

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Coram:**

- 1. Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Member**
- 2. Shri R.Krishnamoorthy, Member**

**Petition No. 84/2007**

**In the matter of**

Approval of tariff of Unit –I (210 MW) of Feroze Gandhi Uchahar Thermal Power Station Stage-III from its date of commercial operation.

**And in the matter of**

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

**..Petitioner**

Vs

1. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
2. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Jaipur
3. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Ajmer
4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Jodhpur
5. Delhi Transco Ltd., New Delhi
6. Haryana Power Generation Co. Ltd., Panchkula
7. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
8. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
9. Power Development Deptt. Govt. of J & K, Srinagar
10. Power Department (Chandigarh), Union territory of Chandigarh, Chandigarh
11. Uttranchal Power Corporation Ltd., Dehradun

**.... Respondents**

**The following were present:**

1. Shri S.N. Goel, NTPC
2. Shri S.K.Khanna, NTPC
3. Shri S.Saran, NTPC
4. Shri S.K.Samui, NTPC
5. Shri T.P.S.Bawa, OSD, PSEB
6. Shri L.P.Kushwaha, DTL
7. Shri R.K.Arora, HPGCL

**ORDER  
(DATE OF HEARING: 27.9.2007)**

The petitioner, NTPC Limited has made this application for approval of tariff for Unit I (210 MW) of Feroze Gandhi Unchahar TPS, Stage-III from its date of commercial operation based on the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2004.

2. Heard the representatives of petitioner and the respondents present. After considering the application, the replies and the oral submissions made at the hearing,

certain additional information is required from the petitioner. The petitioner is accordingly directed to submit the following information latest by 26.10.2007 with an advance copy to the respondents:

- (i) Scheduled date of completion of the generating station;
- (ii) Detailed note to justify the cost of the generating station, an extension of the existing project.;
- (iii) Actual Cash Outflow on capital assets as on the date of commercial operation, duly certified by the Auditors, indicating the deferred liabilities included in the capital cost claimed;
- (iv) Details of deferred liabilities and deferred works as on the date of commercial operation of the unit;
- (v) Proper information (Head-wise) in respect of details of the capital cost as per Performa 5B;
- (vi) Details of taxes & duties, initial spares, erection, testing & pre-commissioning charges and IDC & FC capitalized in capital cost, separately;
- (vii) Name of the supplier, number of bidders, whether ICB or DCB as per the Form 5;
- (viii) Reasons for high escalation in main plant packages given in Form 5D;
- (ix) Reasons for actual expenditure being higher than the award price in the firm contract packages given in Form 5D;
- (x) Detailed break-up of IEDC capitalized (year-wise), duly certified by the Auditors;
- (xi) Detailed computation of IDC & FC indicating the applicable interest rate and financing charges and capitalized in capital cost, duly certified by the Auditors;

- (xii) Certificate to the effect that any revenue from sale of infirm power in excess of fuel cost has been adjusted in the capital cost;
- (xiii) Separate details of HFO & LDO for the months of October, November and December 2006 as per Form-19;
- (xiv) Confirmation to the effect that the capital cost considered does not include, any amount towards liabilities on accrual basis/provisions made, and if it so includes, statement of liability/ provision duly certified the auditors;
- (xv) Details of Euro Bond-II drawal-wise (date of drawal, rate etc.) and closing rate of currency at the end of the relevant financial year and FERV calculations;
- (xvi) Details of equity deployment (quarter-wise) as stipulated in Form 16;
- (xvii) Details of enabling assets considered; and
- (xviii) Clarification towards base floating rates of interest with margin in case of SBI- III and SBI-II loans.

3. During the hearing representative of PSEB raised the issue of capital cost of the generating station. He submitted that capital cost of Kahalgaon extension and Suratgarh extension projects was less than rupees three crore per megawatt and in the present case it is around rupees four crore per megawatt. To support of its claim, the respondent, PSEB is directed to arrange and furnish the details of completed capital cost along with scope of works, etc. of Suratgarh extension project by 26.10.2007 for comparison purposes.

4. HPGCL is also directed to arrange and furnish the details of capital cost along with scope of works for its Yamuna Nagar Thermal Power Project (2x300 MW) and Hissar Thermal Power Project also by 26.10.2007 for further reference.

5. The details to be furnished by PSEB and HPGCL in accordance with the directions in previous paras shall be endorsed to the petitioner and other respondents.

6. List on 20.11.2007 for further directions.

**Sd-/  
(R.KRISHNAMOORTHY)  
MEMBER  
New Delhi dated the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2007**

**sd-/  
(BHANU BHUSHAN)  
MEMBER**