	4.408	3.490	2.629	3.085	4.039
Interest on Loan	651.83	483.47	339.67	369.82	446.38

57. The details of IoL approved in order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up IoL allowed in the instant order is shown in the table below:



(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Approved vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014	642.11	459.98	250.12	232.06	214.01
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	656.65	487.09	342.26	372.69	449.93
Allowed after true-up in this order	651.83	483.47	339.67	369.82	446.38

Return on Equity (RoE)

58. UPPCL submitted that the grossed up rate of interest on Return on Equity for the years 2016-17 to 2018-19 has been worked out by the Petitioner based on presumptive values of MAT rate and therefore, the Petitioner be directed to submit the figures of RoE derived on the basis of MAT rates approved by the Income Tax Authorities.

59. In response, the Petitioner submitted that effective rate of tax considered for the years 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 are based on Assessment Order issued by IT Authorities, for the purpose of grossing up of RoE rate. Further, the effective rate of tax considered for the years 2017-18 and 2018-19 are based on the IT returns filed, for the purpose of grossing up of RoE rates of respective years. The Petitioner has further submitted that the Commission has granted true-up tariff of 2014-19 tariff period vide order dated 18.4.2020 in Petition No. 247/TT/2019, order dated 27.4.2020 in Petition No. 274/TT/2019, order dated 23.4.2020 in Petition No. 245/TT/2019 and order dated 16.4.2020 in Petition No. 307/TT/2019 for transmission assets under the respective petitions, whereas following effective tax rate based (for tariff block 2014-19) on notified MAT rates are considered for the purpose of grossing-up of ROE:

Year	Notified MAT rates (inclusive of surcharge & cess) (%)	Effective tax (in %)	Grossed up RoE [Base Rate/(1-t)] (in %)
2014-15	20.961	20.961	19.611
2015-16	21.342	21.342	19.706



2016-17	21.342	21.342	19.706
2017-18	21.342	21.342	19.706
2018-19	21.549	21.549	19.758

60. The Petitioner has submitted that accordingly the tariff for each year of the 2014-19 tariff period is being determined by the Commission considering the above Effective Tax percentage to arrive at grossed up ROE. The grossed up ROE and effective tax rate for tariff block 2014-19 has already been determined by the Commission. The Petitioner has requested to allow the differential tariff on account of the trued up ROE based on effective tax rate calculated on completion of IT assessment/re-assessment for the years 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 on receipt of the respective assessment orders, directly from the beneficiaries, on year to year basis as provided in the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

61. BRPL has submitted that the information regarding Income Tax Assessment submitted by the Petitioner is in respect of the Petitioner company as a whole and not in respect of the tax on the transmission business in respect of the Northern Region. Accordingly, the said information is not the relevant information for the purposes of effective tax rate. BRPL has submitted that infrastructure transmission companies have been allowed huge tax benefits under the Income Tax Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as "1961 Act") in the form of Tax Holiday for enterprises engaged in infrastructure development etc. as per Section 80IA of the 1961 Act and other benefits like the higher depreciation allowed in initial years. BRPL has submitted that the Petitioner has already stated on affidavit that the effective tax rate is zero and accordingly the effective tax rate for the earlier tariff period (2009-14) would also be zero since the benefits of the tax holiday under Section 80IA of the 1961 Act and other benefits like the higher depreciation etc. were also applicable during earlier tariff period. Regulation 49 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations restricts the claim of tax amount



only to deferred tax liabilities up to 31.3.2009 whenever it will materialize. BRPL has also submitted that the claims of deferred tax are required to be adjusted for the tariff period 2004-09.

62. In response, the Petitioner has submitted that that it does not file income tax return on transmission business in respect of a particular region as the company has a single PAN and there is no provision in the 1961 Act to file separate returns on the basis of nature of business being undertaken by any entity. All the documents in support of income tax (either returns or assessment orders) are for the Petitioner's company as a whole. The Auditor's Certificate clearly showing income from transmission income and income from other segments along with copy of assessment order/income return which is relevant to derive the effective tax rate has already been submitted in Petition No. 24/TT/2020. Further, the region wise Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Accounts for Northern Region 1 for 2014-19, Northern Region 2 for 2014-19 and Northern Region 3 for 2016-19 and Cost Audit Report for 2017-18, 2018-19 are enclosed as Enclosure-2A, Enclosure-2B, Enclosure-2C & Enclosure-2D in vide affidavit dated 10.08.2020 in Petition No. 24/TT/2020. The Petitioner has submitted that it has computed effective tax rate based on actual tax paid pursuant to assessment orders for the years 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17. The income tax due for 2017-18 and 2018-19 has been deposited and tax returns have already been filled, however assessment orders are yet to be received. The Petitioner has further submitted that after deducting depreciation and tax holiday benefit under normal provision, the income tax for the respective year has been calculated along with surcharge and cess, which works out to be in the range of 33.99% to 34.944% during 2014-15 to 2018-19. In case, the tax computed under normal provision is less than the tax calculated on book profit at the percentage prescribed u/s 115JB (Minimum Alternate Tax) then the Company has to pay tax computed as per the provisions of



section 115JB of the 1961 Act which works out between 20.96% to 21.5488%. The Petitioner has submitted that Form-3 is a system generated form and due to a system error/constraint the header in Form-3 displays 0.00 instead of blank and the actual effective tax rate used for grossing up RoE is provided in Form 8. The aforementioned error has now been rectified. The Petitioner has submitted that it is eligible for claiming the deferred tax liabilities for the period up to 31.3.2009 on materialization on subsequent period i.e. financial year 2009-10 onwards. The Petitioner is only claiming the reimbursement of Income tax liability, discharged as per the provisions of the 1961 Act.

63. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and the Respondents, BRPL and UPPCL. The Commission vide order dated 24.1.2021 in Petition No. 136/TT/2020 has already dealt with the concerns of the Respondents. The relevant paragraphs of the order are extracted as under:

“52. We have considered the contentions of BRPL and UPPCL and the clarifications given by the Petitioner. BRPL has contended that details of the income tax submitted by the Petitioner are in respect of the Petitioner’s company as a whole and it does not pertain to the transmission business in Northern Region. The Petitioner has clarified that every registered company has only one single PAN and it has to file one single return and the Petitioner cannot file income tax separately for each region. BRPL has contended that as per the information available in public domain, the Petitioner has to pay the effective tax rate for 2014-15 @8.70% and for the period 2015-19, it is zero and that the excess recovery made by the Petitioner should be returned to the beneficiaries along with simple interest as provided in Regulation 6 of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. The Petitioner has clarified that the effective tax rate was shown as zero for the period 2015-19 inadvertently due to technical reasons and the Petitioner has paid income tax for the said period. The Petitioner has also clarified that as per the provisions of the 1961 Act, tax has to be computed under normal provisions of Income Tax Rules, 1962 and as per MAT provisions under the section 115JB of the 1961 Act and the assessee will have to pay tax higher of the two. As per the submission, during the tariff period 2014-19, the Petitioner calculated the income tax under regular provisions of the 1961 Act (with tax rates of 33.99% to 34.944%) and the tax was worked out to be lower than the tax payable under MAT rates due to deductions under section 80IA and availability of accelerated depreciation under Income Tax. Thus, the Petitioner has been assessed and paid tax under MAT. We are satisfied with the clarifications given by the Petitioner and convinced that the Petitioner has acted prudently and has complied with the provisions of the 1961 Act and the provisions of the tariff regulations.

53. As regards UPPCL’s contention that the grossed up rate of RoE for the period 2016-17 to 2018-19 is not based on the MAT rates approved by the Income Tax



Authorities, it is observed that the effective rate of tax considered by the Petitioner for 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 are based on Assessment Orders issued by Income Tax authorities and the effective rate of tax considered for 2017-18 and 2018-19 are based on the Income Tax returns filed for the purpose of grossing up the RoE rate of respective years. In view of the clarification given by the Petitioner, we are of the view that there is no merit in the contention of UPPCL.”

64. The Petitioner is entitled for Return on Equity for the transmission assets in terms of Regulation 24 and 25 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The Petitioner has submitted that they are liable to pay income tax at MAT rates and has claimed following effective tax rates for the 2014-19 tariff period:

Year	Claimed effective tax rate (in %)	Grossed up RoE [Base Rate/(1-t)] (in %)
2014-15	21.018	19.624
2015-16	21.382	19.716
2016-17	21.338	19.705
2017-18	21.337	19.704
2018-19	21.549	19.758

65. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner. The Commission in order dated 27.4.2020 in Petition No. 274/TT/2019 has arrived at the effective tax rate for the Petitioner based on the notified MAT rates and the same is given in the table below. The same MAT rates as considered in order dated 27.4.2020 in Petition No. 274/TT/2019 are considered for the purpose of grossing up of rate of RoE for truing up of the tariff of the 2014-19 tariff period in terms of the provisions of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The relevant portion of the order dated 27.4.2020 is as under:-

“26. We are conscious that the entities covered under MAT regime are paying Income Tax as per MAT rate notified for respective financial year under IT Act, 1961, which is levied on the book profit of the entity computed as per the Section 115JB of the IT Act, 1961. The Section 115JB(2) defines book profit as net profit in the statement of Profit & Loss prepared in accordance with Schedule-III of the Companies Act, 2013, subject to some additions and deductions as mentioned in the IT Act, 1961. Since the Petitioner has been paying income tax on income computed under Section 115JB of the IT Act, 1961 as per the MAT rates of the respective financial year, the notified MAT rate for respective financial year shall be considered as effective tax rate for the purpose of grossing up of RoE for truing up of the tariff of the 2014-19 tariff period in terms of the provisions of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. Interest imposed on any additional income tax demand as per the Assessment Order of the Income Tax authorities shall be considered on actual payment. However, penalty (for default on the part of the Assessee) if any imposed shall not be taken into account for the purpose of grossing up of rate of return on equity. Any under-recovery or over-recovery of grossed up rate on return on equity after truing up, shall be recovered or refunded to beneficiaries or



the long-term transmission customers / DICs as the case may be on year to year basis.

27. Accordingly, following effective tax rates based on notified MAT rates are considered for the purpose of grossing up of rate of return on equity:

Year	Notified MAT rates (inclusive of surcharge & cess)	Effective tax (in %)
2014-15	20.961	20.961
2015-16	21.342	21.342
2016-17	21.342	21.342
2017-18	21.342	21.342
2018-19	21.549	21.549

66. The same MAT rates as considered in order dated 27.4.2020 in Petition No.274/TT/2019 are considered for the purpose of grossing up of rate of RoE for truing up of the tariff of the 2014-19 tariff period in terms of the provisions of the 2014 Tariff Regulations which is as under:

Year	Notified MAT rates (inclusive of surcharge & cess) (in %)	Base rate of RoE (in %)	Grossed up RoE [Base Rate/(1-t)] (in %)
2014-15	20.961	15.50	19.610
2015-16	21.342	15.50	19.705
2016-17	21.342	15.50	19.705
2017-18	21.342	15.50	19.705
2018-19	21.549	15.50	19.758

67. The Petitioner has claimed RoE for the 2014-19 period after grossing up the ROE of 15.50% with Effective Tax rates (based on MAT rates) each year as per the above said Regulation. The RoE is trued up on the basis of the MAT rate applicable in the respective years and is allowed for the transmission asset as under:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Opening Equity	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70
Additions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Closing Equity	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70
Average Equity	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70
Return on Equity (Base Rate) (%)	15.500	15.500	15.500	15.500	15.500
MAT Rate for respective year (%)	20.961	21.342	21.342	21.342	21.549
Rate of Return on Equity (%)	19.610	19.705	19.705	19.705	19.758
Return on Equity	2591.60	2604.15	2604.15	2604.15	2611.16



68. The details of RoE approved in order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and true up RoE allowed in the instant order is shown in the table below:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Approved vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014	2591.60	2591.60	2591.60	2591.60	2591.60
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	2593.58	2605.48	2604.15	2604.15	2611.16
Allowed after true-up in this order	2591.60	2604.15	2604.15	2604.15	2611.16

Operation & Maintenance Expenses (O&M Expenses)

69. The O&M Expenses claimed by the Petitioner are as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
6 Number 400 kV Sub-station bays					
562.5 km S/C (Bundle Conductor- 4 sub-conductors)					
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	702.67	726.48	750.16	775.37	800.95

70. Regulation 29(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations specifies the norms for O&M Expenses for the transmission system. The norms specified in respect of the elements covered in the transmission assets are as under:

Element	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
S/C (Bundled conductor with four or more subconductors) (₹ lakh/km)	0.606	0.627	0.647	0.669	0.691
400 kV Sub-station (₹ lakh/bay)	60.30	62.30	64.37	66.51	68.71

71. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner. The O&M Expenses allowed under Regulation 29(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations are as under:

Details	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
6 Number 400 kV Sub-station bays	361.80	373.80	386.22	399.06	412.26
562.5 km S/C (Bundle Conductor – 4 sub-conductors)	340.88	352.69	363.94	376.31	388.69
Total	702.68	726.49	750.16	775.37	800.95



72. The details of O&M Expenses approved in order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up O&M expenses allowed in the instant order is shown in the table below:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Approved vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014	702.68	726.49	750.16	775.37	800.95
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	702.67	726.48	750.16	775.37	800.95
Allowed after true-up in this order	702.68	726.49	750.16	775.37	800.95

Interest on Working Capital (IWC)

73. The IWC has been worked out as per the methodology provided in Regulation 28 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations and is allowed for the transmission assets as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Interest on Working Capital					
O&M Expenses (O&M Expenses for 1 month)	58.56	60.54	62.51	64.61	66.75
Maintenance Spares (15% of O&M Expenses)	105.40	108.97	112.52	116.31	120.14
Receivables (Equivalent to 2 months of annual fixed cost)	835.79	813.41	793.05	802.63	821.37
Total Working Capital	999.74	982.92	968.09	983.55	1008.26
Rate of Interest (%)	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.50
Interest of Working Capital	134.97	132.69	130.69	132.78	136.12

74. The details of IWC approved in order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up IWC allowed in the instant order is shown in the table as follows:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Approved vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014	134.81	131.93	128.41	129.39	130.38
Claimed by the Petitioner	135.24	132.93	130.87	132.97	136.32



in the instant petition					
Allowed after true-up in this order	134.97	132.69	130.69	132.78	136.12

Approved Annual Fixed Charges for the 2014-19 Tariff Period

75. The trued up annual fixed charges for the transmission assets for the 2014-19 tariff period are summarised as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Depreciation	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64
Interest on Loan	651.83	483.47	339.67	369.82	446.38
Return on Equity	2591.60	2604.15	2604.15	2604.15	2611.16
Interest on Working Capital	134.97	132.69	130.69	132.78	136.12
O & M Expenses	702.68	726.49	750.16	775.37	800.95
Total	5014.71	4880.44	4758.32	4815.76	4928.24

76. Accordingly, the Annual Transmission Charges in order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014, claimed by the Petitioner and approved after truing up in the instant order is shown in the table below:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Approved vide order dated 11.1.2016 in Petition No. 363/TT/2014	5007.70	4846.50	4656.79	4664.92	4673.44
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	5027.10	4890.94	4766.40	4824.14	4937.32
Allowed after true-up in this order	5014.71	4880.44	4758.32	4815.76	4928.24

Determination Of Annual Fixed Charges for the 2019-24 Tariff Period

77. The Petitioner has claimed the following transmission charges for the 2019-24 tariff period:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Depreciation	938.96	938.96	938.97	938.96	938.97
Interest on Loan	446.33	405.25	364.16	323.08	282.00
Return on Equity	2611.16	2611.16	2611.16	2611.16	2611.16
Interest on Working Capital	87.18	87.68	88.06	88.44	88.69



O&M Expenses	621.30	642.70	665.47	688.48	712.85
Total	4704.93	4685.75	4667.82	4650.12	4633.67

78. The details of the IWC claimed by the Petitioner for the 2019-24 period are as under:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particular	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
O&M Expenses	51.78	53.56	55.46	57.37	59.40
Maintenance Spares	93.20	96.41	99.82	103.27	106.93
Receivables	578.48	577.70	575.48	573.30	569.71
Total Working Capital	723.46	727.67	730.76	733.94	736.04
Rate of Interest (%)	12.05	12.05	12.05	12.05	12.05
Interest on Working Capital	87.18	87.68	88.06	88.44	88.69

Capital Cost as on 1.4.2019

79. Regulation 19 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations provide as under:

“19 Capital Cost: (1) *The Capital cost of the generating station or the transmission system, as the case may be, as determined by the Commission after prudence check in accordance with these regulations shall form the basis for determination of tariff for existing and new projects.*

(2) *The Capital Cost of a new project shall include the following:*

- (a) *The expenditure incurred or projected to be incurred up to the date of commercial operation of the project;*
- (b) *Interest during construction and financing charges, on the loans (i) being equal to 70% of the funds deployed, in the event of the actual equity in excess of 30% of the funds deployed, by treating the excess equity as normative loan, or (ii) being equal to the actual amount of loan in the event of the actual equity less than 30% of the funds deployed;*
- (c) *Any gain or loss on account of foreign exchange risk variation pertaining to the loan amount availed during the construction period;*
- (d) *Interest during construction and incidental expenditure during construction as computed in accordance with these regulations;*
- (e) *Capitalised Initial Spares subject to the ceiling rates in accordance with these regulations;*
- (f) *Expenditure on account of additional capitalization and de-capitalisation determined in accordance with these regulations;*
- (g) *Adjustment of revenue due to sale of infirm power in excess of fuel cost prior to the date of commercial operation as specified under Regulation 7 of these regulations;*
- (h) *Adjustment of revenue earned by the transmission licensee by using the assets before the date of commercial operation;*
- (i) *Capital expenditure on account of ash disposal and utilization including handling and transportation facility;*
- (j) *Capital expenditure incurred towards railway infrastructure and its augmentation for transportation of coal upto the receiving end of the generating station but does not include the transportation cost and any other appurtenant cost paid to the railway;*



- (k) Capital expenditure on account of biomass handling equipment and facilities, for co-firing;
- (l) Capital expenditure on account of emission control system necessary to meet the revised emission standards and sewage treatment plant;
- (m) Expenditure on account of fulfilment of any conditions for obtaining environment clearance for the project;
- (n) Expenditure on account of change in law and force majeure events; and
- (o) Capital cost incurred or projected to be incurred by a thermal generating station, on account of implementation of the norms under Perform, Achieve and Trade (PAT) scheme of Government of India shall be considered by the Commission subject to sharing of benefits accrued under the PAT scheme with the beneficiaries.

(3) The Capital cost of an existing project shall include the following:

- (a) Capital cost admitted by the Commission prior to 1.4.2019 duly trued up by excluding liability, if any, as on 1.4.2019;
- (b) Additional capitalization and de-capitalization for the respective year of tariff as determined in accordance with these regulations;
- (c) Capital expenditure on account of ash disposal and utilization including handling and transportation facility;
- (d) Capital expenditure on account of ash disposal and utilization including handling and transportation facility;
- (e) Capital expenditure incurred towards railway infrastructure and its augmentation for transportation of coal up to the receiving end of generating station but does not include the transportation cost and any other appurtenant cost paid to the railway; and
- (f) Capital cost incurred or projected to be incurred by a thermal generating station, on account of implementation of the norms under Perform, Achieve and Trade (PAT) scheme of Government of India shall be considered by the Commission subject to sharing of benefits accrued under the PAT scheme with the beneficiaries.”

(4) The capital cost in case of existing or new hydro generating station shall also include:

- (a) cost of approved rehabilitation and resettlement (R&R) plan of the project in conformity with National R&R Policy and R&R package as approved; and
- (b) cost of the developer's 10% contribution towards Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyutikaran Yojana (RGGVY) and Deendayal Upadhyaya Gram Jyoti Yojana (DDUGJY) project in the affected area.

“(5) The following shall be excluded from the capital cost of the existing and new projects:

- (a) The assets forming part of the project, but not in use, as declared in the tariff petition;
- (b) De-capitalised Assets after the date of commercial operation on account of replacement or removal on account of obsolescence or shifting from one project to another project:

Provided that in case replacement of transmission asset is recommended by Regional Power Committee, such asset shall be decapitalised only after its redeployment;

Provided further that unless shifting of an asset from one project to another is of permanent nature, there shall be no de-capitalization of the concerned assets.



(c) In case of hydro generating stations, any expenditure incurred or committed to be incurred by a project developer for getting the project site allotted by the State Government by following a transparent process;
(d) Proportionate cost of land of the existing project which is being used for generating power from generating station based on renewable energy; and
(e) Any grant received from the Central or State Government or any statutory body or authority for the execution of the project which does not carry any liability of repayment.”

80. The Petitioner has claimed capital cost of ₹85741.12 lakh as on 31.3.2019 for the Combined Asset. The same has been worked out by the Commission as on 31.3.2019 and considered as the opening capital cost as on 1.4.2019 for determination of tariff in accordance with Regulation 19 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations.

81. The Petitioner has not claimed any ACE during 2019-24 for the Combined Asset under 2019 Tariff Regulations.

Debt-Equity ratio

82. Regulation 18 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations provides as under:

“18. Debt-Equity Ratio: (1) For new projects, the debt-equity ratio of 70:30 as on date of commercial operation shall be considered. If the equity actually deployed is more than 30% of the capital cost, equity in excess of 30% shall be treated as normative loan:

Provided that:

- i. where equity actually deployed is less than 30% of the capital cost, actual equity shall be considered for determination of tariff:
- ii. the equity invested in foreign currency shall be designated in Indian rupees on the date of each investment:
- iii. any grant obtained for the execution of the project shall not be considered as a part of capital structure for the purpose of debt: equity ratio.

Explanation.-The premium, if any, raised by the generating company or the transmission licensee, as the case may be, while issuing share capital and investment of internal resources created out of its free reserve, for the funding of the project, shall be reckoned as paid up capital for the purpose of computing return on equity, only if such premium amount and internal resources are actually utilised for meeting the capital expenditure of the generating station or the transmission system.

(2) The generating company or the transmission licensee, as the case may be, shall submit the resolution of the Board of the company or approval of the competent authority in other cases regarding infusion of funds from internal resources in support of the utilization made or proposed to be made to meet the capital expenditure of the generating station or the transmission system including communication system, as the case may be.



(3) In case of the generating station and the transmission system including communication system declared under commercial operation prior to 1.4.2019, debt: equity ratio allowed by the Commission for determination of tariff for the period ending 31.3.2019 shall be considered:

Provided that in case of a generating station or a transmission system including communication system which has completed its useful life as on or after 1.4.2019, if the equity actually deployed as on 1.4.2019 is more than 30% of the capital cost, equity in excess of 30% shall not be taken into account for tariff computation;

Provided further that in case of projects owned by Damodar Valley Corporation, the debt: equity ratio shall be governed as per sub-clause (ii) of clause (2) of Regulation 72 of these regulations.

(4) In case of the generating station and the transmission system including communication system declared under commercial operation prior to 1.4.2019, but where debt: equity ratio has not been determined by the Commission for determination of tariff for the period ending 31.3.2019, the Commission shall approve the debt: equity ratio in accordance with clause (1) of this Regulation.

(5) Any expenditure incurred or projected to be incurred on or after 1.4.2019 as may be admitted by the Commission as additional capital expenditure for determination of tariff, and renovation and modernisation expenditure for life extension shall be serviced in the manner specified in clause (1) of this Regulation.”

83. The debt-equity considered for the purpose of computation of tariff for the 2019-24 tariff period as under:

Particulars	Capital Cost as on 1.4.2019 (₹ in lakh)	%	Capital Cost as on 31.3.2024 (₹ in lakh)	%
Debt	72525.42	84.59%	72525.42	84.59%
Equity	13215.70	15.41%	13215.70	15.41%
Total	85741.12	100.00	85741.12	100.00

Depreciation

84. Regulation 33(1), (2) and (5) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations provides as under:

"33. Depreciation: (1) Depreciation shall be computed from the date of commercial operation of a generating station or unit thereof or a transmission system or element there of including communication system. In case of the tariff of all the units of a generating station or all elements of a transmission system including communication system for which a single tariff needs to be determined, the depreciation shall be computed from the effective date of commercial operation of the generating station or the transmission system taking into consideration the depreciation of individual units:



Provided that effective date of commercial operation shall be worked out by considering the actual date of commercial operation and installed capacity of all the units of the generating station or capital cost of all elements of the transmission system, for which single tariff needs to be determined.

(2) The value base for the purpose of depreciation shall be the capital cost of the asset admitted by the Commission. In case of multiple units of a generating station or multiple elements of a transmission system, weighted average life for the generating station of the transmission system shall be applied. Depreciation shall be chargeable from the first year of commercial operation. In case of commercial operation of the asset for part of the year, depreciation shall be charged on pro rata basis”

*“(5) Depreciation shall be calculated annually based on Straight Line Method and at rates specified in **Appendix-I** to these regulations for the assets of the generating station and transmission system:*

Provided that the remaining depreciable value as on 31st March of the year closing after a period of 12 years from the effective date of commercial operation of the station shall be spread over the balance useful life of the assets.”

85. UPPCL has submitted that the cumulative depreciation upto 31.3.2019 is ₹41624.35 lakh whereas the cumulative depreciation considered by the Petitioner is ₹61855.01 lakh which is incorrect. In response, the Petitioner submitted that depreciation is computed as per the 2019 Tariff Regulations.

86. We have considered the Petitioner’s claim and UPPCL’s submission. The depreciation has been spread over the useful life as discussed in depreciation paragraph for the 2014-19 tariff period. The depreciation allowed for the Combined Asset for the 2019-24 tariff period is as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Depreciation					
Opening Gross Block	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12
Addition during the year 2019-24 due to projected ACE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Closing Gross Block	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12
Average Gross Block	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12	85741.12
Freehold Land	320.57	320.57	320.57	320.57	320.57
Weighted average rate of Depreciation (WAROD) (%)	spreading				
Balance useful life at the beginning of the year (Year)	16	15	14	13	12
Elapsed life of the asset (Year)	18	19	20	21	22



Aggregated Depreciable Value	76878.50	76878.50	76878.50	76878.50	76878.50
Depreciation during the year	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64
Aggregate Cumulative Depreciation	62873.90	63807.54	64741.18	65674.82	66608.46
Remaining Aggregated Depreciable Value	14004.60	13070.96	12137.32	11203.68	10270.04

Interest on Loan (IoL)

87. Regulation 32 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations provides as under:

“32. Interest on loan capital: (1) *The loans arrived at in the manner indicated in regulation 18 of these regulations shall be considered as gross normative loan for calculation of interest on loan.*

(2) *The normative loan outstanding as on 1.4.2019 shall be worked out by deducting the cumulative repayment as admitted by the Commission up to 31.3.2019 from the gross normative loan.*

(3) *The repayment for each of the year of the tariff period 2019-24 shall be deemed to be equal to the depreciation allowed for the corresponding year/period. In case of de-capitalization of assets, the repayment shall be adjusted by taking into account cumulative repayment on a pro rata basis and the adjustment should not exceed cumulative depreciation recovered upto the date of de-capitalisation of such asset.*

(4) *Notwithstanding any moratorium period availed by the generating company or the transmission licensee, as the case may be, the repayment of loan shall be considered from the first year of commercial operation of the project and shall be equal to the depreciation allowed for the year or part of the year.*

(5) *The rate of interest shall be the weighted average rate of interest calculated on the basis of the actual loan portfolio after providing appropriate accounting adjustment for interest capitalized:*

Provided that if there is no actual loan for a particular year but normative loan is still outstanding, the last available weighted average rate of interest shall be considered;

Provided further that if the generating station or the transmission system, as the case may be, does not have actual loan, then the weighted average rate of interest of the generating company or the transmission licensee as a whole shall be considered.

(6) *The interest on loan shall be calculated on the normative average loan of the year by applying the weighted average rate of interest.*

(7) *The changes to the terms and conditions of the loans shall be reflected from the date of such re-financing.”*



88. Further, the Petitioner has prayed to bill and adjust the impact on IoL due to change in Interest rate on account of floating rate of interest applicable during 2019-24 period, if any, from the respondents.

89. UPPCL submitted that the capital cost is ₹85741.12 lakh and debt-equity ratio is 84.59:15.41. The debt is ₹72528.13 lakh. The figure for cumulative depreciation is ₹41624.35 lakh instead of ₹61855.01 lakh as claimed by Petitioner. UPPCL has submitted that the Petitioner be directed to revise the claim of IoL. Further, UPPCL has submitted that the Petitioner has negotiated the loan portfolios bearing fixed rate of interest and therefore, the apprehension of the Petitioner regarding floating rate of interest is premature. In response, the Petitioner submitted that the IoL is computed as per the 2019 Tariff Regulations. The Petitioner has further submitted that loans with floating interest rate have been deployed in the Combined Asset and hence, it has prayed in the Petition to allow the same.

90. We have considered the Petitioner's claim and the Respondent's submission. The weighted average rate of IoL has been considered on the basis of rate prevailing as on 1.4.2019. The Petitioner has prayed that the change in interest rate due to floating rate of interest applicable, if any, during 2019-24 tariff period will be adjusted. The floating rate of interest, if any, shall be considered at the time of true up. Therefore, IoL has been allowed in accordance with Regulation 32 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations. The IoL has been allowed as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Gross Normative Loan	72525.42	72525.42	72525.42	72525.42	72525.42
Cumulative Repayments up to Previous Year	61940.26	62873.90	63807.54	64741.18	65674.82
Net Loan-Opening	10585.16	9651.52	8717.88	7784.24	6850.60
Additions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Repayment during the year	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64
Net Loan-Closing	9651.52	8717.88	7784.24	6850.60	5916.96
Average Loan	10118.34	9184.70	8251.06	7317.42	6383.78
Weighted Average Rate of	4.375	4.375	4.375	4.375	2.448



Interest on Loan (%)					
Interest on Loan	442.72	401.87	361.02	320.16	156.27

Return on Equity (RoE)

91. Regulation 30 and Regulation 31 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations provides as under:

“30. Return on Equity: (1) Return on equity shall be computed in rupee terms, on the equity base determined in accordance with Regulation 18 of these regulations.

(2) Return on equity shall be computed at the base rate of 15.50% for thermal generating station, transmission system including communication system and run-of river hydro generating station, and at the base rate of 16.50% for the storage type hydro generating stations including pumped storage hydro generating stations and run-of river generating station with pondage:

Provided that return on equity in respect of additional capitalization after cut-off date beyond the original scope excluding additional capitalization due to Change in Law, shall be computed at the weighted average rate of interest on actual loan portfolio of the generating station or the transmission system;

Provided further that:

i. In case of a new project, the rate of return on equity shall be reduced by 1.00% for such period as may be decided by the Commission, if the generating station or transmission system is found to be declared under commercial operation without commissioning of any of the Restricted Governor Mode Operation (RGMO) or Free Governor Mode Operation (FGMO), data telemetry, communication system up to load dispatch centre or protection system based on the report submitted by the respective RLDC;

ii. in case of existing generating station, as and when any of the requirements under (i) above of this Regulation are found lacking based on the report submitted by the concerned RLDC, rate of return on equity shall be reduced by 1.00% for the period for which the deficiency continues;

iii. in case of a thermal generating station, with effect from 1.4.2020:

a) rate of return on equity shall be reduced by 0.25% in case of failure to achieve the ramp rate of 1% per minute;

b) an additional rate of return on equity of 0.25% shall be allowed for every incremental ramp rate of 1% per minute achieved over and above the ramp rate of 1% per minute, subject to ceiling of additional rate of return on equity of 1.00%:

Provided that the detailed guidelines in this regard shall be issued by National Load Dispatch Centre by 30.6.2019.”

“31. Tax on Return on Equity:(1) The base rate of return on equity as allowed by the Commission under Regulation 30 of these regulations shall be grossed up with the effective tax rate of the respective financial year. For this purpose, the effective



tax rate shall be considered on the basis of actual tax paid in respect of the financial year in line with the provisions of the relevant Finance Acts by the concerned generating company or the transmission licensee, as the case may be. The actual tax paid on income from other businesses including deferred tax liability (i.e. income from business other than business of generation or transmission, as the case may be) shall be excluded for the calculation of effective tax rate.

(2) Rate of return on equity shall be rounded off to three decimal places and shall be computed as per the formula given below:

$$\text{Rate of pre-tax return on equity} = \text{Base rate} / (1-t)$$

Where "t" is the effective tax rate in accordance with clause (1) of this Regulation and shall be calculated at the beginning of every financial year based on the estimated profit and tax to be paid estimated in line with the provisions of the relevant Finance Act applicable for that financial year to the company on pro-rata basis by excluding the income of non-generation or non-transmission business, as the case may be, and the corresponding tax thereon. In case of generating company or transmission licensee paying Minimum Alternate Tax (MAT), "t" shall be considered as MAT rate including surcharge and cess.

Illustration-

(i) In case of a generating company or a transmission licensee paying Minimum Alternate Tax (MAT) @ 21.55% including surcharge and cess:

$$\text{Rate of return on equity} = 15.50 / (1 - 0.2155) = 19.758\%$$

(ii) In case of a generating company or a transmission licensee paying normal corporate tax including surcharge and cess:

- (a) Estimated Gross Income from generation or transmission business for FY 2019-20 is Rs 1,000 crore;
- (b) Estimated Advance Tax for the year on above is Rs 240 crore;
- (c) Effective Tax Rate for the year 2019-20 = Rs 240 Crore / Rs 1000 Crore = 24%;
- (d) Rate of return on equity = $15.50 / (1 - 0.24) = 20.395\%$.

(3) The generating company or the transmission licensee, as the case may be, shall true up the grossed up rate of return on equity at the end of every financial year based on actual tax paid together with any additional tax demand including interest thereon, duly adjusted for any refund of tax including interest received from the income tax authorities pertaining to the tariff period 2019-24 on actual gross income of any financial year. However, penalty, if any, arising on account of delay in deposit or short deposit of tax amount shall not be claimed by the generating company or the transmission licensee, as the case may be. Any under-recovery or over-recovery of grossed up rate on return on equity after truing up, shall be recovered or refunded to beneficiaries or the long term customers, as the case may be, on year to year basis."

92. The Petitioner has submitted that MAT rate is applicable to the Petitioner's company. BRPL has submitted that as per Regulation 31(3) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations, the Petitioner has a statutory duty to undertake the true up of the



grossed-up rate of RoE at the end of every financial year based on actual tax paid. The above statutory function delegated to the transmission licensee cannot be exercised unilaterally but required to be conducted in most impartial manner by summoning all the Respondent-beneficiaries.

93. In response, the Petitioner vide affidavit dated 16.3.2021 has submitted that the Petitioner pays the income tax and files income tax returns in a timely manner. The final tax demand including additional tax, interest, penalty and adjustment for refunds if any is decided by the Income Tax Authority through its assessment orders, which are beyond the Petitioner's control. The Petitioner has further submitted that for the 2014-19 tariff period, the Commission vide order dated 27.4.2020 in Petition No. 274/TT/2019 has approved effective tax rate as notified MAT rates and for 2019-24 tariff period tariff has been admitted with grossing of rate of ROE at 18.782% considering MAT rate of 17.472%. Further, any under-recovery or over-recovery of grossed up rate on RoE is taken up at the time of true up for the 2019-24 period.

94. BRPL has submitted that the Petitioner should clarify whether it is grossing up deferred tax amount while billing to beneficiaries and, if so, the same is required to be refunded to beneficiaries. In response, the Petitioner vide affidavit dated 16.3.2021 has submitted that it has claimed deferred tax liability during the period 2009-14 only for the deferred tax liability upto 31.3.2009 and those that have materialized. Further, the claim of deferred tax liability pertaining to transmission system on materialisation is supported with Auditor certificate. The Petitioner has submitted that deferred tax liability amount billed/ materialized is not considered while grossing up the RoE. Further, the deferred tax liability materialized only up to 31.3.2014 is claimed till date and the claim for deferred tax materialized for 2014-19 period is under process.

95. UPPCL submitted that the capital cost is ₹85741.12 lakh and debt-equity ratio is 84.59:15.41. The debt is ₹13215.70 lakh. The grossed up rate of RoE claimed by



the Petitioner is not reliable since it has been worked out on the basis of presumptive value of MAT rates. UPPCL has requested that the Petitioner be directed that RoE shall be recalculated on the basis of reliable MAT rates for the year 2019-20 which shall be provisionally applicable in remaining tariff period for 2019-24.

96. In response, the Petitioner submitted that in the absence of IT assessment order pertaining to 2019-24 period, the ROE should be calculated @ 18.782% after grossing up the ROE with MAT rate of 17.472% (Base Rate 15% + Surcharge 12% + Cess 4%) based on the rate prescribed by the Commission as per illustration under Regulation 31(2)(ii) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations during the 2019-24 period. As per Regulation 31(3) of 2019 Tariff Regulations, the grossed up rate of ROE at the end of every financial year shall be trued up based on actual tax paid together with any additional tax demand including interest thereon duly adjusted for any refund of tax including interest received from the IT Authorities pertaining to the tariff period 2019-24 on actual gross income of any financial year.

97. We have considered the submissions of Petitioner, BRPL and UPPCL. The Petitioner has submitted that MAT rate is applicable to the Petitioner's company. Accordingly, the MAT rate applicable in 2019-20 has been considered for the purpose of RoE, which shall be trued up with actual tax rate in accordance with Regulation 31(3) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations. The RoE allowed for the Combined Asset as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Opening Equity	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70
Additions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Closing Equity	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70
Average Equity	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70	13215.70
Return on Equity (Base Rate) (%)	15.500	15.500	15.500	15.500	15.500
MAT Rate for respective year (%)	17.472	17.472	17.472	17.472	17.472
Rate of Return on Equity (%)	18.782	18.782	18.782	18.782	18.782



Return on Equity	2482.17	2482.17	2482.17	2482.17	2482.17
------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Operation & Maintenance Expenses (O&M Expenses)

98. The O&M Expenses claimed by the Petitioner for the transmission assets for the 2019-24 tariff period are as under:

(₹ in lakh)					
Details	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
6 Number 400 kV Sub-station bays	192.90	199.68	206.70	213.96	221.46
562.5 km S/C (Bundle Conductor – 4 sub-conductors)	424.69	439.31	455.06	470.81	487.68
PLCC	3.71	3.71	3.71	3.71	3.71
Total	621.30	642.70	665.47	688.48	712.85

99. The norms specified under Regulation 35(3)(a) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations provides that:

“35 Operation and Maintenance Expenses (3) Transmission system: (a) The following normative operation and maintenance expenses shall be admissible for the transmission system:

Particulars	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Norms for sub-station Bays (₹ Lakh per bay)					
765 kV	45.01	46.60	48.23	49.93	51.68
400 kV	32.15	33.28	34.45	35.66	36.91
220 kV	22.51	23.30	24.12	24.96	25.84
132 kV and below	16.08	16.64	17.23	17.83	18.46
Norms for Transformers (₹ Lakh per MVA)					
765 kV	0.491	0.508	0.526	0.545	0.564
400 kV	0.358	0.371	0.384	0.398	0.411
220 kV	0.245	0.254	0.263	0.272	0.282
132 kV and below	0.245	0.254	0.263	0.272	0.282
Norms for AC and HVDC lines (₹ Lakh per km)					
Single Circuit (Bundled Conductor with six or more	0.881	0.912	0.944	0.977	1.011
Single Circuit (Bundled conductor with four sub-	0.755	0.781	0.809	0.837	0.867
Single Circuit (Twin & Triple	0.503	0.521	0.539	0.558	0.578
Single Circuit (Single	0.252	0.260	0.270	0.279	0.289
Double Circuit (Bundled conductor	1.322	1.368	1.416	1.466	1.517
Double Circuit (Twin & Triple	0.881	0.912	0.944	0.977	1.011
Double Circuit (Single	0.377	0.391	0.404	0.419	0.433



Multi Circuit (Bundled Conductor with four or	2.319	2.401	2.485	2.572	2.662
Multi Circuit (Twin & Triple	1.544	1.598	1.654	1.713	1.773
Norms for HVDC stations					
HVDC Back-to-Back stations (Rs Lakh per 500	834	864	894	925	958
Gazuwaka HVDC Back-to-Back station (₹ Lakh	1,666	1,725	1,785	1,848	1,913
500 kV Rihand-Dadri HVDC bipole scheme	2,252	2,331	2,413	2,498	2,586
±500 kV Talcher- Kolar HVDC bipole scheme	2,468	2,555	2,645	2,738	2,834
±500 kV Bhiwadi-Balia HVDC bipole scheme	1,696	1,756	1,817	1,881	1,947
±800 kV, Bishwanath-Agra HVDC bipole	2,563	2,653	2,746	2,842	2,942

Provided that the O&M expenses for the GIS bays shall be allowed as worked out by multiplying 0.70 of the O&M expenses of the normative O&M expenses for bays;

Provided further that:

- i. the operation and maintenance expenses for new HVDC bi-pole schemes commissioned after 1.4.2019 for a particular year shall be allowed pro-rata on the basis of normative rate of operation and maintenance expenses of similar HVDC bi-pole scheme for the corresponding year of the tariff period;
- ii. the O&M expenses norms for HVDC bi-pole line shall be considered as Double Circuit quad AC line;
- iii. the O&M expenses of ±500 kV Mundra-Mohindergarh HVDC bipole scheme (2000 MW) shall be allowed as worked out by multiplying 0.80 of the normative O&M expenses for ±500 kV Talchar-Kolar HVDC bi-pole scheme (2000 MW);
- iv. the O&M expenses of ±800 kV Champa-Kurukshetra HVDC bi-pole scheme (3000 MW) shall be on the basis of the normative O&M expenses for ±800 kV, Bishwanath-Agra HVDC bi-pole scheme;
- v. the O&M expenses of ±800 kV, Alipurduar-Agra HVDC bi-pole scheme (3000 MW) shall be allowed as worked out by multiplying 0.80 of the normative O&M expenses for ±800 kV, Bishwanath-Agra HVDC bi-pole scheme; and
- vi. the O&M expenses of Static Synchronous Compensator and Static Var Compensator shall be worked at 1.5% of original project cost as on commercial operation which shall be escalated at the rate of 3.51% to work out the O&M expenses during the tariff period. The O&M expenses of Static Synchronous Compensator and Static Var Compensator, if required, may be reviewed after three year

(b) The total allowable operation and maintenance expenses for the transmission system shall be calculated by multiplying the number of sub-station bays, transformer capacity of the transformer (in MVA) and km of line length with the applicable norms for the operation and maintenance expenses per bay, per MVA and per km respectively.



(c) The Security Expenses and Capital Spares for transmission system shall be allowed separately after prudence check:

Provided that the transmission licensee shall submit the assessment of the security requirement and estimated security expenses, the details of year-wise actual capital spares consumed at the time of truing up with appropriate justification.

(4) Communication system: *The operation and maintenance expenses for the communication system shall be worked out at 2.0% of the original project cost related to such communication system. The transmission licensee shall submit the actual operation and maintenance expenses for truing up.”*

100. We have considered the submission of the Petitioner. The Petitioner has claimed O&M Expenses separately for PLCC under Regulation 35(4) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations @2% of its original project cost in the instant petition. The Petitioner has made similar claim in other petitions as well. Though PLCC is a communication system, it has been considered as part of the sub-station in the 2014 Tariff Regulations and the 2019 Tariff Regulations and the norms for sub-station have been specified accordingly. Accordingly, the Commission vide order dated 24.1.2021 in Petition No. 126/TT/2020 has already concluded that no separate O&M Expenses can be allowed for PLCC under Regulation 35(4) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations even though PLCC is a communication system. Therefore, the Petitioner's claim for separate O&M Expenses for PLCC @2% is not allowed. The relevant portions of the order dated 24.1.2021 in Petition No. 126/TT/2020 are extracted hereunder:

“103. Thus, although PLCC equipment is a communication system, it has been considered as a part of sub-station, as it is used both for protection and communication. Therefore, we are of the considered view that rightly, it was not considered for separate O&M Expenses while framing norms of O&M for 2019-24 tariff period. While specifying norms for bays and transformers, O&M Expenses for PLCC have been included within norms for O&M Expenses for sub-station. Norms of O&M Expenses @2% of the capital cost in terms of Regulation 35(4) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations have been specified for communication system such as PMU, RMU, OPGW etc. and not for PLCC equipment.”

“105. In our view, granting of O&M Expenses for PLCC equipment @2% of its capital cost under Regulation 35(4) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations under the communication system head would tantamount to granting O&M Expenses twice for PLCC equipment as PLCC equipment has already been considered as part of the sub-station. Therefore, the Petitioner's prayer for grant of O&M Expenses for the PLCC equipment @2% of its capital cost under Regulation 35(4) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations is rejected.



106. The principle adopted in this petition that PLCC is part of sub-station and accordingly no separate O&M Expenses is admissible for PLCC equipment in the 2019-24 tariff period under Regulation 35(4) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations shall be applicable in case of all petitions where similar claim is made by the Petitioner. As already mentioned, the Commission, however, on the basis of the claim made by the Petitioner has inadvertently allowed O&M Expenses for PLCC equipment @2% of its original project cost, which is applicable for other “communication system”, for 2019-24 period in 31 petitions given in Annexure-3 of this order. Therefore, the decision in this order shall also be applicable to all the petitions given in Annexure-3. Therefore, PGCIL is directed to bring this decision to the notice of all the stakeholders in the 31 petitions given in Annexure-3 and also make revised claim of O&M Expenses for PLCC as part of the sub-station at the time of truing up of the tariff allowed for 2019-24 period in respective petitions.”

Therefore, the Petitioner’s claim for separate O&M Expenses for PLCC @2% is not allowed.

101. The O&M Expenses allowed for the Combined Asset is as under:

	(₹ in lakh)				
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
O&M Expenses					
6 Number of 400 kV bays					
Norms (₹ lakh/Bay)	32.15	33.28	34.45	35.66	36.91
Total	192.90	199.68	206.70	213.96	221.46
562.5 km S/C (Bundle Conductor- 4 sub-conductors)					
Norms (₹ lakh/km)	0.755	0.781	0.809	0.837	0.867
Total	424.69	439.31	455.06	470.81	487.69
Total O&M expenses allowed (₹ in lakh)	617.59	638.99	661.76	684.77	709.15

Interest on Working Capital (IWC)

102. Regulation 34(1)(c), Regulation 34(3), Regulation 34(4) and Regulation 3(7) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations specifies as under:

“34. Interest on Working Capital

(1)...

(c) For Hydro Generating Station (including Pumped Storage Hydro Generating Station) and Transmission System:

i. Receivables equivalent to 45 days of fixed cost;



- ii. Maintenance spares @ 15% of operation and maintenance expenses including security expenses; and
- iii. Operation and maintenance expenses, including security expenses for one month”

(3)Rate of interest on working capital shall be on normative basis and shall be considered as the bank rate as on 1.4.2019 or as on 1st April of the year during the tariff period 2019-24 in which the generating station or a unit thereof or the transmission system including communication system or element thereof, as the case may be, is declared under commercial operation, whichever is later:

Provided that in case of truing-up, the rate of interest on working capital shall be considered at bank rate as on 1st April of each of the financial year during the tariff period 2019-24.

(4) Interest on working capital shall be payable on normative basis notwithstanding that the generating company or the transmission licensee has not taken loan for working capital from any outside agency.

“3.Definitions ...

(7) ‘Bank Rate’ means the one-year marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) of the State Bank of India issued from time to time plus 350 basis points;”

103. The Petitioner has submitted that it has computed IWC for the 2019-24 period considering the SBI Base Rate plus 350 basis points as on 1.4.2019. The Petitioner has considered the rate of IWC as 12.05%. The IWC is worked out in accordance with Regulation 34 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations. The ROI considered is 12.05% (SBI 1 year MCLR applicable as on 1.4.2019 of 8.55% plus 350 basis points) for 2019-20, whereas, ROI for 2020-21 onwards has been considered as 11.25% (SBI 1 year MCLR applicable as on 1.4.2020 of 7.75% plus 350 basis points). The components of the working capital and interest thereon allowed for the Combined Asset is as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
O&M Expenses (O&M Expenses for 1 month)	51.47	53.25	55.15	57.06	59.10
Maintenance Spares (15% of O&M Expenses)	92.64	95.85	99.26	102.72	106.37
Receivables (Equivalent to 45 days of annual transmission charges)	560.79	559.28	557.09	554.94	536.08
Total Working Capital	704.89	708.38	711.50	714.72	701.55
Rate of Interest (%)	12.05	11.25	11.25	11.25	11.25
Interest on Working Capital	84.94	79.69	80.04	80.41	78.92



Annual Fixed Charges of the 2019-24 Tariff Period

104. The transmission charges allowed for the Combined Asset for the 2019-24 tariff period are summarised as under:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Depreciation	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64	933.64
Interest on Loan	442.72	401.87	361.02	320.16	156.27
Return on Equity	2482.17	2482.17	2482.17	2482.17	2482.17
Interest on Working Capital	84.94	79.69	80.04	80.41	78.92
O & M Expenses	617.59	638.99	661.76	684.77	709.15
Total	4561.06	4536.36	4518.63	4501.15	4360.15

Filing Fee and the Publication Expenses

105. The Petitioner has sought reimbursement of fee paid by it for filing the petition and publication expenses. BRPL has submitted that though the Commission can allow filing fee and publication expenses at its discretion under Regulation 70(1) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations, but the exercise of such discretion is a judicial discretion in the adjudication of tariff for which no justification has been filed by the Petitioner. BRPL also referred to the Commission's order dated 11.9.2008 in Petition No. 129 of 2005 where it declined the claim of Central Power Sector undertakings for allowing the reimbursement of the application filing fee. In response, the Petitioner vide affidavit dated 16.3.2021 has submitted that it has requested for reimbursement of expenditure by the beneficiaries towards petition filing fee and publication expense, in terms of Regulation 70(1) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations. Further, the Petitioner also placed reliance on the Commission's order dated 28.3.2016 in Petition No. 137/TT/2015 where it allowed the recovery of petition filing fee and expenditure for publication of notices from beneficiaries on pro-rata basis.

106. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and BRPL. Regulation 70(1) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations provides for reimbursement of filing fees and publication paid by the Petitioner. Accordingly, the Petitioner is entitled for



reimbursement of the filing fees and publication expenses in connection with the present petition, directly from the beneficiaries on pro-rata basis in accordance with Regulation 70(1) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations.

Licence Fee & RLDC Fees and Charges

107. The Petitioner shall be entitled for reimbursement of licence fee in accordance with Regulation 70(4) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for the 2019-24 tariff period. The Petitioner shall also be entitled for recovery of RLDC fee and charges in accordance with Regulations 70(3) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for the 2019-24 tariff period.

108. UPPCL has submitted that the license fee is the onus of the Petitioner. In response, the Petitioner submitted that Regulation 70 of 2019 Tariff Regulation authorizes to recover Licensee fee separately from the respondents. The fees and charges to be paid by the Petitioner as ISTS licensee (deemed ISTS licensee) under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Fees and Charges of RLDC and other matters) Regulations as amended from time to time shall also be recoverable from the DICs as provided under Regulation 70(3) of 2019 Tariff Regulations.

109. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and UPPCL. The Petitioner shall be entitled for reimbursement of licence fee in accordance with Regulation 70(4) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for the 2019-24 tariff period. The Petitioner shall also be entitled for recovery of RLDC fee and charges in accordance with Regulations 70(3) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for the 2019-24 tariff period.

Goods and Services Tax

110. The Petitioner has submitted that, if GST is levied at any rate and at any point of time in future on charges of transmission of electricity, the same shall be borne and additionally paid by the Respondent(s) to the Petitioner and the same shall be charged and billed separately by the Petitioner. Further, additional taxes, if any, are to



be paid by the Petitioner on account of demand from Government / Statutory authorities, the same may be allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries

111. BRPL has submitted that the demand of the Petitioner is premature and need not be considered at this juncture. In response, the Petitioner vide affidavit dated 16.3.2021 submitted that currently transmission of electricity by an electric transmission utility is exempt from GST. Hence, the transmission charges currently charged are exclusive of GST. Further, if GST is levied at any rate and at any point of time in future, the same shall be borne and additionally paid by the Respondent(s) to the Petitioner and the same shall be charged and billed separately.

112. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and BRPL. Since GST is not levied on transmission service at present, we are of the view that the Petitioner's prayer is premature.

Security Expenses

113. The Petitioner has submitted that security expenses for the instant assets are not claimed in the instant petition and it would file a separate petition for claiming the overall security expenses and the consequential IWC. The Petitioner has requested to consider the actual security expenses incurred during 2018-19 for claiming estimated security expenses for 2019-20 which shall be subject to true up at the end of the year based on the actuals. The Petitioner has submitted that similar petition for security expenses for 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24 shall be filed on a yearly basis on the basis of the actual expenses of previous year subject to true up at the end of the year on actual expenses. The Petitioner has submitted that the difference, if any, between the estimated security expenses and actual security expenses as per the audited accounts may be allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries on a yearly basis.



114. BRPL has submitted that the approach adopted by the Petitioner towards claim of security expenses does not warrant the need for IWC as the same is claimed in advance. The Petitioner, in response has submitted that the expenses are not claimed in the instant petition and shall be claimed separately in a separate petition along with other assets.

115. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and BRPL. We are of the view that the Petitioner should claim security expenses for all the transmission assets in one petition. It is observed that the Petitioner has already filed the Petition No. 260/MP/2020 claiming consolidated security expenses on projected basis for the 2019-24 tariff period on the basis of actual security expenses incurred in 2018-19. Therefore, security expenses will be dealt with in Petition No. 260/MP/2020 in accordance with the applicable provisions of the 2019 Tariff Regulations.

Capital Spares

116. The Petitioner has sought reimbursement of capital spares at the end of tariff block. The Petitioner's claim, if any, shall be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the 2019 Tariff Regulations.

Sharing of Transmission Charges

117. The billing, collection and disbursement of the transmission charges approved shall be governed by the provisions of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2010 or the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2020, as applicable, as provided in Regulation 43 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations for the 2014-19 tariff period and Regulation 57 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for the 2019-24 tariff period.



118. To summarise,

(a) the revised Annual Fixed Charges allowed for the transmission assets as per the APTEL's judgements are:

(₹ in lakh)								
AFC	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Asset-I	9387.61	7502.87	4987.27	4167.82	5275.85	5098.52	4921.22	4569.56
Asset-II	7908.44	6554.54	5280.41	5076.29	5966.16	5744.21	5534.37	5214.37
Asset-III	360.92	284.37	225.67	210.72	206.18	201.99	243.75	233.25

(b) The consequential revision of Annual Fixed Charges allowed for the transmission assets for the 2009-14 tariff period are:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2009-10	2010-11	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Annual Fixed Charges	9663.88	9451.29	9188.46	8926.23	5176.60

(c) The trued-up Annual Fixed Charges allowed for the transmission assets for the 2014-19 tariff period are:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Annual Fixed Charges	5014.71	4880.44	4758.32	4815.76	4928.24

(d) the Annual Fixed Charges allowed for the Combined Asset for the 2019-24 tariff period in this order are:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Annual Fixed Charges	4561.06	4536.36	4518.63	4501.15	4360.15



119. This order disposes of Petition No. 482/TT/2019.

sd/-
(Prakash S. Mhaske)
Member Ex-officio

sd/-
(Pravas Kumar Singh)
Member

sd/-
(Arun Goyal)
Member

sd/-
(I. S. Jha)
Member

sd/-
(P. K. Pujari)
Chairperson

