

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Coram**

1. **Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
2. **Shri G.S. Rajamani, Member**
3. **Shri K.N.Sinha, Member**

**Petition No.128/2002**

**In the matter of**

Approval of tariff of National Capital Thermal Power Station, Dadri (840 MW) from 01.04.1998 to 31.3.2001.

**And in the matter of**

National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd.

**.. Petitioner**

Vs

1. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
2. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Jaipur
3. Delhi Power Supply Company Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
4. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Panchkula
5. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
6. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
7. Power Development Department, Govt. of J&K, Srinagar
8. Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh
9. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Ltd., Dehradun

**..Respondents**

The following were present:

1. Shri K.K. Garg, GM (Comml.), NTPC
2. Shri T.R. Sohal, NTPC
3. Shri V.K. Padha, DGM (Comml.), NTPC
4. Shri S.D. Jha, Sr. Manager (Comml.), NTPC
5. Smt. Rachna Mehta, Mgr (Comml), NTPC
6. Shri R. Singhal, NTPC
7. Shri D.D. Chopra, Advocate, UPPCL
8. Shri Jayant Verma, UPPCL
9. Shri T.K. Srivastava, EE, UPPCL
10. Shri V.K. Gupta, PSEB
11. Shri T.P.S. Bawa, SE, PSEB
12. Shri G.M. Agarwal, DCE (Comml.), RVPNL
13. Shri J.S. Bhargava, AE(JSP), RVPNL
14. Shri R.K. Arora, XEN/T, HVPN

**ORDER**

**(DATE OF HEARING: 27.5.2003)**

In our order dated 22.4.2003, we had directed the petitioner to furnish the additional details/clarifications in respect of NCTPS, Dadri (840 MW) for the

period 1.4.1998 to 31.3.2001. Shri K.K. Garg, Genl. Manager appearing on behalf of the petitioner, NTPC submitted that additional details/clarifications had been filed vide an affidavit dated 21.4.2003. We, found, that the petitioner had not furnished the additional details/clarifications on the prescribed formats. The Form 7, containing information regarding loans, etc., submitted by the petitioner was not prescribed by us. Shri Garg requested that the petitioner may be allowed a meeting with the staff of the Commission for ascertaining the exact details to be submitted before filing of additional details/clarifications. The request is allowed.

2. We direct the petitioner to furnish the following additional details/clarifications within two weeks, duly supported by an affidavit with advance copy to the respondents.

- (a) Date of drawal of loans, repayment schedule separately for each loan, its allocation on the date of drawal as per Form 6.
- (b) Reconciliation of discrepancies in the details of loan, etc. filed as per Form No.6 and Form No.12, for which the representative of the petitioner could discuss the matter with the staff of the Commission
- (c) Copies of Government of India's tariff calculation for Unit III and Unit I to III combined for NCTPS, Dadri
- (d) Reconciliation of O&M expenses for the year 1997-98 given in the petition qua O&M expenses worked out by the staff of the Commission on the basis of formula furnished by the petitioner.
- (e) Details of refinanced loan in prescribed proforma

- (f) Details of IBJ-II loan for Trench 'A', 'B', 'C' and 'D' separately for the period prior to 1996-97.
- (g) Details of Government of India loans along with interest rates and other terms and conditions with regard to repayment period, moratorium, etc.
- (h) Details of initial spares capitalised in the project cost of Rs.1586.38 crore as on 31.3.1997, based on audited accounts.
- (i) Details of new works for which order was placed in the year 1997-98 and in the subsequent years.
- (j) Details of interest accrued on Bonds after the date of commercial operation of the plant.

3. Shri D.D. Chopra, Advocate appearing for UPPCL submitted that the petitioner was asked to furnish the actual variable charges billed for the station during 1.4.1998 to 31.3.2001. But the petitioner had provided only the fuel price adjustment for the year 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 and had relied on variable charges based on Government of India notification dated 25.2.1999. He further submitted that the petitioner should have furnished the information in respect of fuel for computation of energy charges instead of writing "not applicable" in Form 17.

4. On the issue of O&M expenses, Shri Chopra submitted that these expenses should be 2.5% of the capital cost of the project only. He further submitted that there was variation in O&M expenses as claimed in Petition qua profit and loss account for the year 1997-98. Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSEB submitted that the power charges for the supply of power in colony for the year 1998-99 and

1999-2000 should not be paid to the petitioner. He further submitted that as per the order of the umpire, the loan amount should be reduced by the amount of cumulative depreciation. As per the details furnished in Form 11 & 12, the amount of cumulative depreciation was more than the amount of the repayment of loan.

5. Shri G.M. Aggarwal, DCE(Comml.), RRVPNL submitted that the petitioner had loaded the finance and issue expenses @ 1.0% every year on the interest rate applicable on UTI-IV loan. The staff of the Commission clarified that the interest rate was calculated after spreading the finance and issue expenses uniformly over the total repayment and moratorium period of the loan.

6. Shri R.K. Arora, XEN(T), HVPNL submitted that the petitioner had adopted fixed cash credit rate for working out interest on working capital, whereas interest should be reduced with reduction of interest rate on GPF by the government.

7. We will take a view on the submissions made on behalf of the parties.

8. Subject to directions above, hearing concluded and order reserved.

**Sd/-**  
**(K.N. SINHA)**  
**MEMBER**

**Sd/-**  
**(G.S. RAJAMANI)**  
**MEMBER**

**Sd/-**  
**(ASHOK BASU)**  
**CHAIRMAN**

New Delhi dated the 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2003