



सत्यमेव जयते

Order
on
TRUE UP
for
FY 2013-14,
Aggregate Revenue Requirement
and
Distribution Tariff (Wheeling & Retail Supply)
for
FY 2015-16
for
BSES Yamuna Power Limited (BYPL)



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

September, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi- 110017.

F.11(1177)/DERC/2014-15/

Petition No. 13/2015

In the matter of: Petition for Truing up of Expenses up to FY 2013-14, Review & Provisional True up for FY 2014-15, and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for Distribution (Wheeling & Retail Supply) Business for FY 2015-16.

BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
(Through its CEO)
Shakti Kiran Building,
Karkardooma,
Delhi 110 032.

...Petitioner/Licensee

Coram:

Sh. P. D. Sudhakar, Chairperson,
Sh. J. P. Singh, Member.
Sh. B.P. Singh, Member

ORDER

(Date of Order 29.09.2015)

Having deliberated upon the Petition for Truing up of Expenses up to FY 2013-14, Review & Provisional True up for FY 2014-15, and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for Distribution (Wheeling & Retail Supply) Business for FY 2015-16 filed by M/s. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. , the subsequent submissions by the Petitioner during the course of proceedings and the responses received from stakeholders, the Commission in exercise of the powers vested under the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 and extended for one year vide Order dated 22.10.2014, hereby pass this Order signed, dated and issued on 29.09.2015.

The Tariff Schedule, issued by the Commission vide Order No. F.11(1177)/DERC/2014-15 dated 24.09.2015 with the revised tariffs made applicable from 01.10.2015, is an integral part of this Order.

This Tariff Order shall remain in force till replaced by a subsequent Tariff Order and/or is amended, reviewed or modified, in accordance with the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Regulations made thereunder.


(B.P. Singh)
Member


(J. P. Singh)
Member


(P. D. Sudhakar)
Chairperson

CONTENTS

A1: INTRODUCTION.....	11
BSES Yamuna Power Limited (BYPL)	11
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission	11
The Coordination Forum.....	11
Multi Year Tariff Regulations	12
Filing and Acceptance of Petition	12
Interaction with the Petitioner	13
Public Notice	15
Layout of the Order.....	19
Performance Review.....	20
Approach of the Order.....	21
Approach for FY 2013-14	22
Approach for FY 2014-15	23
Approach for FY 2015-16.	23
A2: Response from Stakeholders	25
Introduction	25
Issue 1: Extension of time for filing objections	25
Issue 2: Tariff Petitions to be rejected	27
Issue 3: Funding of Pension Trust	29
Issue 4: Tariff for Railway Traction.....	38
Issue 5: Tariff for DMRC	40
Issue 6: Tariff for Telecom Towers.....	42
Issue 7: Time of Day (ToD) Tariff.....	44
Issue 8: Tariff for Cooperative Group Housing Societies (CGHS)	47
Issue 9: Other Tariff Issues.....	50
Issue 10: Fixed Charges	55
Issue 11: Interest on Security Deposits.....	59
Issue 12: Power Purchase Cost	60
Issue 13: Regulated Power Expenses.....	67
Issue 14: O&M Expenses.....	68
Issue 15: Capital Assets & Costs.....	70
Issue 16: LPSC (Late Payment Surcharge)	72
Issue 17: Past Period Claims & Regulatory Asset.....	73
Issue 18: High Interest on Working Capital and Loans	77
Issue 19: AT&C Losses.....	78
Issue 20: Cash Limit of Rs. 4000 for payment of Electricity Bills.....	85
Issue 21: Waiver of Renewable Power Purchase Obligation (RPO).....	87
Issue 22: Metering of DISCOMs own consumption	91
Issue 23: Power Purchase Adjustment Charges (PPAC).....	92
Issue 24: Government Subsidy.....	96
Issue 25: Open Access.....	97
Issue 26: Street light Maintenance & Charges.....	100
Issue 27: Reliability Surcharge	101
Issue 28: Electronic Meters.....	102
Issue 29: Net Metering.....	103
Issue 30: Additional UI Charges	104
Issue 31: Applicability of RTI to DISCOMs.....	104
Issue 32: Competition among DISCOMs	105
Issue 33: Financial Package proposed by DISCOMs.....	106

Issue 34: Conducting Energy Audit	107
Issue 35: Audit of DISCOMs from Inception	108
Issue 36: Review of Performance Standards	109
Issue 37: Spot Billing	111
Issue 38: Meter Connection per Family	112
Issue 39: Uniform Tariffs.....	113
Issue 40: Collection of Electricity Tax.....	114
Issue 41: Revoking of Long-Term Power Purchase Agreements (PPA).....	115
Issue 42: Plant-wise drawing of power	116
Issue 43: Arresting Theft of Electricity	117
Issue 44: Additional RoE to TPDDL.....	118
Issue 45: Comments received from GoNCTD.....	119

A3: TRUE UP FOR PAST PERIOD UPTO FY 2012-13 AND FY 2013-14..... 122

BACKGROUND.....	122
DIRECTIONS OF HON'BLE APTEL IN VARIOUS JUDGMENTS.....	122
True Up for FY 2013-14.....	187
ENERGY SALES.....	187
AT&C LOSSES.....	191
LONG-TERM POWER PURCHASE.....	198
SHORT TERM POWER PURCHASE	209
Operation and Maintenance Expenses	218
Other Expenses	219
Non Tariff Income	223
Capital Expenditure and Capitalisation.....	234
Means of finance	236
Depreciation.....	236
Working Capital.....	237
Advance Against Depreciation (AAD).....	239
Return on Capital Employed (RoCE).....	240
Income Tax	242
Aggregate Revenue Requirement approved in the Truing up for FY 2013-14	244
Revenue available towards ARR	246
Revenue (Gap) / Surplus	246

A4: Analysis of Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for FY 2015-16..... 248

INTRODUCTION.....	248
ENERGY SALES.....	248
REVENUE IN FY 2015-16 AT EXISTING TARIFF.....	255
AT&C LOSS	257
ENERGY REQUIREMENT	258
POWER PURCHASE.....	259
TRANSMISSION LOSS AND CHARGES.....	277
ENERGY BALANCE	280
SALE OF SURPLUS POWER	281
TOTAL POWER PURCHASE COST.....	284
POWER PURCHASE COST ADJUSTMENT CHARGES (PPAC).....	284
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (O&M) EXPENSES	290
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE AND CAPITALIZATION.....	292
DEPRECIATION	292
MEANS OF FINANCE FOR NEW INVESTMENTS	293

CONSUMER CONTRIBUTION	294
ADVANCE AGAINST DEPRECIATION	294
Working Capital.....	295
Regulated Rate Base (RRB)	297
Weighted Average Cost of Capital	298
Return on Capital Employed (RoCE).....	299
Income Tax.....	299
Non – Tariff Income	300
Aggregate Revenue Requirement without Carrying cost	301
Carrying Cost on Revenue Gap	301
Aggregate Revenue Requirement with Carrying cost.....	304
A5: TARIFF DESIGN	306
COMPONENTS OF TARIFF DESIGN	306
COST OF SERVICE MODEL	310
CROSS-SUBSIDISATION IN TARIFF STRUCTURE	314
TARIFF STRUCTURE	316
TARIFF SCHEDULE:	325
Other Terms and Conditions of the Tariff Schedule	330
A6: DIRECTIVES	338
Annexure-I.....	343
Annexure-II.....	344
Annexure-III.....	349
Annexure-IV	356
Annexure-V	359
Annexure VI.....	365
Annexure-VII	371
Annexure-VIII	378
Annexure-IX.....	382
Annexure-X.....	405

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: List of Correspondence with the Petitioner	14
Table 1.2: Standards of Performance during FY 2013-14	20
Table 3.1: Claims regarding directions of Hon'ble APTEL	122
Table 3.2: Impact on account of disallowance of REL Purchase	125
Table 3.3: Actual rate of Interest	131
Table 3.4: Net Worth Assessment from 2002-03 to FY 2013-14 submitted by the Petitioner	134
Table 3.5: Impact of financing cost of LPSC to be allowed on SBI PLR	135
Table 3.6: Impact of R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07	137
Table 3.7: Impact of R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07 along with carrying cost	137
Table 3.8: Impact of R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07 as considered in Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014	137
Table 3.9: Impact of expenses incurred on account of VRS Optees along with carrying cost	138
Table 3.10: Financial Impact of True-up of Pre-MYT Period	143
Table 3.11: Incremental O&M Expenses due to 11 months impact on actual basis	144
Table 3.12: Provisionally approved Depreciation for FY 2007-08 (11 Months).....	144
Table 3.13: Proposal for revision in Distribution Loss	145
Table 3.14: Impact on account of efficiency factor due to 6th pay commission arrears	146
Table 3.15: Revised Employee Expenses from FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12	147
Table 3.16: Energy billed and revenue billed including enforcement	153
Table 3.17: Net amount collected excluding financing cost of LPSC	153
Table 3.18: AT&C Loss for FY 2008-09	153
Table 3.19: Over-achievement of AT&C Loss for FY 2008-09	153
Table 3.20: Impact to be considered on account of FY 2008-09	154
Table 3.21: Impact along with carrying cost	154
Table 3.22: AT&C Loss for FY 2009-10	156
Table 3.23: Over-achievement of AT&C Loss during FY 2009-10	156
Table 3.24: Re-computation of AT&C Loss during FY 2009-10	157
Table 3.25: Impact along with carrying cost	157
Table 3.26: Rebate deducted from NTI	162
Table 3.27: Treatment of Rebate on Power Purchase Cost under NTI.....	162
Table 3.28: Income from interest on short term capital gains for 1st MYT Control Period	163
Table 3.29: Revised Interest on CSD to be added to Non Tariff Income from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	163
Table 3.30: Revised Interest on financing cost of LPSC for 1st MYT Control Period	164
Table 3.31: Revised Non Tariff Income for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	165
Table 3.32: Amount Disallowed from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations during FY 2012-13	167
Table 3.33: Revised GFA from FY 2004-05 to FY 2013-14 after de-capitalisation	168
Table 3.34: Revised GFA on account of de-capitalization from FY 2002-03 to FY 2012-13.....	169
Table 3.35: Means of finance during PDP (FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07)	170
Table 3.36: Revised Return on Equity approved from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07.....	170
Table 3.37: Means of Finance for net assets capitalized during FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	171
Table 3.38: Equity during FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	173
Table 3.39: Revised R&M Expenses for FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12	174
Table 3.40: Revised Employee Expenses for 2 nd MYT Period	177
Table 3.41: Revised A&G Expenses for 2nd MYT Period	178
Table 3.42: Revised R&M Expenses for FY 2012-13 of the 2nd MYT Period	178
Table 3.43: Comparison of O&M Cost with other DISCOMs	180
Table 3.44: Revised O&M Expenses approved by the Commission for FY 2012-13	180

Table 3.45: Revised O&M Expenses for FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12	180
Table 3.46: Gross and Net Power Purchase costs from FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12	181
Table 3.47: Approved Working Capital Requirement from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	182
Table 3.48: Opening balance for RRB for FY 2007-08	183
Table 3.49: Revised RRB from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	183
Table 3.50: Revised WACC and RoCE from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	184
Table 3.51: Revised Income Tax from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	184
Table 3.52: Revised Annual Revenue Requirement and Revenue Gap for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	185
Table 3.53: Impact of true-up from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07	186
Table 3.54: Revenue Gap and carrying cost for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13	187
Table 3.55: Enforcement Units considered for truing up for FY 2013-14	188
Table 3.56: Trued Up Energy Sales for FY 2013-14.....	191
Table 3.57: Revised AT&C loss trajectory for FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15 proposed by the Petitioner.....	192
Table 3.58: AT&C loss for FY 2013-14 as submitted by the Petitioner.....	192
Table 3.59 Revenue billed for AT&C Loss Computation for FY 2013-14 as approved by the Commission	194
Table 3.60: Revenue Collection during FY 2013-14.....	196
Table 3.61: AT&C Loss considered by the Commission for truing up for FY 2013 -14	197
Table 3.62: AT&C loss for FY 2013-14.....	197
Table 3.63: Computation of under achievement for FY 2013-14	198
Table 3.64: Details of Power Purchase Station wise during FY 2013-14	199
Table 3.65: Amount Disallowed from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations during FY 2013-14	202
Table 3.66: Impact on account of Regulated Power.....	207
Table 3.67: Long-Term Power Purchase quantum and cost considered for FY 2013-14.....	207
Table 3.68: Comparison of Short-Term Power Purchase Quantum	210
Table 3.69: Comparison of Short-Term Power Purchase Cost	210
Table 3.70: Comparison of Short-Term Power Sale	210
Table 3.71: Comparison of Short-Term Power Sales	211
Table 3.72: Percentage of UI Sale v/s. Gross Power Purchase in FY 2013-14	214
Table 3.73: Disallowed power purchase cost on account of UI sale during FY 2013-14	214
Table 3.74: Computation of Normative Rebate	216
Table 3.75: Trued-up Power Purchase cost for FY 2013-14.....	217
Table 3.76: O&M Expenses projected by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14.....	219
Table 3.77: O&M Expenses approved by the Commission for FY 2013-14	219
Table 3.78: Miscellaneous Expenses claimed in Truing up for FY 2013-14	219
Table 3.79: Other Expenses considered in Truing up for FY 2013-14	223
Table 3.80: Non Tariff Income submitted by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14	223
Table 3.81: Approved Funding of LPSC.....	228
Table 3.82: Interest on Consumer Security Deposit	229
Table 3.83: Interest on Consumer Security Deposit	229
Table 3.84: Bad debts along with carrying cost as claimed.....	232
Table 3.85: Trued-up Non Tariff Income approved by Commission	233
Table 3.86: Capital expenditure and capitalisation from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 submitted	234
Table 3.87: Revised GFA from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 submitted	234
Table 3.88: GFA for FY 2013-14	235
Table 3.89: Financing of new investment capitalised projected for FY 2013-14	236
Table 3.90: Consumers Contribution for FY 2013-14	236
Table 3.91: Approved financing of new investment capitalised in FY 2013-14	236
Table 3.92: Computation of Average rate of Depreciation for FY 2013-14	237
Table 3.93: Depreciation for FY 2013-14	237

Table 3.94: Working Capital Requirement as submitted by the Petitioner	238
Table 3.95: Approved Working Capital Requirement for FY 2013-14	239
Table 3.96: AAD submitted in Truing up for FY 2013-14	240
Table 3.97: Regulated Rate Base submitted for FY 2013-14	240
Table 3.98: Approved Regulated Rate Base and RoCE for FY 2013-14.....	241
Table 3.99: Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) submitted for FY 2013-14.....	241
Table 3.100: Normative equity for FY 2013-14.....	242
Table 3.101: Approved Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) for FY 2013-14	242
Table 3.102: Income Tax claimed in Truing up for FY 2013-14.....	243
Table 3.103: Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2013-14	245
Table 3.104: ARR approved for FY 2013-14.....	245
Table 3.105: Revenue details submitted by the Petitioner	246
Table 3.106: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for FY 2013-14	246
Table 3.107: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus upto FY 2013-14.....	247
Table 4.1: Actual Sales from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14	249
Table 4.2: Category-wise CAGR for Various Years	250
Table 4.3: Projected number of consumers, sanctioned load and sales for FY 2015-16.....	251
Table 4.4: Actual Sales from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15	252
Table 4.5: Various Years CAGR (FY 2007-08 to FY 2014-15)	252
Table 4.6: Approved Sales for FY 2015-16 by the Commission	255
Table 4.7: Power Factor considered by the Commission	256
Table 4.8: Revenue estimated for FY 2015-16	257
Table 4.9: AT&C Loss considered by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16	257
Table 4.10: Approved AT&C Loss for FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15	258
Table 4.11: Approved AT&C Loss for FY 2015-16	258
Table 4.12: Energy requirement proposed by the petitioner for FY 2015-16.....	258
Table 4.13: Energy requirement approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16	259
Table 4.14: Allocation of Power to Delhi from Central Generating Stations.....	260
Table 4.15: Allocation of Power to Delhi from State Generating Stations	261
Table 4.16: Energy Quantum from APCPL during FY 2015-16.....	262
Table 4.17 Energy Availability Projected for 2015-16	262
Table 4.18: Energy availability from Central, State and Other Generating Stations as approved for FY 2015-16.....	267
Table 4.19: Power Purchase Cost proposed by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16	269
Table 4.20: Approved Power Purchase Cost for various generating stations for FY 2015-16.....	272
Table 4.21: Cost of REC Purchase Projected Petitioner for meeting Solar RPO during FY 2015-16	275
Table 4.22: Cost of REC Purchase for meeting Non-Solar RPO during FY 2015-16	275
Table 4.23: Renewable Energy to be Procured	276
Table 4.24: Approved Cost of power purchases for RPO	277
Table 4.25: Transmission loss, charges projected by Petitioner for FY 2015-16.....	278
Table 4.26: Transmission loss, charges approved for FY 2015-16.....	279
Table 4.27: Energy Balance Projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16.....	280
Table 4.28: Energy Balance approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16	280
Table 4.29: Projected sale of surplus power for FY 2015-16.....	281
Table 4.30: Quantum of surplus energy sold and unit price realised from FY 2011-12 to FY 2014-15	282
Table 4.31: Approved Sale of Surplus Power for FY 2015-16	283
Table 4.32: Rebate on Power Purchase and Transmission charges approved for FY 2015-16.....	284
Table 4.33: Total Power Purchase Cost approved for FY 2015-16	284
Table 4.34: Schedule – Base cost for FY 2015-16	287
Table 4.35: O&M Expenses submitted by Petitioner for FY 2015-16	290

Table 4.36: R&M Expenses approved by Commission for FY 2015-16	291
Table 4.37: O&M Expenses approved by Commission for FY 2015-16.....	291
Table 4.38: Capital expenditure and Capitalization projected for FY 2015-16.....	292
Table 4.39: Capital expenditure and Capitalization approved for FY 2015-16.....	292
Table 4.40: Depreciation projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16	293
Table 4.41: GFA considered by the Commission for FY 2015-16.....	293
Table 4.42: Means of Finance considered for FY 2015-16.....	293
Table 4.43: Consumer Contributions approved to be capitalized for FY 2015-16	294
Table 4.44 Depreciation approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16	294
Table 4.45: Advance Against Depreciation projected for FY 2015-16.....	295
Table 4.46: Working capital projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16.....	295
Table 4.47: Working Capital considered for FY 2015-16	296
Table 4.48: RRB projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16.....	297
Table 4.49: RRB considered by the Commission for FY 2015-16	297
Table 4.50: WACC projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16	298
Table 4.51: Approved Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) for FY 2015-16	298
Table 4.52: RoCE Projected by Petitioner for FY 2015-16	299
Table 4.53: RoCE considered for FY 2015-16	299
Table 4.54: Income Tax Projected in the RE for FY 2015-16.....	300
Table 4.55: Income Tax approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16	300
Table 4.56: Non tariff Income projected for FY 2015-16.....	300
Table 4.57: Non Tariff Income approved for FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14	301
Table 4.58: Non Tariff Income approved for FY 2015-16	301
Table 4.59: Approved Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2015-16.....	301
Table 4.61: Carrying Cost on Revenue Gap for FY 2015-16.....	304
Table 4.62: Approved Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2015-16.....	304
Table 4.63: Approved ARR for Wheeling business for FY 2015-16.....	304
Table 4.64: Approved ARR for Retail business for FY 2015-16	305
Table 5.1: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of BYPL till FY 2013-14	306
Table 5.2: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of BRPL till FY 2013-14	307
Table 5.3: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of TPDDL till FY 2013-14	307
Table 5.4: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of the three DISCOMS till FY 2013-14.....	308
Table 5.5: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of BYPL at Existing Tariffs for FY 2015-16	308
Table 5.6: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of BRPL at Existing Tariffs for FY 2015-16.....	308
Table 5.7: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of TPDDL at Existing Tariffs for FY 2015-16	308
Table 5.8: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of all the three DISCOMs at Existing Tariff for FY 2015-16.....	308
Table 5.9: Revenue at Existing & Revised tariffs for FY 2015-16	309
Table 5.10: Approved Energy Sales for FY 2015-16	311
Table 5.11: Distribution Loss for FY 2015-16.....	311
Table 5.12: Approved Energy Input for FY 2015-16.....	312
Table 5.13: Wheeling cost allocated to different voltages for FY 2015-16	312
Table 5.14: Wheeling Charges for FY 2015-16.....	312
Table 5.15: Retail Supply cost Allocated to different voltages for FY 2015-16	313
Table 5.16: Retail Supply Charges at different voltages for FY 2015-16.....	313
Table 5.17: Cost of Supply for BRPL	313
Table 5.18: Cost of Supply for BYPL	313
Table 5.19: Cost of Supply for TPDDL	314
Table 5.20: Ratio of ABR to Average Cost of Supply and category-wise approved for FY 2015-16	315

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Explanation
ARR	Aggregate Revenue Requirement
A&G	Administrative and General
AAD	Advance Against Depreciation
ABT	Availability Based Tariff
ACD	Advance Consumption Deposit
AMR	Automated Meter Reading
APDRP	Accelerated Power Development and Reforms Program
AT&C	Aggregate Technical and Commercial
ATE	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
BEST	Birhanmumbai Electric Supply and Transport
BHEL	Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited
BIS	Bureau of Indian Standards
BPTA	Bulk Power Transmission Agreement
BRPL	BSES Rajdhani Power Limited
BST	Bulk Supply Tariff
BTPS	Badarpur Thermal Power Station
BYPL	BSES Yamuna Power Limited
CAGR	Compounded Annual Growth Rate
CCGT	Combined Cycle Gas Turbine
CEA	Central Electricity Authority
CERC	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
CFL	Compact Fluorescent Lamp
CGHS	Cooperative Group Housing Societies
CGS	Central Generating Stations
CIC	Central Information Commission
CISF	Central Industrial Security Force
CoS	Cost of Supply
CPI	Consumer Price Index
CPRI	Central Power Research Institute
CPSUs	Central Power Sector Utilities
CSGS	Central Sector Generating Stations
CWIP	Capital Work in Progress
DA	Dearness Allowance
DDA	Delhi Development Authority
DERA	Delhi Electricity Reform Act
DERC	Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission
DIAL	Delhi International Airport Limited
DISCOMs	Distribution Companies (BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL & NDMC)
DMRC	Delhi Metro Rail Corporation
DPCL	Delhi Power Company Limited
DTL	Delhi Transco Limited

Abbreviation	Explanation
DVB	Delhi Vidyut Board
DVC	Damodar Valley Corporation
EHV	Extra High Voltage
EPS	Electric Power Survey
FBT	Fringe Benefit Tax
FPA	Fuel Price Adjustment
GFA	Gross Fixed Assets
GHS	Group Housing Society
GIS	Geographical Information System
GoNCTD	Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi
GTPS	Gas Turbine Power Station
HEP	Hydro Electric Power
HPSEB	Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board
HRA	House Rent Allowance
HT	High Tension
HVDS	High Voltage Distribution System
IDC	Interest During Construction
IGI Airport	Indira Gandhi International Airport
IPGCL	Indraprastha Power Generation Company Limited
JJ Cluster	Jhugghi Jhopadi Cluster
KSEB	Kerala State Electricity Board
LED	Light Emitting Diode
LIP	Large Industrial Power
LT	Low Tension
LVDS	Low Voltage Distribution System
MCD	Municipal Corporation of Delhi
MES	Military Engineering Service
MLHT	Mixed Load High Tension
MMC	Monthly Minimum Charge
MoP	Ministry of Power
MTNL	Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited
MU	Million Units
MYT	Multi Year Tariff
NABL	National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration of Laboratories
NAPS	Narora Atomic Power Station
NCT	National Capital Territory
NCTPS	National Capital Thermal Power Station
NDLT	Non Domestic Low Tension
NDMC	New Delhi Municipal Council
NEP	National Electricity Policy
NGO	Non Government Organisation
NHPCL	National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Limited

Abbreviation	Explanation
NPCIL	Nuclear Power Corporation of India Limited
NRPC	Northern Regional Power Committee
NTI	Non Tariff Income
NTP	National Tariff Policy
NTPC	National Thermal Power Corporation
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
OCFA	Original Cost of Fixed Assets
PGCIL	Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PLR	Prime Lending Rate
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
PPAC	Power Purchase Cost Adjustment Charges
PPCL	Pragati Power Corporation Limited
PPS	Pragati Power Station
PTC	Power Trading Corporation
PWD	Public Works Department
R&M	Repair and Maintenance
RAPS	Rajasthan Atomic Power Station
REA	Regional Energy Account
RoCE	Return on Capital Employed
ROE	Return on Equity
RRB	Regulated Rate Base
RTI	Right to Information
RWA	Resident Welfare Association
SBI	State Bank of India
SERC	State Electricity Regulatory Commission
SIP	Small Industrial Power
SJVNL	Satluj Jal Vidyut Nigam Limited
SLDC	State Load Despatch Centre
SPD	Single Point Delivery
SPUs	State Power Utilities
SVRS	Special Voluntary Retirement Scheme
THDCL	Tehri Hydro Development Corporation Limited
ToD	Time of Day
TOWMCL	Timarpur Okhla Waste Management Company (P) Limited
TPDDL	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited
TPS	Thermal Power Station
UI	Unscheduled Interchange
UoM	Units of Measurement
WACC	Weighted Average Cost of Capital
WC	Working Capital
WPI	Wholesale Price Index

A1: INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Order relates to the petition filed by BSES Yamuna Power Limited (BYPL) (hereinafter referred to as 'BYPL' or the 'Petitioner') for True-up for FY 2013-14, Review for FY 2014-15, approval of Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2015-16 in terms of Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 (hereinafter referred to as the '2nd MYT Regulations') extended for further period of one year upto 31st March, 2016 vide order dated 22.10.2014.

BSES Yamuna Power Limited (BYPL)

- 1.2 BSES Yamuna Power Limited is a company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956 and is engaged in the business of distribution and retail supply of electricity within the area of supply (as defined in the license) in the National Capital Territory (NCT) of Delhi.

Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

- 1.3 Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (hereinafter referred to as 'DERC' or the Commission') was constituted by the GoNCTD on 3.03.1999 and it became operational from 10.12.1999.
- 1.4 The Commission's approach to regulation is driven by the Electricity Act, 2003, the National Electricity Plan, the National Tariff Policy and the Delhi Electricity Reform Act 2000 (hereinafter referred to as 'DERA'). The Electricity Act, 2003 mandates the Commission to take measures conducive to the development and management of the electricity industry in an efficient, economic and competitive manner, which inter alia includes tariff determination.

The Coordination Forum

- 1.5 The Commission has, since constitution of the Co-ordination Forum on 16.03.2005 held 28 meetings so far. In the 28th Co-ordination Forum Meeting held on 27.02.2015, the Commission discussed the following:

S. No.	Issues Discussed
i.	Status of GIS mapping of network & integration with SAP and SCADA by DISCOMs
ii.	Summer preparedness
iii.	Surrender/Re-allocation of Long term Power, considering the Demand-Supply scenario.
iv.	Progress of DSM initiatives
v.	Progress of projects under Net Metering Regulations, 2014
vi.	Schemes to be taken under Integrated Power Development Scheme (IPDS)
vii.	Proposal for disposal of DTs inherited from DVB, which are beyond repair
viii.	Review of progress of replacement of oil filled transformers by dry type transformers.

Multi Year Tariff Regulations

- 1.6 The Commission issued MYT Regulations, 2011 vide Order dated 02.12.2011 specifying Terms and Conditions for Determination of Tariff for Generation, Transmission and Distribution of electricity under the Multi Year Tariff (MYT) framework for the period FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15.
- 1.7 The Commission vide order dated October 22, 2014 has extended the MYT period of FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15 for a further period of one year i.e. FY 2015-16. It was ordered vide clause 23 that

“..... Further in order to avoid any doubt or ambiguity, the Commission in its wisdom considers it appropriate that the MYT Regulations 2011 be extended in totality i.e. the control period should be extended for one year i.e. FY 2015-16. Therefore the Commission is of the considered view that public interest is best served by extending the MYT regulations 2011 by one year i.e. FY 2015-16”.

Filing of Petition for True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, Review for FY 2014-15 and approval of ARR for FY 2015-16

Filing and Acceptance of Petition

- 1.8 BYPL has filed its petition before the Commission on 19.12.2014 for True-up for FY 2013-14, Review for FY 2014-15 and approval of Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2015-16. The Commission admitted the petition vide its Order dated 11.02.2015 subject to clarifications/additional information, if any, which would be sought from the Petitioner from time to time. A copy of the Admission Order dated 11.02.2015 is enclosed as **Annexure I** to this Order.

- 1.9 Further, as requested by stakeholders/consumers, the Commission directed all the Power Utilities to submit a Hindi version of the Petition filed by them. The Hindi and English versions of the Petition were uploaded on the website of the Commission as well as on the website of the Petitioner for the benefit of stakeholders/consumers.

Interaction with the Petitioner

- 1.10 The Order has referred at numerous places to various actions taken by the “Commission”. It may be mentioned for the sake of clarity, that the term “Commission” in most of the cases refers to the Staff of the Commission and the Consultants appointed by the Commission for carrying out the due diligence on the petition filed by the Petitioner, obtaining and analyzing information/clarifications received from the utilities and submitting all issues for consideration by the Commission.
- 1.11 For this purpose, the Commission Staff and Consultant held discussions with the Petitioners, obtained information/clarifications wherever required and carried out technical validation with regard to the information provided.
- 1.12 The Commission held public hearings to take a final view with respect to various issues concerning the principles and guidelines for tariff determination. The Commission has considered due diligence conducted by the Staff of the Commission and the Consultants in arriving at its final decision. The use of the term “Commission” may, therefore, be read in the context of the above clarification.
- 1.13 A preliminary scrutiny/analysis of the petition submitted by the Petitioner was conducted and certain deficiencies were observed. Accordingly, deficiency notes were issued to the Petitioner. Further, additional information/clarifications were solicited from the Petitioner as and when required. The Commission and the Petitioner also discussed key issues raised in the petition, which included details of capital expenditure and capitalisation plan, allocation of expenses into Wheeling and Retail Supply Business, AT&C loss reduction trajectory, liability towards SVRS expenditure, etc. The Petitioner submitted additional information through various letters, as listed in Table 1.1.
- 1.14 The Commission also conducted multiple validation sessions with the Petitioner during which discrepancies in the petition and additional information required by

the Commission were sought. Subsequently, the Petitioner submitted replies to the issues raised in these sessions and provided documentary evidence to substantiate its claims regarding various submissions.

- 1.15 The replies of the Petitioner, as mentioned in the **Table-1.1** as follows have been considered for approval of the ARR of the Petitioner:

Table 1.1: List of Correspondence with the Petitioner

Sl. No.	Letter No.	Letter Dated	Subject
1	Ref. No. RA/BYPL/2014-15/1132	23/03/2015	Reply to the queries raised in the prudence check session held on 13th March 2015
2	Ref. RA/BYPL/2015-16/14	10/04/2015	Long Term Power Purchase prudence Check FY 13-14
3	RA/BYPL/2015-16/15	15/04/2015	Long term power purchase prudence check FY 13-14
4	RA/BYPL/2015-16/16	15/04/2015	submission on claim of loss on sale of surplus power and disallowance on account of regulated power in FY 12-13 as directed by Tariff order dated 23.7.2014
5	RA/BYPL/2015-16/19	17/04/2015	BYPL reply- regarding fixed cost on account of regulated power FY 13-14 attaching letter No. RA/BYPL/2015-26/19 dated April 17, 2015
6	RA/BYPL/2015-16/19	17/04/2015	Fixed cost on account of Regulated Power
7	RA/BYPL/2015-16/18	16/04/2015	Data Gaps-Short Term Power Purchase Prudence check True up FY 2013-14
8	RA/BYPL/2015-16/25	24/04/2015	Minutes of Meetings: Ref : 1.) Long Term Power Purchase Meetings dated 25.03.15 and 01.04.15 2.) Short Term Power Purchase Meetings dated 03.04.2015
9	RA/BYPL/2015-16/36	28/04/2015	Submission of Slot wise Details related to loss on sale of surplus power for regulated power FY 13-14
10	RA/BYPL/2015-16/57	19/05/2015	BYPL/2013-14/DATA GAPS
11	RA/BYPL/2015-16/61	28/05/2015	Surrender/re-allocation/closure of various power station
12	RA/BYPL/2015-16/67	02/06/2015	Submission of provisional average power purchase cost for the month of Apr 15
13	RA/BYPL/2015-16/70	04/06/2015	Submission of Form -15 for the period Jan 15 to March 15
14	RA/BYPL/2015-16/79	08/06/2015	True up of Rand M and A and G Expenses for FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06.
15	RA/BYPL/2015-16/76	09/06/2015	Normative Self-Consumption
16	RA/BYPL/2015-16/75	09/06/2015	Prior period claims upto FY 2012-13 submission in petition for true up upto FY 2013-14, Review of FY 2014-15 and ARR

			and Tariff determination of FY 2015-16
17	RA/BYPL/2015-16/104	13/07/2015	Power Purchase Cost FY 15-16
18	RA/BYPL/2015-16/105	13/07/2015	Provisional Power Purchase bills (Short-term and Transmission) for FY 2014-15 (April 14 to March 15)
19	RA/BYPL/2015-16/114	24/07/2015	Additional submission in the ARR petition no. 13 of 2015 for FY 2015-16
20	RA/BYPL/2015-16/117	27/07/2015	Implementation of Time of Day Tariff

Public Notice

1.16 The Petitioner published a Public Notice indicating salient features of its petition for inviting comments from the stakeholders and requesting to submit response on the petition on or before 07.04.2015 in the following newspapers on the respective dates mentioned alongside:

a) The Hindustan Times (English)	– 02.03.2015
b) Mint (English)	– 02.03.2015
c) Hindustan (Hindi)	– 03.03.2015
d) Daily Milap (Urdu)	– 03.03.2015
e) Quami Patrika (Punjabi)	– 03.03.2015

1.17 Copies of the above Public Notice in English, Hindi, Urdu and Punjabi are enclosed as **Annexure II** to this Order. A copy of the petition was also made available for purchase from the head-office of the Petitioner on any working day between 11 A.M. and 4 P.M. in the form of compact disc (CD) on payment of Rs 25/- per CD or in the form of hard copy on payment of Rs.100/-. A copy of the complete petition was also uploaded on the website of the Commission, as well as that of the Petitioner, requesting for comments of the stakeholders thereon.

1.18 The Commission also published a Public Notice in the following newspapers on 08.03.2015 inviting comments from stakeholders on the Tariff petitions filed by the Petitioners latest by 07.04.2015.

a) Hindustan Times (English)	–08.03.2015
b) The Hindu (English)	–08.03.2015
c) The Pioneer (English)	–08.03.2015

d) Times of India (English)	–08.03.2015
e) Dainik Jagaran (Hindi)	–08.03.2015
f) Jadid in Dinon (Urdu)	–08.03.2015
g) Quami Patrika (Punjabi)	–08.03.2015

1.19 Copies of the above Public Notice in English, Hindi, Punjabi and Urdu are enclosed as **Annexure III** to this Order.

1.20 The Commission also published a Corrigendum on Public Notice in the following newspapers on 10.03.2015 inviting comments from stakeholders on the Tariff petitions filed by the Petitioners latest by 07.04.2015.

a) Hindustan Times (English)	10.03.2015
b) The Hindu (English)	10.03.2015
c) Times of India (English)	10.03.2015
d) Dainik Jagaran (Hindi)	10.03.2015
e) Jadid in Dinon (Urdu)	10.03.2015
f) Quami Patrika (Punjabi)	10.03.2015

1.21 Copies of the above Public Notice in English, Hindi, Punjabi and Urdu are enclosed as **Annexure IV** to this Order.

1.22 In order to extend help to the consumers in understanding the ARR Petition and filing their comments, the Commission prepared a Staff Paper/Executive Summary highlighting salient features of the MYT Petition filed by the Petitioner, which was uploaded on the Commission's website along with Annexure (including the comparative analysis of the key submissions made by the DISCOMs). In this regard, two officers of the Commission viz. Joint Director (Tariff-Finance), Joint Director (PS&E) and Joint Director (Engineering) were nominated for discussion on the ARR Petitions. This was duly highlighted in the Public Notices brought out by the Commission. In order to increase participation of the stakeholders, the Commission also prepared and uploaded the Hindi version of the Staff Paper on its website.

1.23 At the request of the stakeholders, the Commission extended the last date for filing objections and suggestions up to 17.04.2015 for which the public notice was issued in the following newspapers on the respective dates mentioned along side:

a) The Times of India (English)	– 07.04.2015
b) The Hindustan Times (English)	– 07.04.2015
c) Hindustan (Hindi)	– 07.04.2015
d) The Educator (Punjabi)	– 07.04.2015
e) Daily Milap (Urdu)	– 07.04.2015
f) Amar Ujala (Hindi)	– 07.04.2015

1.24 Copies of the above Public Notice in English, Hindi, Punjabi and Urdu are enclosed as **Annexure V** to this Order.

1.25 At the request of the stakeholders, the Commission extended the last date for filing objections and suggestions 2nd time up to 24.04.2015 for which the public notice was issued in the following newspapers on the respective dates mentioned along side:

g) Times of India (English)	– 18.04.2015
h) Hindustan Times (English)	– 18.04.2015
i) Hindustan (Hindi)	– 18.04.2015
j) The Educator, New Delhi (Punjabi)	– 18.04.2015
k) Milap (Urdu)	– 18.04.2015
l) Amar ujala (Hindi)	– 18.04.2015

1.26 Copies of the above Public Notice in English, Hindu, Punjabi and Urdu are attached as **Annexure VI** to this order.

1.27 The Commission published a Public Notice indicating the venue, date and time of public hearings on 04.08.2015 in the following newspapers on the respective dates mentioned alongside:

a) The Hindu (English)	– 23.07.2015
b) The Pioneer (English)	– 23.07.2015
c) Hindustan Times (English)	– 23.07.2015

d) Nav Bharat Times (Hindi)	– 23.07.2015
e) Dainik Jagran (Hindi)	– 23.07.2015
f) Quami Patrika (Punjabi)	– 23.07.2015
g) Pratap (Urdu)	– 23.07.2015

1.28 Copies of the above Public Notice in English, Hindi, Urdu and Punjabi are enclosed as **Annexure VII** to this order.

1.29 The Commission published a corrigendum on Public Notice indicating the venue, date and time of public hearings on 04.08.2015 in the following newspapers on the respective dates mentioned alongside:

h) The Hindu (English)	– 01.08.2015
i) The Pioneer (English)	– 01.08.2015
j) Hindustan Times (English)	– 01.08.2015
k) Nav Bharat Times (Hindi)	– 01.08.2015
l) Dainik Jagran (Hindi)	– 01.08.2015
m) Quami Patrika (Punjabi)	– 01.08.2015
n) Pratap (Urdu)	– 01.08.2015

1.30 Copies of the above Public Notice in English, Hindi, Urdu and Punjabi are enclosed as **Annexure VIII** to this order.

1.31 The Commission received written comments from 269 stakeholders/consumers. The comments of the stakeholders/consumers were forwarded to the Petitioner. The Petitioner responded to the comments of the stakeholders/consumers with a copy of its replies to the Commission. The Commission invited all stakeholders/consumers, including those who had filed their objections and suggestions, to attend the Public Hearing.

1.32 The public hearings were held at the Siri Fort Auditorium for all stakeholders/consumers on 04.08.2015 to discuss the issues related to the petition filed by the Petitioner. The issues and concerns voiced by various stakeholders/consumers have been examined by the Commission. The major issues discussed during the public hearing and/or written comments made by the stakeholders/consumers, the

responses of the Petitioner thereon and the views of the Commission, have been summarized in Chapter A2.

Layout of the Order

1.33 This Order is organised into six Chapters:

- a) **Chapter A1** provides details of the tariff setting process and the approach of the Order.
- b) **Chapter A2** provides a brief of the Public Hearing including the details of comments of various stakeholders/consumers, the Petitioner's response and views of the Commission thereon.
- c) **Chapter A3** provides details/analysis of the true up for FY 2013-14.
- d) **Chapter A4** provides analysis of the petition for determination of the Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2015-16.
- e) **Chapter A5** provides details of the possible options for determination of Wheeling and Retail Supply Tariff for all consumer categories for FY 2015-16, and the approach adopted by the Commission in its determination.
- f) **Chapter A6** provides details of the Directives of the Commission.

1.34 The Order contains following Annexure, which are an integral part of the Tariff Order:

- a) **Annexure I** - Admission Order.
- b) **Annexure II** - Copies of Public Notices published by the Petitioner.
- c) **Annexure III** - Copies of the Public Notice published by the Commission inviting comments from the stakeholders/consumers.
- d) **Annexure IV** - Copies of the Corrigendum on Public Notice published by the Commission inviting comments from the stakeholders/consumers.
- e) **Annexure V** - Copies of the Public Notice published by the Commission regarding extension of last date of submission of comments.
- f) **Annexure VI** - Copies of the Public Notice published by the Commission regarding 2nd time extension of last date of submission of comments
- g) **Annexure VII**– Public Notice for public hearing held on 04.08.2015 at Siri Fort Auditorium, New Delhi.

- h) **Annexure VIII**– Public Notice for corrigendum on public hearing held on 04.08.2015 at Siri Fort Auditorium, New Delhi
- i) **Annexure IX** -List of the stakeholders/consumers who submitted their comments on True-up for FY 2013-14, Review for FY 2014-15 and approval of Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2015-16.
- j) **Annexure X** – List of Stakeholders/consumers who attended the public hearing.

Performance Review

- 1.35 Regulation 10.2 of the DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulation, 2011 stipulates as under:

“The Distribution Licensee shall submit information as part of annual review on actual performance to assess the performance vis-à-vis the targets approved by the Commission at the beginning of the Control Period. This shall include annual statements of its performance and accounts including latest available audited accounts as well as the regulatory accounts in the prescribed formats and the tariff worked out in accordance with these Regulations.”

- 1.36 The Commission sought inputs on overall Standards of Performance prescribed in Schedule-II of the Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007. The details submitted by BYPL for FY 2013-14 are given in Table 1.2 as follows:

Table 1.2: Standards of Performance during FY 2013-14

Parameter	Prescribed Time Limit / Measure	Overall Standard of Performance	Number of complaints received	No. of complaints attended within specified timelines	% Complied during FY 13-14
Normal Fuse-Off Calls	Within three hours for Urban areas	At least 99% calls received should be rectified within prescribed time limits in both Cities and Towns and in Rural areas.	424934	423664	99.70%
	Within eight hours for Rural areas				
Line breakdown	Within six hours for Urban areas	At least 95% calls received should be rectified within prescribed time limits in both Cities and Towns and in Rural areas.	6415	6410	99.92%
	Within twelve hours for Rural areas				
	Temporary supply to be				

Parameter	Prescribed Time Limit / Measure	Overall Standard of Performance	Number of complaints received	No. of complaints attended within specified timelines	% Complied during FY 13-14
Distribution Transformer Failure	restored within four hours from alternate source, wherever feasible.	At least 95% of DTR's to be replaced within prescribed time limits in both Cities and Towns and in Rural areas.	10	10	100%
	Rectification of fault and thereafter restoration of normal power supply within twelve hours.				
Scheduled Outage	Maximum duration in a single stretch shall not exceed 12 hours.	At least 90% of cases should be complied within prescribed time limits.	2514	2514	100%
	Restoration of supply by 6:00 P.M.		2514	2511	99.88%
			No of Bills issued	No of Bills with mistakes	Percentage
Billing Mistakes	Licensee shall maintain the percentage of bills requiring modifications following complaints to the total number of bills issued.	Not exceeding 0.20%	10274462	4838	0.05%
			No of Meters	No of Defective Meters reported	Percentage
Faulty Meter	Licensee shall maintain the percentage of defective meters to the total number of meters in service.	Not exceeding 3%	1397847	11500	0.82%
Reliability Indices	SAIFI	NA	Achieved during FY 2013-14		1.684
	SAIDI	NA			2.466
	MAIFI	NA			0.0015
Augmentation of Distribution Network during FY 2012-13	Number of power transformers	NA	Augmentation during FY 2013-14		5
	EHV capacity(MVA)	NA			116
	Shunt capacitors (MVAR)	NA			3
	Number of distribution transformers	NA			264
	Distribution transformer capacity(MVA)	NA			225.74
	Number of 11kV feeders	NA			5
	11kv cables laid (km)	NA			9
	Total number of LT feeders	NA			143
	LT lines laid (km)	NA			39

Approach of the Order

- 1.37 The Petitioner has submitted the ARR petition for FY 2015-16 along with the True-up petition for FY 2013-14 and also sought review for FY 2014-15.

Approach for FY 2013-14

1.38 Under the MYT Framework, the Commission has projected the ARR for the Petitioner for each year of the Control Period in the MYT Order 2012-15 issued on 13.07.2012. Under MYT Regulation 2011, the components of ARR have been segregated into controllable and un-controllable parameters. As per the regulation 4.21 of the MYT Regulation 2011, various controllable and un-controllable parameters shall be trued-up as per the principle stated as follows:

- a) Variation in revenue/expenditure on account of uncontrollable sales/power purchase respectively shall be trued-up every year;
- b) For controllable parameters,
 - i. Any surplus or deficit on account of Operation and Maintenance (O&M) expenses shall be to the account of the Licensee and shall not be trued-up in ARR; and
 - ii. Depreciation and Return on Capital Employed shall be trued-up every year based on the actual capital expenditure and actual capitalization vis-à-vis capital investment plan (capital expenditure and capitalisation) approved by the Commission.

Provided that any surplus or deficit in Working Capital shall be to the account of the Licensee and shall not be trued-up in ARR.

Provided further that the Commission shall not true-up interest rate, if variation in State Bank of India Base Rate as on 01.04.2012, is within $\pm 1\%$ during the Control Period. Any increase / decrease in State Bank of India Base Rate beyond $\pm 1\%$ only shall be trued-up.

1.39 The Commission has accordingly, trued up the uncontrollable parameters viz. power purchase cost, energy sales and revenue based on the audited accounts and other information submitted by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14 after exercising prudence check. The true up of controllable parameters is governed by Regulation 4.21 of the MYT Regulations, 2011 as mentioned above. All parameters related to capitalisation have been Trued up on Provisional basis subject to the physical verification report of the asset capitalized from FY 2004-05 to FY 2013-14. The detailed treatment of each component of uncontrollable and controllable parameters is provided in Chapter A3 of this Order.

1.40 The Commission has implemented various directions of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 61&62 of 2012, 177&178 of 2012, 171 of 2012 and 195 of 2013 subject to the issues which have been covered under Clarificatory application filed before Hon'ble APTEL due to variance in judgement on similar issues. Following issues have been covered under Clarificatory application:

- a. Change in methodology for computation of AT&C losses
- b. True up of rate of interest on loans
- c. AT&C loss true up of FY 2009-10 due to disallowance of KWH figures
- d. AT&C loss target revision for FY 2011-12
- e. Efficiency factor applied on O&M expenses during 2nd. MYT Control Period
- f. SVRS terminal benefit payment
- g. Food and Children Education Allowance
- h. Comparable pay for Non FRSR employees
- i. Arbitrary computation of efficiency factor for FY 2011-12

Approach for FY 2014-15

1.41 The Petitioner has requested for a review of ARR for FY 2014-15 which had been determined earlier by the Commission in its Order dated 23.07.2014. The mechanism for True up as specified in the MYT Regulations envisages that variations on account of uncontrollable items like energy sales and power purchase cost shall be trued up. Truing up shall be carried out for each year based on actual/audited accounts and prudence checks undertaken by the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission is of the opinion that in accordance with the MYT Regulations, 2011 the True up of FY 2014-15 can only be considered based on the audited financial statement once the Petitioner makes a regular tariff Petition for True up of FY 2014-15.

Approach for FY 2015-16.

1.42 The Commission vide order dated October 22, 2014 has extended the MYT period of FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15 for a further period of one year i.e. FY 2015-16 and made applicable the MYT Regulations 2011 in totality

The ARR for the FY 2015-16 shall be determined inter alia based on the following provisions of the MYT Regulations, etc. pertaining to Distribution business:

- a) Regulation 3.2 - ARR and Tariff for Wheeling Business and Retail Supply business separately.
- b) Regulations 4.5 and 4.6 - Base line values (operating and cost parameters) and performance targets.
- c) Regulations 4.7 and 4.8 - Targets for controllable Parameters including AT&C loss, Distribution losses, Collection efficiency, O&M expenditure, Return on capital employed, Depreciation and quality of supply and conditions for eligibility for higher rate of incentive.
- d) Regulations 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12 - Sales forecast.
- e) Regulations 5.28 and 5.29 - AT&C loss reduction trajectory for each year of the Control Period.
- f) Regulation 5.30 - Transmission and Load Dispatch Charges and Wheeling charges.
- g) The allocation from the unallocated quota of Power at the disposal of GoNCTD may change from time to time and needs to be considered based on the latest available data or the Commission may have to make reasonable assumptions with respect to allocation of power from the unallocated quota.
- h) Availability of power from the new sources of generation, based on their actual/revised Commissioning schedule.

1.43 The Commission has evaluated the ARR submitted by the Petitioner on the basis of the MYT Regulations, 2011 extended for further period of one year upto 31.03.2016 and other factors considered appropriate by the Commission.

A2: Response from Stakeholders

- 2.1 Summary of objections/suggestions from stakeholders, response of DISCOMs (Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL), BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL) and BSES Yamuna Power Limited (BYPL) and Commission's View.

Introduction

- 2.2 Section 64(3) of the Electricity Act, 2003, stipulates that the Commission shall determine tariff under Section 62 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for the distribution licensees, after consideration of all suggestions received from the public and the response of the DISCOMs to the objections/suggestions of stakeholders, issue a tariff order accepting the applications with such modifications or such conditions as may be specified in the order. Public hearing, being a platform to understand the problems and concerns of various stakeholders, the Commission has encouraged transparent and participative approach in hearings to obtain necessary inputs required for tariff determination. Accordingly public hearings were held on 04.08.2015 in Siri Fort Auditorium, Delhi with consumers to discuss the issues related to the petitions filed by the Licensees viz., Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited, BSES Rajdhani Power Limited and BSES Yamuna Power Limited for true up of expenses for FY 2013- 14, Review and provisional true up for FY 2014-15 and Annual Revenue Requirement (ARR) for FY 2015-16.
- 2.3 In the public hearings, the stakeholders offered their comments and suggestions before the Commission in the presence of the Petitioners.
- 2.4 The Commission has examined the issues taking into consideration the comments/suggestions offered by the various stakeholders in their written statements and during the public hearings and also the response of the Petitioners thereon.
- 2.5 The comments/suggestions of various stakeholders, the replies/response by the Petitioners and the views of the Commission thereon are summarized below under various subheads.

Issue 1: Extension of time for filing objections**Stakeholders' View**

- 2.6 The date of submission of suggestions/objections from public may be extended up to

20.05.2015.

- 2.7 Tariff petitions filed by the DISCOMs are extremely complicated with huge reference to APTEL's Judgments, the implication of which are not known to the consumers. Hence, need more time at least 6 weeks to study and consult legal professionals who are conversant with the matter.
- 2.8 The Commission has uploaded executive summary of the voluminous ARR's filed by DISCOMs with fancy charts and tables expecting the consumer to go through about 2000 pages of the petitions, analyze the complex tables and legal submissions made by the DISCOMs supported by complex financial statements.
- 2.9 The Commission, instead of staff papers has issued executive summary that conceals major part of ARR. This is a case of non material disclosure by the Commission and the Commission should publish full facts of ARR petition, true-up and the relevant portion of the order in the past tariff orders. The carrying cost of Regulatory Asset has not been disclosed. Hence it is requested to extend time for filing response on the petitions filed by DISCOMs.
- 2.10 The Commission should appoint a consultant or auditor to analyze the tariff petition on behalf of consumer and represent their view point during the process of approval of ARR and determination of Tariff.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

- 2.11 TPDDL has filed the petition in the formats and sequence prescribed by the Commission for true-up / ARR petition. The other formats are introduced to enable the consumer to understand the petition easily.

BYPL

- 2.12 The reasons and justification for tariffs proposed have been explained in the ARR petition.

BRPL

- 2.13 No Response

Commission's View

- 2.14 On request of some of the stakeholders, the Commission extended the date for filing

of objections/suggestions on the tariff petitions filed by the DISCOMs i.e. in first instance upto 17.04.2015 and then up to 24.04.2015.

- 2.15 The purpose of executive summary is to highlight the submissions filed by the DISCOMs. The executive summary does not reflect the Commission's view.
- 2.16 In order to extend help to the consumers in understanding the ARR Petition and filing their comments, the Commission had also nominated two officers of the Commission viz. Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) and Joint Director (Tariff Engineering) for discussion on the ARR Petitions. This was duly highlighted in the Public Notices brought out by the Commission.
- 2.17 The Commission is of the view that the Electricity Consumers Advocacy Centre which will have a panel of lawyers who will assist consumers to take up their grievances with Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and courts in Delhi may also assist in analyzing the Tariff Petitions and represent the consumers view point during the public hearing etc. The Commission is also providing funds to this centre. This will be further examined and detailed guidelines will be issued to the Electricity Consumer Advocacy Centre as may be required.

Issue 2: Tariff Petitions to be rejected

Stakeholders' View

- 2.18 In the admission orders dated 11.02.2015, the Commission had observed that the petitions have been scrutinized and found to be in order. BRPL and BYPL have not submitted their detailed capital expenditure for true-up for last two Multi Year Tariff Periods 2007-12 and 2012-15. As per the Commission's earlier tariff orders, every year capital expenditure was provided on provisional basis and in view of this, the tariff for FY 2007-08 till FY 2014-15 has been treated as provisional. DISCOMs cannot be allowed to escape from submission of true-up petitions for capital expenditure for so many years. The ARR petitions are apparently not in order and are liable to be rejected.
- 2.19 The true up petition for FY 2013-14 is not acceptable as the audited report for FY 2013-14 was not signed by four of the Directors of the Board for Government. Hence, also true up petitions are liable to be rejected.

Petitioner's Submission**BRPL**

2.20 The true up petition filed is in accordance with the provisions of MYT Regulations and Electricity Act, 2003, based on the financial statements audited by Statutory Auditors. Realistic projections are made in the ARR petition for ensuing years based on the audited statements available till the submission of ARR. Based on the submission made by the petitioner in the ARR petition, the Commission determines the tariff after following a comprehensive due diligence process for FY 2015-16. The Petitioner has already submitted annual financial statements audited by statutory auditors and cost audit report.

BYPL

2.21 As per DERC (Terms and Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011, the variation in revenue/cost on account of uncontrollable factors like sales, power purchase and controllable factors like RoCE and depreciation shall be trued up annually. Hence as per the Regulations there should not be any delay in truing up of the expenditures mentioned above.

TPDDL

2.22 The tariff petition for ARR and true up have been filed in the formats and in sequence prescribed by the Commission.

2.23 Tariff determination process is an independent exercise which should not be stalled as it directly affects the cash flows of DISCOMs. Further, the suggestion that true up should be done at the earliest and within statutory time limit is welcome.

Commission's View

2.24 As per Section 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Commission processes and finalizes the tariff petitions filed by the Petitioners after considering all suggestions and objections received from the public. Deficiencies in the petitions are sought from the Petitioners. The process of tariff determination every year is mandated by law and has been reiterated in the Hon'ble APTEL's judgment in OP.1 of 2011.

2.25 Finalization and approval of capital expenditure and capitalisation for DISCOMs are under process with the help of consultants.

2.26 The Commission during the course of process of the petitions undertakes prudence

check of all the cost elements obtains audited financial statements, auditors certificates on revenue billed and collected, power purchases, etc. Based on prudence check, the Commission considers the cost elements of the ARR for truing up in the tariff order. Determination of tariff is a regular and continuing annual process as prescribed by the Electricity Act, 2003.

- 2.27 The Commission is empowered to revisit the tariff orders, if it believes that certain cost elements are subject to further true-up and accordingly can recover/allow the costs along with carrying cost, if any.

Issue 3: Funding of Pension Trust

Stakeholders' View

- 2.28 To arrange funds for Pension Trust in the ARR to cover payments towards retirement pension etc to voluntary retirees also. The DVB Pension Trust should not deviate from its sole purpose as defined in clause (b) of trust deed and not discriminate among retirees.
- 2.29 DERC is allocating funds to DVB Pension trust but the trust is not making payment to voluntary retirees. The DVB Pension trust is discriminating against retirees and misusing funds provided by DERC in previous years.
- 2.30 The Madhya Pradesh Regulatory Commission in its order No 1191/MPREC/2012 stated that DISCOMs have no liabilities w.r.t. employees prior to the date of restructuring i.e. 01.06.2005 but the funds arranged by DERC in the last three tariff orders for the pension trust are utilized for employees retired prior to 01.07.2002 i.e. past liabilities.
- 2.31 In its letter No. 2901 dated 03.11.2009, GONCTD has clearly advised the trust to pay all retirement benefits (to employees who sought voluntary Retirement under Rule 48A of CCs (Pension) Rules, 1972) on par with the normal retirement cases.
- 2.32 TPDDL (NDPL) has already paid contribution towards pension etc to pension trust every month till date but the trust misused the funds by making payment to employees retired subsequently.
- 2.33 The stakeholders, who attained the age of 65 years, are still deprived of terminal benefits namely, gratuity, leave encashment and commutation after 34 years of DVB service since October 2006 and both TPDDL and DVB Pension Trust left them

abandoned.

2.34 In view of the above, it is requested that:

- a. While allocating funds for the trust in FY 2015-16, specific directions be issued to the Trust to pay all the retirees, including optees of voluntary retirement, without any discrimination and harassment as per DERC approval note dated 13-06-2013. TPDDL may be advised to pay directly to voluntary retirees through this fund.
- b. The funds allowed to trust through DISCOMs should not be used for retirees prior to 01.07.2002.
- c. DTL and DVB Pension Trust be directed to submit audit reports on utilization of funds without any bias to DERC.
- d. Till date the Pension Trust failed to conduct any proper annual actuarial valuation of its campus and has also not raised any valid demand for additional contribution as per terms of Trust Deed and the Terminal Benefit Rules appeared to the Trust Deed.

2.35 Commission to frame Regulations under Section 9 (2) and 61 (1) of the Reforms Act and Electricity Act 2003 for providing funds for payment of life time pension and terminal benefits liability of DVB (Retired and to be retired)

Pension Trust's Submission

2.36 With the continuing default by the DISCOMs, the Pension Trust has completely run out of funds and after the expiry of the provision of the funds for the financial year 2014-15, the Trust will not be having any funds in 2015-16. Therefore, pending solving of the disputes/issues, the Trust has to resort to its funding for the financial year 2015-16 through the contributions of DISCOMs.

2.37 The Trust is submitting the following for consideration of the Commission on the efforts made by Pension Trust and the status of accounts and procedures : -

- a. As a permanent solution for the funding of Pension Trust, a proposal for the management of funds through LIC of India was initiated by Pension Trust which was demanded by the DISCOMs. The LIC of India submitted a detailed proposal in this respect and gave presentation also to all the successor utilities. In the said proposal, LIC of India has proposed for the funding requirement for the existing

pensioners as well as for the working employees of DVB origin on actuarial basis. For rationalisation of the consumer tariffs, the LIC of India has also given alternative slabs of fund requirement of Pension Trust for each year which shall have to be provided by successor utilities and which can be considered by the Commission in the ARR of successor utilities on yearly basis. DISCOMs have not agreed to this proposal. However efforts are being continued by Pension Trust in consultation with GoNCTD for a permanent solution of the funding of Pension Trust based on the proposal of LIC of India. In case the same gets implemented successfully with the consent of DISCOMs the ad-hoc funding as may be provided by the Commission on yearly basis based on the representation of Pension Trust shall be discontinued and necessary adjustment as may be required for the ad-hoc funding provided by the Commission till date shall be considered in the valuation model of LIC of India.

- b. The annual accounts of the Pension Trust have been finalized up-to the financial year 2013-14 and have been audited up-to 2010-11. The copies of audit accounts up-to the financial year 2010-11 and copies of the unaudited accounts for the financial years 2011-12 and 2012-13 have already been forwarded to successor utilities for comments, if any. Till date no comments have been received on the same. The Board of Trustees of the Pension Trust, in their 24th meeting held on 5th February, 2015 have approved the accounts for the financial years 2011-12 to 2013-14 which are being placed for audit by independent auditors appointed by the Board of Trustees.
- c. As per the statutory advice given by the Commission the oversight Committee, constituted by GONCTD, has been reviewing the procedures and norms adopted by the Pension Trust with regard to its functioning and fund requirement.

2.38 In view of the above facts, the Commission is requested to provide funds for the Pension Trust to the extent of Rs.573 Crore for the financial year 2015-16 by allowing the same in the ARR of DISCOMs, NDMC & MES.

DVB Pensioners Association's Submission

2.39 After disbursing the retirement benefits, out of the funds contributed by Government of Delhi at the time of unbundling, there is consistent uncertainty on

the receipt of the pension and other benefits by the retirees on monthly basis. During the last four years the monthly pension and other guaranteed retirement benefits could be provided by the Pension Trust only through the intervention of the Commission as the Pension Trust is not getting regular funds from DISCOMs, DTL and IPGCL.

- 2.40 The medical bills of the pensioners since September, 2014 are pending and the pensioners who are in their old age are not able to obtain essential medical facilities.
- 2.41 The DISCOMs are also not complying with the directions of DERC for monthly contribution of funds to the Trust against allocation of Rs. 470 Crore made by the Commission in the tariff orders for 2014-15 but are delaying payments.
- 2.42 There is no provision for funding the Pension Trust for 2015-16 and as a result it is not certain whether the pensioners will be able to draw their pension for the months of April – May, 2015 and whether they will be able to receive reimbursement against expenditure incurred on the treatment of their poor health in this old age. The Commission is requested to provide in the meantime funds to the Pension Trust for 2015-16 which would work out approximately Rs. 750 to 800 Crores, so that the pensioners could draw their pension and other retirement benefits from the Pension Trust without any break as these are the only source of living for the old age DVB pensioners after their retirement.
- 2.43 The DVB Pensioners Association in its letter dated 04.07.2015 has referred to the following and requested to provide funding through Tariff of DISCOMs for making payment to DVB pensioners relating to monthly pension, medical bills, LTC etc.
- (a) Govt. letter dated 21.01.2004: GoNCTD has clarified that vigilance/disciplinary/court cases in respect of employees of the DVB who could not become part of any of the companies, viz. BYPL/BRPL/IPGL/DTL and NDPL on 01.07.2002, the date of restructuring, shall be processed and decided by such Company who would have been the controlling authority of the employees but for their retirement/removal/ dismissal/compulsory retirement etc as per schedule 'B', 'C', 'D' and 'F' of Delhi Reform (Transfer Scheme) Rules, 2001.
- (b) The High Court of Delhi in LPA No 98/2005 held that there is no escape from concluding that even in all these suits which were pending or filed by the retired

employees of the DVB claiming their service benefits, the respective transferee company shall be substituted instead of DVB.

- (c) The Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 4269 of 2006 read with C.A. No. 4270 of 2006 had upheld the GoNCTD letter dated 21.01.2004 and also the order of the High Court in LPA No 98/2005.

2.44 The Supreme Court in its judgment dated 03.05.2010 in case no. 4269 of 2006 read with case no. 4269 of 2006 has categorically fixed the responsibility on the respective DISCOMs of paying past retirement benefits to pensioners like gratuity, leave encashment, medical facilities, LTC and pension etc. taking in to consideration every aspect of 'Transfer Scheme', 'Tripartite Agreement' and also questions/doubts /claims made by DISCOMs. In spite of this, the DISCOMs are trying to escape from their responsibilities by putting blame on each other as well as blaming the 'Pension Trust'. The Commission is therefore requested to provide funding to the pension trust through Tariff of each DISCOM for making payment to the retirees all the above mentioned terminal benefits on par with the serving employees, instead of through DTL.

2.45 The grievances which need immediate attention and resolutions are as under;

- (a) Permanent mechanism for regular and smooth reimbursement of pension and other benefits be resolved.
- (b) Merger of ad-hoc payment of Rs. 500/- while fixing the revised pension of retirees retired after 01.07.2002.
- (c) Enhancement of concessional energy units on par with working employees.
- (d) Implementation of Saxena Committee recommendation and Hon'ble Supreme Court decision.
- (e) Restoration of medical credit facilities to the pensioners and timely payment of medical bills also be assured.
- (f) New empanelment of hospitals and diagnostic centers of DGEHS list be allowed as already requested time and again.
- (g) Revision of minimum pension as ordered by the pay Commission for pensioners prior to 01.01.2006 be implemented with arrears.

(h) Implementation of revision of pension in various cases on account of various grounds post retirement which is not being done by the trust officials.

DVB Engineers Association's Submission

2.46 The present requirement of the pension trust for FY 2015-16 for 21000 pensioners for funding by all successor entities of DVB, including three DISCOMs is estimated at Rs. 564 Crore as under:

Monthly Pension	Rs. 35 Crore
All terminal benefits (Including DA, medical reimbursement, LTC, etc.)	Rs. 12 Crore
Total monthly requirement	Rs. 47 Crore
Annual requirement	Rs. 564 Crore

2.47 Pension is a right to the pensioners and not a bounty or gratuitous payment and does not depend on the discretion of the petitioner but is governed by CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972, Reforms Act, 2000 and Transfer scheme rules, 2001. This is a settled principle of law by Apex. Court.

2.48 DISCOMs have disputed liability under various heads (payment of DVB pensions related to monthly pension, LTC medical bills etc) and the said liability is to be borne by the Pension Trust / GONCTD only. As the Commission is allowing contribution to the Pension Trust through ARR of DTL all liability must be serviced from the said contribution which is being paid by DISCOMs already.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.49 Pension Trust should be responsible to disburse the amounts without discrimination. The Commission may direct the Pension Trust accordingly.

2.50 The amount to be released for FY 2015-16 may be utilized for optees of voluntary retirement also.

2.51 The audit reports on utilization of the Pension Trust funds be provided to DISCOMs and the Commission.

2.52 LIC has provided way forward for managing the Pension Trust funds, which should not be confused with funding disputes of past. TPDDL has not given any approval to LIC proposal as it does not address the disputes on liability between DISCOMs and

the Pension Trust.

- 2.53 GoNCTD cannot absolve itself of the liability of funding the Pension Trust and GoNCTD must adequately fund the Pension Trust so that such requests for funding are not made by the Pension Trust to the Commission.

BRPL

- 2.54 The underfunding of the Pension Trust as on the date of transfer is a pending issue before the Delhi High Court in W.P. No. 1698 of 2010 (Delhi State Electricity Workers Union Vs GONCTD & Others).
- 2.55 Till date no actuarial valuation has been conducted by the Pension Trust since the transfer date which is a violation of Terminal Benefit Rules and therefore no question arises towards additional contribution in this regard. However BRPL and BYPL have paid an amount of Rs. 174.26 Crore each respectively to the Pension Trust regarding leave salary contribution and pension contribution.
- 2.56 The Commission in the past tariff orders has noted that the arrangement made by it is ad-hoc and the same cannot be permitted to be institutionalized.
- 2.57 There is no need for meeting the shortfall in respect of past liabilities by including them in the present ARR. The Pension Trust holds the past service contribution in respect of all employees of DVB. The amounts contributed to the Pension Trust including Pension and leave salary contribution by BRPL and successor entities are for a monthly contribution.
- 2.58 It is an admitted fact that GONCTD has discharged its one time lump sum liability of Rs. 1329 Crore for terminal benefits such as pension, family pension, gratuity, GPF and CPF which is based on actual valuation as on 31-03-2001 but did not provide leave encashment. There was underfunding to the extent of Rs. 1253.54 Crore. Had this underfunding would not have been there, there would not have been any issue with respect to the Pension Trust.

BYPL

- 2.59 The Commission has already issued statutory advice to GONCTD under Section 108 of Electricity Act, 2003, regarding the financial crisis of the Delhi DISCOMs.

Commission's View

- 2.60 The Pension Trust was established as a part of Transfer Scheme Rules, 2001 framed under Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000 (DERA) and the Tripartite Agreements executed by the GoNCTD with unions of employees and Associations of officers of the erstwhile DVB. In terms of the aforesaid Rules and Tripartite Agreements, the Pension Trust was funded at the time of unbundling of the DVB by way of one lump sum payment by the GoNCTD. The issue of underfunding of corpus fund of the pension trust is sub-judice in W.P.(C) 1698/2010 in the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. Subsequent contributions from the date of unbundling have to be made to the Pension Trust by the successor entities of DVB. The Commission has been releasing ad-hoc payments in the DTL Tariff orders from FY 2011-12 onwards upto FY 2014-15.
- 2.61 Section 86 of the Electricity Act, 2003, which defines functions of State Commission, does not provide for issuing Regulations of Pension Trust. The fact has also been appreciated by the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 238 of 2013 (Mahendra Gupta & Others Vs DERC), wherein it has held that "*the learned state Commission has no jurisdiction to go into disputes between the Appellants and the Pension Trust with regard to release of terminal benefits in their favour. The grievances of individual employees/appellants relating to service matters relating to the terminal benefits including pension are not under the jurisdiction of the State Commission*". The Commission reiterates its view that it is beyond its jurisdiction to regulate the Pension Trust or to frame regulations in this regard.
- 2.62 The Commission vide letter no. F.17(44)/Engg./DERC/201213/C.F. No.3481/3320 dated 11.09.2012 has issued Statutory Advice under Section 86(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 to Govt. of NCT of Delhi to constitute an Oversight Committee to look into the issues related to pensioners of erstwhile DVB. The subject matter is presently subjudice before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and the parties to the dispute should expedite the proceedings before the court and explore other avenues for settlement of dispute.
- 2.63 The Commission has already made provision on ad-hoc basis of Rs.150 Crore, Rs.160 Crore and Rs.400 Crore and Rs. 470 Crore in the Tariff order of FY 2011-12, FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 respectively for passing on to the Pension Trust to avoid undue hardship to the pensioners till all issues concerned with Pension Trust

are settled by the Courts/Delhi Govt.

- 2.64 A correspondence was made by DTL seeking clarification from GoNCTD in regard to the competent authority (new entity) to deal with vigilance/disciplinary/court cases in respect of employees of the erstwhile DVB, who could not become part of any company on 01.07.2002 in terms of Delhi Reform (Transfer Scheme) Rules, 2001 due to pending cases of retirement/dismissal/remove compulsory retirement while in the DVB. The GoNCTD clarified in its letter dated 21.01.2004 that the DVB employees who could not become part of any company i.e. DPCL, DTL, IPGCL, BYPL, BRPL and NDPL (now TPDDL) on the date of restructuring due to cases of retirement/dismissal/removal/compulsory retirement etc being pending as on 01.07.2002 shall be processed and decided by such company who could have been the controlling authority of the employee. And retirement/removal/dismissal/ compulsory retirement etc will be dealt as per schedule 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E' and 'F' of the Delhi Electricity Reform (Transfer Scheme) Rules, 2001.
- 2.65 In LPA No 98/2005, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in its judgment dated 30.03.2006 has held that: *"..... There is no escape from concluding that even in all these suits which are pending are filed by the retired employees in the Court claiming for their service benefits, thereby creating liability of DVB on the respective transfer company. The transferor company shall be substituted instead of DVB."* In civil Appeal No 4269 of 2006 read with civil appeal No 4270 of 2006, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has observed that the GoNCTD has taken a clearest decision possible by its letter dated 21.01.2004, which is binding on all parties. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further observed that the view taken by the High Court of Delhi is correct.
- 2.66 In view of the clarification given by the GoNCTD in its letter dated 21.01.2004 and the above mentioned judgments of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is the responsibility of the respective DISCOMs to look after the interests of the DVB retirees as well as those who retired/retire in the DISCOM after unbundling of the DVB. It would therefore be appropriate that the DISCOMs provide for funding for the liabilities of the retired/ to be retired employees under their control in their respective ARRs.

- 2.67 The Commission has considered the amount of Rs. 573.23 Crore sought for FY 2015-16 by the Pension Trust in the ARR of DTL on an ad-hoc basis recommended by GoNCTD vide its letter dated 21.01.2004. The Commission is of the view that actuarial valuation of liability towards Pension Trust should be expedited by pension trust in consultation with the stakeholders.
- 2.68 The Govt. of NCT of Delhi may like to take a decision on the proposal of LIC for funding of Pension Trust as suggested by Pension Trust.

Issue 4: Tariff for Railway Traction

Stakeholder's View

- 2.69 There should be no increase in railway traction tariff for FY 2015-16 and traction tariff should be kept low in view of deemed licensee status of Railways taking into account the NTPC/NHPC rates of supply @ Rs. 3.92/3.43 per unit to TPDDL for FY 2015-16.
- 2.70 Railways should be exempted from payment of penalty charges on over-drawal of power on situations like failure of supply from supplying authorities, accidents, agitations etc. which lead to bunching of trains in a particular zone causing maximum demand to exceed for a short spell only. It is requested that a reasonable cushion of at least 10% of contract demand may be permitted over and above the CMD without penalty.
- 2.71 There should be no disparity in tariff between Railways and DMRC.
- 2.72 Railways should be permitted for payment of ACD/consumption security deposit in the shape of letter of Assurance from RBI instead of cheque/DD or in the shape of bank guarantee instead of cash.
- 2.73 Billing demand should be 65% of the contract demand or recorded maximum demand during the month, whichever is higher, as in Haryana.

Petitioner's Submission

BRPL

- 2.74 The determination of electricity tariff to be charged from a category of consumer is the prerogative of the Commission.
- 2.75 The APTEL in its judgment dated 13.03.2007 held that the purpose of supply to

DMRC is different from the purpose of supply of electricity to the Appellant and Section 62 (3) of Electricity Act, 2003 permits differential treatment to DMRC as compared to the Appellant.

- 2.76 A separate tariff for railways with lower demand charges has been suggested in ARR petition for FY 2015-16.
- 2.77 Banks do not issue the bank guarantee with lifetime validity, which means, if allowed, will need to be renewed from time to time failing which supply of power may need to be discontinued. Further, while all other categories of consumers are required to submit cash deposits, it tantamount to discrimination if only Railway traction is allowed to substitute cash deposit with bank guarantee.

BYPL/TPDDL

- 2.78 No Response

Commission's View

- 2.79 The Commission has determined the tariff for Northern Railway after taking all factors into consideration. While the Commission acknowledges the critical role played by the Railways in the economic development of the Nation, it may be difficult to reduce the tariff in view of growing costs, particularly power purchase costs year on year.
- 2.80 Regarding exemption of penalty charges for exceeding contract demand, the Commission is of the view that levying of surcharge on fixed charges corresponding to excess demand for such billing cycle is necessary for all consumers as the utilities have to plan in advance to cater to the load of the consumers including the railways. In case of over drawal of electricity by any consumer, the utility has to arrange for additional power from costlier sources to meet the demand of the consumer.
- 2.81 The Commission has treated DMRC as a distinct special class for the purpose of tariff as DMRC provides Mass Rapid transit systems in Delhi. Railways are also treated as a special category for the critical role it plays. The tariff for Railways cannot be at par with DMRC since DMRC plays a vital role in providing ready and affordable transport facility to average middle class population of Delhi. The Appellate Tribunal for Electricity in the matter of Northern Railway versus Delhi Electricity Regulatory

Commission and others upheld the impugned Order of the Commission, whereby, the Commission treated the DMRC as a distinct special class for the purpose of the tariff. The Appellate Tribunal for Electricity further observed that the establishment of DMRC for providing the Mass Rapid Transit System is itself an important ground for treating the DMRC as a separate and distinct class of consumer. In view of the above, the Commission is of the view that Railways and DMRC will continue to be in different tariff categories because power supply for railway's traction is not exclusive for Delhi and the Railways also cover freight movement and not passengers alone as compared to DMRC.

- 2.82 The Commission has reviewed the request of Railways regarding submission of irrevocable bank guarantee in lieu of security deposit. The issue of security deposit is part of Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations which is being revised and this issue will be dealt appropriately.
- 2.83 The billing demand has already been defined in Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007. The consumer can choose lower contract demand as per requirement in supply agreement. However, contract demand in any case cannot be less than 60% of the Sanctioned load.

Issue 5: Tariff for DMRC

Stakeholder's view:

1. Tariff Increase:

- 2.84 NDMC proposed to increase the tariff for DMRC i.e. fixed charges from Rs. 125/KVA to Rs. 164/KVA (31% increase) and energy charges from Rs. 6.10/KVAh to Rs. 7.99/KVAh (31% increase).
- 2.85 The unit rate is fixed over and above the power purchase cost of DISCOMs, instead of fixing unit rate based on purchase cost by DISCOM at 66 KV/220 KV. Thereby even after taking supply at 220KV/66 KV, DMRC is made to bear energy losses of the distribution network as well as paying to DISCOMs at the tariff which is higher than Power Purchase Cost.

2. Effect of increase in Tariff:

- 2.86 There is an effective increase of almost 178% in last 5 years (i.e., from Rs. 2.50 to 6.94 per unit). This has resulted in increase in working expenses of DMRC by 647.7%

(i.e. from Rs. 51.5 Crore in 2007-08 to Rs. 399 Crore in 2013-14), whereas increase in energy consumption is only 186% (22 Crore units in 2007-08 to 63 Crore units in 2013-14). DMRC will not be in a position to sustain any additional increase in tariff without passing it on to the consumer.

3. Distribution Losses

2.87 DISCOMs have not disclosed voltage wise losses in their ARR Petitions for FY 2015-16. The purchase cost at 66 KV without considering distribution losses of lower voltage will be much lower than Rs. 5.77/unit. Since DMRC takes power at 220kV/66KV and does not contribute to distribution losses, separate power purchase costs may be given by DISCOMs at various voltage levels (i.e. 220KV 66KV and L.T. level) after taking into consideration losses at corresponding voltage levels along with power purchase cost at each of the above voltage levels, clearly accounting for the losses for respective voltage levels.

4. Change in contract demand twice in a year

2.88 DMRC may be allowed to change the contract demand twice in a year as the maximum demand in summer due to high Air Conditioners in service is nearer to contract demand and it is much lower in winter. DMRC is paying every month for contract demand same amount throughout the year.

5. Fixed Charges

2.89 As per agreed principle in November 2002, there is no provision of fixed charges. Hence, fixed charges are not applicable to DMRC and withdrawal of the same to be considered by DERC.

6. Revenue Deficit Surcharge

2.90 DMRC may be exempted from payment of Revenue Deficit surcharge (8% Surcharge).

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.91 Fixation of Tariff in the sole prerogative of the Commission.

- 2.92 Power is procured at Ex-generator Bus and all billing is based on this. Hence power purchase cost cannot be bifurcated at different voltage level.
- 2.93 Revision in contract demand for six months is agreed in principle if it is in line with DERC Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standard Regulations, 2007.
- 2.94 Revenue deficit surcharge has been implemented to recover the past revenue gap. Hence it is suggested to continue the same till the entire revenue gap is recovered.

BRPL/BYPL

- 2.95 No Response.

Commission's View

- 2.96 The DMRC has already been considered as a special tariff category in the tariff orders issued by the Commission year on year. The issue of drawing power at higher voltage and rebate thereon has been inbuilt in the Tariff design and addressed appropriately in the Tariff Order.
- 2.97 The revision in load can be carried out as per the Provisions of Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007.
- 2.98 The commission is of the view that any increase in tariff for DMRC is on account of increase in power purchase cost and other components forming part of the ARR of the distribution licensees.
- 2.99 The Commission has already directed to the petitioner for energy audit to determine the voltage wise loss in the network of the petitioner.
- 2.100 The Tariff determined by the commission in respective tariff order was also fixed by considering all the factors discussed above.
- 2.101 The Commission has already directed Petitioner for restricting the outages so that they do not exceed 1% in its area. Therefore, the losses have also been factored in determining tariff of relevant category.

Issue 6: Tariff for Telecom Towers**Stakeholder's View****1) Rationalization of tariff for telecom towers**

- 2.102 The current average structure of tariff for a commercial consumer (consuming 12 KW at 0.75 load factor operating 24 hours a day) is Rs. 8.71/unit in the city. The current

tariff/unit is amongst the highest in the country for commercial consumers. If the tariff is not brought down, it would be detrimental to the commercial consumers like Indus Towers.

2) Introduction of new sub-category for telecom towers under commercial category:

2.103 Creation of a sub-category should be considered for the following reasons.

- a) All the major telecom players have an obligation to provide access to basic telegraph services to people in rural and remote areas at affordable and reasonable rates.
- b) Essential services like telecom towers are required to provide an uninterrupted service and hence form the backbone for many other essential services like medical emergencies, law and order response, weather emergencies etc.
- c) The consumption pattern of a telecom tower is unique amongst general commercial consumers given the high load factor and nearly low flat profile of such connection.
- d) To implement consolidated billing for Indus Telecom Tower Company.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.104 Fixation of Tariff to any consumer category and sub-category is the sole prerogative of the Commission. However, the Tariff has to be cost reflective ultimately along with recovery of accumulated past revenue gap.

BRPL

2.105 Regarding rationalization of tariff for Telecom Towers, Categorization of consumer category and implementation of billing (AMR), it is the sole prerogative of the Commission as per the provisions of the E.A, 2003.

BYPL

2.106 No Response

Commission's View

2.107 The Commission is of the view that in most of the states, telecom towers are covered under commercial Tariff Category only. For example MERC and UPERC etc.

also do not recognize Telecom Service Sector as a separate category for electricity Tariff Purpose. Therefore, creation of a separate Tariff category for Telecom Tower Operators is not considered necessary.

Issue 7: Time of Day (ToD) Tariff

Stakeholders' View:

- 2.108 There is surplus electricity and hence the rational of ToD should be reviewed.
- 2.109 (a) To repeal the ToD data classification system / load calculation system;
- (b) Only peak hour readings are being used arbitrarily in order to assign / ascertain the sanctioned load of the non-domestic connections.
- (c) The proposed tariff schedule is arbitrary and providing benefits to domestic consumers at the cost of non-domestic consumers is unreasonable, unethical and against parity.
- (d) To amend the proposed category wise Tariff schedule by the DISCOM as there is justifiable and reasonable difference between the domestic and non-domestic categories at present.
- 2.110 The industrial consumers strongly object to levy of 25% surcharge for drawal of power in peak load hours and the cost per unit works out to more than Rs. 14 which is unbearable. It should be withdrawn.
- 2.111 ToD tariff should be abolished and reduction in existing tariff to be made according to the power purchase cost.
- 2.112 DISCOMs have proposed to cover all consumers under ToD having sanctioned load of 10 KW and above in order to flatten the load curve. It should be ensured that smart meters procured by DISCOMs should have all features like ToD, net metering etc and all these features should be activated so that undue burden on consumers is avoided.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

- 2.113 ToD is being propagated only from the perspective of flattening the load curve so as to reduce the requirement of peak power procurement which is expensive.
- 2.114 TOD has already been implemented for consumers with sanctioned load / MDI of 50 KW and above and it is optional for consumer having sanctioned load between 25

KW – 50 KW. Now the Commission has been requested to extend ToD tariff to industrial and commercial consumers having sanctioned load / MDI greater than 10 KW to achieve shift in peak load and optimize power purchase cost. The objective of this proposal is to cover significant electrical consumption and benefit reasonably large number of consumers under ToD tariff which will help in shifting of peak load and flattening of load curve and ultimately optimizing the power purchase cost and CAPEX.

2.115 TOD concept was introduced to make power purchase cost less and to pass on the benefit to customers as purchasing power at peak hours is relatively costlier than in the off peak hours.

2.116 TPDDL would like to have the smart meters having ToD features suitable for net metering as well as other functionalities.

BRPL

2.117 BRPL meters are in compliance with the applicable standards and the CEA (Installation and Operation of meters) Regulations, 2006. BRPL has proposed for consideration of the Commission to extend ToD tariff to consumers with loads more than 10 kW to further flatten the load curve.

BYPL

2.118 The cost of production of electricity varies from hour to hour and also widely depending upon the total load and the particular generating units used to secure this load. The theory behind the ToD rates is simply to vary the price of electricity in accordance with fluctuations in production costs. When production cost is high, the price would be high. Conversely when the cost of production is low, the prices would be low. The advantages of ToD pricing is also apparent. Under a Time of Day pricing system, this inequity can be corrected because the off-peak user is charged less than the peak-hour user.

2.119 All existing meters issued for connections above 10 kW of sanctioned load are enabled for ToD metering and also net meters are enabled for ToD metering. All existing meters are compliant with the applicable standards and the CEA (Installation and Operation Meters) Regulations, 2006.

Commission's View

2.120 The Commission has reviewed the ToD time slots as per the suggestions/comments received from various stakeholders including GoNCTD and the latest available trend for demand and supply of power.

2.121 It is observed that during the months of October - April, the maximum demand is less than the available base supply of power. Accordingly, the ToD Tariff has been modified and shall be applicable for remaining five (5) months i.e., May – September of the year as follows:

Months	Peak Hours	Surcharge on Energy Charges	Off-Peak Hours	Rebate on Energy
May-September	1300-1700 hrs and 2100-2400 hrs	20%	0300-0900 hrs	20%

- The Rebate during the Off Peak hours has been reduced from 25% to 20%, whereas for Peak hours Surcharge shall continue at existing 20%.
- For other than Peak and Off Peak period, Normal charges as defined shall be applicable.
- It shall be now applicable for all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/ MDI is 25kW/ 27kVA and above instead of 50kW/ 54kVA.
- Option of TOD tariff is also available for all consumers (other than Domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) is 11kW/12kVA to 25kW/27kVA. Such ToD Consumers will have the option to move back to non-ToD regime only once within one Financial Year.

2.122 The Commission is of the view that ToD tariff is an important Demand Side Management (DSM) measure to flatten the load curve of the DISCOMs. The Commission in its tariff order dated 13.07.2012 had for the first time introduced ToD Tariff on a pilot basis for large industrial and commercial categories with a sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) of more than 300 kVA. Surcharge had been introduced under ToD tariff during the peak hour consumption to offset the costly power purchase during the peak hours and rebate given to consumers for shifting the demand from peak to off peak hours.

Issue 8: Tariff for Cooperative Group Housing Societies (CGHS)**Stakeholder`s View**

- 2.123 Individual Separate meters for each flat to be provided.
- 2.124 Each flat has to pay exorbitantly high electricity charges every month due to high fixed and energy charges. Special rebate to be given to Cooperative Group Housing Societies, treating them as a separate class of bulk consumers. Subsidy may be granted to members of the society (generally CGHS) with consumption of less than 400 units.
- 2.125 Tariff for common facilities for independent connection residences in societies to be charged under domestic category and not at CGHS rates.
- 2.126 There is discrimination in electricity tariff between CGHS and Non- CGHS domestic category.
- 2.127 To restore parity in slab rates with other domestic categories i.e. 0-200 units Tariff rate.
- 2.128 The supply of domestic consumer at LT is cheaper than that availed at HT under CGHS which is unjustified. The domestic consumer of HT supply (CGHS) is not getting the benefit of slab unit system and the GoNCTD subsidy.
- 2.129 Rebate to be increased to 15% to CGHS for availing 11 kV supply at single point due to which distribution losses, meter readings, billings, collection etc. expenses are lower to DISCOMs.
- 2.130 Three slabs of 44.4%, 44.4% and 11.2% to be restored.
- 2.131 (a) The distinction between Cooperative Group Housing Society and Group Housing by private builders / developers is an arbitrary and artificial one. Retaining the said distinction and permitting single point delivery on 11 KV to Cooperative Housing Societies would be a violation of Section – 62 (3) of Electricity Act 2003. None of the factors recognized under Section 62 (3) of Electricity Act, 2003 on the basis of which differentiation between consumers can be made are attracted in the present case when cooperative housing societies are permitted to have single point HT domestic connection while Group Housing by private bidders / developers are not. There can be no lawful distinction between cooperative and other Group Housing Societies as far as Section 62 (3) of the Act is concerned.

However, the proposed category wise tariff schedule in the present tariff petition should be suitably amended to the extent that the category in SL. 12 in table 5.16 should be read as “Single delivery point on 11 KV for Group Housing” instead of “Single Delivery Point on 11 KV for CGHS”.

- (b) Necessary directions may be issued to the DISCOMs not to treat group housing societies having single delivery point connection as “bulk consumers” but levy equal tariff for all CGHS Flats, irrespective of whether they are given SDP connection or individual flat connection. Also the rebate of 30% originally allowed may be restored to offset the cost incurred by the societies on account of internal distribution, metering, billing and electrification etc.

Petitioner’s Submission

TPDDL

- 2.132 Common facilities such as pumping system for the residence of CGHS are being charge as per tariff defined in tariff schedule table point No. 1.2 and not at non-domestic tariff.
- 2.133 The CGHS is already treated as a separate category and a rebate of 10% is given to CGHS consumers having supply at 11 KV. In T.O for FY 2014-15 the Commission has already directed DISCOMs to provide individual connections to consumers residing in Group Housing Societies, if they so request subject to the condition that the Housing Society will make available space at convenient place for installing transformers, allied equipment and meters for effecting direct supply to such persons – TPPDL is complying with the directions.

BRPL

- 2.134 The determination of tariff to be charged to a category of consumers is the prerogative of the commission and the petitioner is bound to charge tariff as determined by the Commission.
- 2.135 The stakeholder may apply for reduction of contract load in line with the procedure laid down in Para 21 of DERC Supply Code and the petitioner has to act on the application within the time limit specified.
- 2.136 The conversion of CGHS to individual LT metered connections is technically and commercially to be considered and several issues need to be addressed in

consultation with the Commission. Based on the discussions held with the Commission, a detailed representation has already been submitted highlighting the various aspects of conversion and the Commission's clarification or advice is awaited.

- 2.137 The Section 65 of Electricity Act, 2003 empowers the State Government to provide subsidy to any consumer or class of consumers. The determination of rebate is the sole prerogative of the Government.
- 2.138 It is expected that consumers will prefer to avail of the benefits of single point connection at 11 KV given to the society. However tariff for CGHS Society, which receives electricity at 11 KV, has been kept in the lower side. The Commission has decided to allow a rebate of 10% admissible on energy charges.

BYPL

- 2.139 Regarding providing separate meters for individual flats or conversion of CGHS 11 KV SDP connection to individual LT domestic connections, the Commission in the tariff order dated 23.07.2014 has already clarified vide para's 2.119 and 2.120. However, operationalisation procedure of the aforesaid direction of the Commission is yet to be notified. The Petitioner would be obliged to follow directions of the Commission on the same.
- 2.140 Regarding rebate to CGHS, the Commission in the tariff order dated 23.07.2014 allowed rebate of 10% admissible on energy charges having supply at 11 KV.
- 2.141 The applicant shall apply for load reduction to the licensee in the format prescribed at annexure IV to the Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performances standards Regulations 2007 or as approved by the Commission from time to time along with the reasons for load reduction. Further, the Regulations prescribe that such load reduction shall be limited to 50% of the load at the time of original release of supply.

Commission view

- 2.142 Tariffs for CGHS Society, which receives electricity at 11 kV, has been rationalized in this Tariff Order as follows:
- Composite Tariff for GHS has been fixed at Rs. 6.00/kWh based on Average Billing Rate of the domestic consumers against earlier tariff.
 - Individual Consumers availing the supply at single delivery point through Group

Housing Society may claim the benefit of subsidy, applicable if any, as per the Order of GoNCTD. Group Housing Society shall submit the details of eligible consumers with consumption details and lodge claims for subsidy on behalf of individual members from DISCOMs

- iii. The definition of GHS has been broadened to cover all the GHS including residential complex developed by a developer.
- iv. The Single Point Delivery Supplier (GHS) shall charge the Domestic tariff as per slab rate of Tariff Schedule 1.1 to its Individual Members.
- v. Any Deficit/Surplus due to sum total of the billing to the Individual Members as per slab rate of Tariff Schedule 1.1 and the billing as per the Tariff Schedule 1.2 including the operational expenses of the Single Point Delivery Supplier shall be passed on to the members of the Group Housing Societies on pro rata basis of consumption.

2.143 The Commission is also in the process of formulating a procedure for conversion of single point connection into individual connection for Group Housing Societies (GHS).

Issue 9: Other Tariff Issues

Stakeholders' View:

2.144 DERC has increased electricity price to Rs. 7.15/Unit from Rs. 2.48/Unit in a span of last two years which has resulted in increase of milk processing cost. Hence, electricity price may be decreased for Mother Dairy.

2.145 Tariff rates for middle class consumers should be reduced upto 70% as they are the main part of the society. The proposed Tariff rates are unfair and require to be revised as under to soldiers and veterans

Upto 400 Units Rs. 2/Unit

401 to 800 Units Rs. 4/Unit

801 and Above Units Rate to be fixed

2.146 There is no need to increase Tariff, if the power losses are minimized and revenue collection is improved.

2.147 Tariff to be lowest for industries. T&D Losses are very less in industrial areas and paying electricity bills promptly within time. Hence, some incentive to be given.

2.148 Tariff hike sought by TPDDL for FY 2015-16 is 10.32% whereas on perusal of the

Petition, it is 20.65% (Main Petition)

- 2.149 The DISCOMs have proposed an additional hike of about 50% of the existing Tariff. Since PPA rates of the generators have not been increased that much, then on what grounds DISCOMs are claiming increase in Tariff.
- 2.150 Tariff hike is opposed as DISCOMs have tremendously reduced losses during the last years but no benefit has been passed on to the consumers.
- 2.151 Kewal Park Agarwal Sabha is a registered society for religious functions of traditional and established characters and cultural activities and the society is registered under Societies Act – vide RC No 5/36146 of 1999 dated 08-02-1999 issued by the Registrar of Societies, Delhi. TPDDL has covered it under Non-domestic (commercial use) on the plea that any category which is not covered under Tariff schedule would be included in Non-domestic (commercial) category.
- 2.152 Hence, the following amendment may be incorporated in the Tariff schedule in col. 3 of Sl. No 1.1 Domestic Category:
- “(I) Office RAW, Panchayat Sabha Society etc., (Registered under the Society Act applicable to National Capital of Delhi); used for meetings; social/cultural/ Religion Activities provided that the total consumption of electricity in a month does not exceed 200 Units.”
- 2.153 Clinics of Doctors’ Residences should not be charged at commercial Tariff rate as they are for service to the country.
- 2.154 The medical/hospital services cannot be considered as commercial but to be treated as public utility service and kept out of the commercial category.
- 2.155 For professionals, especially Advocates, allow domestic Tariff or an alternative separate category be created and kept lower than non-domestic Tariff as the activities of the professionals are not commercial.
- 2.156 Separate Tariff to be provided for e-vehicles so that they will not miss use domestic/cheaper power as these vehicles are used for commercial purpose.
- 2.157 The Commission is requested to consider concessional tariff to senior citizens, places of worship and educational institutions run by NGOs on land given by MCD/GONCTD. All non-profit organizations and charitable services or hospitals which are rendering services for the under privileged be charged under the category of domestic Tariff.

- 2.158 Before determination of Tariff for the period FY 2015-16, the Commission shall true up for capital cost and physical verification of the assets for MYT period 2007-12 in public interest. Until they are trued up, they remain provisional and the consumer will not get the excess amount refunded back in the form of interest. Hence, the exercise of determination of Tariff for FY 2015-16 must be stopped.
- 2.159 BYPL has created a myth of “non-cost reflective tariff” in spite of every effort made by the DERC to balance tariff account of the DISCOM in every annual tariff determination exercise and worked out the best ARR possible. The licensee repeatedly violated the directives of the Commission for sale of surplus power and reduction of AT&C losses, thus creating huge revenue deficit which is licensee’s own making. The revenue gap was covered in the tariff order with carrying cost. The petitioner cannot be allowed to violate every tariff order and appeal before APTEL.
- 2.160 North Municipal corporation of Delhi requested for:
- Slab system for Govt. Hospitals / Educational Institutions etc. shall have the same as allowed to CGHS single point connection.
 - Tariff of unmetered street light connections is to be kept at less or at the same level of metered street light Tariff.
 - For public parks either agriculture Tariff or as an alternate domestic Tariff be charged.
 - Tariff for dispensary/hospital/public libraries/schools/working women’s hostels/orphanages/charitable places etc may be treated at the same Tariff for single delivery point at 11 KV and slabs may be 55%, 45% and 5%.

Petitioner’s Submission

BYPL

- 2.161 Regarding reduction in tariff by curbing theft, it is submitted that in order to further reduce losses, the Petitioner is focusing on measures like augmentation of teams and requisite infrastructure, establishment of analytics to assist in targeted enforcement, improvement across all enforcement metrics etc. A large number of theft accused have also been sent to Jail for varying jail terms. In FY 2013-14, intensified drive against electricity theft has resulted in recovery of Rs. 17.82 Crore and such income will be considered towards lowering ARR by the Commission. The Petitioner is

responsible to provide quality power supply to its consumers. It is essential that retail tariff is to be cost reflective. However the present tariff is not cost reflective and the same has been mentioned in ARR petition.

- 2.162 The reasons and justification for the tariff proposal have been explained in detail in the ARR Petition. Power purchase cost has increased more than 300% since privatization whereas retail tariff rate to be charged from consumers has merely increased about 90% for the same period. The Tariff hike is sought to meet the increased power cost.
- 2.163 However as per the provision of the Electricity Act, 2003, the determination of tariff and framing of categories/slabs is the sole prerogative of the Commission.
- 2.164 Classification of any category into domestic or Non-domestic is the sole prerogative of the Commission.

TPDDL

- 2.165 Regarding tariff increase it is submitted that the current tariff is not fully cost reflective to cover up the entire power purchase cost. O&M expenses and increasing interest burden on loan taken. Hence the tariff hike is proposed, which may be considered by the Commission after prudence check. Further for full recovery of the projected controllable and uncontrollable cost for FY 2015-16 along with speedy recovery of past accumulated revenue gap and to save the consumers from artificial burden of interest cost on unrealized revenue gap, the tariff hike is required. The retail tariff is determined based on the provisions of the E.A, 2003, National Tariff Policy and the regulations notified from time to time, which the Commission takes into consideration.
- 2.166 As per Supply Code Regulations, professionals like Doctors, Lawyers, Chartered Accountants etc., may utilise upto 25% of the covered area of residential space in their possession upto a maximum of 50 square meters for carrying out professional work in the nature of consultancy without attracting non-domestic tariff for the electricity consumed.
- 2.167 In the public notice the proposed tariff hike of 10.32% mentioned over the existing tariff is to meet the deficit gap of Rs. 635.47 Crore i.e. on account of difference between the ARR excluding carrying cost and revenue available at existing tariff for

FY 2015-16. Whereas in the main petition, the proposed the tariff hike of 20.65% mentioned over the existing tariff is the total hike required to meet the entire revenue deficit/gap of Rs. 1382. 94 Crore.

- 2.168 Fixation of Tariff for any consumer category and sub-category is the sole prerogative of the Commission. Differential Tariff between metered and unmetered street lights has been provided by the Commission as a mechanism for incentivizing the street lighting agencies to meter the same. Further, as per Tariff Order for FY 2014-15 dated 23.07.2014, public parks are already being charged on Domestic Tariff.

BRPL

- 2.169 Regarding proposed increase in tariff, it is submitted that the domestic tariff is the lowest in the country and Delhi is one of the few cities to enjoy a flat subsidy of 50% up to 400 units of consumption. BRPL has sought tariff increase which is primarily necessitated to meet the increased cost of Power Purchase, O&M expenses and also to amortize part of the huge regulatory asset in addition to carrying cost of the same, apart from other expenses.

Commission's View

- 2.170 The Commission determines the ARR for the DISCOMs as per the provisions of the Regulations. The Commission in its Tariff Order has provided the breakup of the major components considered for projecting costs of supply during FY 2015-16, like power purchase cost, O&M costs, CAPEX, financing cost, gap in true up of FY 2013-14 and carrying cost for the regulatory assets etc. This forms the basis for projection of the gap between present requirement in terms of ARR and revenue available at existing tariff. It is in the consumer's overall interest, that the gap between these two figures is filled by adjusting the tariffs so as to reduce the accumulated Revenue Gap/Regulatory Assets and the Carrying Cost thereof, which otherwise would impose an additional burden on the average consumer. The Tariff Order is issued after prudence check of the Petitions submitted by the DISCOMs and after considering each element of cost projected in the petitions with due analysis and ensuring proper justification.

- 2.171 The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal no. 1065/2000 has held that

"....thus the question whether an advocate can be said to be carrying on a

commercial activity does not arise for consideration. As the user is admittedly not domestic it would fall in category of “commercial and Non-domestic”. In such cases even for Non-Domestic use the Commercial rates are to be charged. Exclusively running an office is clearly a “Non-Domestic” use. The case of medical/hospitals is analogous to that of advocates. Hence this may not require separate consideration.

- 2.172 The Commission is of the view that extending concessional tariff to hospital, cultural societies etc., run by private parties would be a retrograde step and will increase the cross subsidy element.
- 2.173 The Commission is of the view that the domestic consumers including senior citizens are availing slab benefit for low consumption and the government is also providing subsidy to support such consumers having lower consumption (0-400 units per month).
- 2.174 The restriction of connected load upto 2kW under Domestic Category for Cattle/Dairy Farm/Dhobhi Ghat has been removed. The only applicable criteria will be monthly consumption upto 400 units.

Issue 10: Fixed Charges

Stakeholders' View:

- 2.175 Levying fixed charges is to be abolished.
- 2.176 The proposal for uniform fixed charges upto 5 kW is not justified. Services against fixed charges and its utilization be provided and surcharge on fixed charges to be removed. The fixed charges should be uniform and on monthly basis only.
- 2.177 90% of Domestic consumers are within 2 to 5 KW and Rs. 100/KW fixed charges is very high.
- 2.178 The monthly fixed charges should be reduced to the minimum for SIP consumers and the same should be adjustable in energy charges bill.
- 2.179 Fixed charges at Rs.150 per kW for LIP consumers is very high.
- 2.180 8% surcharge should not be levied on fixed charges.
- 2.181 Baraat Ghars as per MCD tax norms have not been accorded commercial status but a separate socio-club status. The utilization of power in such establishments is erratic, peculiar and non- periodic and no consumption pattern can be established. Baraat

Ghars are billed for 20-25 days in a year and fixed charges levied for long period when such establishments remain un-booked/closed/underutilized which is causing a heavy burden on the establishment owners who are not able to distribute the tariff burden on the ultimate consumers. Fixed charges are to be adjusted against minimum consumption units. The Commission may use its discretion so that such establishments do not suffer or close down as these establishments are for a cause of healthy social society activity.

- 2.182 Consumption of electricity is to be decided by monthly meter reading and then billing is to be done based on consumption. In certain cases electricity is not used and reading is zero (0). In such cases, fixed charges (F.C) provision is valid. But when the consumption is on actual meter reading, there should be no fixed charges.
- 2.183 If fixed charges are levied, they should be adjustable in energy charges. The sole logic behind levy of fixed charges is to recover the fixed cost from the consumer whose consumption is below a fixed level. Fixed charges recovery on the basis of sanctioned load irrespective of how much power they consume is not correct.
- 2.184 Load enhancement is done on the basis of three highest kW readings in a year but it is not decreased on the same pattern. Load enhancement to be done based on average of at least six highest kW readings.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

- 2.185 The licensees' fixed charges incurred per consumer per month are much more than present service charges, causing other domestic consumers of sanctioned load above 5 kW and consumer of other categories to cross subsidize the consumers of sanctioned load of lower than 5 kW. This gives undue advantage to consumers, who have not increased their sanctioned load to actual requirement. To avoid this, it has been proposed to restructure the fixed charges for domestic category so that uniform fixed charges are levied upto 5 kW load.
- 2.186 Fixed charges are part of total tariff, which are charged to create and maintain distribution network according to load demand licensee's in the areas irrespective of whether such load demand is actually used or not but the DISCOM is required to

maintain such infrastructure in place. Further fixed charge being part of tariff is based on recovery cost concept. Infrastructure is required to be maintained for services provided to the consumers as prescribed under Performance Standards. Regulations framed by the Commission. The levy of fixed charge is in line with Section 45 (3) of the Electricity Act 2003.

- 2.187 If fixed charges are reduced, the energy charges would increase correspondingly as these form part of total revenue of the utility.

BRPL/BYPL

- 2.188 The Petitioner has not made any proposal for uniform fixed charges upto 5 KW. The determination of tariff is the sole prerogative of the Commission. The suggestion of stakeholders may be appropriately considered while finalizing ARR.
- 2.189 Fixed charges component in a two part tariff is claimed at defraying the capital related and other fixed costs and all revenue earned from fixed costs is considered as income in ARR submitted by the Petitioner. The Commission in its various tariff orders has decided the issue and considered fixed charges as a part of tariff schedule implying that income from such charges need to be considered as part of total revenue. In Form 2.1a the Commission directed the licensee to consider income from fixed charges as a part of total revenue.
- 2.190 The rationale for levying fixed charges is to recover a part of the fixed cost of the utility so that at least a part of fixed cost is recovered even if there is no consumption by the consumer. Alteration of fixed charges in the present tariff schedule is the prerogative of the Commission. The Commission in its tariff order has viewed that with existing tariff structure, the recovery of fixed charges is nominal as compared to the fixed costs of the licensees.

Commission's View

- 2.191 The Commission fixes the Tariff keeping in view the provisions of the Tariff Policy and Electricity Act, 2003. The Commission feels that the proposal to levy uniform charges upto sanctioned load of 5KW will burden the low end consumers falling within the Tariff category of 2 KW. Therefore the Commission has retained the existing practice of different fixed charges slab for load upto 2 KW and between 2-5 KW.

2.192 The Commission is of the view that the fixed cost in the Tariff has to be recovered so as to meet the fixed cost element of the distribution business.

2.193 The Commission has discussed the matter in detail in tariff order for FY 2004-05 and the relevant extract is as below:

“The Commission had explained the importance of two-part Tariff and the reasons for introduction of Fixed Charges for domestic category in the previous Order. While doing so, the Commission abolished the Minimum Charges, as it may lead to under- recovery of Fixed Charge, in cases where the consumption exceeds certain minimum levels, as only energy charges will be levied in such cases. The rationale for levying Fixed Charges is to recover a part of the fixed cost of the utility through Fixed Charges, so that at least a part of the fixed cost is recovered, even if there is no consumption by the consumer. In view of the objections/suggestions received in this regard, the Commission has again explored the various options for levying Fixed Charges for domestic consumers. The Commission has considered options such as Fixed Charges per connection, Fixed Charges linked to Consumption, Fixed Charges linked to sanctioned load in kW, etc. When a consumer is connected to the system, the utility has to provide/allocate certain capacity of the distribution system to serve the consumer. Ideally, the Fixed Charges levied on the consumer should reflect the cost of such capacity requirements of the consumer after considering the fixed cost of such system and diversity of load in the system.”

2.194 Section 45(3) of the Electricity Act, 2003 also provides for the levy of fixed charges. The section states that “the charges for electricity supply by a distribution licensee include fixed charges in addition to the charge for actual electricity supplied.”

2.195 The Commission is of the opinion that the best method of levying Fixed Charges for domestic consumers is on the basis of the sanctioned load, as other options do not appropriately reflect the cost of providing the capacity requirements of the consumer. After analysing all the options of levying Fixed Charges to Domestic Consumers, the Commission has modified the methodology for levy of Fixed Charges. The Commission has introduced a slab based system on sanctioned load for levy of Fixed Charges.

2.196 Tariff includes both Fixed and Energy charges. If Fixed charges are reduced, the Energy charges are to be correspondingly increased to meet the ARR. When only energy charge is levied or energy charge as well as fixed charge is levied, the same would have to be recovered from the consumers. The Commission has already initiated revision in Standard of Performance Regulation, 2007 and the stakeholder's comments/suggestions regarding revision of Sanctioned Load based on the three highest MDI has been noted.

Issue 11: Interest on Security Deposits

Stakeholders' View

2.197 The consumer security deposit gets interest @ 6% P.A only whereas DISCOMs revenue gap gets interest is at 12-13% P.A. The recovery of revenue gap and interest on security deposit be reconciled before enhancing the security deposit.

2.198 The interest on consumer security deposit is to be suitably enhanced.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.199 The differential amount of interest on consumer security deposit has already been deducted from ARR.

BRPL/BYPL

2.200 Consumer's security deposits are meant for funding working capital requirement of the Petitioner. The Commission considers notional interest earned on consumer security deposits. The notional interest is considered as Non-Tariff Income of the Petitioner and the same is reduced from ARR of the relevant year. Therefore, benefit or difference in interest rate is already being passed on to the consumers.

Commission's View

2.201 The Commission is in the process of revising Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007 and will examine the issue of interest rate on security deposit, while finalizing the revised Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations.

2.202 The Commission is of the view that the Consumers Security Deposits are meant as

security towards charges to be paid by the consumer for consumption of Electricity. The amount is normally utilized by the Petitioner for funding the working capital requirements of the Petitioner. Accordingly, the Commission is considering the notional interest earned on consumers security deposits as the cost of debt for RoCE. The notional interest as pointed out by the stakeholder (13%-6%) is considered as Non-tariff income of the Petitioner and the same is reduced from Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) of the relevant year. Therefore, the benefit of difference in interest rates is already being passed on to the consumers in the area of Licensee.

Issue 12: Power Purchase Cost

Stakeholders' View

- 2.203 Power purchase cost should be checked to see whether BRPL is purchasing power from its group companies, like Sasan or other group companies or not. Reliance is a company having many groups, one company may purchase power from the other to provide benefit. If BRPL has done trading from its group company then the same should be scrutinized in detail and should not be included in tariff for the time being.
- 2.204 TPDDL has several generating companies from which it only takes power and if long term Power Purchase Agreement is done, nothing can be done. In the case of short term, DERC should check whether Tata is manipulating the purchase of short term and sale of excess power which may happen for the following reasons:
- i. Tata is purchasing power from its group of companies with a third party trader/ Tata Trading in between. Where is the need for such a trader when power is purchased from a group company and such cost should not be allowed.
 - ii. Tata is purchasing power from its group companies without any demand in Delhi and sells such unnecessary power through banking at the same duration of purchase. By this, Tata gives benefit to its group company.
 - iii. Tata purchases power through some other generators in bilateral mode and selling at the same duration through barter system. Tata is the mediator, which it is doing to benefit Tata trading.
- 2.205 The genuineness of purchase of power by DISCOMs needs verification as they purchased power at much high rates than sold by Indian Energy Exchange. From FY

2011 onwards, the average yearly rate of electricity purchased by DISCOM has been consistently much higher, often more than 40 to 50%, as compared to the average yearly rate of electricity sold through Indian Energy Exchange.

- 2.206 The short term Power Purchase was considered at Rs. 4.22/unit (FY 2014-15) at Rs. 4.13/ unit (FY 2015-16) while sale was at Rs. 2.62/unit during peak summer months of April 2014 to September, 2014. Thus purchasing power at higher cost and selling surplus power at a lesser rate has resulted in huge loss.
- 2.207 Though there is need to promote trading in electricity for making the market competitive, the Commission should monitor transactions for trading continuously to ensure that traders do not indulge in profiteering during power shortages. Trading margin should be resorted to for achieving this objective.
- 2.208 DERC is requested to instruct the DISCOMs to place on website every fortnight details of power purchased such as quantity, price, source etc to enable consumers to verify the prevailing competitive costs in the market. Cartelization has to be stopped and purchase among sister concerns has to be discouraged.
- 2.209 The cost of power purchased from generating companies has to be examined as the power rate from the Central Government companies is much higher than the tariff provided by the CERC. The CERC made midterm truing up for MYT period 2009-14 and found that most of the capital expenditure of the ISGS and ISTU could not be capitalized. Their projected capital cost awarded in the tariff order for the utilities were reduced considerably. Hence the cost of purchase of power must be approved after prudence check.
- 2.210 All the power purchase costs that are attributable to the petitioner cannot be passed on to the consumer. Prudence in buying power needs to be analysed by DERC. UI charges due to defective scheduling should not be passed on to the consumers.
- 2.211 2% rebate must be taken on power purchase cost. In the alternative, the working capital interest be reduced to one month receivables (instead of 2% receivables) less 20% (RoCE and Depreciation)
- 2.212 The power purchase from Bawana and Jhajjar Plant must be avoided to reduce power purchase cost. In any case, this is a small quantity and can be managed by short term power purchase through UI/exchange.

Petitioner's Submission**BRPL**

- 2.213 As regards power purchase cost, BRPL purchases almost 90% of its power from Government owned Companies by virtue of long term power purchase agreements which have been inherited from DTL (initially signed by M/s. DTL). Prior approval of Commission is sought while entering into Power Purchase Agreement with a generating company. The quantum of power purchased from various generators are accounted / metered by Government bodies like NRLDC / SLDC.
- 2.214 The details of power purchased and source is displayed on website of Delhi SLDC which can be viewed and analysed by any one.
- 2.215 Procurement/sale of power, if any, through a trading company, if required, is done through traders licensed by CERC in terms of provision of Act. The trading margin is also fixed by the CERC for such transactions. Further the purchase of power through a licensed trader is insignificant and is further subject to rigorous scrutiny by the Commission before allowing power purchase cost.
- 2.216 It is very difficult to estimate the demand in advance so as to enter into long term or medium bilateral agreements. The option available to the DISCOM is to sell the surplus power through exchanges or on short term basis and the rate of sale is beyond the control of the licensee as the same is based on market forces. The Petitioner puts all efforts to maintain the revenue through sale of surplus power and was able to realize the revenue through sale of surplus power at an average sale of Rs. 2.69 per kW as against Rs. 4.00 per kWh estimated by the Commission in the Tarff Order dated 13.07.2013. Since the short term variations are not covered in the existing PPAC formula and there was considerable gap between the actual average rate of sale of power and that estimated in the ARR for FY 2013-14. Hence huge revenue gap remains increased which ought to be recovered now along with at least two years of carrying cost.
- 2.217 The Petitioner fulfills its power purchase requirements mainly through long term PPAs through which it obtains Round the Clock (RTC) power. This fulfills 90% of the Petitioner's power requirements, while almost 70% of the required RTC is obtained from NTPC alone. Further 100% of RTC power is sourced through government run

plants (NTPC / NHPC etc) whose tariff are determined by CERC / DERC and whose accounts are subjected to CAG audit. Further the bills raised by the GENCOs are further validated by the SLDC, an independent system operator, and the invoices raised by these stations on DISCOMS are further subjected to detailed scrutiny by the Commission during technical validation session. The entire power purchase expenses are further audited by the statutory auditors every year based on which the Commission True-up the power purchase expenses.

- 2.218 Table 4.12 of the petition includes the details of power purchases during FY 2014-15 from long term plants but excluding short term purchases/sales and also details in respect of inter and intra state losses which give an average rate of Rs. 4.5/unit during FY 2014-15. On the other hand, table 4.20 includes power purchases from both long term and short term sources which results in an average rate of Rs. 5.22/unit.
- 2.219 BRPL has made detailed representation before the GONCTD and the Commission to close down certain stations in Delhi, which have shown dramatic increase in generation cost in the last few years and fuel freed from these plants be redirected to Aravali and Bawana plants which will result in substantial savings in power purchase cost.

BYPL

- 2.220 The power purchase cost covers more than 85% of ARR and out of which more than 90% of the power is purchased through long term sources at the tariff approved by the Commission i.e. either CEA / DERC. The remaining power is purchased to meet the increased demand of the consumers through bilateral sources through a transparent competitive bidding process.
- 2.221 With regard to surplus power, it may be noted that it is difficult to estimate the surplus power that would be available with them due to load curve of Delhi. The demand of Distribution licensee depends upon many parameters. Weather temperature is one of such parameters. Any sudden change in temperature results in drastic change in demand. Accordingly, it is very difficult to estimate the demand in advance to any degree of accuracy so as to enter into long term or medium term bilateral arrangements. The option available with Delhi DISCOMs is to sell the surplus

power through exchanges or on short term basis. However, the rate of sale is beyond the control of the licensee as the same is based on market forces. The Petitioner puts its all-out efforts to maximize the revenue through sale of surplus power. However, it is not possible to predict why the rate of sale of power in energy exchanges is falling as the rates are determined by market forces.

2.222 The tariff determination for NTPC is the sole prerogative of the CERC. Being a stakeholder of NTPC, the petitioner gets opportunity to file its comments on various petitions filed by NTPC in CERC and other Forums. The petitioner is addressing the concern of consumers in CERC hearings.

2.223 Regarding the maximum rebate of 2% on account of timely payment by DISCOMs, the petitioner submitted that the concept of normative rebate is based on assumption that the system is perfect keeping in view that:

- a) There is no creation of Regulatory Asset.
- b) The Commission has timely implemented all the judgments of APTEL.
- c) There is no major variation in power purchase cost.
- d) PPAC is timely allowed.
- e) All consumers are paying on time.

2.224 None of the above conditions hold well in the case of licensee. The licensee has been unable to make timely payments to GENCOs and TRANSCO as the licensee has been facing precarious financial position due to absence of cost reflective tariff and repeated creation of Regulatory Assets by the Commission in contravention of tariff policy and MYT Regulation (2007 to 2011) which has accumulated to Rs. 3795 Crore (till FY 12-13).

TPDDL

2.225 Tariff for generating companies is determined as per Regulations/orders of respective Regulatory Commissions i.e. CERC/DERC. In Power Purchase, CSGS and Delhi GENCOs contribute to about 90% of power requirement of TPDDL. The Tariff for the CSGS Stations comprises of fixed and variable charges. The fixed charges are determined by the CERC as per its 2009-12 and 2014-19 tariff orders and variable cost is determined based on the formulae mentioned in the Regulations. The Energy charge rate is determined on the basis of actual fuel cost (coal or gas as may be used

- by the plant), transportation charges and SHR of the plant.
- 2.226 No manipulation can be done in short term sale/purchase of power as the same is governed through market determined rates of exchange. All short term bilateral sale/purchase transactions are done transparently by using tenders for participating in tenders of the other States. The details of shortage/surplus are also uploaded in TPDDL website. Any offer for sale/purchase/banking of power is done for meeting its shortages/disposal of its surplus at the best available market rates. In the absence of any participation by other stakeholders/utilities in tender issued by TPDDL or non-availability of tender of other States which meets the specified slot wise and quantum wise requirement of TPDDL, the sale/purchase of short term power is done after negotiation through tender on the best offer basis. The DPPG is also being informed of all transactions in time and recorded in the minutes of the meeting. DPPG informs the same to DERC. At the time of annual true up all short term sale/purchase transactions along with justifications thereof is provided to DERC.
- 2.227 The Petitioner puts all out efforts to maximize the revenue through sale of surplus power. However the Petitioner was able to get revenue through sale of surplus power at an average rate of 2.69/kWh as against Rs. 4.00/kWh estimated by Commission in its Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013. Since the short term variations are not covered in the existing PPAC formulae and there was a considerable gap between the actual average rate of sale of surplus power and net estimated in the ARR for FY 2013-14, huge revenue gap remains uncovered which has to be recovered now along with at least two years of carrying cost.
- 2.228 The TPDDL share of Power Purchase from Aravali Power Plant is already reallocated to other needy DISCOMs.
- 2.229 The rate from Bawana plant is high due to high prices of gas and its non-availability. Bawana plant mostly generates at 300 MW only but the fixed costs are required to be borne for the entire 1372 MW of the plant which when seen on a per unit basis makes the cost of procurement exorbitantly high. TPDDL has been continuously advocating for making cheaper gas available to Bawana plant which otherwise is very efficient in terms of heat rate as compared to other plants such as Pragati and Gas Turbine plants.

Commission's View

- 2.230 The long term Power Purchase Agreements are generally entered into by the Petitioner considering the overall average projected demand of the consumers and likely growth in the demand vis-à-vis the likely availability of Power from various sources. The surplus/shortfall in power availability arising due to difference in demand during peak hours and non-peak hours including seasonal variations is required to be sold/purchased by the Petitioner on need basis. The Commission has directed the Petitioner to optimize such short term transactions and maintain transparency in its short-term power purchases and sales.
- 2.231 The Commission has already approved various PPAs entered into by the utilities for procurement of power from long term sources. The Commission has also directed the DISCOMs vide its letter dated 21.10.2009 that they should endeavor to provide uninterrupted power supply to the consumers in their respective areas. The licensees shall ensure that electricity which could not be served due to any reason what-so-ever (including maintenance schedule, break-downs, load shedding etc.) shall not exceed 1% of the total energy supplied by them in any particular month except in cases of force-majeure events which are beyond the control of the Licensees.
- 2.232 The Commission has also noted that the load curve in Delhi is peculiar in nature with high morning and evening peaks and very low load demand during night hours. It is due to the fact that a majority of the load in Delhi is of commercial establishments, office buildings, which have requirement of power primarily during day time. The round-the clock industries, which are a common feature in most of the States and which contribute towards flattening of the load curve, are very few in Delhi.
- 2.233 To cater to the peak demand during day time, DISCOMs have been buying Round the Clock (RTC) Power. The surplus power during night hours/off peak hours gets sold at the prevailing short-term market rate/Power Exchange Rate/UI Rates which is much lower than the average power cost. In order to optimize the cost of power purchase, the Commission has advised the distribution utilities to explore the possibility of higher banking transactions to avoid purchase of peaking power for a short duration, so as not to burden the consumers with avoidable purchases of RTC power which

entail the sale of off-peak surplus at very low rates under the mechanism of Unscheduled Interchange.

- 2.234 The Commission has also directed the distribution utilities to explore possibility of selling surplus power to bulk consumers in adjoining areas in neighboring States who are deprived of grid power and are resorting to generation of expensive power from captive units. This will result in a win-win situation for all concerned. In this regard, the Commission has also issued statutory advice to the Govt. of NCT of Delhi to facilitate this process. The Commission has put in place a mechanism whereby all the power procurements are approved by the Delhi Power Procurement Group.
- 2.235 The Commission has already issued guidelines for short term power procurement which inter-alia include provisions related to power purchase and sales from sister concerns. Most of the power for Delhi is purchased from Central Generating stations and State Generating Stations based on long term Power Purchase Agreements. The price of power supplied by Central/State Generating stations is determined by CERC/DERC. A small quantum of power is purchased in the short term to meet the peak demand. The Commission tries to ensure that the entire process for power purchase for Delhi is transparent. The Commission approves the cost of power procurement after prudence check. The Commission is not allowing the trading margin given by the DISCOMs to its sister concerns. In the directives issued vide present Tariff Order, it has been clearly stated that any transactions through sister concerns will not be taken cognizance of.
- 2.236 The Commission is computing the normative rebate in accordance with Regulation 5.24 of MYT Regulations, 2011.

Issue 13: Regulated Power Expenses

Stakeholder's View

- 2.237 Fixed Cost due to power regulation is shown as expenditure. This is due to the default as consumers are deprived of good and cheaper power and instead they are paying for defaults also. In FY 2012-13, it is Rs. 23 Crore for BRPL and Rs. 13 Crore for BYPL. Financial implication due to regulation should not be allowed as it is due to the inefficiency of DISCOMs.

Petitioner's Submission**BRPL/BYPL**

2.238 BRPL and BYPL have preferred an Appeal against Commission's decision of disallowing fixed cost borne by the Petitioner during regulation of power by certain generators. The Appeal (265 & 266 of 2013) is presently sub-judice before APTEL and hence the Petitioner is refraining from any comment in the matter.

Commission's View

2.239 The decision of APTEL in Appeal No's. 265 & 266 of 2013 is awaited. The Commission is of the view that the fixed cost paid to generating station when the power was regulated during some months due to nonpayment of dues by the petitioner is an additional burden on consumers of such petitioner's area.

Issue 14: O&M Expenses**Stakeholders' View**

2.240 Any modification of norms for O&M expenses require approval of CEA. Modification of O&M norms should not be accepted.

2.241 O&M expenses comprise of salary component, A&G expenses and Repair and Maintenance expenses. The Petitioner is supposed to capitalize works worth thousands of Crore in which at least 25-30% are overhead costs for construction, supervision and administration costs. Hence, the salary and administration costs should be apportioned from the O&M for supervision and salary component for capital works as per accounting principles for determination of tariff. This will reduce cost significantly while truing-up capital expenditure over the period.

2.242 O&M expenses are deemed to be controllable in nature and the same has been determined by the Commission on normative basis. Limits have been defined for these expenses by the Commission and in case actual expenses exceed the limit, the excess expenditure would not be allowed to be passed on to the consumer.

2.243 As per MYT Regulations 2011, any surplus or deficit on account of O&M expenses shall not be trued-up in ARR. Hence, all expenses as requested by the petitioner are not admissible.

2.244 A Company may require more capital expenditure and not O&M expenditure to

reduce losses. Tata should not be allowed to recover O&M expenses above normative level and no relaxation in AT&C loss reduction should be given as it has been allowed more capital expenditure and also earning high return on higher CAPEX allowed.

- 2.245 On one side Tata is asking to reset AT&C loss trajectory based on normative and on the other side asking for O&M expenses on actual basis because they have already achieved AT&C loss trajectory. What is this double Standard?

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

- 2.246 The methodology of determination of normative O&M expenses as per MYT Regulations, 2011, is already under challenge by TPDDL before Delhi High Court.
- 2.247 Firstly, the current methodology of determination of O&M expenses is faulty, which is subject to outcome of the proceedings of the Delhi High Court. Secondly, exceeding normative level of O&M expenses by TPDDL is to be seen in relation to revenue only. The expenses under O&M head which are to be incurred owing to legal compulsions are not within the control of TPDDL.

BRPL/BYPL

- 2.248 More than 85% of ARR is the power purchase cost and balance cost of ARR relates salary to employees, R&M, A&G expenses, procurement of materials etc, which is controllable in nature and the same has been approved on normative basis.
- 2.249 O&M expenses are allowed by the Commission as per applicable MYT Regulations and orders of various superior judicial authorities.

Commission's View

- 2.250 O&M expenses are approved based on the audited financial statements of earlier years after prudence check and other relevant factors including benchmarking of the expenses of all the DISCOMs. During the 2nd MYT control period, the O&M expenses have been finalized on a normative basis with an appropriate escalation factor on the base year expenses as per the principles laid down in MYT Regulations, 2011. Thus irrespective of claims made by the DISCOMs, the O&M expenses are allowed on

a pre-determined normative basis in the tariff fixation process.

- 2.251 O&M expenses are a controllable parameter in terms of Regulation 4.7(d) of MYT Regulations, 2011. Further, the Regulation 4.21(b) of MYT Regulations, 2011 specify that any surplus or deficit on account of O&M expenses shall be to the account of the Licensee and shall not be trued up in the ARR.

Issue 15: Capital Assets & Costs

Stakeholder`s View

- 2.252 The Commission ordered the DISCOMs that all information on capital cost including GIS mapping should be furnished by 30.9.2014 but they failed. For this failure, action must be taken under section 142 of Electricity Act, 2003. The Petitioner is approaching higher courts with Appeals with an intention not to cooperate in the matter of truing up of physical assets. Hence, the Commission is requested to disallow entire capital cost for MYT period 2007 to 2012, as most of the capital projects for earlier years have not yet been started and accounts were simply manipulated.
- 2.253 True up of capital expenses for the period 2007-2012 should have been completed in 2013. In the absence of such true up, the Commission provisionally trued up and directed the DISCOMs to complete verification of assets with GIS mapping and furnish requirement for actual true up. The DISCOMs failed to complete asset verification and consequently CAPEX for the period 2007-12 has not been trued up. If assets do not exist, R&M expenses shall reduce because expenses for a non-existing asset cannot be allowed.
- 2.254 Without truing up of capital expenditures of earlier MYT periods and one year of policy direction period of 2006-07, the depreciation should not be allowed to the Petitioner in a provisional manner.
- 2.255 As per the DERC`s findings, 25% of the projects of the petitioner have not been started yet and the DISCOMs are taking away capital costs from consumers and also claimed carrying costs in it. The Commission should disallow all the capital costs allowed since 2006 to 2012 and re-determine tariffs, since the DISCOMs instead of participating in true up went to court against DERC to avoid truing up. For the period 2004-05 to 2005-06, the petitioner did not submit details but on public interest, the

- Commission suo-moto took the exercise and the DISCOM was caught in manipulation of capital cost accounts and disallowed Rs. 535 Crore from capital cost.
- 2.256 The DISCOM has not executed the CAPEX and is making false claim. The Commission may therefore disallow all expenses the DISCOM made in second control period along with carrying cost so as to effectively reduce tariff and adjust Regulatory Asset including carrying cost. The DISCOMs have also not paid over Rs. 2500 Crore to Delhi Genco and it should be recovered from the petitioners.
- 2.257 During determination of tariff for the period FY 2015-16, the Commission shall do truing up of capital cost and physical verification of the assets for the MYT period from 2007-12, in public interest, since until they are trued up they remain provisional and the consumers are not getting the excess amount refunded back with the interest. Hence the exercise of determination of tariff for FY 2015-16 must be stopped till then.
- 2.258 The purchase of equipment for capital expenditure from M/s RIL which was 68% over the market rate during FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06 has been dealt with as per the Chairman's specific mention in Tariff order file. Not only the Commission detected the fraud and also forwarded a copy of the document like VAT Return of REL to VAT authorities for payment of VAT, which stands confirmed by VAT Department of NCT of Delhi. It is abundantly clear that the Commission considered the price given in RIL VAT statement plus 5% as RIL margin of profit. 117 consumer groups raised strong objection at the attempt of the petitioner to siphon off funds to defraud the consumer.
- 2.259 APTEL has allowed the licensee to capitalise assets within 15 days after completion of the project. No electric line can be commissioned without a certificate from the Electrical Inspector. The direction of APTEL is in excess of its jurisdiction as the Tribunal does not have power of review under the Act and compromise the safety of the consumer. Hence the direction of APTEL is to be taken as advisory in nature.

Petitioner's Submission

BRPL submission

- 2.260 The Petitioner has sought true-up of capitalization from 2007-08 to 2012-13 in line with the provisions of the DERC MYT Regulation, 2011. Capitalization is required to

be trued-up. In the case of BRPL, the same is pending for over 3 years after expiry of first MYT period, thus severely limiting the licensee's ability to recover legitimate expenses, such as interest, depreciation and RoCE. Further the issue was subject matter of challenge in Appeal No. 36 of 2008 before APTEL. BRPL's claim to seek capitalization from 2007-08 till 2012-13 is based on judgment dated 06-10-2009 rendered by APTEL and is thus fair, legal and valid in law. The Petitioner's claim pertaining to previous period entitlement has been delayed by the Commission. The relevant documents have been submitted from time to time for which the claim pertains.

BYPL

2.261 M/s. Feedback Infra has been appointed by the Commission for completion of the physical verification of assets and the same is currently under process.

TPDDL

2.262 The exercise of physical verification of assets is already in progress and TPDDL is fully cooperating with the Commission for the same.

Commission's View

2.263 The matter related to non-compliance of the direction of the Commission by DISCOM in regard to timely completion of GIS mapping has been dealt in the Tariff Order of the concerned DISCOM.

2.264 Finalization of Capital Expenditure and Capitalisation of the DISCOMs is under process. Pending completion of True up exercise for capitalisation, the Commission has approved the capitalisation on provisional basis so that the future consumers are not burdened with past costs.

Issue 16: LPSC (Late Payment Surcharge)**Stakeholder's View**

2.265 The LPSC should form part of either revenue or Non-Tariff Income and should be accounted for in ARR of DISCOMs as income but the same has been deducted in revenue collected as well as Non-Tariff Income of FY 2013-14.

Petitioner's Submission

BRPL

2.266 The Commission in Tariff Order for FY 2013-14 has specified the manner in which LPSC is to be accounted for. The benefit of LPSC is passed on to consumers as non-Tariff income (which is deducted from ARR) after deducting the cost of financing of LPSC incurred by the Petitioner.

BYPL

2.267 The treatment of LPSC is done in the manner specified in DERC MYT Regulations and various orders/judgments.

TPDDL

2.268 No Response.

Commission's View

2.269 The net LPSC (i.e., LPSC amount collected after deducting the financing cost of LPSC) forms part of Non-Tariff Income and accordingly the Commission has considered the LPSC in Non-Tariff Income and reduced the same from ARR.

Issue 17: Past Period Claims & Regulatory Asset**Stakeholders' View**

2.270 BRPL has made claims for previous periods; DERC should allow only genuine claims.

2.271 The following require to be answered:

- i. Why DERC is loading the cost of power of the past period on the present day consumers.
- ii. Why DERC deferring the realization of past arrears to DISCOMs and thereby getting the interest burden on present consumers
- iii. When DERC is aware that each passing year is adding to the interest burden, why the realization plan of the accumulated losses is being spread over 8 years? A shorter period will reduce interest cost to a large extent.
- iv. What action DERC will take to reduce and minimize the interest burden loaded on the consumers due to the regulatory asset.
- v. The present consumer is paying interest burden on past consumption simply because DERC kept deferring the realization of regulatory losses.

2.272 The regulatory assets projected by DISCOMS are imaginary and incorrect. The

Commission has wrongly allowed regulatory asset of Rs 14000 Crore upto FY 2012-

13. The Commission is requested to disallow the inflated revenue gap/ regulatory asset as projected by DISCOM due to the following:

- a. The accumulated revenue gaps projected by the petitioners for FY 2012-13 to 2015-16 are found arbitrary, false and incorrect. The Petitioners are reluctant in providing actual data in respect of assets inherited from DVB and added during the period and has been projecting and showing imaginary asset and accumulated revenue gap. Due to this, the Commission has been deprived from conducting prudence check.
- b. DERC should not pass on the burden of past revenue gap on honest consumers of Delhi.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.273 Since the current tariff is not cost reflective to cover up the entire power purchase cost, O&M expenses and increasing interest burden on loan taken to fund accumulated revenue gap, the tariff hike is proposed. Also for full recovery of the projected controllable and uncontrollable cost for FY 2015-16 and along with speedy recovery of past accumulated revenue gap and to save the consumer for additional burden of interest cost on unrealized gap, the tariff hike is proposed.

BRPL

2.274 As regards past period claims, by virtue of APTEL orders, the Commission undertakes exhaustive prudence check to verify the claims before allowing them in ARR.

2.275 The profits of the Petitioner and other DISCOMS in Delhi are regulated i.e. their tariff is regulated where they operate on cost+ RoCE basis and in the event their costs exceed the revenue, the resultant gap is recoverable by a tariff hike as determined by the Commission, which is recognized as regulated asset in the books over the years. The financial position of the petitioner has grown worst to a point where maintaining day to day operations has become an ardent task. The precarious financial position of the three DISCOMs has been brought out and appropriate action is suggested in statutory advice dated 01.02.2013 to the GONTCD by the Commission. The total accumulated revenue gap of Rs 19504.04 Crore has been

recognized by the Commission. Hence it becomes absolutely imperative that time bound recovery of RA by way of cost reflective tariff and applicable surcharge is ensured by the Commission at the earliest.

BYPL

2.276 To the stakeholders understanding of regulatory assets, the Petitioner likes to submit that the facility of a regulatory asset has been adopted by some Regulatory Commissions in the past to limit tariff impact in a particular year. This should be done only as exception and subject to the following guidelines:

- (a) The circumstances should be clearly defined through regulations, and should only include natural causes or force majeure conditions. Under usual conditions, the opening balances of uncovered gap must be covered through transition financing arrangement or capital restructuring;
- (b) Carrying cost of Regulatory Asset should be allowed to the utilities;
- (c) Recovery of Regulatory Asset should be time-bound and within a period not exceeding three years at the most and preferably within control period;
- (d) The use of the facility of Regulatory Asset should not be repetitive.
- (e) In cases where regulatory asset is proposed to be adopted, it should be ensured that the return on equity should not become unreasonably low in any year so that the capability of the licensee to borrow is not adversely affected.

2.277 Also, a time bound recovery of Regulatory Asset through an appropriate surcharge should be provided to ensure that the future consumers are not burdened with the unavoidable carrying cost on the regulatory Assets.

2.278 Further, the Commission has allowed a surcharge @ 8% for recovery of carrying cost and partial recovery of regulatory Assets. However, the RA surcharge of 8% is not enough even to recover the carrying cost on opening balance of Regulatory Assets.

2.279 In view of the above, the Petitioner in its present tariff petition has prayed to the Commission to ensure recovery of accumulated Revenue Gap up to FY 2014-15 through an appropriate surcharge, to ensure that the future consumers are not burdened with the past cost and the Petitioner's ability to effectively carry on its operations and pay for power purchase costs is not impacted.

Commission's View

- 2.280 Recovery of accumulated revenue gap, Regulatory Asset as envisaged in clause 8.2.2 of Tariff policy is as under:
- Carrying cost of Regulatory Assets should be allowed to the utilities.*
 - Recovery of Regulatory Assets to be time bound and within a period not exceeding three years at the most, preferably within the control period.*
 - The use of the facility of Regulatory Assets should not be retrospective.*
 - In case when Regulatory Asset is proposed to be adopted, it should be ensured that the ROE should not become unreasonably low in any year so that the capability of licensee to borrow is not adversely affected.*
- 2.281 The Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (APTEL) has also reiterated the above policy in its judgment dated 11.11.2011 (OP 1 of 2011).
- 2.282 The Commission is guided by the National Tariff Policy and in accordance with the Hon'ble APTEL judgment has allowed carrying cost to DISCOMs. For liquidation of the past accumulated revenue gap, the Commission introduced a surcharge of 8% over the revised Tariff, in tariff order dated July 13, 2012, and has been revising tariffs every year to a reasonable level to provide additional revenue to DISCOMs and also to reduce the burden of carrying cost on the consumers of Delhi.
- 2.283 The buildup of the revenue gap commenced in 2009-10 when power purchase costs went up substantially and the rate of sale of surplus power steeply declined due to stringent frequency controls imposed by CERC.
- 2.284 The Tariff Order for FY 2010-11 was not issued due to court proceedings. Therefore, while the tariff increase from FY 2011-12 onwards has to some extent offset the incremental increase in revenue gap, however cumulative revenue gap along with applicable carrying costs still remained uncovered. Thus, the formula evolved by the Commission i.e., including carrying costs in the ARR every year, for tariff determination and using 8% surcharge for liquidating the principal over a time is expected to liquidate the Regulatory Assets in a reasonable period of 6 to 8 years.
- 2.285 The Commission had provisionally recognized a cumulative revenue gap of Rs. 11431 Crore for all the three private DISCOMs till 31.03.2012 which is provisionally trued up to Rs. 13670 Crore at end of FY 2012-13. In accordance with the directions of Hon'ble

APTEL, the Commission had provided a road map for liquidating this gap along with applicable carrying cost. In principle it has been decided to meet past carrying costs every year by including these in the ARR for the forthcoming years. An additional surcharge of 8% is being levied to gradually reduce the principal amount of Revenue Gap. The Commission had adopted this conservative approach so as to ensure that no tariff shock ensues every year on the consumers and at the same time the past revenue gap is fully recovered in a reasonable time frame.

- 2.286 There is no change in levy of additional surcharge of 8% on the consumers of the private DISCOMs for gradual liquidation of principal amount of the accumulated revenue gap as submitted by the Commission before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 884 of 2010.

Issue 18: High Interest on Working Capital and Loans

Stakeholder's View

- 2.287 The DISCOMs are claiming high rate of interest on working capital and also the cost of debt shown by DISCOMs is very high.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

- 2.288 TPDDL has sought working capital/CAPEX least rate of interest for second control period based on the rate approved by the Commission in its MYT Order. The cost of computing carrying cost has been considered in line with the APTEL judgment dated 28.11.2014.

BRPL

- 2.289 The claim for interest on working capital is in line with provisions of MYT Regulations, 2011 and judgment accorded by APTEL in Appeal No.153 of 2009.
- 2.290 Regarding cost of debt, the same has to be seen in the light of regulatory uncertainty arising out of non-cost reflective tariff and repetitive creation of regulatory assets without a time bound amortization plan for recovery of the same by the Commission. This has affected the risk perception of the lenders leading to relatively higher cost of debt.

BYPL

2.291 BYPL continuously endeavors to avail loan at the lowest possible interest rate. However, the rate of interest on commercial borrowings is based on various parameters and associated risk assessment by the lender. The continuously increasing revenue gap since 2009-10, absence of cost reflective Tariff and lack of visibility of defined path for recovery of accumulated RA has resulted in downgrading of external credit rating of BYPL. As a result, the lenders extended the subsequent loans at a comparatively high rate of interest with additional stringent stipulations. Further, the cost of borrowing also went up during the period on account of RBI raising the interest rate during 2007-08 to 2012-13, which is reflected in the corresponding increasing trend in bank Primary Lending Rate (BPLR)/Base Rate of respective banks since FY 2007-08 which has also contributed to high rate of interest.

Commission's View

2.292 Interest rates are considered by the Commission which are relevant to that particular year as per DERC Tariff Regulations in force. Carrying costs are allowed whenever necessary only after detailed analysis and prudence check

Issue 19: AT&C Losses**Stakeholders' View:**

- 2.293 In the absence of 100% metering system, how the loss levels were authenticated?
- 2.294 What is the basis for MYT targets, achievement and incentives thereof when initial loss levels were under question?
- 2.295 BRPL has not been reducing loss levels potentially and should be directed to expedite reduction as they have not achieved 15% loss level which was the target set for FY 2011-12.
- 2.296 BYPL should get some franchisee in loss making areas or may hire some expertise to reduce line losses. Their AT&C losses has not come below 20% whereas Tata is at 10%
- 2.297 Last year TPDDL has shown distribution loss of 10.23% and collection efficiency of 99.54% to achieve AT&C loss level of 10.64% and this year distribution loss of 10.63%

and collection efficiency of 100.31% to achieve AT&C loss level of 10.35%. In one year TPDDL was able to reduce loss by 1.04% and in second year increased distribution loss by 0.40%. Similarly collection efficiency fell down by 0.46% and in second year collection efficiency increased by 0.80%. It seems TPDDL is showing false AT&C losses by way of either false sales or false collection figures to avail benefits.

2.298 TPDDL and BRPL started with same loss level of 48% at the time of privatization and DERC set a target of 17% for FY 2010-11 for both companies which was based on loss level at the time of privatization. Thus the loss level of Tata should also be the same as that of BRPL in FY 2011-12, which was 15%. Further Tata is applying loss reduction of 0.5% on YoY basis by which Tata would reach only 13.25% at the end of FY 2014-15, whereas BRPL would reach 12.50% at the end of FY 2014-15. Tata is trying to make more benefit and befooling the Commission of Delhi. AT&C losses should not be allowed beyond the normative loss level as per DERC Regulation.

2.299 AT&C losses figures are not acceptable without prudent check. At the end of MYT period 2007-12 the loss target for both BRPL and NDPL was 17% and for BYPL, it was 22%. The discrimination is unjustified and therefore not acceptable. From inception of FY 2003-04 till 2008-09, BRPL has been calculating losses on the basis of total units injected less total units billed. Upto 2008-09, this procedure was adopted. In 2009-10 true up petition, a different procedure was adopted, which was easier for manipulation. As per the earlier procedure, the AT&C losses for FY 2009-10 should have been 13.3%. But the petitioner (BRPL) subtracted huge amount as unbilled and increased the AT&C losses to 20%. Of the losses, figure of 13.3% in FY 2009-10 is considered as per Regulation 4.8 and 5.1 of DERC MYT Regulations. The AT&C losses should have been $(13.3 - 3.4) = 9.9\%$. Hence, the AT&C losses were manipulated by DISCOMs siphoning thousands of Crore of rupees from consumer without any account and such manipulation must be checked.

2.300 During public hearing on 04.08.2015 stakeholders raised following comments.

- (i) Why can't DERC allow high load shedding in high loss areas to punish the consumers in these divisions?
- (ii) Why honest consumers should bear the burden of the consumers who do theft?
- (iii) Cannot DERC minimize losses and improve electricity in low-loss areas?

(iv) How is DERC planning to compensate losses of around Rs. 10000 Crore claimed by DISCOMs?

(v) Why full- pledged efforts including deployment of police force, army, CISF, CRPF should not be made?

2.301 If honest and sincere efforts are made, the losses can be plugged and increase in tariff can be checked. Hence it should be ensured that the AT&C loss does not burden the consumer. If the DISCOMs fail to achieve the target, the DISCOMs have to bear the loss.

2.302 The losses recorded in large number of distribution transformers in many areas of Delhi in ARR petition of FY 2013-14 were shown negative by TPDDL. For the purpose of computation of AT&C losses, the recording on those distribution transforms have been ignored. The petitioner has not shown improvement in successive ARR petition of FY 2014-15. Thus the projection of AT&C losses shown by the petitioner is a fabrication of the records to suppress their deficient service to the consumer. The Commission is requested to ensure audit of AT&C losses of the petitioners by Technocrats, preferably from IITS.

2.303 (a) The Commission adopted AT&C target of 18% for FY 2011-12 (extended MYT period 2011-12) for BYPL and hence the projection cannot be distorted and should be maintained. After DERC discovered zero billing to the extent of 56 MU and adjusted enforcement sale at twice the tariff rate, their loss came down to 21.9%. In case No. 195 to 2013, the APTEL has remanded back the case to DERC to true up for FY 2011-12 for zero billing and consumption. Hence the energy account of BYPL needs more scrutiny for billing for 2011-12 and may be taken up at appropriate time. For the present the target of 18% shall hold good and true up of energy account finalised provisionally.

(b) BYPL has submitted that AT&C losses in Pavas, Chandini Chowk, Yamuna Vihar and Seenapuri are still in excess of 25% to 30%. How such high loss can take place when the DISCOM has all power connections through electronic meters and all conductors are sheathed and cabled to avoid any hooking or bypass. The Enforcement Department of DISCOM only targets vulnerable consumer and harass him by threat, notice, legal action etc.

Petitioner's Submission**TPDDL**

- 2.304 TPDDL has computed the incentive due to overachievement of AT&C losses reduction as per MYT Regulations 2011. The AT&C loss is computed as per MYT Regulations, 2011. Each and every claim made by the Petitioner undergoes several levels of prudence check by the Commission before the same is accepted. The claims pertaining to AT&C losses reduction are scrutinized to the highest order because of the reason that DISCOM are liable to be incentivized or penalized based on their achievement/non-achievement of AT&C loss targets set forth by the Commission. Hence the question of claiming false sale / collection is untenable.
- 2.305 TPDDL has already reduced losses from 48% in FY 2002 to the level of 10.35 in FY 2014. The TPDDL not only achieved these targets but also shared the benefit of overachievement with its consumers. The progressive decrease after the certain level needs much more efforts and cooperation than in the initial period where most of the losses were due to unrecovered revenue.
- 2.306 Regarding the suggestion that AT&C losses should not be allowed beyond normative level, it is submitted that based on the targeted AT&C loss level (base year for second MYT period), the Commission in its orders for FY 2012-13 to 2014-15 has fixed 0.50% as yearly reduction in AT&C loss level for previous years over the likely actual AT&C loss level (Total reduction of 1.50% in AT&C loss level over a period of three years).
- 2.307 The Commission in its Tariff Order July 2014, has revised the target for AT&C loss level for the base year FY 2011-12 and has not made the corresponding adjustments for ensuring yearly target of AT&C loss level.
- 2.308 The distribution transformer losses are calculated by metering the consumption of a particular distribution transformer and comparing with the consumption recorded in the meters of all consumers fed from that distribution transformer. The distribution of low tension network is dynamic and load balancing/transfers are routinely carried from one transformer to another depending on local over loading /under loading of low tension lines, feeders and distribution transformers. Till the actual change over is transferred in the records and indexed, the transformers may show negative losses

as consumers shifted to other distribution transformer/new distribution transformer/other LT network, still continues to show up on previous distributional transformer meters.

BRPL

- 2.309 The methodology issued by the Commission for calculation of opening loss levels and the loss levels in subsequent years have been specified in tariff order dated 22-02-2002 and in subsequent tariff orders. The opening levels were determined by the Commission after detailed consultation and scrutiny of submissions duly following due process of law.
- 2.310 Since BRPL took over the distribution business, AT&C losses in the Petitioner's area have been reduced from 48.1% in FY 2002-03 to around 16.0% in FY 2013-14, which by any standard is a significant reduction of around 36% over a period of 12 years.
- 2.311 The APTEL in its judgment in Appeal No. 177 of 2012 has directed DERC for re-fixing the AT&C loss target for the second MYT period (FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15). BRPL has requested the Commission to give effect to the APTEL judgment.
- 2.312 Regarding imposing of penalties on consumers residing in high loss areas, the Commission would appropriately consider stakeholders comment while finalizing ARR / Tariff for FY 2015-16.
- 2.313 Regarding availing assistance of CISF / CRPF in conducting enforcement activities, the petitioner has requested the GONCTD to restore CISF support for conducting enforcement activities / raids.
- 2.314 The reasons for non-achievement of AT&C losses set by the Commission are due to:
- a) **Financial Viability:** Capital expenditure is the sine quo non for reduction of AT&C losses, availability of funds is critical for reduction of AT&C losses. The CAPEX will not only depend on the capital cost of the schemes required for loss reduction but also on requirement of system augmentation to improve quality and reliability of power supply, renovation and modernization of the old system which has completed its useful life etc. Reduction of AT&C losses by 0.83% on Y-O-Y basis is impossible to achieve due to:
- i. Subsidy which pertains to current tariff is adjusted against the dues of the DISCOMs resulting in reduction of current tariff.

- ii. Non-approval or under-approval of quarterly PPAC.
- iii. Low credit rating of DISCOMs
- iv. CISF support to BRPL was withdrawn resulting in constraint in conducting enforcement raids.
- v. 8% surcharge approved by the DERC is not sufficient even to cover the carrying cost.
- vi. Funds recoverable are not sufficient for CAPEX infusion for reduction of losses.
- vii. No government funding for loss reduction schemes, which are available to SEBs.

b) **Consumer Mix:** More than 96% of theft is noticed in case of domestic and non-domestic categories and the occurrence of theft is not there in case of industrial consumers. It is not possible for BRPL to achieve a reduction of 0.83% in FY 2015-16 as proposed by the Commission unless the Commission changes consumer mix which will make BRPL to achieve the targets.

2.315 The Commission is therefore requested to rework/reconsider the target for FY 2015-16 based on a clearly laid down methodology.

BYPL

2.316 AT&C losses include both commercial as well as technical loss components. While the commercial component includes theft, non-payment of bills, the technical component is dependent on factors like geographical spread, network condition, capital investment, loading conditions, voltage level at which energy is drawn etc. When the petitioner took over in July 2002, the actual opening loss levels were higher (63.1%) than the bid opening loss levels (57.2%). Since privatization the AT&C losses were reduced to around 21.04% in FY 2013-14 which by any standard is a significant reduction over a period of 12 years. Further to reduce losses and curb theft, the Petitioner has been focusing on several measures like augmentation of teams and infrastructure, improvement across all enforcement metrics etc. The enforcement machinery has also been streamlined and strengthened along with augmentation of requisite infrastructure, team of dedicated officers etc.

2.317 In regard to reduction of tariff by curbing theft, the petitioner has been focusing on

various measures like augmentation of teams and requisite infrastructure, establishment of analytics to assist in targeted enforcement, improvements across all enforcement metrics etc. The teams of officers are dedicated for the purpose of detection of theft and bringing to book offenders. Drive against theft and stealing of power has been intensified and the accused have also been sent to jail for varying jail terms. In FY 2013-14 due to intensified drive Rs. 17.82 Crore has been recovered and deducted from ARR.

- 2.318 The DERC MYT Regulations will specify the mechanism for penalizing the licensee in case of underachievement of AT&C losses and to incentivize the licensee for overachievement. In case of underachievement of AT&C loss target, it shall be to the licensee's account.

Commission's View

- 2.319 The Commission has fixed the targets of AT&C loss for each year of the second control period (FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15) in MYT Order dated July 13, 2012. The DISCOMs are given an incentive if the loss is reduced below the target fixed. If the losses are more than the target fixed, the loss above the target fixed is fully to the account of the DISCOMs. The targets every year are progressively decreasing and it is expected that DISCOMs will achieve them by putting in the extra efforts required. If the DISCOM does not achieve the target, the financial impact will be to the account of the DISCOMs alone as penalty. Penalty, if any, is reflected in the true-up of ARR of the respective DISCOM.
- 2.320 The Commission is of the view that Distribution loss is an inherent loss in the System which can be minimized upto the technical permissible limit whereas AT&C losses also include the theft/commercial losses which can be controlled by DISCOMs. The targets for AT&C losses are fixed at the beginning of the 2nd MYT Control Period and these are based on past performance, the trajectory given in the 1st MYT Control Period as well as other relevant factors.
- 2.321 The details of actual incentive/disincentive given to the DISCOMs for over and under achievement of AT&C loss target are available in Chapter A3 (True up of ARR) of the respective tariff orders which are available at Commission website (www.derc.gov.in).

- 2.322 The Commission has been repeatedly emphasizing on the DISCOMs to step up their enforcement activities to reduce theft and control AT&C losses. The Commission is of the view that carrying out more load shedding in high loss/theft area is not an appropriate measure, as the honest consumers in these areas will also suffer without being on fault. The Petitioner should make all efforts to prevent theft of electricity by strengthening their enforcement activities without harassing the paying consumers.
- 2.323 The Commission determines AT&C loss in truing up after prudence check of all relevant components. The Commission is of the view that the negative losses recorded under some distribution transformers were due to incorrect consumer tagging/consumer indexing. Further, the readings of distribution transformer meters and the consumers are not synchronized. In case areas showing high AT&C losses, the Commission has been informed that selective load shedding in those areas is not legally possible. Furthermore, it would amount to induce hardships to honest consumers in those areas.
- 2.324 For liquidation of revenue gap of past period, The Commission has introduced 8% surcharge as per Tariff Order dated 13.07.2012.
- 2.325 Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards (Second Amendment) Regulations, 2015 is under consideration to deal with Standard of performance.
- 2.326 BYPL has been penalized in past as per direction of Hon'ble APTEL in appeal number 195 of 2013.

Issue 20: Cash Limit of Rs. 4000 for payment of Electricity Bills

Stakeholders' View

- 2.327 Higher cash transaction leads to generation of black money, particularly when there is resistance from CAG.
- 2.328 DISCOMs should give an undertaking that there is no transaction beyond Rs. 4000/- in cash.
- 2.329 One can make payment of the bill upto Rs. 5000/- only through credit card at the counter. If one can make payment of any amount online by credit/debit card, then what is the wisdom in not allowing the same facility at the counter.
- 2.330 Cash limit of Rs. 4,000 for payment of bills in cash is to be enhanced to Rs. 20,000. Unnecessarily cheque folios are getting wasted because of the condition that

payment of bills of above Rs. 4000 is to be only by cheque or DD.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.331 The Commission has already clarified that the limit of Rs. 4000/- in cash is for all kinds of payments as per Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 for FY 2014-15 and DISCOMs are bound to follow the direction of the Commission. However, in view of the ground realities and hardship faced by the consumers in issuing cheques, preparing demand drafts and increasing chances of default by consumers in case payments are not accepted in cash, the Commission may consider doing away with the limit of acceptance of cash in case of domestic consumers for all types of bills.

BRPL

2.332 BRPL has a mechanism in place to ensure transparency in payment collection and proper accounting including cash transaction. The same goes through the prudence check by the Commission during ARR/Tariff determination process. The issue is presently sub-judice before the APTEL in appeal no: 235 of 2014. The petitioner has already in the past has requested the Commission to allow higher limit for acceptance of cash keeping in mind the inconvenience of the consumers.

2.333 The Commission, in its directive dated 08.08.2014, directed the licensees to ensure that processing fee on credit payments should not be passed on to consumers and the same should be waived off by the concerned banks and banks are required to waive off the processing fee. This request has been denied by banks. The petitioner has therefore no option but to refrain from accepting payments exceeding Rs. 5000/- through credit cards. The Commission has been apprised of this situation by BRPL. It may be noted that the stakeholder may make payments through credit cards without any limit on the BSES website.

BYPL

2.334 BYPL has proper mechanism in place to ensure transparency in payment, collection and proper accounting thereof including cash transactions. The same goes through prudence check/validation to be conducted by the Commission during ARR/ Tariff determination process. Moreover it may be noted that this issue is presently sub-judice before the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 236 of 2014.

- 2.335 The Petitioner in compliance to the direction of the Commission accepts cash payment of electricity bills only up to Rs. 4000/-. However, the Petitioner on various occasions has appraised the Commission of the difficulties in enforcing the above mentioned direction as this causes inconvenience to the consumers besides adversely affecting our recovery.
- 2.336 The Commission was also appraised that the background in which the Rs. 4000/- limit was introduced by the Commission was in the context of one of the criteria for filing a income tax return included in the Financial Bill, 2005 of the Govt. of India. It is noteworthy that this particular criteria was subsequently withdrawn and was applicable only up to 01.04.2005. Also as per the Section 40A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 and provisions under Income Tax Rules, the maximum limit for payments/receipt in cash is Rs. 20,000/-.
- 2.337 BYPL has time and again requested the Commission for the relaxation of limit for accepting cash payments for several reasons. Also, the Petitioner at Para 5.11.2 page no 257 of its Tariff petition for FY 2015-16 has proposed an increase in cash limit for payment of electricity bills.

Commission's View

- 2.338 Regarding payment of electricity bills of more than Rs. 4000/- not by cash, the Commission has taken a conscious decision that in case the bill for consumption of electricity is more than Rs. 4000/-, payment of the bill be accepted by the Petitioner by means of Account Payee Cheque/DD. However, payment of any amount can be made through net banking payment. The Commission has in its tariff order for FY 2009-10 also directed the petitioner to accept the cash payment of more than Rs. 4000/- for payment of electricity bill in the case of visually impaired consumers only.

Issue 21: Waiver of Renewable Power Purchase Obligation (RPO)

Stakeholders' View:

- 2.339 The DISCOMs have implemented the tariff order of FY 2013-14 partially by carrying out tariff portion but not obligation of purchase of renewable power to the extent to 4.8% as mandated. The waiver of RPO may be considered only after action is taken for full implementation of tariff order for FY 2013-14.

- 2.340 Request of the DISCOMs (Obligated entity) for deferment RPO obligation should be rejected.
- 2.341 For continuous default in compliance of solar RPO, action should be initiated as per the provisions of the DERC (Renewable Purchase Obligation and Renewable Energy Certificate Framework Implementation) Regulation, 2012.
- 2.342 DISCOMs should be compelled to meet Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO) and failing which penalty equivalent to the market value of such quantity of RE not purchased by DISCOMs to be imposed.
- 2.343 DISCOMs shall also be encouraged to set up small wind, solar, bio-mass and LPG based plants.
- 2.344 RPO accumulation may be deferred over the next 4 to 5 years. DISCOMs may be allowed to procure power instead of RECs which result in unnecessary Tariff increase without any flow of physical power to the utility.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

- 2.345 RPO should be deferred so that DISCOMs are not burdened unnecessarily with additional costs when no physical power is available to them.
- 2.346 Setting-up of new capacities through competitive bidding initiated takes one / two years and hence RPO should be deferred to allow bidders sufficient time to set up new capacities, which shall ensure physical flow of power to TPDDL and ultimately benefit the consumers. TPDDL has already installed solar projects having capacities of 1.65 MW.

BRPL

- 2.347 We agree with the stakeholder's observation that imposition of RPO will cause additional burden to be passed on to end consumers, since the cost of RPO presently is much higher than conventional sources of energy. The petitioner has already requested the Commission to relax the RPO targets for FY 2012-13 to FY 2016-17 and to allow the appellants to fulfil its accumulated RPO in a staggered manner over a period of 10 years keeping in view their precarious financial position and to minimize the tariff burden on consumers. The issue is presently sub-judice before the Commission.

- 2.348 The RPO targets cannot be achieved till renewable sector is developed in Delhi. Renewable Energy Generation is at nascent stage and will gradually develop in coming years. At the meeting held with the Commission on 09.10.2012, the petitioner highlighted the difficulty in mobilizing resources to meet RPO announced by the Commission. Further in its letter dated 03.12.2013 appraised the financial position of the DISCOM and requested the Commission to waive off the solar and non-solar RPO during 2013-14.
- 2.349 A gap of Rs. 957 Crore has been observed during FY 2013-14 on account of non-recovery of variations between actual power purchase cost and fuel allowed by the Commission (including cost of RPO) in tariff order dated 31-07-2013. In its letter dated 09.12.2014, the Petitioner estimated that if the RPO obligation is allowed to be recovered in one year, it will result in a tariff increase of 10% on the consumers. The Petitioner has therefore requested the Commission to relax RPO targets for FY 2012-13 to FY 2016-17 and to allow the appellant to fulfil its RPO obligation in a staggered manner over a period of 10 years keeping in view the precarious financial position and minimizing tariff burden on consumers.

BYPL

- 2.350 We agree with the stakeholder's observation that imposition of RPO will cause additional burden to be passed on to end consumers, since the cost of RPO presently is much higher than conventional sources of energy. The petitioner has already requested the Commission to relax the RPO targets for FY 2012-13 to FY 2016-17 and to allow the appellant to fulfil their accumulated RPO in a staggered manner over a period of 10 years keeping in view the precarious financial position and to minimize the tariff burden on consumers.

Commission's View

- 2.351 The Electricity Act, 2003 entrusts on the appropriate Commission the responsibility for promotion of co-generation and generation based on renewable energy sources. The policy framework of the Government of India also stresses on the encouragement of renewable energy sources keeping in view the need for energy security and reducing carbon footprint.
- 2.352 Section 86 (1) (e) of the Electricity Act 2003 states:

“The State Commission shall discharge the following functions:

Promote co-generation and generation of electricity from renewable sources of energy by providing suitable measures for connectivity with the grid and sale of electricity to any person, and also specify, for purchase of electricity from such sources, a percentage of the total consumption of electricity in the area of a distribution licensee”

- 2.353 The Commission in pursuance of the same has mandated the renewable purchase obligation to be met through purchase of energy from renewable energy sources/renewable energy certificate to ensure that RPOs are met in the most optimum manner.
- 2.354 The Commission has issued DERC (Renewable Purchase Obligation and Renewable Energy Certificate Framework Implementation) Regulations, 2012, notified on 01.10.2012. As per these Regulations, every obligated entity is required to fulfil a defined minimum percentage of the total quantum/consumption from eligible renewable energy sources at the percentages as per the following schedule: -

Year	Solar	Total
2012-13	0.15%	3.40%
2013-14	0.20%	4.80%
2014-15	0.25%	6.20%
2015-16	0.30%	7.60%
2016-17	0.35%	9.00%

- 2.355 The Commission has deferred the RPO obligation of DISCOMs for FY 2012-13 to be fulfilled in FY 2013-14 on the request of the DISCOMs keeping in view that DERC RPO Regulations has been notified on 01.10.2012 and projected the cost towards RPO under power purchase cost in the respective Tariff order.
- 2.356 The Commission has prescribed penalties for non-compliance of clause 11 of the above RPO regulations. Mixed response from the stakeholders has been received with regards to exemption/imposition of penalty. However, the Commission is of the view that generation of electricity from renewable sources of energy should be promoted and hence non-compliance shall attract the penalty as per provisions of the Regulations. Further, the penalty imposed by the Commission on the obligated entity will not be a pass through in the Aggregate Revenue Requirement, in case the obligated entity is a Distribution Licensee.

2.357 The Commission vide letter dated 02.01.2015 has intimated the distribution licensees that they have to strictly comply with the RPO Regulations and meet their RPO targets, failure of which action shall be taken as per applicable provisions of the Act/Regulations.

Issue 22: Metering of DISCOMs own consumption

Stakeholders' View

2.358 The DERC directed DISCOMs to meter own consumption in their establishments within two months on 26.08.2011. The directive 7.9 of 2011-12 confirms that supply to DISCOM's offices if unmetered amounts to theft of energy as per Electricity Act 2003. But DISCOMs continued to avail unmetered supply upto 2011-12 and DERC did not act. Non-billing of consumption amounts to evading 5% electricity tax.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.359 All TPDDL offices / buildings are already metered as per directive of the Commission.

BRPL / BYPL

2.360 The said directive has been complied with and presently all establishments of petitioner are metered. In case any consumption is not metered or the meter is temporarily non-functional and energy consumed at such a point is accounted by assessment of such energy by using the methodology prescribed in DERC Supply Code and Performance Standard Regulations, 2007. All consumption in the petitioners' premises have been accounted for either through energy meters or if meter is non-functional by the methodology mentioned above.

Commission's View

2.361 The Commission has already given directive to the DISCOMs to provide appropriate meters to record electricity consumption every month in the substations, offices, collection centers etc related to own consumption of the DISCOMs. Any unmetered own consumption will be treated as unaccounted energy and it will be to the account of the DISCOM. Furthermore, in order to promote conservation of energy under Own Consumption, the Commission has fixed norms for Own Consumption

based on total sales during the year. Any excess consumption beyond norms will be charged as per applicable tariff categories, which shall not be allowed to be passed on in ARR of the Petitioner.

Issue 23: Power Purchase Adjustment Charges (PPAC)

Stakeholder's View

- 2.362 i. Why PPAC is applied on Fixed Cost? The cost of distribution lines/ meters etc is not affected by gap in any power cost and sale price.
- ii. If PPAC is applied, why surcharge is kept?
- iii. Surcharge is applied on PPAC also, why?
- 2.363 PPAC formula is in place since 2012 which covers all power purchase procurement cost variations except short term power purchases. Hence there should not be much variation in power procurement cost vis-a-vis revenue collected. But there is high variation in DERC projections v/s Actual claimed.
- 2.364 DERC is allowing FCA as a percentage of retail cost whereas FCA should be made applicable on production cost only. DERC has been allowing upto 8% as fuel cost adjustment.
- 2.365 DISCOMs have not paid their dues to NTPC and others for the power purchased. Where is the question of Fuel Cost Adjustment?
- 2.366 Different DISCOMs sell electricity and hike fuel surcharge at different rates even though their source of supply is same. i.e., DTL.
- 2.367 Generator Tariff in MYT is for five years that take care of minor fuel adjustments, hence increase may be allowed accordingly and not on different percentages.
- 2.368 DERC over the time blurred the line between FCA and PPCA. The Electricity Act provides for FCA to be adjusted quarterly and not any other production cost.
- 2.369 The power purchase cost adjustment variations were not on account of fuel charges as per the audited accounts of DISCOM for the period 2012-13 and 2013-14. During the period 2012-13, the fuel cost increased by 1 paise/unit and that too only for imported coal used by DVC, despite availability of coal in nearby coal field at very cheaper rates. In Tariff petition of BRPL it was mentioned that for FY 2013-14, there was fuel hike by 1 paise/unit only. There was PPA hike from May to July 2013, for BRPL and BYPL it was 4.5% and for TPDDL it was 3%. Subsequently, PPAC was

increased from time to time for all DISCOMs arbitrarily by the Commission. This is contrary to law and hence revision of formula does not arise.

2.370 In its order dated 13.11.2014, the Commission has approved PPAC surcharge. The order to withdraw provisional PPAC dated 14.11.2014 shows that the order dated 13.11.2014 was issued without prudence check to favour DISCOMs and thus arbitrary and illegal.

2.371 The PPAC allowed by DERC is illegal and void. The APTEL is clearly in excess of its jurisdiction to take up power purchase adjustment cost contrary to provision - 62 (4) of Electricity Act, 2003, which provides fuel surcharge only. The directive given by APTEL to the State Commission for power purchase adjustment cost mechanism was bad in law and void.

Petitioner's Submission

BRPL

2.372 BRPL procures power from Central generating stations and State generating stations through long term power purchase agreements and also through short term purchases. The power purchase cost accounts for about 80% of ARR of the petitioner and includes the cost paid for procurement of power, transmission charges, UI charges, SLDC/RLDC charges. The power purchase cost, being uncontrollable in nature, is a pass through to the consumer but the difference in actual cost of procurement of power and the estimated cost of purchase of power gets trued up only after 2 years. The time lag of two years puts further burden on consumers by way of interest charges which have to be borne by the consumer additionally. A Power Purchase Adjustment cost was put in place by the commission in tariff order dated 13.7.2012 on a quarterly basis for GENCOs having long term PPAs.

2.373 The 8% surcharge has been allowed by the Commission for liquidating of huge regulatory asset, which is against the provision of Electricity Act, 2003, NTP, MYT Regulation and various directives of APTEL.

2.374 Based on the judgment of APTEL in OP No 1 of 2011 dated 11.11.2011, the power purchase adjustment cost was put in place by the Commission in its Tariff Order dated 13.07.2012 on a quarterly basis for GENCOs having long term PPAs with

DISCOMs. However, the PPAC formula specified did not include the variations on account of arrears, transmission charges, short term power purchase cost and sale of surplus power. Even the revised formula notified in tariff order dated 23.7.2014 does not include variations on account of short term power purchase and sale of surplus power. During FY 2014-15, the Commission did not allow any PPAC. In view of this, there will be significant variations in the DERC projections vis-a-vis the actuals.

TPDDL

- 2.375 DTL is no more the source of power supply now and so DISCOMs manages power supply on its own as per long term PPAs with generating companies which were earlier executed by DTL and reallocated to the DISCOMs post 2007 as per the DERC Orders.
- 2.376 PPAC is the percentage of Average Billing Rate (ABR) and ABR comprises of fixed charges and Energy Charges and so PPAC is levied on the Fixed Charges and Energy Charges.
- 2.377 Earlier there was no consideration of transmission charges and short term sale / purchase charges in PPAC. The transmission charges have been included as part of PPAC only from FY 2014-15 and short term sale and purchase have not been considered for PPAC till date. Even after inclusion of transmission charges in PAAC, the Commission has not approved any PPAC in last three quarters i.e. since July 2014 onwards. Hence effectively transmission charges have never been allowed in PPAC. For the years in which PPAC was approved by the commission for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14, the PPAC requirement vis-à-vis approved has always been less than the PPAC required. The difference in actual power purchase cost and that projected by the DERC is also on account of amounts pertaining to previous year billed during the current year i.e. previous year's arrears.

BYPL

- 2.378 More than 85% of ARR is the power purchase cost and balance cost of ARR relates salary to employees, R&M, A&G expenses, procurement of materials etc, which is controllable and approved on normative basis. All transactions with vendors are undertaken through open and competitive bidding process on commercial terms at arm-length basis and copies thereof are duly enclosed in the Annual Reports of the

company in accordance with the provisions of companies Act, 1956 and accounting policies and principles governing such disclosures.

- 2.379 The PPAC mechanism has been instituted to recover the uncontrollable factors of power purchase cost. It is difficult for the Commission to accurately estimate the power purchase cost at the time of annual tariff fixation because of highly unpredictable prices of the fuel (coal/gas), availability of power from new sources weather conditions and demand supply/gap of power within the country. The PPAC on the above issues may be either positive or negative, depending on whether the power purchase costs during a particular quarter have increased or decreased vis-à-vis the estimated cost in the Tariff Order.

Commission's View

- 2.380 The Power Purchase cost accounts for about 80% of Annual Revenue Requirement of the distribution licensee and includes the cost paid for procurement of power, transmission charges, UI charges, SLDC/RLDC charges and is netted off with revenue earned from sale of surplus power.
- 2.381 The cost of long term power has been fixed by the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC) of plants supplying power to more than one State and by the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC) for plants located within the NCT of Delhi and supplying only to distribution utilities in Delhi. The charges for unscheduled interchanges and interstate transmission charges including RLDC charges are being fixed by the CERC. The purchase/sale of intrastate power and intrastate transmission charges are fixed by DERC. The short term purchases/sale is through traders, bilateral contracts, banking and power exchanges at market determined prices.
- 2.382 Thus, the Power Purchase costs are uncontrollable in nature and inter alia, dependent upon price of fuel (coal/gas) which are highly unpredictable; availability of power from new sources; demand supply gap of the power within the country etc.
- 2.383 Legally, the provisions of various Acts, viz. section 28(8) of Delhi Electricity Reforms Act, 2000; Section 62(4) of Electricity Act, 2003; Regulations viz., Clause & Clause 8.2.1 of the Tariff Policy empowers the Commission to devise, adopt and implement a Power Purchase/fuel price adjustment mechanism.

- 2.384 The Commission is allowing PPAC on a quarterly basis so that differential of power purchase costs incurred during the course of the year are charged from the consumers in a timely manner without burdening them subsequently with carrying costs which would accrue if the extra charges are passed on at later dates/years.
- 2.385 Variation in the price of purchase of power and transmission charges only is allowed under PPAC. Variation in short term Power Purchase is not covered in PPAC.
- 2.386 The PPAC concept has also been endorsed by Hon'ble APTEL in its order in OP 1 of 2011 dated 11.11.2011 and its introduction made mandatory for all SERCs. Earlier the Commission has restricted the PPAC calculation to enhancement of power purchase charges only but there is a strong case for including increase in transmission charges and arrears as well which has been duly incorporated in the renewed PPAC formula for FY 2014-15.
- 2.387 The 8% surcharge is not to be levied on PPAC. The Distribution Licensees have filed an Appeal against the Order dated 14.11.2014. The matter is sub-judice in Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. OP No. 1 of 2015.

Issue 24: Government Subsidy

Stakeholder's View

- 2.388 The subsidy given by the Government is a part of revenue to DISCOMs and should have been shown as a separate head in revenue. The subsidy for FY 2013-14 taken into account is Rs. 124 Crore whereas the actual subsidy released by the Government is Rs. 162.3 Crore.
- 2.389 In the profit & loss account earnings have been segregated into two parts, Revenue from operations and other income. During the period DISCOMs received huge amounts as subsidy from Government and this has not been shown in their financial reports and the reasons are not known. In the Audited Report, the total revenue earnings from the consumers in FY 2013-14 are mentioned as 7921 Crore including subsidies and rebate and units sold as 9326. However in form R3(a), the DISCOMs stated that the total units sold as 9689 and they could realize only 6473 Crore. There is a difference of Rs. 916 Crore. Therefore audited financial accounts of DISCOMs are not acceptable and truing up must be carried out only after CAG audit is completed.
- 2.390 Subsidy is to be provided to all consumers irrespective of their consumption.

Petitioner's Submission**TPDDL**

2.391 TPDDL distributes the subsidy amount released by GONCTD through their electricity bills as per the conditions stipulated for disbursement of subsidy in accordance with the provisions of Section 65 of Electricity Act, 2003 and sub-clause 4 of Para 8.3 of National Tariff Policy. TPDDL has no authority to decide the conditions for disbursement of subsidy.

BYPL/BRPL

2.392 The provision of Electricity Act, 2003 stipulates that subsidy ought to be disbursed in advance by the GoNCTD. However, this does not happen as release of subsidy by GoNCTD is most often delayed, thus adversely impacting the Petitioner's cash flow.

2.393 Since the disbursal of subsidy through energy bills to a consumer is a continuous process, there would always be a time lag between the disbursal and release of subsidy by the GoNCTD. Also subsidy is released by GoNCTD on a best estimate basis from time to time whereas disbursal is done by BRPL based on actual billing and entitlement of a consumer. Therefore there would also be some difference in the amount released by the Government and actually disbursed to the consumers. The difference is trued up by the Commission from time to time and adjusted in the subsequent subsidy instalments.

Commission's View

2.394 Subsidy is a subject matter of the State Government and is not under the purview of the Commission. However, as per the provisions of Electricity Act 2003, subsidy is to be paid by the State Government in advance.

Issue 25: Open Access**Stakeholder's View**

2.395 There are many complaints on open access pending before DERC but no action has been taken against the licensee. Some DISCOMs are not complying with DERC's order on open access and even not giving approval for open access to consumers.

2.396 There are some specific charges to be imposed on Open Access Consumers and

behind every charge, there is an in principle rationale. Regulatory surcharge shall not be applicable corresponding to the units it is purchasing in open access.

- 2.397 Commission shall determine Cross Subsidy on principle which actually compensates the distribution licensee towards subsidy of subsidized category of consumers. There are instances where distribution licensees are calculating Cross Subsidy and imposing the same on Open Access Consumer but the Commission has not taken any view on this contrary action being taken by the distribution licensee(s).
- 2.398 When no Open Access was initiated in Delhi, the Commission determined the additional surcharge on suo-moto basis through the order dated 24-12-2013. This is purely irrational as it is like giving compensation amount to DISCOMs for the loss which has not happened at all. The DERC is requested to make the additional surcharge as zero/nil and also in future, additional surcharge shall be determined on the basis of logic envisaged in Electricity Act, 2003 and National Tariff Policy.
- 2.399 Had the DERC considered the result of open access on small load consumers, if large and key high load consumers leave the DISCOMs? What measures can DERC take to protect the interests of common small load consumers keeping open access in mind?

Petitioner's Submission

BRPL

- 2.400 Open Access, at present, is applicable to consumers with a load of 1 MW and above. The Commission may also allow Open Access to consumers with capacity requirement less than 1 MW subject to review of the operational constraints and other factors and the experience of open access for loads above 1 MW.
- 2.401 The stakeholder's observation pertaining to levy of regulatory surcharge on Open Access customers relates to the Commission. The Commission would appropriately consider the stakeholder's comments while formulating ARR/Tariff for FY 2015-16.
- 2.402 The issue of cross subsidy on open access consumers may be appropriately considered by the Commission while determining the Tariff for FY 2015-16.

TPDDL

- 2.403 It is wrong to say that DISCOMs are not giving approval for Open Access as Open Access Policy is already in place for consumers with a sanctioned load of 1 MW and

above and also the Commission has appointed the SLDC as the nodal agency for smooth implementation of the Open Access in Delhi.

- 2.404 The Commission should ensure that cross subsidy surcharge and 8% regulatory surcharge are levied on Open Access Consumer to keep the lower end consumers unharmed. Open Access consumers are exempted from payment of 8% regulatory surcharge. TPDDL recommends for allow to recover the 8% surcharges from open access consumers as well.
- 2.405 Cross Subsidy Surcharge is calculated based on the formula given in Tariff Policy. Parameters in the formula are decided by the Commission in Tariff Order of relevant year.
- 2.406 The Additional Surcharge has been calculated on the basis of difference in projected demand of DISCOMs and availability of power from long term agreements. The cost difference between sale at UI rate and the rate of power from long term agreements gives the additional surcharge during that period. The Commission has further decided that additional surcharge taken from Open Access customers shall be adjusted at the end of each financial year as per actual by nodal agency.

BYPL

- 2.407 The Electricity Act, 2003 defines Open Access and mandates the Distribution Licensees to provide open access to eligible consumers subject to payment of cross subsidy surcharge, additional surcharge and other applicable charges. The Commission while determining the cross subsidy surcharge payable by open access consumers keeps in view the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, National Electricity Policy, National Tariff Policy and the Open Access Regulations of the Commission.
- 2.408 Hence, determination of open access charges is the sole prerogative of the Commission.

Commission's View

- 2.409 The Commission has already formulated Regulations for allowing open access to consumers whose contract demand is 1 MW and above. The Commission has decided to allow Transmission and Wheeling Charges, Cross Subsidy Surcharge, Additional Surcharge and other applicable charges under Open Access keeping in

view the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, National Electricity Policy, National Tariff Policy and the Open Access Regulations of the Commission. The Commission is of the view that Open Access should be encouraged.

- 2.410 The Commission has deliberated the issues relating to Open Access in Orders dated 24.12.2013 and 18.05.2015.

Issue 26: Street light Maintenance & Charges

Stakeholders' View

- 2.411 Before revision of tariff the issues such as status of performance in the existing system, number of working/non working lights, duration of lighting, consumption by metering, type and quality of lamps, replacement schedule, manpower required and availability of feedback etc are to be evaluated.
- 2.412 Street lights should be promptly switched off. Burning of street lights day time and thus wasting of electricity to be avoided.
- 2.413 Street lights complaints to be attended promptly.
- 2.414 The Commission may direct GoNCTD to appoint one grievance agency for NCT Delhi and set up a call centre for upkeep of street lights.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

- 2.415 The Commission may like to decide the issue.

BRPL/BYPL

- 2.416 Street lights are owned by various civic agencies and determination of tariff is the sole prerogative of the Commission. Maintenance charges on street lights would be additional to the specified tariff @ Rs. 84 / light point / month and material cost at the rate of Rs. 10 / point / month as per Commission order dated 22.09.2009. These charges will be payable to the DISCOMs as they are exclusive of applicable taxes and duties.

Commission's View

- 2.417 The Commission has directed the DISCOMs that 100% metering shall be done for street lighting. Energy consumption on account of ballast etc. shall be accounted

through metered consumption only. Commission is given to understand that all street lights have now been metered by all the DISCOMs.

2.418 The Commission has prescribed the timelines for rectification of faulty street lights in Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007.

2.419 As regards, maintenance charges for street lighting, such charges and other conditions for maintenance of street lights are already approved vide Commission's Order dated September 22, 2009 and will continue till such time it is amended. These maintenance charges are exclusive of applicable taxes and duties.

2.420 The Commission has directed the Petitioner to install controllers for controlling MCD Street lights. The Commission has further directed the Distribution licensees to evolve a mechanism for ensuring that the street lights are switched off during the day time.

Issue 27: Reliability Surcharge

Stakeholder's View

2.421 Since the power situation and voltage have been considerably improved, a reliability surcharge on the high end consumers be levied by creating another higher tariff category.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL / BRPL / BYPL

2.422 No Response

Commission's View

2.423 The Commission is of the view that it is the obligation of the distribution licensee to provide uninterrupted power supply to its consumers. The distribution licensee cannot differentiate in making supply available to different areas. The Commission has already directed the distribution licensees to strive for uninterrupted power supply and the power which could not be supplied due to any reason should not exceed 1% in a month. The Commission does not consider it appropriate to allow reliability surcharge or premium Tariff to a set of consumers.

Issue 28: Electronic Meters**Stakeholder`s View**

2.424 The electronic meters installed by the DISCOMs are faulty and running fast. Whether electronic meters have been installed as per Regulation 41 of CERC Regulations, 2010 which are the guidelines for replacement of IE Rules, 1956. It is the duty of the service provider to provide separate neutral upto the metering point. Meters are recording residual back flow.

2.425 Independent meter testing laboratories to be provided at convenient places.

Petitioner`s Submission**BRPL / BYPL**

2.426 In compliance with the provision of Electricity Act 2003, CEA Regulations and Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standard Regulation, 2007 all consumer meters are replaced with static meters (Electronic Meters). Electronic meters are ISI marked and are tested for quality and accuracy as per IS 13779.99 prior to installations. Action for advising the consumers about electronic meters, internal wiring, earth leakage indication etc before installation of meters are also complied with in terms of applicable Regulations.

TPDDL

2.427 No Response.

Commission view

2.428 The Commission has already directed the DISCOMs to install meters in accordance with the CEA Regulations on installations and operations of meters dated 17th March, 2006 and amendments. The Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations 2007 prescribe compliance with the standards of IS 13779 and IS 15707. Any contradiction of the same is liable for penal action u/s 142 of Electricity Act, 2003.

2.429 Neutral looping occurs when outgoing neutral of the consumer`s meter is connected to incoming neutral of another consumer`s meter. This results in a meter recording higher consumption. To avoid neutral looping, neutral wires to the consumer meter should be energized through bus bars. The problem is seen to occur more in the case

of multi-storey buildings. The consumer may keep his internal wiring exclusive to his connection and ensure that there is no interconnection with any other consumer's meter. The consumer may get the wiring checked by a licensed electrical contractor to ensure that there is no neutral looping in his connection. The Commission has advised DISCOMs to ensure that connections are given with separate neutrals. In case of any specific complaint, the consumer may approach their respective DISCOMs.

2.430 The Commission is in the process of revising Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standard Regulations, 2007 and will examine the issue of neutral looping, while finalizing the revised Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations.

2.431 The Commission has notified Central Power Research Institute (CPRI) as the Independent third party Meter Testing Lab under the aegis of Public Grievances Cell, Department of Power, GoNCTD. The Public Grievances Cell, Department of Power, GoNCTD has also been advised to identify more parties for the purpose. Further, the Commission has also issued Public Awareness Bulletin in this regard.

2.432 The Commission has allowed payment of Rs. 0.70 Crore towards Public Grievances Cell (PGC) for meter testing and consumer advocacy.

Issue 29: Net Metering

Stakeholders' View

2.433 DISCOMs have proposed that consumers opting for net metering for installing solar PV plant on their roof tops should pay in single slab of 400 – 800 units (Rs. 7.80 / unit). This will discourage production of solar power which is a clean and sustainable power.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.434 TPDDL has not proposed any measures for tariff fixation in regard to installation of solar PV panels on roof tops. However, the Commission may like to decide.

BRPL/BYPL

2.435 There is need to rationalize the slabs for high end domestic consumers who would

be opting for net metering in line with the DERC (Net Metering for Renewable Energy) Regulations, 2014. The consumers, after implementation of net metering, would be only billed for net energy flowing to their premises from the licensees grid. Under such circumstances, these consumers who were otherwise cross-subsidizing the low end consumers, would now enjoy slab benefit at the cost of other consumers. Not only this, they would also get financial benefit for the energy contributed by them to the licensees grid. To circumvent this, it is proposed that the domestic consumers who would be opting for net metering should have a single slab for consumption upto 800 units which should be charged at rates defined for 400-800 units of normal domestic consumers. This will ensure that the high end consumers do not avail the benefit of both the slab rates as well as net metering.

Commission's View

2.436 The Commission has issued guidelines for implementation of net metering. Regulation which includes the adjustment of energy generated and energy consumed by the net metering consumers. The net metering regulations and guidelines approved by the commission is also available of DERC website.

Issue 30: Additional UI Charges

Stakeholders' View

2.437 Additional UI charges are due to penalty imposed on DISCOMs for over-drawal and hence cannot be passed on to consumer.

Petitioner's Submission

BRPL/BYPL/TPDDL

2.438 No Response.

Commission's View

2.439 Additional UI charges paid for over drawal of energy when grid frequency is less than 49.5 Hz is not considered in Power Purchase cost approved by the Commission.

Issue 31: Applicability of RTI to DISCOMs

Stakeholder's View

2.440 Delhi Government and DERC failed to bring DISCOMs under RTI Act, 2005. The Delhi Electricity Consumers Society has therefore decided not to give any suggestion or observation till DISCOMs are brought under RTI Act.

Petitioner's Submission

BRPL/BYPL

2.441 No Response.

TPDDL

2.442 DISCOMs have been incorporated under the laws of the land and at present are not covered under RTI Act. However, the transparency in ARR/Tariff determination and functioning of DISCOMs is maintained. Information to consumers is already provided to them and any grievances of consumers are dealt with in a transparent manner. Further all information on performance parameters is shared with the Commission by DISCOMs.

Commission's View

2.443 As per the Order of the Central Information Commission (CIC) dated 30.11.2006 "*DISCOMs are public authorities within the meaning of Right to Information Act*". The said impugned Order of the CIC was subsequently challenged before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi by the Distribution Licensees and the said Order was stayed by the Hon'ble High Court. The matter is sub-judice.

Issue 32: Competition among DISCOMs

Stakeholder's View

2.444 The Commission may consider introduction of more than one distribution licensee / company in the same area so that there is competition between the licensees as in case of mobile phones and the consumer has a choice to opt for any of the distribution licensees and Tariff rates will also come.

2.445 Monopoly of DISCOMs should be ended and competition shall be brought in.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.446 While competition is welcome in Delhi, it is for the interested party to first satisfy the

Commission and stakeholders that it can discharge its functions as a distribution licensee/supplier.

BRPL

2.447 Regarding competition and introduction of new Licensees the Commission has already taken a progressive step towards enabling greater competition and efficiency in electricity distribution by providing choice to consumers with load of more than 1 MW through open access. The Commission may also consider open access to consumers with capacity requirement less than 1 MW subject to review of the operational constraints and other factors and experience of open access for loads above 1 MW.

Commission's View

2.448 If any company or party who is interested in participating in distribution business in Delhi approaches the Commission, the same will be considered in accordance with the provision of Electricity Act, 2003.

Issue 33: Financial Package proposed by DISCOMs**Stakeholders' View**

2.449 DERC is planning to compensate losses amounting to Rs. 10,000 Crore as claimed by DISCOMs. DERC should seek assistance from GoNCTD for financial package for DISCOMs so that the Delhi consumers are not burdened with tariff hike and interest costs.

Petitioner's Submission**TPDDL**

2.450 The Commission has already recommended to GONCTD for funding of DISCOMs through financial bail-out package in its statutory advice dated 01.02.2013.

Commission's View

2.451 Any bailout package is not within the purview of this Commission. The DISCOMs may have to pursue with the GoNCTD for any financial bailout package by the Government.

Issue 34: Conducting Energy Audit**Stakeholders' View**

2.452 Energy Audit shall be conducted to identify what percentage of power is being consumed for domestic use, industrial/ commercial use, public utilities and Government offices and how much power is being consumed by bureaucrats in LUTYENS Delhi and at what price.

2.453 Energy Audit shall be conducted to identify high loss areas to take remedial measures.

Petitioner's Submission**BRPL**

2.454 The petitioner has already put in place state of the art technologies like GIS, SCADA and AMR to track energy consumption at various points. These technologies work in conjunction and enable the petitioner to collect automated energy consumption data and also map network assets. The petitioner has also undertaken a comprehensive process for mapping network elements which are maintained in terms of SAP data as well as GIS system. EHV level data for all the circles in the area of operation is uploaded on the GIS server network and integration with SAP is completed and also updated single line diagram for all grid stations is attached and accessed through GIS. On HT side, data for all 19 divisions is uploaded on GIS server and its integration with SAP is also completed. However due to paucity of funds the last leg of GIS linkage to consumer level for the LT network is in progress.

TPDDL

2.455 Each unit of Electricity is being accounted for based on the regular energy audit done in TPDDL at the District, zonal, feeder and DT level to consumer level.

Commission's View

2.456 The Commission has directed the DISCOMs to conduct the energy audit regularly and display the losses on its website. The DISCOMs of Delhi have reported that they have adopted the latest technology like GIS, SCADA, and Distribution Automation etc.

2.457 The Commission is also of the view that wastage of electricity should be avoided. The

Commission has been issuing the public awareness bulletins from time to time for use of energy efficient equipment/lighting.

Issue 35: Audit of DISCOMs from Inception

Stakeholders' View:

- 2.458 Audit of all DISCOMs from starting date of the DISCOMs shall be done before increasing Tariff.
- 2.459 Should not take up Tariff increase till CAG audit is completed.
- 2.460 The AAP government has indicated DERC not to hike Tariff till the audit of CAG of the DISCOMs is over.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

- 2.461 While CAG audit is an independent exercise being undertaken, the said exercise cannot be allowed to stall the Tariff exercise as the Commission is empowered to undertake tariff revision as per its statutory functions laid down in the Act, 2003.

BRPL

- 2.462 CAG audit of DISCOM is underway and is also sub-judice before the High Court of Delhi. The Petitioner is extending all cooperation to the audit team. As a distribution licensee BRPL has to continue to buy power and pay for the power purchase bills raised by the generators and also fulfill its other statutory obligations, continue its operations and finance them for which it is imperative that a cost reflective tariff is allowed by the Commission.

BYPL

- 2.463 CAG is conducting audit of Petitioners accounts and records in pursuance to the GoNCTD letter dated 07.01.2014 and the Petitioner is fully cooperating with audit officers for smooth flow of information, records and replies to the audit observations during audit. Even if, it is assumed that there will be any change in revenue gap/surplus after CAG audit, it can very well be offset against the additional Regulatory Assets due to True-Up of FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 and giving effect to ATE judgments which are yet to be implemented by the Commission.

Commission's View

- 2.464 The Commission is of the view that tariff determination and CAG audit are independent activities. Tariff determination process is guided by the provisions of Section 64 of the Electricity Act 2003.
- 2.465 The need to issue a Tariff Order every year as per the above provisions has been endorsed by Hon'ble APTEL in its judgment dated 11.11.2011 in OP1 of 2011. If the CAG Audit results in any changes in financial figures, those changes will be dealt appropriately in future tariff orders.

Issue 36: Review of Performance Standards**Stakeholders' View**

- 2.466 The standards of performance as prescribed by the DERC need to be reviewed regularly and for any violation, necessary penalty has to be imposed for the same.
- 2.467 Performance standards pertaining to stable and uninterrupted 24X7 supply of power was one of the reasons for privatization. Consumers should be compensated for the loss due to voltage fluctuations and spikes as per schedule- I of guaranteed standards of performance. In the absence of any punitive provision, DISCOMs do not find it important to invest in infrastructure.
- 2.468 Longer Power cuts are keeping the inverter industry alive and consumers have to spend nearly Rs. 1200/- per month for their maintenance.
- 2.469 Any failure in meeting standards of performance by the DISCOMs should lead to consumer claiming the penalty for deficiency in service and the consumers should be encouraged to lodge their grievances.

Petitioner's Submission**TPDDL**

- 2.470 The performance standards are being adhered to and monthly data on performance standards is being submitted to the Commission. Regarding revision of performance standards, the Commission may like to respond.

BRPL / BYPL

- 2.471 BRPL complies with the performance standards and various periodical reports are

also submitted to the Commission highlighting the performance vis-à-vis the threshold specified in the Regulation, 2011.

- 2.472 BYPL in complied with the Commission's directive to maintain uninterrupted supply and weekly reports are also submitted to the Commission.

Commission's View

- 2.473 The Commission vide Order dated 21 October, 2009 has already directed that "Distribution Licensees shall endeavour to maintain uninterrupted power supply in their respective areas. The Distribution Licensees shall inform the consumers in advance, about the anticipated disruption in power supply due to any reason (including maintenance schedule, breakdowns, load-shedding etc.), except Force majeure events which are beyond the control of the Licensee. The Licensee shall ensure that the power which could not be served due to any reason what-so-ever (including maintenance schedule, breakdowns, load-shedding etc.) shall not exceed 1% of the total energy supplied in units (kWh) by them in any particular month, except in the case of force-majeure events which are beyond the control of licensee" and "In case the disruption in power supply exceeds the limit prescribed above, for any particular month, the licensee shall be liable to a penalty which may extend upto Rs.5 Lakh for every two lakh units/kWh un-served."
- 2.474 The Commission has also directed the licensee to maintain the quality of power supply within the limits prescribed in Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standard Regulations, 2007.
- 2.475 The DISCOMs should undertake augmentation and maintenance of the distribution network to minimize the failure of supply due to breakdowns.
- 2.476 The Commission has directed Distribution Companies to upload the information in advance of anticipated/scheduled power outages for next 15 days on their website as well as to display the same on notice board at their offices/billing centre. Further, DISCOMs have also been directed to update the information and confirm the schedule of power outages or any change at least 2 days in advance.
- 2.477 The Commission in its Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007 has specified compensation payable to the affected consumers for failure of distribution licensees to meet the guaranteed Standards of Performance.

Further, the Commission has issued a draft amendment in Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations for making the penalties for default on restoration of power supply more stringent. The amendment is under consideration of the Commission in light of comments/suggestions on the draft amendment, received from various stakeholders.

Issue 37: Spot Billing

Stakeholders' View

2.478 Directive 7.9 of Tariff Order for FY 2011-12 should be complied with while considering spot billing. The status of billing by DISCOM and mechanism of monitoring and outcome thereof are essential for introduction of spot billing.

2.479 Meter readers should be provided with equipment which generates instant bills as in UP.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.480 DISCOMs are currently using different technology for reading and billing of consumers' supply. TPDDL has also proposed to the Commission for introduction of spot billing under which bills are generated by handheld devices at site. The Commission may like to decide the same.

BRPL / BYPL

2.481 BRPL uses a state-of-the-art SAP system for billing. However feasibility for spot billing will be explored as and when a decision is taken by the Commission

Commission's View

2.482 The Commission is of the view that though the spot billing avoids meter reading errors, delay in serving bills etc, but the spot bill delivered to the consumer may not contain the detailed information now being provided by the DISCOM.

2.483 However, in order to make the processes customer-centered and to streamline and implement an effective metering and billing system the Commission has allowed the distribution licensee for spot billing which will enable Consumers to pay their bill conveniently.

Issue 38: Meter Connection per Family**Stakeholders' View**

- 2.484 A large number of families are residing in unauthorized colonies in NCT of Delhi and multiple families dwell in the same floor, due to constraint of space and income and are not able to avail the benefit of subsidy, as there is only one meter per floor. The Commission may allow one meter connection per family instead of one connection per floor and ensure the benefit of subsidy reaches them.
- 2.485 The power consumers should have option to buy meters from the open market.

Petitioner's Submission**TPDDL / BRPL**

- 2.486 In compliance with the Delhi supply code and Performance Standard Regulations, 2007 connections are being given to tenants on submission of No objection certificate from landlord in addition to other necessary documents which are required for giving a new connection.

BYPL

- 2.487 The consumers have got an option to purchase their own meter, which should be as per CEA regulation in terms of Electricity Act (Section 55), 2003 and with features as approved by the Commission. The meter purchased by the consumer shall be tested, installed and sealed by the Petitioner. The consumer meters have to comply with standards specified in IS: 13779.
- 2.488 If the consumers applies for new connection and all the formalities like relevant documents and payment of security deposit/service line charges etc are satisfactory as per DERC Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007 the connection will be given to the consumer in a time bound manner.

Commission's View

- 2.489 The electricity connections are released as per the provisions of Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007 based on the production of necessary documents.
- 2.490 There is already a provision in Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance

Standards Regulations, 2007, where the consumer, if so desire, may procure a meter conforming to the regulations issued by the Central Electricity Authority under section 55 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Issue 39: Uniform Tariffs

Stakeholders' view

2.491 Why the consumers should bear the cost of theft due to inefficiency of the DISCOMs.

The Commission has been maintaining that it is bound by the policy directive issued by the GoNCTD, which appears to be a false statement in view of the submissions made by the Commission before the Apex Court in W.P (Civil) 104 of 2014. A perusal of the submission clearly establishes the fact that the consumers have been hood-winked by the Commission by making a claim that it is bound by the policy directive to have identical tariff for the three DISCOMs, while having separate tariff for NDMC area. The Commission is requested to:

- i. frame issues as provided under section 4 (1) (C) of the RTI Act, 2005 and
- ii. invite suggestions from the public

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL/BRPL/BYPL

2.492 No response.

Commission's View

2.493 The Commission is already following the process of scrutinizing the Tariff petitions filed by the Distribution Licensees in the website, giving public notice calling for objections and suggestions from the stakeholders on the petitions filed by the licensees and also conducting public hearing to hear the objections/suggestions of the stakeholders before determining the ARR and Tariff of licensees.

2.494 The consumer mix is different in the DISCOMs. Because of formation of distribution companies different Tariff rates cannot be determined for different areas causing inconvenience to some of the consumers. Uniform Tariff was there prior to privatization. Hence, the Commission is of the view that uniform Tariff only has to be maintained in the DISCOMs.

Issue 40: Collection of Electricity Tax**Stakeholders' View**

2.495 Electricity Tax should be charged only on the energy charges and not on 8% surcharge.

Petitioner's Submission**TPDDL**

2.496 TPDDL acts in compliance with MCD laws while collecting electricity tax/duty and any relaxation for the same can only be allowed by Municipal Authorities.

BRPL

2.497 Under Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 (DMC Act), BRPL acts merely as a collector of the tax on behalf of MCD. The electricity tax is a levy of MCD which is the sole adjudicator for its applicability as well as the amount. BRPL has no role in determining the electricity tax and merely acts as the collecting agency for the MCD.

BYPL

2.498 The Petitioner in accordance with the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 charges Electricity Tax at a rate determined by the concerned department, only on energy consumption charges.

Commission's View

2.499 As per DMC(Assessment and collection of Tax on the consumption, Sale or Supply of Electricity) Bye Laws 1962, electricity tax can be levied on consumption, Sale or supply of electricity and also levies a tax on electricity generated for own consumption

2.500 The Commission is of the view that Electricity tax is levied and collected by respective DISCOMs on the basis of DMC (Assessment and collection of Tax on the consumption, Sale or Supply of Electricity) Bye Laws 1962. As the matter of applicability of Electricity Tax pertains to MCD, the same is subject to the Order of MCD.

Issue 41: Revoking of Long-Term Power Purchase Agreements (PPA)**Stake holder's View**

2.501 DISCOMs have entered into long-term PPAs for 25 years on competitive bidding under section 63. Whether the cost is reasonable or not, whether there is enough evidence of transparent bidding etc., are to be verified by the DERC which approves tariff under section 63. The present situation seems to be that bidding route gives cheaper power but experience has proved otherwise and no study appears to have been made as to how the scheme has been working out. The possibility of revoking the long term PPAs which are more expensive and its implication need to be examined.

Petitioner's Submission**TPDDL**

2.502 Most of the long term PPAs have been inherited from Delhi Transco and as per the revised orders of DERC, DISCOMs do not enter into PPAs without the approval of DERC. TPDDL has been exploring the options to terminate the long term PPAs which are prohibitively expensive; however there are no specific termination clauses available in the existing PPA.

BYPL/BRPL

2.503 No Response

Commission's View

2.504 The cost of long term power is being fixed by the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission for plants supplying power to more than one State.

2.505 The long term PPAs are generally entered into by the DISCOMs considering the overall projected demand of the consumers and likely growth in the demand vis-à-vis the likely availability of power from various sources. Due to non availability of sufficient gas and less generation of power, cost of power generated by gas based stations has become expensive.

2.506 As indicated by TPDDL above, all the 3 DISCOMs have been exploring options to terminate long term PPA's which are very expensive. The Commission has been supporting these initiatives for surrender of costly power, which are in the overall

consumer's interest.

Issue 42: Plant-wise drawing of power

Stakeholder's View

2.507 It is understood that the PPA of the power generating station, more particularly NTPC, provides for an option for plant-wise drawing of power depending on the cost of purchase from any Unit but in actual practice the DISCOMs are forced to place consolidated indents resulting in uneconomical purchase of power which is detrimental to the interest of the consumers. DERC to take appropriate remedial measures.

Petitioner's Submission

TPDDL

2.508 Prior to March 2014, power was scheduled to Delhi on the basis of requirement of Delhi as a whole and power to each DISCOM was forcefully scheduled on the basis of its percentage share that was scheduled for Delhi. In such scenario, the DISCOM which did not require power was forced to take expensive power and sell at lower rates or under-drawal in UI. After March 2014, the power scheduled to every DISCOM is based on individual requirement of the DISCOM on the principle of Merit Order Scheduling. This has resulted into more efficient management of power and thus reducing the power purchase cost and ultimately reducing the burden on consumers to a certain extent. Few exceptions like BTPS, GT, Pragati (which are must run plants as per SLDC) are still there. The power from these plants is expensive and TPDDL has already filed a petition before DERC regarding the same.

BYPL/BRPL

2.509 No Response

Commission's View

2.510 The objection of the stakeholder and the submission of the petitioner are noted. The Commission has already instructed the DISCOMs to schedule power requirement from various stations strictly on Merit Order (duly observing technical minimum generation). The Commission has also already introduced Inter-DISCOM ABT so that

power can be purchased or sold among the DISCOMs also.

Issue 43: Arresting Theft of Electricity

Stakeholders' View

- 2.511 There is no need to increase Tariff, if the power losses are minimized and revenue collection is improved.
- 2.512 Why the consumers should bear the cost of theft for inefficiency of the DISCOMs?
- 2.513 DISCOMs shall appraise the Commission on theft of energy, status of penalties imposed and amount realized.
- 2.514 Although theft is down to 15% from 65%, still a third of Delhi is showing 65% to 98% theft.
- 2.515 Why can't DERC allow higher load shedding in high loss areas to punish consumers in those divisions where losses are more? Can DISCOMs minimize losses and improve electricity supply in low loss areas by restricting supply to high loss areas.
- 2.516 The following steps are to be taken for arresting theft
- To appoint Mohalla representatives to go and check each house regarding actual consumption and what is billed. This will enable catching hold of electricity thieves which is being done by 55% Delhties in some form or other.
 - Shift of metering system from the residence to supply point.
 - Stop supply to colonies/Mohallas having theft of even 1%.
 - All DISCOMs Officials right from linemen to Head of Operations to be made responsible for dereliction of duty in controlling theft.

Petitioner's Submission

BRPL

- 2.517 Theft cases are booked strictly in accordance with the provision of DERC Supply Code, 2007. The alleged consumer is given due opportunity to make submission in writing as well as in person which are also taken into account before passing a speaking order.
- 2.518 As regards settlement of theft assessment bills, it is submitted that theft of electricity is socio economic offence and the main focus remains to make the guilty person pay for the loss to the society in terms of Electricity Act 2003.

BYPL

2.519 Electricity theft is one of the aggressively pursued agenda of the company and internal objectives are being set and performance will be measured and rewarded based on loss reduction. The issue of honest and distinct citizen equally applies to entire service sector (i.e. water, telephone, railways, road transport taxes etc.). The electricity sector cannot be isolated. The control of power theft needs active participation and support from all stakeholders, including government, public representatives, citizens, RWAs and NGOs.

TPDDL

2.520 TPDDL is making all out efforts to curb power theft and reduce AT&C losses and to come up to the expectations of the consumers. Consumers who indulge in power theft are severely punished and criminal proceedings are initiated against them in court by DISCOMs. Many such offenders are convicted and imposed with hefty fines and even sentenced to undergo imprisonment.

Commission's View

2.521 Regarding load shedding in theft prone areas, the Commission is of the view that carrying out more load shedding in high loss/theft area is not an appropriate measure, as the honest consumers in these areas will also suffer without being at fault. The Commission has also been informed that it may not be legally permissible to carry out selective load shedding in theft prone areas and furthermore this would be prejudicial to the honest paying consumers in those areas.

2.522 The Commission has been repeatedly emphasizing on the DISCOMs to step up their enforcement activities to reduce theft and control AT&C losses. Strict penalties have been prescribed for underachievement and the entire revenue loss on account of under achievement has to be borne by the concerned DISCOM. Penalties for under performance have been specified in the Tariff Orders of respective DISCOMs.

Issue 44: Additional RoE to TPDDL**Stakeholders' View**

2.523 TPDDL has claimed Rs. 93.03 Crore on account of incentive as additional return on equity due to overachievement of AT&C losses in true up of ARR for FY 2012-13 by

considering 42.56% as equity instead of 30%. Considering the equity at 30%, the RoE will be only Rs. 68.86 Crore i.e. Rs. 24.17 Crore excess claimed.

2.524 Similarly for FY 2013-14, TPDDL claimed Rs. 104.95 Crore as additional return on equity as incentive due to overachievement of AT&C loss target. The equity ratio mandated is 70:30 and it cannot be altered. By considering equity at 30% the RoE would be Rs. 71.46 Crore i.e. the Petitioner is claiming Rs. 33.49 Crore extra.

2.525 The same should not be allowed and the Petitioner has to be penalized for not getting CAG audit done.

Petitioner's Submission

2.526 TPDDL has computed the incentive due to overachievement of AT&C loss reduction target as per MYT, Regulations, 2011.

Commission's View

2.527 The Commission has tried up AT&C loss incentive/penalty as per formula specified in MYT Regulations, 2011 for AT&C loss computation.

2.528 The stakeholder's comment for consideration of 42.56% as equity instead of 30% for computation of incentive of AT&C loss for FY 2012-13 is not factually correct as the equity in FY 2012-13 has been considered at 29.68%.

2.529 The Commission is of the view that tariff determination and CAG audit are independent activities. Tariff determination process is guided by the provisions of Section 64 of the Electricity Act 2003.

Issue 45: Comments received from GoNCTD

Stakeholder's view

2.530 The Commission has received the comments from Delhi Govt. on the following issues:

- i) Release of electricity connection within 15 days in normal conditions
- ii) Allowance of L.T. connection up to 150 kVA
- iii) Rationalisation of L.T. and H.T Tariff
- iv) Minimisation of documents required for release of electricity connection
- v) Review of Standard of Performance

- vi) Change in methodology for revision of sanctioned load based on MDI for Domestic Consumers
- vii) Advance information of scheduled power outage
- viii) Restoration of power supply within 1 hour for the areas affecting large number of consumers and compensation payable
- ix) Testing of meters in case of suspected dishonest abstraction of energy
- x) Proper purchase of capital goods and their installations
- xi) Maintenance of regulatory accounts by DISCOMs.
- xii) Implementation of ToD Tariff for all categories of consumers up to 11 kW.
- xiii) Forensic audit of billing system

Commission's View

- 2.531 As regards to the issues at i) and ii), the Commission has already notified the amendment in Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007 for release of connection within 15 days and for getting L.T connections up to 200kW/215 kVA along with service line cum development charges in line with the Tariff Structure.
- 2.532 The issues at iii) is being dealt in the subsequent chapter on Tariff Schedule.
- 2.533 In regards to issues at iv), v) and vi), the Commission has taken note of the suggestions of the Delhi Govt. The Commission is in process of revision of Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standard Regulations, 2007 and accordingly the matter shall be dealt appropriately while revising the Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standard Regulations, 2007.
- 2.534 In regard to issue vii), the Commission has directed Distribution Companies to upload the information in advance of anticipated/scheduled power outages for next 15 days on their website as well as to display the same on notice board at their offices/billing centre. Further, DISCOMs have also been directed to update the information and confirm the schedule of power outages or any change at least 2 days in advance.
- 2.535 In regard to issue viii), the Commission has issued a draft amendment in Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations for making the penalties for default on restoration of power supply more stringent. The amendment is under consideration of the Commission in light of comments/suggestions on the

draft amendment, received from various stakeholders.

- 2.536 In regard to issue ix), the Commission has directed the DISCOMs for carrying out testing of meters by an NABL Accredited Laboratory recognized by Public Grievances Cell (PGC) of GoNCTD in case of suspected dishonest abstraction of energy. The Commission has also requested PGC and GoNCTD for incorporating more number of laboratories for timely testing of meters.
- 2.537 In regard to issue x), the Commission has already issued the competitive bidding guidelines to be followed by DISCOMs for transparent procurement of materials and services. The Commission has also issued a cost data book for estimation of cost of capital schemes. Further, the Commission has engaged consultant for carrying out review of capital expenditure and capitalization which also includes physical verification of assets.
- 2.538 In regard to issue xi), the Commission has already issued draft Accounting Regulations and stakeholder's comments have been received, the said is in the process of finalization.
- 2.539 In regard to issue xii), the view of the Commission has already been discussed above at Issue No. 7 under Time of Day Tariff.
- 2.540 In regard to issue xiii), as a first step the Commission has appointed consultant for conducting Audit of Billing and Metering System of DISCOMs.

A3: TRUE UP FOR PAST PERIOD UPTO FY 2012-13 AND FY 2013-14**BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The Commission had approved the Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) of the Petitioner i.e. BSES Yamuna Power Limited (BYPL) for each year of the Multi Year Tariff Control Period (FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15) in its Multi Year Tariff Order dated 13.07.2012 (hereinafter referred as 2nd MYT Order). Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 provide for truing up of controllable and uncontrollable parameters at the end of each year of the control period based on the audited figures & prudence check by the Commission.
- 3.2 The Petitioner in its Petition has sought truing up of the expenditure and revenue for FY 2013-14 along with factoring in the impact the prior period true ups on account of implementation of various judgments.
- 3.3 In this Chapter, the Commission has analyzed the Petition of BRPL in accordance with the principles laid down under the Policy Direction Period guidelines, Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2007, Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011.

DIRECTIONS OF HON'BLE APTEL IN VARIOUS JUDGMENTS**Petitioner's Submission**

- 3.4 The Petitioner in its Petition has claimed the impact of the directions of Hon'ble APTEL in various judgments as below:

Table 3.1: Claims regarding directions of Hon'ble APTEL

Sl. No	Judgment	Directions	Amount claimed (Rs. Crore)
1	Judgment dated October 6, 2009 (Appeal 36 of 2008)	To allow increase in employee expenses corresponding to increase in consumer base	97
2		To allow capital expenditure pertaining to REL based on comparison of prices for the items purchased by TPDDL	874
3		To allow capitalisation pertaining to EI Certificates based on EI Application + 16 days	
4	Judgment dated	To allow funding of working capital in debt-	

Sl. No	Judgment	Directions	Amount claimed (Rs. Crore)
	November 28, 2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012)	equity ratio of 70:30	
5		To true-up the actual interest rates of loans in next tariff exercise	
6		To consider repayment of loans while calculation of WACC	
7	Judgment dated July 12, 2011 (Appeal 142 of 2009)	Financing cost of LPSC to be allowed on SBI PLR	26
8	Judgment dated November 28, 2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012)	To allow R&M expenses and A&G Expenses from FY 05 to FY 07 based on actuals instead of benchmarking	68
9		To allow the payments made to VRS Optee employees on adhoc basis and adjust the same after decision of Acturial Tribunal	96
10		To allow impact of truing-up of first 11 months of FY 08 in next tariff exercise	419
11		To consider the proposal for revision in distribution loss within 3 months from date of issuance of Judgment and pass a reasoned order	132
12		To rectify the mistake of applying efficiency factor on arrears pertaining to employee expenses during FY 06 and FY 07	6
13		To allow the impact on account of arbitrary determination of efficiency factor during FY 2011-12	6
14		To consider the AT&C Loss of FY 2011-12 as normative AT&C Loss target at FY 2010-11 less 1%	118
15		To reconsider the matter of Truing-up of AT&C Loss of FY 2008-09	234
16		To re-compute the AT&C losses for FY 2009-10 using actual kWh figures	34
17		To allow carrying cost on reactive energy charges for FY 2006-07	1
18		To allow the impact of DVB Arrears during FY 2008-09	7
19		Deduction of CISF expenses from AT&C incentive	0
	Total		2118

The issues as indicated above are discussed follows:

Issue No. 1: Increase in Employee Expenses corresponding to increase in Consumer Base
Petitioner's Submission

3.5 The Petitioner has referred the Hon'ble ATE Judgment dated 06.10.2009 (Appeal No. 36 of 2008) in their petition requesting the Commission to true up employee expense to the extent of increase caused by increase in consumer base as per the

judgment of Hon'ble ATE.

Commission's Analysis

- 3.6 This issue has already been addressed by the Commission in its Tariff Order dated 26.08.2011. The relevant extracts of the same are as follows:

"3.98 As per the MYT Regulations, employee expense is classified as a controllable expense. In the MYT Order, permissible employee expense has been provided for each year of the Control Period as per the methodology prescribed in the MYT Regulations. While approving the employee expenses for each year of the Control Period, the Commission had undertaken analysis and prudence check of the actual employee cost incurred in the base year as per audited accounts and the expected scenario in the future years of the Control Period was also considered.

3.99 The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit details of employees (number of employees and their salary) for FY 2006-07, FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 along with details of employees retired and hired during each year.

3.100 The Petitioner through its letter dated 18 January, 2010 submitted the details of employees for each year i.e. FY 2006-07, FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 and their total cost.

3.101 The Commission observed that as on April 1, 2007, the total number of employees of the Petitioner were 5256 (2917 DVB, 2015 Temporary and 324 Permanent). As on March 31, 2009, the total number of employees of the Petitioner were 4975 (2718 DVB, 1865 Temporary and 392 Permanent)

3.102 The Commission observes that the total number of employees for the Petitioner has gone down and it did not deploy additional employees to cater to increase in number of consumers. The Commission therefore decides to not allow any additional employee expense on account of consumer growth for FY 2007-08, FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10

3.103 The Commission would also like to mention that during Policy Direction Period, it had allowed the Petitioner an expenditure of Rs 104.12 Cr on account of special voluntary retirement scheme offered by the Petitioner as the Petitioner

has submitted that it has surplus employees. If the Commission allows any increase in employee base on account of increase in consumer base, it will defy the logic of offering special voluntary retirement scheme to DVB employees and will charge consumers of the Petitioner twice, once for amount paid by the Petitioner on account of special voluntary retirement scheme and later on account of hiring of new employees.”

- 3.7 The Petitioner had not raised this issue in Appeal No. 61 & 62 of 2012 against Tariff Order dated 26.08.2011, where the matter was addressed as per the directions of Hon’ble APTEL in Appeal No. 36 of 2008. Therefore, this issue has attained finality with respect to judgment in Appeal No. 36 of 2008 as the issue has been addressed in Tariff Order dated 26.08.2011.

Issue No. 2: Capital Expenditure and Capitalization pertaining to REL to be allowed based on comparison with TPDDL

Petitioner’s Submission

- 3.8 The Petitioner has stated that the Commission in its Tariff Order dated February 23, 2008 disallowed capital expenditure of Rs. 170.84 Crore, since the goods were purchased by the Petitioner from REL for Rs. 364.87 Crore during FY 2004-05 & FY 2005-06. It has been further mentioned that the goods purchased have been put to use by the Petitioner and they are servicing 13.98 Lakh consumers. Since FY 2004-05, the Petitioner claimed to have been deprived of the costs of such expenditure, the year-wise bifurcation of which is tabulated below:

Table 3.2: Impact on account of disallowance of REL Purchase (Rs. Crore)

S. No	Particulars	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08
1	REL Disallowances	6	41	66	57

Commission’s Analysis

- 3.9 The Hon’ble APTEL in Appeal No. 177 & 178 of 2012, has observed that;
- “9.1 The State Commission has not allowed the capital expenditure of various nature from the sister concerns of the Appellants. According to the Appellants, the State Commission has acted contrary to the findings of this Tribunal in BRPL Vs DERC: 2009 ELR(APTEL) 880 wherein this Tribunal directed to allow the*

Appellant an opportunity to prove, item-wise, that the prices paid by it was not higher than the price paid by NDPL, the other distribution licensee and which was allowed by the State Commission.

.....

9.3 This Tribunal in BRPL Vs DERC: 2009 ELR (APTEL) 880 decided as under:

- i) Both NDPL and Appellant have incurred capital expenditure of various nature and have purchased goods and commodities in furtherance of their business. The State Commission has to treat all the distribution companies at par. It is not disputed that NDPL has purchased products of the same description although they may be different in their quality and technical specifications. Of the long list of articles which are involved in the dispute in hand some may be comparable to the Articles purchased by the NDPL. If for these Articles, the State Commission has allowed some price then the same price can be allowed to the Appellant.*
- ii) The NDPL submitted its records before the State Commission simultaneously with the Appellant during the tariff hearing of the relevant year. As such the records are available with the State Commission.*
- iii) It would be appropriate to allow the Appellant appropriately to prove item-wise that the prices paid by it to REL (its sister concern) were not higher than the price paid by NDPL and allowed to it by the State Commission for similar products.*
- iv) The onus would be entirely on the Appellant to prove that the products purchased by it and the one purchased by NDPL offered for comparison are of the same technical specifications and quality and also should be similarly, priced on account of other relevant factors influencing the prices namely, the time of purchase, the quantity purchased, vendor rating, etc.*
- v) In case the price paid to REL is same or lower than the price allowed to NDPL for comparable commodity, the State Commission shall allow the price paid to REL. However, if the NDPL's price is lower than the price of REL's purchase plus 5% profit margin, the State Commission shall allow lesser price.*
- vi) Till such exercise is completed the Appellant will have to accept the decision of the Chairman, as reflected in the view of the Chairperson.*
- vii) The above*

directions should not mean that the prudence check by the State Commission should be scarified altogether and if there is sufficient material with the State Commission to hold that the price paid by NDPL was inflated it will be open for the State Commission to take an appropriate view in the matter.

9.4 According to the State Commission, the Appellant ought to have made comparison of the items purchased by it in from its sister concern with the items purchased by NDPL (now known as TPDDL). However, the same has not been done. Hence, the State Commission cannot allow such purchases.

9.5 On the other hand the claim of the Appellant is that they had sought the information related to purchase by NDPL from the State Commission but the same was not provided.

9.6 Without going into the controversy, we direct the Appellants to submit the details of the items for which data is required by an application to the State Commission. The State Commission will make available the data to the Appellants within a month of the application. The Appellant after analysis will file its claim before the State Commission and the Commission will consider the same as per the directions of the Tribunal in Appeal No. 36 of 2008 decided on 06.01.2009 and decide the matter within 60 days of submissions made by the Appellants. Accordingly directed.”

- 3.10 In view of the above judgment, the Petitioner has requested for inspection of documents/records vide its letter 13.02.2015 before the Commission in order to submit its claim before the Commission after analyzing the relevant document and comparing the rate of TPDDL . As per request of the Petitioner, two opportunities have been provided to the Petitioner for inspection of the relevant documents/records available in the office of the Commission on 11.03.2015 and 23.04.2015. As per the direction of Hon’ble APTEL, the Petitioner is yet to submit the detailed report after analyzing the documents inspected in the Commission’s office. Therefore, the Commission shall take a final view, as per directions of Hon’ble APTEL, after receipt of the Petitioner’s report.

Issue No. 3: Capitalisation pertaining to EI Certificates based on EI application date plus 16 days

Petitioner's Submission

- 3.11 The Petitioner has submitted in the Petition that the Commission in the Tariff Order dated 23.02.2008 had disallowed capitalization of Rs. 300 Crore, pending clearance for the capital schemes by the Electrical Inspector for the FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07. The Petitioner in this regard mentioned that the capital schemes have been put to use and are servicing 13.98 Lakh consumers but since FY 2004-05, the Company has been deprived of the costs of such expenditure.
- 3.12 The Petitioner has quoted that the Hon'ble ATE order dated October 6, 2009 which is as follows:
- "118)...For capitalisation of fresh assets the DISCOM shall make appropriate applications to the Electrical Inspector and the capitalisation of such assets will be allowed w.e.f. 16th day of filing of the application and payment of necessary fee.."*
- 3.13 It is submitted by the Petitioner that the Commission is required to give effect to the directions given by Hon'ble ATE with respect to the capitalization of assets within 16 days of EI application date which is yet to be implemented. The details sought by the commission vide letter dated 11.10.2013 has been attended vide letter dated 20.11.2013.
- 3.14 The Petitioner mentioned that they have already applied to the Electrical Inspector with requisite fee and the 16th day waiting period has also expired as per the order of Hon'ble ATE.

Commission's Analysis

- 3.15 The Commission had allowed capitalisation on a provisional basis pending completion of physical verification of such assets for 1st MYT Control Period in Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013.
- 3.16 The Commission has appointed consultants for physical verification of the assets vis-a-vis value and relevant documents pertaining to capitalization of assets from FY 2006-07 to FY 2010-11. Further, the Commission has also invited bids for appointment of consultants for physical verification of asset for FY 2004-05, FY 2005-06 and FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14.
- 3.17 True up of capitalisation and the impact of EI certificate as per the direction of

Hon'ble APTEL will be considered based on the final reports submitted by the Consultant and subject to the outcome of Civil Appeal No. 884 of 2010 filed by the Commission before Hon'ble Supreme Court on this issue.

Issue No. 4: Funding of working capital in debt-equity ratio of 70:30

Petitioner's Submission

3.18 The Petitioner mentioned that the Hon'ble APTEL in Judgment dated 28.11.2014 (Appeal No. 61 and 62 of 2012) has ruled as under:

"9. However, the Appellants have reiterated in written submission that the Respondent has still not implemented the direction of this Tribunal to consider the working capital in the Debt: Equity ratio of 70:30.

10. We are not inclined to involve ourselves into fact finding and direct the Commission to implement our directions in letter and spirit."

3.19 The Petitioner has also submitted that due to the following reasons, the direction of the Hon'ble APTEL may be implemented:

- (a) The funding of working capital has been considered in the debt-equity ratio of 70:30 directly in the closing balance of average equity and debt whereas the same was required to be allowed individually in respective year of first control period.
- (b) The Hon'ble Commission has applied DERC Tariff Regulations, 2011 and changed the opening balance of equity and debt for FY 2012-13. However Clause-5.11 read with Clause-1.2 of DERC Tariff Regulations, 2011 clearly states that working capital, i.e., the change in working capital and not entire working capital during second Control Period is required to be funded in debt-equity ratio of 70:30. On one hand, the Hon'ble Commission has applied DERC Tariff Regulations, 2011 on opening balance of equity and debt for working capital and changed the opening balance of equity and debt for working capital whereas on the other hand, the Hon'ble Commission has considered the closing balance of working capital for FY 2011-12 as the opening balance of working capital for FY 2012-13.
- (c) Further the Hon'ble Commission has also deducted 30% of depreciation utilized for funding of working capital during policy direction period assuming that the

working capital was funded through debt and equity in the ratio of 70:30. The Hon'ble ATE in its Judgment dated 23.05.2007 states as under:

"40. Depreciation: The issue of depreciation so far as it relates to the parties in this appeal is no more res-integra. This Tribunal in Appeal Nos. 38 & 39 of 2005 upheld a claim of depreciation at the rate of 6.69% for the years 2002-03 (nine months), 2003-04 and 2004-05. This decision of this Tribunal was passed on the basis of Ministry of Power Notification dated 31.01.1992 and 29.03.1994. It was also held that the policy direction dated 22.11.2001, the normative tariff and bulk supply tariff order dated 22.02.2003 (BST Order) and the statutory scheme of Delhi Electricity Reforms Act were binding on the Commission..." (Emphasis added)

Commission's Analysis

3.20 The Commission has implemented the Hon'ble APTEL judgment in Appeal No. 153 of 2009 in its Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013 wherein the funding of Working Capital is considered in the ratio of 70:30.

3.21 The Petitioner has wrongly interpreted the provisions of MYT Regulations 2011 that "working capital", i.e., the change in working capital and not entire working capital during second Control Period is required to be funded in debt-equity ratio of 70:30. Relevant extract from MYT Regulations 2011 is as follows:

"5.11.....

Provided that the Working capital shall be considered 100% debt financed for the calculation of WACC"

3.22 The Commission has analyzed the observation of the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 61 & 62 of 2012. The Commission has implemented the judgment in letter and spirit and the entire working capital funding is considered in the ratio of debt: equity of 70:30 in the Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013 for FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12. It is to clarify that the closing balance of total working capital is part of RRB closing of the relevant previous year which is considered as opening balance of the relevant year RRB.

3.23 The Petitioner has relied upon the direction of the Hon'ble APTEL's Judgment dated 23.05.2007 to consider the principles laid down in the Policy direction period even

after completion of this period. However, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its Judgment dtd. 15/02/2007 on the same issue with reference to the direction of Hon'ble APTEL to consider the principles laid down in the Policy direction period afterwards also, in Civil Appeal No. 2733 of 2006 has stated as follows:

“However, we state that our judgment is confined to the facts of the present case alone and the reasoning given hereinabove is in the context of the period of 5 years. This judgment should not be construed to apply for all times. It is confined to the transition period only.”

- 3.24 In view of the above observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court it is inferred that the principles laid down in the Policy direction period shall not continue after the expiry of Policy direction period i.e., 1st MYT Control Period, 2nd MYT Control Period and future periods. Therefore, the entire working capital is considered in debt: equity ratio of 70:30 as per the above Regulation for computation of WACC and 100% debt funded for 1st MYT and 2nd Control Period respectively.

Issue No. 5: True-up of Actual Rate of Interests on loans

Petitioner's Submission

- 3.25 The Petitioner vide its letter dated July 11, 2013 submitted the actual rate of interest for Capex loans from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 which are as under:

Table 3.3: Actual rate of Interest

Particulars	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
Rate of Interest	11.32%	11.52%	11.28%	12.06%	14.12%	14.71%

- 3.26 The Petitioner mentioned that the Hon'ble ATE in Judgment dated 28.11.2014 (Appeal No. 61 and 62 of 2012) has ruled as under:

“37. On perusal of the data submitted by the Appellant related to SBI PLR, it is clear that SBI PLR has deviated by more than 1% during the Control Period and accordingly the Commission was required to revise the rate of interest on loan and carry out the required true up. Further, despite admitting that true of Return on Capital Employed (RoCE) would done at the end of control period, the Delhi Commission has failed on both the counts. The Delhi Commission is directed to revise the rate of interest on loan as well true up of the RoCE in its next tariff

exercise. The issue is accordingly decided in favor of the Appellants.” (Emphasis added)

- 3.27 The Petitioner has considered the above mentioned rate of interest while calculation of RoCE from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13.

Commission’s Analysis

- 3.28 The issue related to rate of interest allowed to the Petitioner in the ARR for FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11 has already been analyzed by Hon’ble APTEL in Appeal No. 36 of 2008 and observed as follows:

“....

114) The Commission has not approved the rate of 9.50% without reference to reality. The rate is neither fanciful nor unrealistic. It is only a projection for the future. In the absence of any given formula, the Commission will have to be allowed some discretion in the matter. It appears to us that the discretion has been used keeping in view the available data. We as an appellate authority will not interfere with the discretion of the Commission unless the same has been exercised with arbitrariness. The exercise of executing discretion has to be transparent, just, fair and non-arbitrary. The impugned order to the extent of approval of interest cannot be said to suffer from any defect.

115) Further, the Commission has at the very outset said that it shall true up the interest rate for the new loans to be taken for capital investment and for working capital requirement if there is a deviation in the PLR of the scheduled commercial banks by more than 1% on either side. Thus, there is sufficient safeguard for the appellant and sufficient room to procure loans at the given market rate of interest. We are not inclined to interfere with the Commission’s decision on the approval of interest rate.”

- 3.29 In view of the above direction of the Hon’ble APTEL, it is pertinent to state that the SBI PLR has not deviated from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11 by more than 1% on either side. Therefore the Commission has not revised the interest rate from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11. The Commission, as such, has considered the revision in interest rate in trueing up of FY 2011-12, since the SBI PLR has deviated by more than 1% (14.01% - 12.50%) in FY 2011-12.

3.30 The Commission had provisionally allowed the actual rate of interest for FY 2011-12. It is observed that the SBI PLR varied by 2.13% in FY 2011-12 over the previous year, while the DISCOM was provisionally allowed the interest rate at 4.91% above the normative interest rate for FY 2010-11 in the Tariff Order dated July 2013. The Commission has decided to revise the rate of interest applicable to FY 2011-12 based on actual variation in average rate for SBI PLR from FY 2010-11 to FY 2011-12 of 2.13% and revised rate of interest is 11.32% (9.19% + 2.13%). Further, in view of the Hon'ble APTEL's direction in Appeal No. 36 of 2008 and Appeal No. 61 & 62 of 2012, the Commission has filed a Clarificatory Application before the Hon'ble APTEL, therefore a view in the matter will be taken, as deemed fit and appropriate, after receipt of the direction of the Hon'ble APTEL in the said application.

Issue No. 6: Consideration of repayment of loans while calculation of WACC

Petitioner's Submission

3.31 The Petitioner submitted that 1/10 of outstanding loan is considered as repayment during the year and accordingly computed the average loan/debt during the year as per the Hon'ble ATE vide its Judgment dated 28.11.2013 (Appeal No. 14 of 2012) has ruled as under:

"102. In the light of above discussions we find force in the contentions of the Appellant and direct the Commission to re-evaluate the WACC considering the repayment of loans during the period and recomputed RoCE payable to the Appellant. The issue is decided in favor of the Appellant."

Commission's Analysis

3.32 The Commission had not considered the actual equity available with the Petitioner in its financial statements for computation of Return on Equity from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07 (Policy Direction Period) and computation of Return on Capital Employed (RoCE) from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (MYT Period).

3.33 The Commission had proposed to consider the actual equity deployed as net shareholders fund to be used for determination of the ratio of actual equity deployed to total funds required in computation of Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) in Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013 as follows:

Net Worth	= Original Cost of Fixed Assets
Add	: Closing Work in Progress
Add	: Net Current Assets
Less	: Cumulative Depreciation
Less	: Outstanding Loans
Less	: Consumer Contribution/security deposits/grants etc.

3.34 The Petitioner has submitted the net worth assessment from FY 2002-03 to FY 2011-12 vide their letter dated 04.04.2014 and for FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15 vide their letter dated 22.06.2015 which is as follows:

Table 3.4: Net Worth Assessment from 2002-03 to FY 2013-14 submitted by the Petitioner (Rs. Crore)

Financial Year	Equity + Free Reserves (net worth)	Average Equity to be considered
FY 2002-03	15.05	
FY 2003-04	(24.02)	(4.49)
FY 2004-05	(18.64)	(21.33)
FY 2005-06	26.87	4.12
FY 2006-07	73.90	50.39
FY 2007-08	17.90	45.90
FY 2008-09	74.51	46.21
FY 2009-10	150.36	112.44
FY 2010-11	304.75	227.56
FY 2011-12	756.09	530.42
FY 2012-13	781.00	768.55
FY 2013-14	812.00	796.50

3.35 The Commission has considered the Actual available Equity including Free reserve upto Maximum of 30% of RRB for the purpose of computation of WACC. RRB includes original cost of Fixed Asset excluding accumulated depreciation. By considering the Actual Equity available, the balance of RRB has been considered to be funded from Debt which is net of repayment of loans.

Issue No. 7: Financing cost of LPSC to be allowed on SBI PLR

Petitioner's Submission

3.36 The Petitioner has stated that the Commission in its last Tariff Order has erroneously allowed the financing of LPSC at the rate lower than the prevailing PLR from FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 and the impact is Rs.26 Crore.

- 3.37 The Petitioner requests the Hon'ble Commission to allow the impact on account of financing cost of LPSC at SBI PLR.

Table 3.5: Impact of financing cost of LPSC to be allowed on SBI PLR (Rs. Cr.)

Sl. No	Particulars	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
1	Opening Balance	0	5	10	14	19	23
2	Additions	5	4	3	3	1	
3	Closing Balance	5	9	13	17	20	23
4	Average Balance	2	7	11	15	19	23
5	Rate of carrying Cost	13.68%	13.75%	13.11%	13.38%	14.88%	15.03%
6	Carrying cost	0	1	1	2	3	3
7	Total Closing Balance	5	10	14	19	23	26

Commission's Analysis

- 3.38 The approach followed by the Commission is that financing cost of outstanding dues on principal amount on which LPSC is levied at the same rate as that approved for working capital requirement. This matter has been upheld in the judgment in Appeal No. 14 of 2012 in favour of the Commission. Relevant extracts of the judgment are as below:

"135. Delhi Commission has submitted that allowing financing cost for LPSC means allowing of additional working capital for the time period between the due date and the actual date of payment. Hence, financing cost of LPSC has to be at the same rate as that approved for working capital funding. The view taken by the Delhi Commission is correct and need not be interfered with."

- 3.39 Thus, in accordance with the above judgment, the rate of interest for funding of working capital is allowed towards the financing cost of LPSC of the Petitioner.

- 3.40 The issue relates to 1st Control Period of FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 pertaining to allowance of lower interest rate which was originally covered under Appeal No. 36 of 2008. Relevant extracts of the judgment are as below:

"The Appellant (BRPL) asked for approval of interest rate at 11.50% on its borrowings for repayment tenure of 10 years. The Commission observed that the appellant has managed to procure funds at a lower rate than the SBI PLR. Based on the observations the Commission has allowed interest at 9.50%."

.....

115 Further the Commission has at the very outset said that it shall true up the interest rate for the new loans to be taken for capital investment and for working capital requirement, if there is a deviation in the PLR of the scheduled commercial banks by more than 1% on either side. Thus there is sufficient safeguard for the appellant and sufficient room to procure loans at the given market rate of interest. We are not inclined to interfere with the Commission's decision on the approval of interest rate".

- 3.41 It was observed by the Hon'ble APTEL that interest rate for new loans to be taken for Capex and working capital shall be trued up if there is a deviation in the PLR by more than 1% on either side and there is safeguard for the appellant. As the SBI PLR has not deviated from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11 by more than 1% on either side, therefore the Commission has not revised the interest rate from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11.
- 3.42 Further, in view of the Hon'ble APTEL's direction in Appeal No. 36 of 2008 and Appeal No. 61 & 62 of 2012, the Commission has filed a Clarificatory Application before Hon'ble APTEL therefore a view in the matter will be taken, as deemed fit and appropriate, after receipt of the direction of the Hon'ble APTEL in the said application.

Issue No. 8: R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2005 to FY 2007

Petitioner's Submission

- 3.43 The Petitioner has stated that the Commission in Tariff Order dated July 23, 2014 has allowed the R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07 based on benchmarking with other DISCOMs of Delhi.
- 3.44 The Petitioner has mentioned the Hon'ble ATE Judgment dated November 28, 2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012) as under:

"22. We agree with the contentions made by the Appellants that true up for the policy direction period cannot be carried out on the basis of benchmarking concept muted in MYT Regulations. The Commission is directed to implement the direction of this Tribunal in true letter and spirit and do not involve in inventing any new methodology to circumvent to such directions. The issue is decided in favour of the Appellants. "(Emphasis added)"

3.45 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow the impact of R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07 which is tabulated as under:

Table 3.6: Impact of R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07

Particulars	FY 2004-05			FY 2005-06			FY 2006-07			Total
	Audited A/c	Tariff Order	Diff	Audited A/c	Tariff Order	Diff	Audited A/c	Tariff Order	Diff	
A&G	26.6	19.8	6.8							6.8
R&M	64.6	46.9	17.7	55.5	48.0	7.4	47.8	47.7	0.1	25.3
Total	91.2	66.7	24.5	55.5	48.0	7.4	47.8	47.7	0.1	32.0

3.46 The total impact on account of R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07 along with carrying cost is as under:

Table 3.7: Impact of R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07 along with carrying cost (Rs. Cr.)

S. No	Particulars	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
1	Opening	0	26	36	39	44	50	57	65	59
2	Additions	25	7							
3	Closing	25	33	36	39	44	50	57	65	59
4	Average	12	29	36	39	44	50	57	65	59
5	Rate of carrying cost	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	13.68%	13.75%	13.11%	13.38%	14.88%	15.03%
6	Carrying cost	1	3	3	5	6	7	8	10	9
7	Less: Allowed								15	
8	Total Closing balance	26	36	39	44	50	57	65	59	68

Commission's Analysis

3.47 The Commission has already provided additional R&M and A&G expenses with carrying cost in Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 as below:

Table 3.8: Impact of R&M and A&G Expenses from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07 as considered in Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 (Rs. Cr.)

Particulars	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07
Revised True Up for R&M & A&G costs	72.23	48.06	45.59
Incremental expenses allowed in earlier trued up R&M and A&G expenses	8.73	0.02	(2.14)

3.48 In compliance of the direction of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 61 and 62 of 2012, the Commission has appointed a Chartered Accountant firm empanelled with C&AG for independent verification of the claims of the Petitioner in respect of R&M and A&G expenses for FY 2004-05 to FY 2005-06. Final impact will be considered based on the

report of Chartered Accountant firm appointed by the Commission.

Issue No. 9: Impact incurred due to benefits given to VRS Optees in the ARR pending decision of Actuarial Tribunal

Petitioner's Submission

3.49 The Petitioner has mentioned the Hon'ble ATE Judgment dated 28.11.2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012) which is as under:

"14. Similarly, in view of specific assertion made by the Delhi Commission in the subsequent order, the Delhi Commission is directed to allow the payments made by the Appellant to VRS optee employees on ad hoc basis and adjust the same after the decision of the Actuarial Tribunal."

3.50 Accordingly, the Petitioner has calculated the impact on account of the same along with carrying cost as under:

Table 3.9: Impact of expenses incurred on account of VRS Optees along with carrying cost (Rs. Cr.)

S. No	Particulars	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
1	Opening		48	70	64	73	84
2	Additions	45	15	(15)			
3	Closing	45	63	56	64	73	84
4	Average	22	55	63	64	73	84
5	Rate of carrying cost	13.68%	13.75%	13.11%	13.38%	14.88%	15.03%
6	Carrying cost	3	8	8	9	11	13
7	Total Closing Balance	48	70	64	73	84	96

Commission's Analysis

3.51 In Appeal No. 36 of 2008 Hon'ble APTEL has directed that the Commission and Petitioner have to ensure that SVRS eventually leads to cost saving to the consumers. Relevant extracts of the judgment are as follows:

"...The appellant may take steps for constitution of the Tribunal. However, the Commission will have to allow the expenditure as far incurred by the appellant towards the terminal benefits of the SVRS optees."

76. ... The Commission as well as the appellant have to ensure that SVRS eventually lead to cost saving and further that such cost saving is passed on to the consumers."

3.52 The Commission had approved the SVRS scheme costs as incurred by the Petitioner in FY 04 amounting to Rs. 94.83 Crore. Relevant extracts from the Tariff Order dated

23.02.2008 are reproduced as below:

“Special Voluntary Retirement Scheme (SVRS) Related Expenses

3.97 The Petitioner has incurred an outgo of Rs. 94.83 Cr towards Special Voluntary Retirement Scheme (SVRS) offered to its employees in FY04. The Petitioner, in its petition for FY05, had submitted that it would not claim the amount of SVRS outgo in the ARR and had taken commercial loans at an interest rate of 8% with tenure of 2-3years to fund this liability. The Petitioner had further submitted that in case the SVRS outgo is spread over a number of years, it would ensure that the consumers do not have to bear any cost over and above the employee expenses that would have been incurred, had these employees continued in service. The Petitioner had also considered the increase in salaries, DA and other perks and retirement profile of employees while computing the savings from SVRS.

3.98 The Commission approved the above mentioned methodology and allowed employee expenses in FY04, FY05 and FY06 accordingly.

3.99 The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit details regarding SVRS expenses and its amortization in previous years.

3.100 The Petitioner vide letter no RCM/07-08/828 dated 20 December, 2007 submitted the details of amortization of SVRS expenses. The Petitioner has submitted that its actual employee expenses for FY04, FY05, FY06 and FY07 was Rs 102.18 Cr, Rs 83.90 Cr, Rs 92.95 Cr and Rs 107.08 Cr respectively. In addition to the employee expenses, the Petitioner has also incurred bill distribution and meter reading expenses of Rs 4.71 Cr, Rs 3.15 Cr, Rs 0.28 Cr and Rs 0.28 Cr for FY04, FY05, FY06 and FY07 respectively. The Petitioner also claimed the payment of terminal benefits of Rs 14.7 Cr, Rs 12.40 Cr and Rs 10.61 Cr for FY05, FY06 and FY07 respectively.

3.101 The Commission directed the Petitioner to reconcile the figures quoted in the above letter with the audited accounts. In response, the Petitioner submitted letter No RCM/06-07/1101 dated 19 February, 2008 and revised the payment of terminal benefits for FY07 to Rs 11.9 Cr. The Petitioner also corrected the bill

distribution and meter reading expenses which were claimed erroneously for FY06 and FY07 and expenses against these heads are zero.

3.102 The ATE in its Order dated 23 May, 2007 held that the Commission has to allow all actual expenses towards employee cost including contractual employees. As per the ATE Order, the Commission allows the contractual employee expenses (bill distribution and meter reading expenses) while computing the savings available for SVRS expense amortization.

3.103 The table below shows the amortization of SVRS expenses till FY06 against the now approved employee expenses by the Commission:

Particulars	FY04	FY05	FY06
A. Gross Employee Expenses Approved	114.15	133.84	142.52
B. Gross Actual Employee Expenses	102.18	83.90	92.95
C. Bill Distribution And Meter Reading Expenses	4.71	3.15	
D. Saving available for SVRS amortization (A – B – C)	7.26	46.79	49.57
SVRS			
E. Opening SVRS Amount	94.83	89.67	48.19
F. Carrying Cost (@8%)	2.10	5.30	1.87
G. Un recovered SVRS Amount (E + F – D)	89.67	48.19	0.49

3.104 The unamortized SVRS amount at the end of FY06 is Rs 0.49 Cr which the Commission has allowed while truing up of employee expenses for FY07 along with the carrying cost of Rs 0.02 Cr (Refer Table 29).

3.105 In addition to the one-time payment of Rs 94.83 Cr, the Petitioner has also claimed the payment of Pension/Medical /LTA to VSS retirees. The amount claimed by the Petitioner under these heads is Rs 14.70 Cr, Rs 12.40 Cr and Rs 11.90 Cr for FY05, FY06 and FY07 respectively.

3.106 The matter of aforesaid additional liabilities was argued before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi which has pronounced its judgement on the issues of payment of terminal benefits including pension, gratuity, earned leave, etc. to the VSS optees. The High Court observed that the optees do not fall within the description of those voluntarily retiring as per conditions of service existing as on 1 July, 2002; they were induced to contractually depart from employment. The Trust is not geared to bear this sudden and substantial, unilaterally created burden; the GoNCTD, too is not liable in terms of the Act or Rule 6(9) to fund the

payment of terminal benefits, of such VRS/SVSS optees. The severance being achieved through contract between the DISCOMs and the employees, the liability for payment of terminal benefits, as well as commutation of pension and monthly residual pension, is that of the DISCOMs."

3.53 It is clear from above that the Commission has already allowed the one time payout on account of the SVRS scheme as a pass through and that the amount claimed by the Petitioner under heads Pension/Medical/LTA to VSS retirees as a result of severance achieved through contract between the DISCOMs and the employees, the liability for payment of terminal benefits, as well as commutation of pension and monthly residual pension, is that of the DISCOMs. During the Technical Validation Session held with the Secretary Pension Trust, the issue was discussed and it was observed that Pension Trust is refunding the amount of Terminal benefit paid by the Utilities on account of SVRS Optees in the year of superannuation of such employees. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner is being adjusted from such refunded amount and the Commission has not allowed these amount separately into the ARR of the Petitioner.

3.54 In the judgment in Appeal No. 61 & 62 of 2012 this Hon'ble Tribunal observed as follows regarding terminal benefits towards VRS Optees:-

"12. The Third Issue is related to terminal benefits payments to VRS optee employees. The Respondent Commission has submitted that the Commission in subsequent Order has observed that pending decision of Actuarial Tribunal the ad hoc payment will be made by the Appellant and the same will be adjusted after the decision of Actuarial Tribunal.

13. The same issue had come up before the Tribunal in Appeal No. 14 of 2012 and this Tribunal in its judgment dated 29.11.2013 has held as under:

"59. In view of specific assertions and undertaking referred to above made by the Delhi Commission, the Appellant is directed to give all the details along with the documentary proof and the same shall be considered and appropriate orders will be issued"

14. Similarly, in view of specific assertion made by the Delhi Commission in the subsequent order, the Delhi Commission is directed to allow the payments made

by the Appellant to VRS optee employees on ad hoc basis and adjust the same after the decision of the Actuarial Tribunal."

- 3.55 Referring to the judgment of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal 14 of 2012, the principle issue under the Appeal 14 of 2012 was different from the issue in Appeal 61 & 62 of 2012. Relevant extracts of the judgment of 14 of 2012 is as below:

"52. On this issue, the Appellant has made the following submissions:

...

(e) The issue pending before the Arbitral Tribunal pertains to the extent of contribution to be made by the Discoms such as the Appellant towards pension and other terminal benefits for VSS optees, to the pension fund that was set up for ex-DVB employees at the time of privatization. As per the order of the Delhi High Court dated 02.07.2007, the monthly pension has to be borne by the Appellant until the Arbitral Tribunal passes an award and the payments are subject to Adjustment upon adjudication by the Arbitral Award. It is submitted that the Appellant has accordingly been making the payments towards monthly pension of VSS optees and has also given effect to the recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission.

(f) Therefore, it is submitted that even if the final amounts payable to VSS optees is made subject to the outcome of proceedings before the Arbitral Tribunal, the Delhi Commission may be directed to allow the arrears on account of increased monthly pension due to the impact of the 6th Pay Commission.

...

57. In reply to the above submissions on the issue No.5-A, 5-B and 5-C, the learned Counsel for the Delhi Commission has made the following submissions:

(a) The pension expense for the employees opting for VSS as allowed in the MYT Order dated February 23, 2008 and tariff order dated August 26, 2011 has been made on a provisional basis and shall be trued-up at the end of the Control Period, subject to prudence check and ATE judgment on this case."

- 3.56 Thus it is observed that one time lump sum payment towards SVRS optees has already been allowed in the ARR of all the DISCOMs (BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL) and reconciled in MYT Order dated 23.02.2008. TPDDL has not claimed additional

payment towards SVRS optees other than one time lump sum payment as claimed by the Petitioner of Rs 14.70 Crore, Rs 12.40 Crore and Rs 11.90 Crore for FY 2004-05, FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 respectively. The Commission has sought clarification regarding document related to payment of these amounts and it is found that the payment has been released after FY 2006-07. The detailed verification is required for these payments to be allowed in ARR of the Petitioner due to the reason that same amount has not been claimed by other Distribution Licensees unbundled from DVB where SVRS scheme was also applicable. Therefore, the Commission has filed a Clarificatory Application before Hon'ble APTEL in view of the above findings.

Issue No. 10: To allow impact of first 11 months of FY 2007-08

Petitioner's Submission

- 3.57 The Petitioner has claimed the impact on account of non-Truing up for the Pre-MYT Period as per the judgment dated July 12, 2011 in Appeal 142 of 2009 as below:

Table 3.10: Financial Impact of True-up of Pre-MYT Period (Rs. Crore)

S. No	Particulars	Impact
1	True-up-FY 08-Reg. 12.1	118
2	Impact on a/c of revision of O&M Expenses	117
3	Carrying cost from FY 08 to FY 12	184
4	Total	419

Commission's Analysis

- 3.58 The Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 142 of 2009 has adjudged that:

"4.9. Failure to True up the expenses for the FY 2007-08 for the period 1.4.2007 till the commencement of the MYT Tariff Order dated 23.2.2008:

The State Commission acted in contravention of the Regulation 12.1 of the MYT Regulations by not truing up the expenditure for the period between 01.04.2007 and commencement of MYT tariff order i.e. 23.02.2008 on the basis of the actual/audited information.

13.8....and the State Commission is directed to true up the financials for the period 1.4.2007 to 28.2.2008 at the earliest and allow the costs with carrying cost."

- 3.59 As per MYT Regulations 2007, Regulation 12.1

“Performance review and adjustment of variations of the Distribution Licensees for year FY 2006-07 and period between 1st April 2007 and commencement of MYT Tariff Order shall be done based on actual/audited information and prudence checks by the Commission and shall be considered during the Control Period.”

- 3.60 In accordance with the judgment and in view of the MYT Regulations 2007, the Commission has analyzed the submissions made by the Petitioner for True-up of expenses based on Audited information. Actual expenses on account of O&M and Depreciation as per Audited financial statement has been revised as follows:

Table 3.11: Incremental O&M Expenses due to 11 months impact on actual basis
(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Approved in MYT Order dated 23.02.2008 (prorated to 11 months)	Additional expenses to be allowed
Reference	A	B	A - B
Employee Expenses	118.29	118.44	9.72
A&G Expenses	38.25	40.01	1.57
R&M Expenses	46.50	32.02	17.14
Total	203.03	190.47	28.43

- 3.61 The Petitioner has claimed the depreciation at the rate of 6.69% instead of 3.60% as provisionally approved by the Commission for 11 months. However, the Commission has considered the actual rate of Depreciation based on the Audited financial statements for FY 2007-08 in accordance with Regulation 12.1 of MYT Regulations 2007. The additional allowance on account of revision in the rate of depreciation is as follows:

Table 3.12: Provisionally approved Depreciation for FY 2007-08 (11 Months)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Amount	Remarks
A	Depreciation as per audited financial statements for FY 2007-08	71.37	Audited financial statements
B	Opening GFA for FY 2007-08	1249.92	
C	Rate of Depreciation (%)	5.70	A/B
D	Rate of depreciation (%) as per MYT Regulations, 2007	3.60	
E	Average Rate of depreciation (%) for FY 2007-08 considering 11 months as per audited statements and 1 month as per MYT Regulations, 2007	5.53	(C*11/12)+(D/12)

3.62 The impact of change in rate of depreciation has been considered in subsequent paragraphs.

Issue No. 11: Revision in Distribution loss from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11

Petitioner's Submission

3.63 The Petitioner has mentioned the Hon'ble ATE Judgment dated November 28, 2014 (Appeal No. 61 and 62 of 2012) which is as under:

"31. In view of submission of the Appellants, the Commission is directed to reconsider the matter with in three months from date of issuance of the judgment and pass a reasoned order. The issue is decided accordingly."

3.64 The Petitioner also stated that they have already submitted the detailed computation regarding the entitlements on account of revision in Distribution loss from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11 vide letter No. RCM/2009-10/BYPL/643 dated December 2, 2009. The Loss targets approved by the Hon'ble Commission vis-à-vis proposed by the Petitioner from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11 as sought in the aforesaid proposal are tabulated below:

Table 3.13: Proposal for revision in Distribution Loss (Rs. Cr.)

S. No	Particulars	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11
A	As per MYT Order dated Feb 23, 2008				
1	AT&C loss Reduction Target	34.77%	30.52%	26.26%	22.00%
2	Distribution Loss	34.11%	29.99%	25.89%	21.61%
3	Collection Efficiency	99.00%	99.25%	99.50%	99.50%
B	Revised Proposal				
1	AT&C loss Reduction Target	37.76%	32.47%	27.15%	22.00%
2	Distribution Loss	37.13%	31.96%	26.78%	21.61%
3	Collection Efficiency	99.00%	99.25%	99.50%	99.50%

3.65 The Petitioner requested the Commission to approve the aforesaid revision in AT&C Loss trajectory.

Commission's Analysis

3.66 The Commission has reviewed the distribution loss for 1st MYT Control Period (FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11) as per the direction of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 61 of 2012, in its Order dated 20.04.2015, and the relevant extract is as follows:

"8. In case of BRPL, there was only marginal increase over the set targets in FY

2007-08, FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11 for which they have been penalized as per the Regulations in force. Failure to achieve pre-set targets cannot be an excuse for re-fixing subsequent targets since regulatory certainty has already been assured through advance notification of targets in MYT order. It is expected that the DISCOM will make all possible efforts to achieve the set targets and the very fact that two out of three DISCOMs, could achieve the set targets fixed on the same basic principle clearly indicates that these targets cannot be considered as unreasonable.

9. It is also stressed that distribution loss is a part of the AT&C loss targets and hence no separate targets are set for distribution loss.

10. In conclusion, the Commission while reviewing the issue of Distribution loss and AT&C loss targets during the first MYT period as directed by APTEL hereby decides that keeping in view the above observations, a revision of the Distribution loss and AT&C loss targets given in the MYT order is not warranted”.

3.67 In view of the above order passed by the Commission in compliance of the Hon'ble APTEL direction the issue has attained finality in respect of Appeal No. 62 of 2012.

Issue No. 12: Rectification of efficiency factor on arrears pertaining to Employee Expenses

Petitioner's Submission

3.68 The Petitioner submitted that the efficiency factor has been erroneously applied on 6th pay commission arrears during FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 may be considered as follows:

Table 3.14: Impact on account of efficiency factor due to 6th pay commission arrears (Rs. Crore)

S. No	Particulars	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
1	Arrears	7.3	117.9
2	Efficiency Factor	2%	3%
3	Efficiency on arrears	0.1	3.5

Commission's Analysis

3.69 The Commission has removed the impact of efficiency factor applied on 6th Pay Commission arrears for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 respectively. The Commission

has also provisionally revised the SVRS Pension paid by the Petitioner on actual basis in light of judgment of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal no. 14 of 2012 subject to outcome of the decision of Arbitral Tribunal. The revised Employee Expenses from FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 are as follows:

Table 3.15: Revised Employee Expenses from FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Remarks
A	Employee Expenses	107.29	108.96	116.44	161.90	169.08	Net of capitalisation
B	Efficiency Factor		2.00%	3.00%	4.00%	4.00%	MYT Orders
C	6 th Pay Commission Arrears		7.26	117.86			
D	SVRS Pension	11.15	5.61	12.49	6.64	4.93	
E	Employee Expenses	118.44	119.65	243.30	162.06	167.25	A*(1-B)+C+D

3.70 The impact on account of revised Employee Expenses from FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 has been considered in subsequent paragraphs.

Issue No. 13: Arbitrary efficiency factor during FY 2011-12

Petitioner's Submission

3.71 The Petitioner has submitted that the arbitrary determination of efficiency factor has resulted in reduction of Operation and Maintenance Expenses approved for FY 2011-12 by Rs. 18 Crore.

3.72 The Petitioner has also mentioned that the Hon'ble ATE in Judgment dated 28.11.2014 (Appeal No. 61 and 62 of 2012) has ruled as under:

"126...This issue was also considered by this Tribunal in Appeal No. 14 of 2012 and was decided in favor of the Appellant therein. The relevant extracts of the said judgment are as under:

"25....However, the efficiency factor has to be determined by the Commission based on licensee's filing, benchmarking, approved cost by the Commission in the past and any other factor that Commission feels appropriate. In the impugned order the Commission has determined the efficiency improvement factor as 2%, 3% and 4% for FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY-2011 respectively arbitrarily without any benchmarking or any analysis and identification of area of inefficiency where the improvement is desired to be carried out. Such efficiency factor has naturally to

be determined only on the basis of material placed before the State Commission and analysis of various factors and not on ad- hoc basis as done by the State Commission. Therefore, this point is answered accordingly in favour of the Appellant”.

201 So, on the strength of the judgment of this Tribunal in Appeal No. 28 of 2008, we decide this point accordingly in favour of the Appellant.”

127. The above ratio of this Tribunal’s judgment in Appeal No. 14 of 2012 applies squarely into the facts of the present case. The issue is decided in favour of the Appellants.”

Commission’s Analysis

3.73 It may be observed that Hon’ble APTEL had, in its earlier judgment upheld the applicability of efficiency factor in favour of the Commission in judgment in Appeal No. 52 of 2008 by stating that the findings of the Tribunal in Appeal No. 28 of 2008 which is related to Transmission Utility and cannot apply in case of the Distribution Utilities. However, in Appeal No. 14 of 2012, the Hon’ble APTEL has upheld the findings of judgment in Appeal 28 of 2008 on the same issue of determination of efficiency factor.

3.74 It is however observed that Hon’ble APTEL in judgment in Appeal No. 52 of 2008 (TPDDL V/s DERC) had directed as follows:

“65. In view of the above reasonings, the State Commission was constrained from allowing them to continue to operate in such a manner and pass on the higher costs to the consumers. The increase in the O&M cost is supplemented by the increase in the efficiency level and cost of saving/cost of reductions/other economies being available to the Appellant. Therefore, there is no merit in this contention raised by the Appellant.

66. The Learned Counsel for the Appellant has relied on the findings of the Tribunal in its judgment dated 29.9.2010 in Appeal No. 28 of 2008 in the matter of Delhi Transco Ltd. vs. DERC and Others wherein in paragraph 25 of the judgment the Tribunal set aside the order of the State Commission in respect of efficiency factor for Delhi Transco decided by the State Commission on ad-hoc basis without any benchmarking or any analysis and identification of area of

efficiency. However, in the present case the State Commission has compared the O&M expenses of the Appellant with other utilities and given a reasoned order. Thus the findings of the Tribunal in Appeal No. 28 of 2008 will not apply to the present case. Accordingly, this issue is answered as against the Appellant.”(Emphasis)

- 3.75 The Commission has filed a Clarificatory Application before Hon’ble APTEL and requested to reconsider the issue in line with judgment in Appeal No. 52 of 2008 as FY 2011-12 is part of extended 1st MYT Control Period and the same principle for efficiency factor may be considered throughout the Control Period (FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12). The view on impact of efficiency factor for FY 2011-12 will be considered, as deemed fit and appropriate, after receipt of the judgment of Hon’ble APTEL in the said Clarificatory Application.

Issue No. 14: Revision in AT&C Loss Target of FY 2011-12

Petitioner’s Submission

- 3.76 The Petitioner has stated that AT&C Loss Target for FY 2010-11 was 22%. The AT&C Loss Target for FY 2011-12 ought to be 21%, i.e., (22%-1%) in line with the directions of the Hon’ble ATE in Judgment dated November 28, 2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012), the relevant para of which is quoted here under.

“72. In the light of above discussions we direct the Delhi Commission to refix the AT&C loss levels for the FY 2011-12 as per its letter dated 8.3.2011 and give consequential relief to the Appellants. The issue is decided in favour of the Appellants.”

- 3.77 The Petitioner also mentioned that the Commission vide letter dated March 08, 2011 fixed the AT&C Loss Target for FY 2011-12 as under:

“The AT&C loss target for FY 2011-12 will be the lower of the following two figures.

i. Actual AT&C loss for 2010-11: &

ii. Reduction at 1% over the AT&C target for FY 2010-11”

- 3.78 The Petitioner has submitted that the AT&C targets may be re-fixed in accordance with the letter of the Commission dated 08.03.2011 to 21%.

Commission’s Analysis

3.79 The issue of fixation of AT&C loss target for FY 2011-12 has been discussed in Appeal No.14 of 2012 and Appeal No. 61 and 62 of 2012.

3.80 The relevant extract from Appeal No. 14 of 2012 is as follows:

“186. While fixing the targets for the AT&C losses, the Delhi Commission has considered actual AT&C losses achieved during the previous year. However, while fixing the O&M expenses, the Delhi Commission has ignored actual expenses and indexed the normative expenses as per 2007 MYT Regulations.

187. This approach taken by the Delhi Commission is not correct. It should have adopted either the normative AT&C losses trajectory or O&M expenditure as per 2007 MYT Regulations or actual. The Delhi Commission cannot adopt a method under which the Appellant is at loss under all the circumstances.”

3.81 The relevant extract from Appeal No. 61 and 62 of 2012 is as follows:

“we will refer to the findings on this issue in the impugned order as quoted below:

2.48 In respect of fixation of AT&C loss targets for FY 2011-12, the Commission noted the general trend of trajectory for target loss reduction during the Control Period (FY 07-11) as well as the actual performance as claimed by the DISCOMs during FY 2010-11. The Commission felt that it is in the public interest to consider the earlier trajectory and at the same time ensure that the target is lower than actual achievement during FY 2010-11. The Commission observed that the progressive reduction in AT&C losses is necessary for reducing power purchase so that the consumers are benefitted through a reduction in ARR.

2.49 Hence, in view of the above reasons, the Commission has decided that the following target levels are reasonable and fair for both, the DISCOMs and the average consumer:

(i) BYPL - 18%

(ii) BRPL - 15%

(iii) NDPL - 13%

5.44 The Commission while fixing the targets has taken into consideration the general trend of the trajectory for target loss reduction during

the Control Period (FY 2007-08 to 2010-11) as well as the actual performance claimed by the Petitioner for FY 2010-11. The Commission was of the opinion that it is in the public interest to consider the earlier trajectory and fix the target at a level that is lower than the actual achievement during FY 2010-11.

71. Perusal of above findings of the Delhi Commission in the Impugned Order would indicate that the Commission has not given any reason for not adhering to its approach for fixing the loss targets for FY 2011-12 communicated vide its letter dated 8.3.2011 that the AT&C loss target for FY 2011-12 will be the lower of the Actual AT&C loss for 2010-11 or the reduction at 1% over the AT&C target for FY 2010-11. In accordance with the said approach, the AT&C loss targets works out to be either 21% (target for 2010-11 at 22% minus 1%) or 20.64% as claimed by the Appellant”.

.....

72. we direct the Delhi Commission to refix the AT&C loss levels for the FY 2011-12 as per its letter dated 8.3.2011 and give consequential relief to the Appellants. The issue is decided in favor of the Appellants”.

- 3.82 The Commission while fixing the AT&C targets for FY 2011-12 as part of the extension of MYT Regulations 2007 for FY 2011-12, had conducted the public hearing on 02.05.2011. The said public hearing was consequent to the public notice dated 18.03.2011 wherein the Commission had proposed,

“The AT&C loss target for FY 2011-12 will be the lower of the following two figures.

- i. Actual AT&C loss for 2010-11: &*
- ii. Reduction at 1% over the AT&C target for FY 2010-11”*

- 3.83 In respect of fixation of AT&C loss targets for FY 2011-12, the Commission noted the general trend of the trajectory for target loss reduction during the Control Period (FY 2007-11) as well as the actual performance as claimed by the DISCOMs during FY 2010-11. The Commission also took note of the comments of various stakeholders that the formula given in public notice for target fixation was too soft & would lead to unjust enrichment of the private DISCOMs. The Commission felt that in public interest we may by and large follow the earlier trajectory and at the

same time ensure that the target is lower than the actual achievement during 2010-11. This approach would obviate the argument by some stakeholders that the formula for loss reduction given in the public notice is too soft. The Commission observed that progressive reduction in AT&C losses is necessary for reducing power purchase so that the consumers are benefited through reduction in ARR.

- 3.84 The Commission had fixed the distribution loss target levels vide for FY 2011-12 its Order dated 10.05.2011 as follows:

BYPL	-	18%
BRPL	-	15%
NDPL	-	13%
NDMC	-	9.6%

- 3.85 The Commission had already implemented the judgment in Appeal No. 14 of 2012 in case of TPDDL for AT&C trajectory of FY 2011-12 in last year Tariff Order for FY 2014-15 on the basis of the normative trajectory AT&C loss target. Accordingly the Commission has filed a Clarificatory Application before Hon'ble APTEL, requesting to reconsider the AT&C loss target for FY 2011-12 of the Petitioner for maintaining parity amongst all the Distribution Utilities. The view on impact of AT&C Loss Target for FY 2011-12 will be considered, as deemed fit and appropriate, after receipt of the judgment of Hon'ble APTEL in the said Clarificatory application.

Issue No. 15: Truing-up of AT&C Loss of FY 2008-09

Petitioner's Submission

- 3.86 The Hon'ble ATE in Judgment dated November 28, 2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012) has ruled as under:

"75. In view of categorical assertions made by the Appellants that full details related to AT&C losses to the Commission, we direct the Commission to reconsider the matter taking in to account the information submitted by the Appellants. The Appellants are also directed to make all the additional information, if any, required by the Commission. The matter is disposed of accordingly."

- 3.87 The Petitioner has recomputed the AT&C Loss for FY 2008-09 based on the above direction of Hon'ble ATE in Appeal 61 of 2012 as under.

- 3.88 Enforcement Units has been calculated by dividing revenue collected by twice the ABR for other categories prevailing during FY 2008-09

Table 3.16: Energy billed and revenue billed including enforcement

Particulars	UoM	Amount	Reference
Total energy billed during FY 09	Rs. Cr.	3965	A
Less: Enforcement	Rs. Cr.	63	B
Energy Billed excluding enforcement	MU	3902	C=A-B
Amount billed excluding enforcement	Rs. Cr.	1753	D
Amount collected on account of enforcement	Rs. Cr.	28	E
ABR of other categories	Rs./ kWh	4.49	F=D*10/C
Enforcement units	MU	31	G=E/(2*F)
Total energy billed incl. enforcement	Rs. Cr.	3933	H=C+G
Revenue billed incl. enforcement	Rs. Cr.	1781	I=D+E

- 3.89 Amount collected has been computed by deducting financing cost of LPSC from the total amount collected during FY 2008-09 as under:

Table 3.17: Net amount collected excluding financing cost of LPSC

S. No	Particulars	Amount (Rs. Cr.)
1	Total amount collected	1803
2	Less: financing cost of LPSC	11
3	Net amount collected	1792

- 3.90 Accordingly, AT&C Loss for FY 2008-09 has been computed as under:

Table 3.18: AT&C Loss for FY 2008-09

Particulars	UoM	Amount	Reference
Total revenue collected	Rs. Cr.	1792	A
Revenue Billed	Rs. Cr.	1781	B
Collection efficiency	%	100.62%	C=A/B
Energy Input	MU	5283	D
Energy Billed	MU	3933	E
Distribution Loss	%	25.54%	F=1-E/D
AT&C loss	%	25.08%	G=(1-(1-F)*C))

- 3.91 The over-achievement during FY 2008-09 is computed below:

Table 3.19: Over-achievement of AT&C Loss for FY 2008-09

Particulars	UoM	Target level	Actuals	Reference
AT&C Loss	%	30.52%	25.08%	A
Over achievement/ (Under achievement)	%		5.44%	B
Energy Input	MU	5283	5283	C
Units realized	MU	3670	3958	D=C*(1-A)
Average Billing Rate	Rs./ kWh	4.53	4.53	E

Amount realized	Rs. Cr.	1662	1792	
Over-achievement	Rs. Cr.		130	
Proposed to be transferred to contingency reserve	Rs. Cr.		65	
Proposed to be retained	Rs. Cr.		65	

3.92 The impact due to excess revenue considered by the Hon'ble Commission is tabulated below:

Table 3.20: Impact to be considered on account of FY 2008-09 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Amount
Amount realized	1792
Add: Prior period income	3.21
Add: Prior period interest	0.04
Total amount realised	1796
Less: benefit to be retained by the Petitioner	65
Less: DISCOM adjustment passed on to consumers	65
Total revenue for the purpose of ARR	1665
Less: LPSC considered as NTI	9.77
Less: Prior period income (2007-08) considered as NTI	3.21
Less: prior period interest	3.21
Less: E. Tax	72.02
Net revenue for ARR	1577
Considered by DERC in T.O dated 31.07.2013	1707
Impact to be considered by DERC	129

3.93 It is submitted by the Petitioner that the above impact has been considered along with carrying cost as under. The Petitioner requests the Hon'ble Commission to consider the impact on account of the same.

Table 3.21: Impact along with carrying cost

S. No	Particulars	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
1	Opening	0	138	156	177	204
2	Additions	129	0	0	0	0
3	Closing	129	138	156	177	204
4	Average	65	138	156	177	204
5	Rate of carrying cost	13.75%	13.11%	13.38%	14.88%	15.03%
6	Carrying cost	9	18	21	26	31
7	Total Closing Balance	138	156	177	204	234

Commission's Analysis

3.94 The Petitioner vide its letter dtd. 08/04/2015 has submitted the additional information required for true up of AT&C loss for FY 2008-09 in response to the email dtd. 01/04/2015. The Petitioner in the said letter has submitted that the

Commission has considered only EBS data and not the COBOL data which was also demonstrated by the Petitioner during Technical Validation Session held on 01.04.2010. However, the Commission in its Tariff Order dtd. 26.08.2011 has indicated that inspite of the presence of CEO and CFO of the Petitioner the claim on account of AT&C overachievement could not be established. The relevant extract of the said Order is as follows:

“3.183 As a follow-up to the decision of the Commission to afford another opportunity to the Petitioner, technical validation session was held on April 1, 2010. In this validation session the team of the Petitioner was led by the CEO of the Petitioner. In the team, the CFO and other senior officers of the Petitioner were also present.

...

(k) An attempt was made to verify the energy as well as the demand charges in respect of some of the consumers on test check basis. However, the Petitioner explained that these statistics are picked up from bills and that bills are available in different files. The net result is that the data remains unverified.

3.186 It is relevant here to point out that Form 2.1 (a) and the daily collection register (which was also not produced) have a direct bearing on calculation of AT&C losses claimed by the Petitioner. When the Petitioner is not able to substantiate the claim of AT&C loss, the claim of over achievement cannot be accepted and the benefit on account of over achievement cannot be allowed to them. Therefore, the claim of AT&C losses by the Petitioner, as made in the tariff Petition, is rejected.”

3.95 The claim of the Petitioner on account of AT&C overachievement is being re-examined as per the direction of the Hon’ble APTEL. Considering that the data is more than 5 years old, it involves thorough analysis, because the Petitioner was not able to substantiate its claims in the past as indicated in the paras of the said Order as referred above.

3.96 The impact on account of True up of AT&C loss for FY 2008-09, if any, may be considered by the Commission in subsequent Tariff Order.

Issue No. 16: Re-computation of AT&C Losses for FY 2009-10 using actual kWh figures**Petitioner's Submission**

3.97 The Petitioner submitted that the Hon'ble ATE in Judgment dated November 28, 2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012) has ruled as under:

"80. In the light of above discussions we direct the Commission to recomputed the AT&C losses for FY 2009-10 using actual kWh figures as recorded in para 4.8 of the Impugned order. The issue is decided in favour of the Appellants."

3.98 The Petitioner also submitted that the Commission in its Tariff Order dated August 26, 2011 deducted 22.81 MU on account of calculation of kWh figures for FY 2009-10. Since the units deducted are now required to be reinstated, the AT&C Loss will be revised as under:

Table 3.22: AT&C Loss for FY 2009-10 (Rs. Crore)

S. No	Particulars	Units	Now Approved
A	Units consumed at BYPL Periphery	MU	5708
B	Units billed	MU	4310
C	Amount billed	Rs. Cr.	1944
D	Distribution Loss	%	24.50%
E	Amount collected	Rs. Cr.	1959
F	Collection efficiency	%	100.76%
G	Units realised	MU	4343
H	AT&C Loss level	%	23.92%

3.99 The over-achievement on account of AT&C Loss for FY 2009-10 is tabulated below:

Table 3.23: Over-achievement of AT&C Loss during FY 2009-10

Particulars	UoM	Target level	Actual	Reference
AT&C Loss	%	26.26%	23.92%	A
Over achievement/ (Under achievement)	%		2.34%	B
Energy Input	MU	5708	5708	C
Units realized	MU	4209	4343	D=C*(1-A)
Average Billing Rate	Rs./ kWh	4.51	4.51	E
Amount realized	Rs. Cr.	1899	1959	
Over-achievement	Rs. Cr.		60	
Proposed to be transferred to contingency reserve	Rs. Cr.		30	
Proposed to be retained	Rs. Cr.		30	
Less: E. Tax	Rs. Cr.		82	
Less: LPSC	Rs. Cr.		21	
Total revenue	Rs. Cr.		1796	

3.100 The impact on account of re-computation of AT&C Loss of FY 2009-10 is tabulated

below:

Table 3.24: Re-computation of AT&C Loss during FY 2009-10 (Rs. Crore)

S. No	Particulars	FY 2009-10
1	Revenue submitted by Petitioner	1817
2	Revenue considered in Tariff Order	1796
3	Net Impact	21

3.101 The total impact including carrying cost as projected by the Petitioner is tabulated below:

Table 3.25: Impact along with carrying cost (Rs. Crore)

S. No	Particulars	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
1	Opening	0	22	26	29
2	Additions	21			
3	Closing	21	22	26	29
4	Average	11	22	26	29
5	Rate of carrying cost	13.11%	13.38%	14.88%	15.03%
6	Carrying cost	1	3	4	4
7	Total Closing Balance	22	26	29	34

Commission's Analysis

3.102 The Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 61 and 62 of 2012 regarding AT&C loss calculation using kWh has observed:

"79 The perusal of the findings of the Commission in the Impugned Order would suggest that the Delhi Commission has failed to understand the working of the tri-vector meters installed at the consumers' premises by the Appellant. Basic electricity meters record only active power i.e. kWh consumed by the consumer. Tri-vector meters records all three vectors i.e. Active Power (kWh), Reactive Power (kVARh) and Apparent Power (kVAh). The principle parameter recorded by these meters is kWh. Other parameters are determined from this basic parameter based on instantaneous values of the current and voltage and their phaser angle. Therefore, the Commission has erred in computing kWh based on kVAh and power factor. It is interesting to note that the Commission has computed the average power factor for FY 2010-11 on the basis of kWh and kVAh recordings and computed kWh figures by reverse calculations using the kVAh figures for 2009-10 and average power factor for FY 2010-11.

80 In the light of above discussions we direct the Commission to recomputed the AT&C losses for FY 2009-10 using actual kWh figures as recorded in para 4.8 of the Impugned order. The issue is decided in favor of the Appellants”.

- 3.103 It is pertinent to state that the tariff schedule approved by the Commission for FY 2009-10 provides for billing for Non-Domestic NDLT more than 10 KW, MLHT more than 100 KW, Industrial more than 10 KW, DJB, DIAL, Railway Traction and DMRC on the basis of kVAh recorded in the meter for the respective consumers. As per Hon’ble APTEL directions in the above appeal, actual kWh should be used for truing up of AT&C loss of FY 2009-10.
- 3.104 The Commission has indicated the power factor to be applied in the respective Tariff orders for projection of revenue and accordingly the revenue has been estimated and considered in the respective tariff orders for the purpose of tariff fixation. The power factor derived from the data provided by the Petitioner for FY 2009-10 was not in line with either the power factor considered by the Commission for projection of revenue or actual power factor for the past period. It is observed that the Petitioner had submitted only one actual data i.e. kWh, whereas, for computation of billed amount in respect of the consumers where kVAh billing is approved in the Tariff Schedule, either actual kVAh or kWh together with power factor is required. In view of this, the Commission has filed Clarificatory Application before Hon’ble APTEL and the view on impact of AT&C Loss for FY 2009-10 will be taken, as deemed fit and appropriate, after receipt of the judgment of Hon’ble APTEL in the said Clarificatory Application.

Issue No. 17: Carrying cost on Reactive Energy Charges

Petitioner’s Submission

- 3.105 The Petitioner requested the Commission to allow Rs. 1.30 Crore on account of carrying cost due to reactive energy charges. The Petitioner also mentioned the Hon’ble ATE in Judgment dated November 28, 2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012) has ruled as under:

“91. This Tribunal in number of judgments have held that carrying cost is a legitimate right of the licensee and its recovery is legitimate expense. Once the Commission has allowed certain expenses in the truing up or on the directions of

higher authority, the carrying costs for such expense would also become recoverable. The Commission is, therefore, directed to allow the carrying cost on Reactive Energy Charges for FY 2006-07. The issue is decided in favour of the Appellants."

3.106 The Petitioner is claiming an impact of Rs. 1.30 Cr. as carrying cost on the same.

Commission's Analysis

3.107 In accordance with the judgment of Hon'ble APTEL, the Commission allows the Carrying cost on reactive energy charges of Rs. 0.98 Crore paid in FY 2006-07 till the year the amount of the reactive energy charges was allowed by the Petitioner.

Issue No. 18: Impact on account of DVB Arrears

Petitioner's Submission

3.108 The Hon'ble ATE in Judgment dated November 28, 2014 (Appeal 61 and 62 of 2012) has ruled as under:

"58. In view of the above discussions the issue is decided as under:

1) All the parameters such as LPSC, ED, DVB arrears have to be included both in the numerator as well in the denominator for computing the collection efficiency."

Commission's Analysis

3.109 It is observed from the direction of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 61 & 62 of 2012, that all the parameters such as LPSC, ED, DVB arrears have to be included both in the numerator as well in the denominator for computing the collection efficiency. However, as per the judgment of Hon'ble APTEL relating to collection efficiency in Appeal No. 14 of 2012, the amount realized by DPCL directly is ought to be either included or excluded in both the numerator and the denominator of the formula for collection efficiency. In accordance with the direction in Appeal No. 14 of 2012, the Commission has excluded LPSC, ED and DVB arrears from numerator as well as denominator for the purpose of computation of collection efficiency to determine the AT&C loss levels achievement.

3.110 Further, in view of the variance in Hon'ble APTEL's directions in Appeal No. 14 of 2012 and Appeal No. 61 & 62 of 2012, the Commission has filed a Clarificatory

Application before Hon'ble APTEL. View in the matter will, therefore, be taken, as deemed fit and appropriate, after receipt of the direction of the Hon'ble APTEL in the said application.

Issue No. 19: Deduction of CISF expenses from AT&C Incentives

Petitioner's Submission

3.111 The Petitioner has requested to reduce the CISF expenses for FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11 from AT&C Incentives in accordance with the Judgment of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal no. 61 & 62 of 2012.

Commission's Analysis

3.112 Pursuant to the judgment of Hon'ble APTEL, the Commission has allowed additional other expenses to the tune of 50% of such CISF expenses which is attributable to the retained share of the Petitioner out of the AT&C incentives. Accordingly, the Other expenses for FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11 have been increased by Rs. 0.22 Crore and Rs. 0.05 Crore respectively.

Claims for additional UI Charges earlier disallowed - APTEL Judgments in Appeal No. 177 & 178 of 2012

Petitioner's Submission

3.113 The Petitioner has submitted to reconsider the additional UI Charges disallowed in the Tariff Order dated 13.07.2012 based on the direction of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 177 of 2012.

Commission's Analysis

3.114 The Commission, in compliance to the Hon'ble APTEL's judgment in Appeal No. 177 of 2012, has vide its letter dated 05.08.2015 sought the details of additional UI charges paid by the Petitioner in FY 2010-11 duly certified by SLDC. The Petitioner vide its letter dated 12.08.2015 has submitted additional UI charges paid in FY 2010-11 as Rs. 5.50 Crore certified by SLDC, which is the same amount disallowed by the Commission in the Tariff Order dated 13.07.2012. It is pertinent to state that SLDC has not differentiated between penal and additional charges on account of UI. All the additional UI charges are imposed on the Distribution Licensee to maintain the

Grid discipline. The Forum of Regulators in its Press Release dated 23.07.2009 had stated that additional UI charges imposed on various distribution utilities across the country for excessive over drawl from the Grid will not be allowed to be recovered from the consumers w.e.f 01.08.2009 as follows:

“....

*all the Chairpersons of State Electricity Regulatory Commissions as its members, has agreed that the **additional Unscheduled Interchange (UI)** charges imposed on distribution utilities for excessive over drawl from the grid would not be allowed to be recovered from consumers w.e.f. 1st August, 2009.”*

3.115 In view of the above, the Commission has not considered any impact on the same.

Impact on account of Regulated Power for FY 2012-13

Petitioner's Submission

3.116 The Petitioner has submitted its claim on account of regulated Power as net saving to consumers of Rs. 107 Crore during FY 2012-13.

Commission's Analysis

3.117 The Commission has received the claims regarding disallowance on account of regulated power in truing up of FY 2012-13 in tariff order dated 23.07.2014. In order to finalize the claim of the petitioner, the Commission has directed SLDC to submit the relevant information like quantum of Short Term Purchase during regulated period in case there has been no regulation of Power. The said information is awaited from SLDC. The Commission will take the final view on the basis of information submitted by SLDC.

Adjustment in Non Tariff Income in earlier years

a) Rebate @ 1% on the Power Purchase Cost

Petitioner's Submission

3.118 The Petitioner submitted that the Hon'ble Commission while computing the rebate over 1% from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11 has erroneously deducted higher amount than that submitted by the Petitioner. The amount considered by the Hon'ble Commission and that submitted by the Petitioner is tabulated below:

Table 3.26: Rebate deducted from NTI (Rs. Crore)

S. No	Financial Year	Rebate above 1% as per Audit Certificate	Rebate deducted by the Hon'ble Commission
1	FY 2007-08	10.52	14.53
2	FY 2008-09	10.52	13.29
3	FY 2009-10	5.04	16.17
4	FY 2010-11	3.29	16.43
5	FY 2011-12	0.00	13.00
6	Total	29.37	73.42

Commission's Analysis

3.119 The Commission has considered rectification in the treatment of rebate on Power Purchase Cost in Non Tariff Income in accordance with Hon'ble APTEL's judgment in Appeal No. 153 of 2009. Accordingly the amount now adjusted in the non tariff income of respective years is as tabulated below.

Table 3.27: Treatment of Rebate on Power Purchase Cost under NTI

Sl. No	Financial Year	Rebate considered by the Commission in T.O. 31.07.2013 under NTI	Rebate above 1% as per Audit Certificate (now considered)	Amount recovered (Rs. Crore)
1	FY 2007-08	14.53	10.52	4.01
2	FY 2008-09	13.29	10.52	2.77
3	FY 2009-10	16.17	5.04	11.13
4	FY 2010-11	16.43	3.29	13.14
5	FY 2011-12	13.00	0.00	13.00
6	Total	73.42	29.37	44.05

b) Income from interest/Short Term Capital Gains

Commission's Analysis

3.120 As per the MYT Regulations 2007,

"5.23 All incomes being incidental to electricity business and derived by the Licensee from sources, including but not limited to profit derived from disposal of assets, rents, delayed payment surcharge, meter rent (if any), income from investments other than contingency reserves, miscellaneous receipts from the consumers and income to Licensed business from the Other Business of the Distribution Licensee shall constitute Non-Tariff Income of the Licensee."

3.121 The Commission has observed that any income from investments other than Contingency reserves shall constitute Non Tariff Income of the Licensee. Accordingly, the Commission has considered Income from interest/Short Term

Capital Gains as Non Tariff Income for 1st MYT Control Period.

Table 3.28: Income from interest on short term capital gains for 1st MYT Control Period (Rs. Crore)

Financial Year	Interest/Short term capital gain
FY 2008-09	0.86
FY 2009-10	1.59

c) Income from write back of excess provisions for doubtful debts

3.122 As per Regulation 5.23 of the MYT Regulation 2007, the miscellaneous receipts from the consumers shall constitute non tariff income of the licensee. Write back of provision of doubtful debts relates to recovery of debts which forms part of the miscellaneous receipts of the Petitioner. The Commission is of the view that the target of AT&C loss has been fixed by considering the collection efficiency at 99.50% with a scope of 0.50% provisions for bad/doubtful debts. Therefore, any recovery on account of bad and doubtful debts shall constitute non tariff income of the licensee to the extent of 0.50% provision on debtors. Accordingly the income on account of any such write back provision for doubtful/bad debts is considered as Non tariff income.

d) Change in normative interest on Consumer Security Deposit (CSD) with change in available equity towards determination of carrying cost

3.123 Non-Tariff Income on account of normative interest on consumer security deposit from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 has been revised based on revised carrying cost due to actual availability of equity and free reserve as below.

Table 3.29: Revised Interest on CSD to be added to Non Tariff Income from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	Remarks
A	Opening balance	114.63	138.94	161.74	187.08	212.05	298.52	Audited Financial Statements
B	Closing Balance	138.94	161.74	187.08	212.05	298.52	316.59	
C	Average	126.79	150.34	174.41	199.57	255.29	307.56	
D	Interest Rate (Carrying Cost)	10.90%	12.17%	12.13%	11.64%	13.36%	10.39%	
E	Interest on CSD	13.82	18.29	21.16	23.23	34.11	31.96	C*D
F	Interest on CSD paid during FY	4.96	6.09	7.78	9.62	10.50	17.40	Audited Financial Statements
G	Addition in Non Tariff	8.86	12.20	13.38	13.61	23.61	14.56	E-F

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	Remarks
	Income on account of normative interest on Consumer Security Deposit							

e) Service Line Cum Development Charges

3.124 The Commission is of the view that service line charges were actually received by the utility and deferring certain portion of these charges for future years is not justifiable in terms of Accounting Standards/principles. The Commission has revised the treatment for the service lines charges received by the DISCOMs as income in the year in 2nd MYT Control Period since FY 2012-13. Accordingly, the Commission has considered an additional amount of Rs. 45.46 Crore as non-tariff income in the truing up for FY 2012-13.

f) Interest Cost for LPSC

3.125 The Commission considers the financing cost of LPSC equal to the working capital rate of funding in accordance with the judgment of Hon'ble APTEL. Accordingly, the impact of interest cost is revised as follows:

Table 3.30: Revised Interest on financing cost of LPSC for 1st MYT Control Period (Rs. Crore)

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
LPSC Collected	26.66	20.68	20.87	17.33	28.35
Principal Amount	148.11	114.89	115.94	96.28	157.50
Rate of Interest as applied	9.50%	9.50%	9.50%	9.50%	13.31%
Financing Cost of LPSC - in Non Tariff Income	14.07	10.91	11.01	9.15	20.96
Net LPSC (As reduced from revenue available for ARR)	12.59	9.77	9.86	8.18	7.39
Revision in LPSC					
Revised rate for funding of Working Capital (As applied for WACC)	9.30%	9.57%	9.89%	10.34%	12.72%
Financing Cost of LPSC	13.77	11.00	11.47	9.96	20.04
Net LPSC	12.89	9.68	9.40	7.37	8.31
Net LPSC now adjusted to revenue available - increase in revenue collected	(0.30)	0.08	0.45	0.81	(0.92)

Revision in Non Tariff Income for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13

3.126 As discussed above, the revised Non Tariff Income for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 is as follows:

Table 3.31: Revised Non Tariff Income for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
a	Gross Non Tariff Income	84.18	133.09	221.69	148.93	150.45	120.46
b	Additional Service Line Charges considering Revenue on 100% receipt basis						45.46
c	Income from street light maintenance	7.74	9.06	11.93	13.32		
	Income from normative interest of Consumer Security Deposits	8.86	12.20	13.38	13.61	23.61	14.56
1	Sub Total of income	100.78	154.35	247.00	175.86	174.06	180.48
Less: Income Included in above, not passes for Tariff determination							
a	Transfer from consumer contribution for capital works	-	2.63	2.16	4.20		
b	Financing of LPSC Charges	13.77	11.00	11.47	9.96	20.04	12.79
c	Rebate of Power Purchase	10.52	10.52	5.04	3.29	-	24.71
d	Interest on Contingency Reserve	0.58	0.35	0.46	0.27	0.13	
e	UI Charges				0.07		
f	Income from Other Business (REAP)						0.60
2	Total (a to f)	24.87	24.50	19.13	17.79	20.17	38.10
Total : Non Tariff Income (1-2)		75.91	129.86	227.87	158.08	153.89	142.36

Adjustment in other costs up to FY 2012-13**Disallowance of Avoidable Power Purchase Cost from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas in FY 2012-13**

3.127 The Clause 5.2(a) of the Terms and Conditions of the Licence granted by the Commission to the Petitioner deals with approval of the Commission for purchase of power which is as follows:

“The Licensee shall not, without the general or special approval of the Commission:

- a. Purchase or otherwise acquire electricity for distribution and retail supply except in accordance with this License and on the tariffs and terms and conditions as may be approved by the Commission."*

- 3.128 During the Technical Validation Session, it was observed from the internal audit report of the Petitioner that validity of PPA from Anta, Auriya and Dadri stations have expired on 31.03.2012 and Singrauli's PPA has expired on 30.04.2013. These PPAs have been renewed by the Petitioner without intimating or getting prior approval from the Commission. As per internal audit report of the Petitioner for FY 2013-14, Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas based stations are costlier than their average power purchase cost. The Commission has also sought clarification vide its letter dated 19.03.2015 from the Petitioner regarding renewal of PPA from these stations without getting the approval of the Commission.
- 3.129 The Petitioner has submitted that the renewal of PPA has been extended on existing terms and conditions. Therefore, approval of the same from the Commission is not required. The Petitioner's submission regarding renewal of PPA is factually incorrect because whenever the analysis for projected demand and supply is considered, the supply from each station is being considered up to the date of validity of existing PPA. Therefore, before extending the existing PPA for further periods, cost benefit analysis for procurement should have been considered by the Petitioner and as per license condition, the approval from the Commission was required, which has not been done by the Petitioner. Further, the Petitioner vide its letters dated 15.06.2015, 30.06.2015, 13.07.2015 has submitted its proposal to surrender its allocation from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations forever from their portfolio due to high cost of generation from these stations. The said letters were also submitted to GoNCTD by the Petitioner.
- 3.130 In view of the above, the Commission has decided that the power purchase cost from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas based station should not be considered into the total power purchase cost after the expiry date of PPA due to their high cost of generation. As regards power from Singrauli, the Commission has considered the same even after the expiry of PPA and its renewal without intimation to the Commission, in the overall interest of the consumers as the generation cost from

this station is Rs. 1.76/kWh which is quite less than the average Power Purchase Cost from the Petitioner's portfolio and the Petitioner has also not submitted any proposal for surrender of power from Singrauli to GoNCTD/Commission.

3.131 The Commission has thus decided that the differential power purchase cost from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas based station has to be disallowed for FY 2012-13. The Commission has considered the power scheduled from Anta, Auriya and Dadri gas stations as these powers were procured by the Petitioner through short term sources. Therefore, the cost of procurement of these powers has been allowed at the monthly average rate of exchange as per CERC market monitoring report for FY 2012-13. Accordingly, the difference between the actual rate of power procured and exchange rate of Northern Region (N2) amounting to Rs. 37.17 Crore from these stations has been disallowed in FY 2012-13 which is shown in the Table below:

Table 3.32: Amount Disallowed from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations during FY 2012-13

MU Purchased in FY 2012-13													
	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total
Anta Gas	3.88	4.64	4.22	4.83	3.60	2.12	1.90	4.25	4.48	2.37	2.95	3.94	43.18
Auriya Gas	4.25	5.97	6.54	4.09	3.66	1.42	1.93	3.47	4.77	3.89	4.81	2.32	47.10
Dadri Gas	9.49	10.51	9.82	9.66	8.26	2.61	4.48	7.44	6.51	5.44	6.32	6.81	87.37
Rate (Rs./kWh)													
Anta Gas	7.53	4.71	4.80	4.27	4.05	5.39	6.34	3.93	4.03	6.78	4.81	5.26	
Auriya Gas	4.51	11.82	4.52	5.49	4.77	6.88	5.97	5.24	4.55	5.45	4.28	7.26	
Dadri Gas	3.64	4.30	9.86	4.37	4.13	6.31	5.23	4.36	4.69	5.42	4.45	4.85	
Delhi Exch. Rate	2.73	3.21	3.95	4.15	3.32	2.19	3.45	2.93	3.31	3.24	2.33	2.62	
Disallowed Cost (Rs. Crore)													
Anta Gas	1.86	0.69	0.36	0.06	0.26	0.68	0.55	0.43	0.32	0.84	0.73	1.04	7.83
Auriya Gas	0.76	5.14	0.37	0.55	0.53	0.66	0.49	0.80	0.59	0.86	0.94	1.08	12.76
Dadri Gas	0.87	1.14	5.80	0.21	0.67	1.08	0.80	1.06	0.90	1.19	1.34	1.52	16.58
TOTAL													37.17

Zero Billing – 195 of 2012

3.132 As per the direction of Hon'ble APTEL in appeal no. 195 of 2012, the Commission has revised the AT&C Loss Computation for FY 2010-11. It is observed that the petitioner had submitted total quantum of zero billing at 40.85 MU for the period between Jan'11 to Mar'11. The Petitioner was directed to submit the details of zero billing entire FY 2010-11 in view of the APTEL's direction. The Petitioner has submitted that total quantum of zero billing during FY 2010-11 which was lesser than earlier submission during the technical validation in true up of FY 2010-11 in tariff order

dated 13.07.2012. Therefore, the Commission has decided that total quantum of zero billing basis be prorated for the entire year based on the three months information as provided while true up of FY 2010-11. Accordingly, the total impact of an amount of Rs. 57.98 crore on account of under achievement in AT&C loss target has been added into the revenue available towards ARR in FY 2010-11.

De-Capitalisation of Fixed Assets

- 3.133 It has been observed that the Commission has allowed RoCE in respective years ARR on Regulated Rate Base (RRB) including book value of the assets de-capitalised. The Commission directed the Petitioner to furnish the details of de-capitalisation (replacement/retirement) vide its letter dated 26.11.2014. The Petitioner has submitted year wise detail of de-capitalisation of assets from FY 2004-05 to FY 2013-14.
- 3.134 The Commission, in the interest of the consumers and to avoid undue hardship on consumers, has decided to reduce the book value of de-capitalised assets from Gross Fixed Asset block of the Petitioner in respective years in the interest of the consumers and to avoid undue benefit to the Petitioner. Any profit/loss on account of de-capitalisation of asset shall be dealt as per the final order in Petition No. 46 of 2012 regarding retirement of assets.
- 3.135 Based on the above discussion, the revised GFA block from FY 2004-05 to FY 2013-14 as submitted by the Petitioner is as follows:

Table 3.33: Revised GFA from FY 2004-05 to FY 2013-14 after de-capitalisation (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Financial Year	Gross Block of Fixed asset	Gross Block of de-capitalised asset	Revised GFA
1	2	3	4	5 = (3-4)
A	2004-05	461.52	0.11	461.41
B	2005-06	642.52	4.24	638.28
C	2006-07	726.31	6.14	720.17
D	2007-08	865.49	8.40	857.09
E	2008-09	1133.66	9.69	1123.97
F	2009-10	1447.96	10.95	1437.01
G	2010-11	1645.72	12.39	1633.33
H	2011-12	1854.30	18.07	1836.23
I	2012-13	1960.86	63.86	1897.00

Impact of De-capitalisation on Depreciation

3.136 The Commission has revised depreciation from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07 on the basis of opening GFA and FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 on the basis of average GFA (net of Consumer Contribution) due to change in GFA on account of de-capitalisation and also due to change in rate of depreciation in FY 2007-08. The revised GFA due to consideration of de-capitalisation of assets is as follows:

Table 3.34: Revised GFA on account of de-capitalization from FY 2002-03 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013
A	Opening GFA	360.00	382.70	461.52	642.52	726.32	865.50	1,133.67	1,447.97	1,645.73	1,854.31	1,960.87
B	Additions to Asset during the year	22.70	78.82	181.11	87.92	141.08	270.43	315.59	199.02	210.02	112.24	69.12
C	De-capitalisation during the year			0.11	4.13	1.90	2.26	1.29	1.26	1.44	5.68	45.79
D	Net Assets Capitalised (B-C)	22.70	78.82	181.00	83.79	139.18	268.17	314.30	197.76	208.58	106.56	23.33
E	Closing GFA (A+D)	382.70	461.52	642.52	726.32	865.50	1,133.67	1,447.97	1,645.73	1,854.31	1,960.87	1,984.19
F	Average GFA (A+E)/2	371.35	422.11	552.02	684.42	795.91	999.58	1,290.82	1,546.85	1,750.02	1,907.59	1,972.53
G	Less: Average Consumer Contribution	Not considered as per PDP					64.66	80.55	102.95	146.44	182.74	192.71
H	Average GFA net of Consumer Contribution (F-G)						934.92	1,210.27	1,443.90	1,603.58	1,724.85	1,779.82
I	Average rate of depreciation	6.69%	6.69%	6.69%	6.69%	6.69%	5.53%	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%	3.03%
J	Depreciation	18.06	25.60	30.88	42.98	48.59	51.65	43.57	51.98	57.73	62.09	53.93
K	Depreciation allowed in earlier T.O.	18.06	25.60	30.88	42.99	48.87	33.92	43.90	52.35	58.15	62.64	55.17
L	Difference to be allowed/(recovered) (J-K)	0.00	0.00	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.28)	17.73	(0.33)	(0.37)	(0.42)	(0.55)	(1.24)

Impact of De-capitalisation on means of finance and return on equity**A. During Policy Direction Period**

3.137 GoNCTD had notified Policy Directions vide its notification dated 22.11.2001 to enable restructuring of the Delhi Vidyut Board (DVB) and privatization of the distribution business in exercise of the powers conferred by section 12 and other applicable provisions of Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000. The relevant clause related to Return on Equity to be allowed for the distribution licensees is as follows:

“16 (c) Distribution licensees earn, at least, 16% return on the issued and paid up

capital and free reserve.”

3.138 During the Policy Direction Period, the depreciation was utilized for funding of capital investments. With consideration of the de-capitalization, the requirement of funds has therefore been reduced for the Policy Direction period as well.

3.139 With revision in the depreciation due to de-capitalization, utilization of depreciation and means of finance are accordingly revised for FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07 as follows:

Table 3.35: Means of finance during PDP (FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07) (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	Remarks
A	Capital Expenditure (incl. IDC)	56.36	87.69	414.42	298.92	209.08	T.O. dated 23.02.2008
B	Closing value of Sundry Creditors in Previous Year				104.32	85.48	
C	Financing Required	51.61	87.69	414.42	403.24	294.56	
	Funding						
D	Consumer Contribution	8.00	13.91	34.48	17.35	21.25	
E	APDRP Grants		16.22				
F	APDRP Loans		16.22				
G	Depreciation utilisation	7.93	8.75	8.79	38.20	43.41	
H	Internal Accruals	10.70	9.78	40.19	30.74	36.35	
I	Loan	24.97	22.81	226.64	231.47	193.55	
J	Closing value of Sundry Creditors in Year End			104.32	85.48		
K	Total	51.61	87.69	414.42	403.24	294.56	

3.140 The Commission has reviewed the available Equity and free reserves of the Petitioner during the Policy Direction period as per Policy direction issued by GoNCTD mentioned above and has revised Return on Equity based on the issued, paid up capital and free reserve of the Petitioner from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07 as follows:

Table 3.36: Revised Return on Equity approved from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	As on 01.07.2003	FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	Remarks
A	Net Worth as per Audited statements	116.00	15.05	(24.02)	(18.64)	26.87	73.90	
B	Average Net Worth for the period		65.53	(4.49)	(21.33)	4.12	50.39	
C	Opening Equity	116.00	116.00	126.70	136.48	176.67	207.41	
D	Internal Accruals - based on capex		10.70	9.78	40.19	30.74	36.35	Table 3.35
E	Closing balance of	116.00	126.70	136.48	176.67	207.41	243.76	C+D

Sl. No.	Particulars	As on 01.07.2003	FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	Remarks
	Equity eligible for RoE							
F	Average Equity (Equity Capital + Average Free Reserve)		121.35	131.59	156.58	192.04	225.58	(C+E)/2
G	RoE Offered @ 16%		14.56	21.05	25.05	30.73	36.09	F*16%
H	Limiting Average normative Equity to actual equity		65.53	0	0	4.12	50.39	Min(F,B, 0)
I	Revised RoE		7.86	0	0	0.66	8.06	H*16%
J	(Allowance)/ Recovery of RoE		6.70	21.05	25.05	30.07	28.03	G-I

B. During 1st and 2nd MYT Regulation Period (FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13)

3.141 The means of finance of the net assets capitalized during the MYT Regulation Period has also been revised based on de-capitalisation i.e., for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 as follows:

Table 3.37: Means of Finance for net assets capitalized during FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Remarks
A	Net Assets Capitalised	268.17	314.30	197.76	208.58	106.56	23.33	Table 3.34
B	Investment capitalized out of opening CWIP till FY 07	135.51	158.13	99.72	105.24	56.24		T.O. dated 31.07.2013
C	Investment capitalized out of fresh investments	132.66	156.17	98.04	103.34	50.32	23.33	A-B
D	Less: Consumer Contribution	1.63	10.15	22.81	62.09	10.51	9.44	T.O. dated 31.07.2013/ 23.07.2014
E	Net	131.03	146.02	75.23	41.25	39.81	13.89	C-D
	Financing/Funding							
F	Debt (70%)	91.72	102.22	52.66	28.88	27.87	9.72	E*70%
G	Equity (30%)	39.31	43.81	22.57	12.38	11.94	4.17	E*30%
H	Total	131.03	146.02	75.23	41.25	39.81	13.89	F+G

3.142 Regulation 5.10 of MYT Regulations, 2007 deals with Return on Equity and relevant extracts is as follows:

“5.10 The WACC for each year of the Control Period shall be computed at the start of the Control Period in the following manner:

$$WACC = \left[\frac{D/E}{1 + D/E} \right] * r_d + \left[\frac{1}{1 + D/E} \right] * r_e$$

Where,

D/E is the Debt to Equity Ratio and for the purpose of determination of tariff, debt-equity ratio as on the Date of Commercial Operation in case of new distribution line or substation or capacity expanded shall be 70:30. Where equity employed is in excess of 30%, the amount of equity for the purpose of tariff shall be limited to 30% and the balance amount shall be considered as notional loan. The interest rate on the amount of equity in excess of 30% treated as notional loan shall be the weighted average rate of the loans of the Licensee for the respective years and shall be further limited to the prescribed rate of return on equity in the Regulations. Where actual equity employed is less than 30%, the actual equity and debt shall be considered.

..."

- 3.143 Regulation 5.11 of MYT Regulations, 2011 deals with Return on Equity and relevant extracts is as follows:

"5.11 The WACC for each year of the Control Period shall be computed at the start of the Control Period in the following manner:

$$WACC = \left[\frac{D/E}{1 + D/E} \right] * r_d + \left[\frac{1}{1 + D/E} \right] * r_e$$

Where,

D/E is the Debt to Equity Ratio and for the purpose of determination of tariff, debt-equity ratio for the asset capitalized shall be 70:30. Where equity employed is in excess of 30%, the amount of equity for the purpose of tariff shall be limited to 30% and the balance amount shall be considered as notional loan. The interest rate on the amount of equity in excess of 30% treated as notional loan shall be the weighted average rate of the loans of the Licensee for the respective years and shall be further limited to the prescribed rate of return on equity in the Regulations. Where actual equity employed is less than 30%, the actual equity and debt shall be considered:

Provided that the Working capital shall be considered 100% debt financed for the calculation of WACC;

Provided further that the Debt to Equity Ratio for the assets covered under Transfer Scheme, dated July 1, 2002 shall be considered as per the debt and equity in the transfer scheme;

Provided further that Debt to Equity Ratio for the assets capitalised till 01.04.2012 (other than assets covered under Transfer Scheme) shall be considered as per the debt and equity approved by the Commission at the time of capitalization.

..."

3.144 In view of the Regulation 5.10 of MYT Regulations, 2007 and 5.11 of MYT Regulations, 2011, it is clarified that return on equity shall be restricted to actual available equity including free reserves in case where the actual available equity including free reserves is less than 30% of the asset capitalized. Further, as per MYT Regulations 2011, Working capital shall be considered 100% debt financed for the calculation of WACC.

3.145 Total Capital requirement in the Distribution business for the relevant year is indicated in the form of RRB which includes Actual Equity and Actual Debt after repayment. The Commission has considered the actual available equity including free reserve upto maximum of 30% of RRB for the purpose of computation of WACC. RRB includes original cost of fixed asset excluding accumulated depreciation. RRB includes original cost of fixed asset excluding accumulated depreciation. By considering the actual equity available, the balance of RRB has been considered to be funded from debt which is net of repayment of loans.

3.146 In view of the above, the revised equity of the Petitioner is as follows:

Table 3.38: Equity during FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Remarks
A	Opening Equity	243.76	325.14	375.32	394.14	396.82	408.16	Closing balance for FY 2006-07 as in Table 3.36 is opening balance for FY 2007-08
B	Addition during the year – Capitalisation	39.31	43.81	22.57	12.38	11.94	4.17	
C	Addition during the year - Working Capital	42.07	6.37	(3.74)	(9.70)	(0.60)		
D	Adjustment in Working Capital (due to 2 nd MYT Regulations)						(33.38)	July 2014 Order

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Remarks
E	Closing Balance	325.14	375.32	394.14	396.82	408.16	378.95	A+B+C+D
F	Average Equity	284.45	350.23	384.73	395.48	402.49	393.56	(A+E)/2

Revision of O&M Expenses

3.147 The Commission has revised R&M expenses for the 1st. MYT Control Period due to de-capitalisation during FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 as follows:

Table 3.39: Revised R&M Expenses for FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Reference
A	Revised Opening GFA	865.50	1,133.67	1,447.97	1,645.73	1,854.31	Table 3.33
B	K Factor	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	MYT Order
C	R&M Expenses	32.02	41.95	53.57	60.89	68.61	A*B

3.148 The Commission has re-determined the Employee, A&G and R&M Expenses as per the directions of the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 171, 177 & 178 of 2012. Relevant extracts from the said judgments is as follows:

"10.12 We find that the employees cost and A&G expenses have been determined in violation of the Tariff Regulations and, therefore, these are set aside along with the methodology used in determination of these expenses with direction to re-determine the same as per the Regulations.

...

The State Commission has determined the 'K' factor for the Control Period 2012-13 to 2014-15 as average of 'K' factor for the period 2008-09 to 2011-12 ignoring the FY 2007-08

Therefore the 'K' factor for the Control Period has to be recalculated on the basis of 'K' factor for the FY 2007-08 to 2011-12."

3.149 One of the major objective of unbundling of Delhi Vidyut Board (DVB) was to provide for the constitution of an Electricity Regulatory Commission, restructuring of the electricity industry (rationalization of generation, transmission, distribution and supply of electricity), increasing avenues for participation of private sector in the electricity industry and generally for taking measures conducive to the development and management of the electricity industry in an efficient,

commercial, economic and competitive manner in the National Capital Territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto. The relevant extract of the Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000 is as follows:

“To provide for the constitution of an Electricity Regulatory Commission, restructuring of the electricity industry (rationalisation of generation, transmission, distribution and supply of electricity), increasing avenues for participation of private sector in the electricity industry and generally for taking measures conducive to the development and management of the electricity industry in an efficient, commercial, economic and competitive manner in the National Capital Territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.”

3.150 As indicated above in Delhi Electricity Reforms Act, 2000, the Distribution Licensees should manage their expenses & operations in an Efficient, Commercial, Economic and Competitive manner. O&M expenses are one of the major indicators to judge whether efficiency has been brought into the system by controlling and managing day to day company's expenses which comprises of Employees, Administrative & General and Repair & Maintenance Expenses.

3.151 The Hon'ble APTEL has directed to re- determine O&M expenses by taking into consideration following factors:

- a. MYT Regulations, 2011
- b. Audited Financial Statements for FY 2011-12,
- c. R&M expenses for FY 2007-08,
- d. Different modes of work carried out by the Distribution Licensees,
- e. Performance of Distribution Licensees.

3.152 In view of the above directions of the Hon'ble APTEL, the Commission has re-determined the O&M Expenses i.e., Employee Expenses, A&G Expenses and R&M Expenses by considering the following factors:

- a. MYT Regulations, 2011 and**
- b. Audited Financial Statements for FY 2011-12**

3.153 The O&M Expenses has been determined as per Regulation 5.4 of the MYT Regulations, 2011 reproduced as follows:

“...The O&M expenses for the Base year shall be approved by the Commission taking into account the latest available audited accounts, business plan filed by the licensees, estimates of the actuals for the Base year, prudence check and any other factor considered appropriate by the Commission.

3.154 Accordingly, the Commission has now considered the Audited Financial Statements for FY 2011-12 for determination of base year O&M Expenses.

c. Different modes of work carried out by the Distribution Licensees and

d. Performance of Distribution Licensees

3.155 The Commission has re-determined the O&M Expenses for the Petitioner without comparing with other Distribution Licensees operating in the area of GoNCTD.

3.156 The base year (FY 2011-12) O&M Expenses has been determined considering the actual O&M expenses incurred by the Petitioner during 1st MYT Control Period (FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12). The actual growth in individual parameters (Employee Expenses, A&G Expenses and R&M Expenses) has been analyzed with the:

- 1) Actual Sales growth,
- 2) Increase in CPI and WPI,
- 3) Increase in Consumer Base and
- 4) Performance on account of reduction in AT&C Loss levels.

Employee Expenses

3.157 The Employee Expenses is majorly impacted by Sales Growth, Increase in CPI and WPI indices and performance on account of reduction in AT&C Loss levels. Therefore, the Commission has compared the Actual Employee Expenses of FY 2011-12 as per audited Financial statement of FY 2011-12 with the Actual Employee Expenses of FY 2007-08 escalated by proportionate increase in five years Sales Growth, Increase in CPI and WPI indices and performance on account of reduction in AT&C Loss levels. It has been observed that the Actual Employee Expenses of FY 2011-12 is less than the escalated Employee Expenses by considering Sales Growth, Increase in CPI and WPI indices and performance on account of reduction in AT&C Loss levels.

3.158 Therefore, the Commission has approved the base year Employee Expenses of the Petitioner at Rs. 206.51 Crore which is minimum of computed (Rs. 219.21 Crore)

and Audited Employee Expenses (Rs. 206.51 Crore). Hon'ble APTEL has upheld the escalation factor of 8% to be applied for projection of Employee expenses during second MYT Control Period in Appeal No. 171, 177 and 178 of 2012.

3.159 Accordingly, the Commission has approved the Employee expenses for second MYT Control Period as follows:

Table 3.40: Revised Employee Expenses for 2nd MYT Period (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Audited FY 12	Revised Employee Expenses (FY 12)	Base Year Expenses	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15
Gross Employee Expenses	206.51	219.21	206.51	223.03	240.87	260.14
Less: capitalisation (@10%)				22.30	24.09	26.01
Net Employee Expenses				200.73	216.79	234.13

A&G Expenses

3.160 The A&G Expenses is majorly impacted by Increase in CPI and WPI indices and Consumer growth. It has been observed that Bill Printing, Distribution, Collection, Handling and Postage Expenses in A&G Expenses have direct relationship Consumer Base Growth. Therefore, the Commission has compared the Actual A&G Expenses of FY 2011-12 as per audited Financial statement of FY 2011-12 with the Actual A&G Expenses of FY 2007-08 escalated by proportionate increase in five years CPI and WPI indices and increase on account of Bill Printing, Distribution, Collection, Handling and Postage Expenses based on Consumer Growth.

3.161 It has been observed that the audited A&G Expenses (Rs. 60.29 Crore) of FY 2011-12 is less than the escalated A&G Expenses (Rs. 64.84 Crore) as per methodology above. Therefore, the Commission has approved the base year A&G Expenses of the Petitioner at Rs. 60.29 Crore. Hon'ble APTEL has upheld the escalation factor of 8% to be applied for projection of A&G expenses during second MYT Control Period in appeal no 171, 177 and 178 of 2012.

3.162 Accordingly, the Commission has approved the A&G expenses for second MYT Control Period as follows:

Table 3.41: Revised A&G Expenses for 2nd MYT Period (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Audited FY 12	Revised A&G Expenses (FY 12)	Base Year Expenses	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15
A&G Expenses	60.29	64.84	60.29	65.11	70.32	75.95

R&M Expenses

3.163 The R&M Expense is majorly impacted by Increase in Sales Growth, CPI and WPI indices and performance on account of reduction in AT&C Loss levels. Therefore, the Commission has compared the Actual R&M Expenses of FY 2011-12 as per audited Financial statement of FY 2011-12 with the Actual R&M Expenses of FY 2007-08 escalated by proportionate increase in five years Sales Growth, Increase in CPI and WPI indices and performance on account of reduction in AT&C Loss levels. It has been observed that the audited R&M expenses of FY 2011-12 (Rs. 66.16 Crore) is more than the escalated R&M Expenses (Rs. 62.75 Crore) by considering Sales Growth, Increase in CPI and WPI indices and performance on account of reduction in AT&C Loss levels.

3.164 Therefore, the Commission has restricted the base year R&M Expenses of the Petitioner at Rs.62.75 Crore to determine the k factor for the 2nd MYT Control Period.

3.165 The 'k' factor for the 2nd MYT Period has been determined as 3.37% based on ratio of R&M Expenses as discussed above with $GFA_{(n-1)}$ for the base year.

3.166 Thus, the Commission approves the R&M expenses for second MYT Control Period (FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15) based on 'K' factor of 3.37%.

Table 3.42: Revised R&M Expenses for FY 2012-13 of the 2nd MYT Period (Rs. Crore)

Sl.No.	Particulars	Amount	Reference
A	Opening GFA for FY 2011-12	1854.31	Table 3.33
B	R&M expenses considered for base year (FY 2011-12)	62.75	
C	K Factor	3.37%	B/A*100
D	Closing GFA for FY 2011-12 (i.e. $GFA_{(n-1)}$ for FY 2012-13)	1960.87	Table 3.33
E	R&M expenses for FY 2012-13	66.08	D*C

Efficiency Factor

3.167 Hon'ble APTEL has directed the Commission to reconsider the efficiency factor on

O&M expenses for the Control Period (FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15) in judgment in Appeal No. 177 of 2012, the relevant extract of which is as follows:

“37.3 This issue has been considered by this Tribunal in Appeal no. 171 of 2012.

The relevant paragraph of the judgment are reproduced below:

“12.5 We find that as per the Regulations, the efficiency factor can be determined by benchmarking and, therefore, there is no fault in the Commission’s basic approach for benchmarking the O&M cost of the Appellant with other distribution companies. However, the benchmarking of O&M has to be with respect to like distribution licensees and for a larger span with analysis. In the present case, the State Commission has given figures of O&M cost per unit of sales and per consumer for a single year i.e. FY 2010-11. It is not clear whether the O&M expenses considered are the actual audited expenses or trued up expenses or the estimate of expenses approved in the tariff order. The State owned distribution licensee considered in the benchmarking should be much who maintains reliable power supply and distribution loss level comparable to the Appellant. The Commission should have benchmarked the O&M costs of some more distribution licensees having metropolitan area of supply such as other licensees of Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata for last three years before coming to a conclusion. The approach adopted by the State Commission is over simplified and lacks analysis.

12.6 While we agree with the basic approach of benchmarking, the data and the analysis is required to be augmented as discussed above. Therefore, we remand the matter to the State Commission for redetermination of the Efficiency Factors.”

- 3.168 The Commission has compared the O&M expenses of R-infra-D and TPC-D operating in Mumbai as Distribution Licensees in line with the direction of Hon’ble APTEL. It is observed that the O&M expenses for R-infra-D and TPC-D is much lower than the Petitioner. The comparison of O&M expenses of BRPL and R-infra- D and TPC-D is as follows:

Table 3.43: Comparison of O&M Cost with other DISCOMs

DISCOM	O&M cost per unit of sales (Rs.) (as projected in MYT Order)		
	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
R Infra – D	0.41	0.44	0.47
TPC – D	0.11	0.11	0.12
BRPL	0.52	0.52	0.52
BYPL	0.70	0.70	0.70
TPDDL	0.59	0.59	0.59

3.169 In view of the above decision of the Hon'ble APTEL, the Commission has reconsidered the efficiency factor and it is observed that O&M expenses per unit of sales for all Delhi Distribution Licensees (BRPL, BYPL & TPDDL) are more than R-Infra-D and TPC-D for MYT period FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15. Therefore, the efficiency factor determined in MYT Order dtd. 13/07/2012 has been retained at 2%, 3% and 4% for FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 respectively.

Summary of O&M Expenses

3.170 As per the discussions above, the O&M Expenses approved by the Commission for FY 2012-13 is as follows:

Table 3.44: Revised O&M Expenses approved by the Commission for FY 2012-13
(Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Approved in Tariff Order dtd. 23/07/2014	Now Approved	Reference
A	Employee Expenses	213.23	200.73	Table 3.40
B	A&G Expenses	52.40	65.11	Table 3.41
C	R&M Expenses	61.54	66.08	Table 3.42
D	Gross O&M Expenses	327.17	331.92	A+B+C
E	Efficiency Factor	2.00%	2.00%	
F	Less: Efficiency improvement	6.54	6.64	D*E
G	Add: SVRS Pension	4.92	4.14	As submitted by the Petitioner as actually paid
H	Net O&M expenses	325.55	329.42	D-F+G

Table 3.45: Revised O&M Expenses for FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Reference
A	Employee Expenses	107.29	108.96	116.44	161.90	169.08	As earlier trued up

Sl. No	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Reference
B	R&M Expenses	32.02	41.95	53.57	60.89	68.61	Table 3.39
C	A&G Expenses	40.01	42.09	44.05	46.10	48.25	As earlier tried up
D	Total O&M Expenses	179.32	193.00	214.06	268.89	285.94	A+B+C
E	Efficiency Factor		2.00%	3.00%	4.00%	4.00%	MYT order
F	6 th Pay Arrears		7.26	117.86			no efficiency applied
G	SVRS Pension	11.15	5.61	12.49	6.64	4.93	As actually paid
H	Net O&M Expenses	190.47	194.75	220.13	264.78	279.43	$D*(1-E)+F+G$

Adjustment in Working Capital Requirement from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13

3.171 The Commission has also reviewed the working capital requirement by considering the net Power purchase cost instead of gross power purchase cost for FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12. As the revenue receivable from sale of electricity does not include the receivables on account of sale of surplus power, thus the revised Power purchase cost now considered by the Commissions is as follows:

Table 3.46: Gross and Net Power Purchase costs from FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
Gross Power Purchase Costs considered for earlier true ups	1,972.75	1,913.99	2,185.35	3,280.83	3,844.68
Net Power Purchase cost now revised	1,101.95	1,316.89	1,818.56	2,606.12	3,300.71

3.172 Further, the Net Power Purchase cost for FY 2012-13 amounting to Rs. 3481.76 Crore has been adjusted with disallowance of cost for Anta, Auriya and Dadri gas stations amounting to Rs. 37.17 Crore. Accordingly the revised Net Power Purchase cost is now considered at Rs. 3444.59 Crore.

3.173 The revised O&M Expenses, as discussed above, are also now being considered to revise the working capital requirement for the MYT Periods.

3.174 During FY 2012-13, the Commission had considered the annual revenue available

towards ARR as Rs.3325.27 Crore instead of revenue billed at Rs.3138.59 Crore which is now being rectified.

3.175 Accordingly, the revised working capital requirement since FY 2007-08 is as follows:

Table 3.47: Approved Working Capital Requirement from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Reference
A) i)	O&M Expenses		190.47	194.75	220.13	264.78	279.43		Table 3.45
A) ii)	O&M Expenses for 1 Month		15.87	16.23	18.34	22.06	23.29	-	A) i)/12
B)	Receivables								
B) i)	Annual Revenue Requirement		1,547.96	1,780.67	1,943.97	2,121.51	2,449.43	3,138.59	
B) ii)	Receivables equivalent to 2 months average billing		257.99	296.78	324.00	353.59	408.24	523.10	B)i)/6
C) i)	Power Purchase expenses		1,101.95	1,316.89	1,818.56	2,606.12	3,300.71	3,444.59	Table 3.46
C) ii)	power purchase expenses for 1 Month		91.83	109.74	151.55	217.18	275.06	287.05	C)i)/12
D)	Total Working Capital	41.79	182.04	203.27	190.79	158.47	156.47	236.05	A) ii) + B) ii) - C) ii)
E)	Change in Working Capital		140.25	21.23	(12.47)	(32.32)	(2.01)	79.58	FY _(i) -FY _(n-i)
F)	Equity Funding		42.07	6.37	(3.74)	(9.70)	(0.60)	23.88	30%*E
G)	Debt Funding		98.17	14.86	(8.73)	(22.62)	(1.41)	55.71	70%*E; for FY 2012-13, 100%*E

Advance Against Depreciation

3.176 Due to de-capitalisation of fixed assets, the requirement of debt is also revised. The Petitioner has considered the normative debt repayment equal to 1/10 of the loan balance. It is observed that actual 1/10 of the loan and debt repayment may not be equal in each year from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14. As per MYT Regulations, for computation of AAD, the Petitioner is required to submit the actual debt repayment schedule for the purpose of determination of AAD during FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14. Accordingly, the Petitioner is directed to submit the revised claim on account of AAD for the said period. Final view will be taken upon the receipt of requisite data by the Petitioner.

RRB and RoCE

3.177 The accumulated depreciation for opening balance of FY 2007-08 has been arrived at

Rs. 236.12 Crore considering the cumulative depreciation at the time of transfer at Rs. 70 Crore and depreciation during PDP at Rs. 166.12 Crore. Further Rs. 1.60 Crore on account of depreciation already allowed on decapitalised assets is being reduced from the accumulated depreciation upto FY 2006-07 for the purpose of RRB. Accordingly, the Accumulated depreciation considered in opening balance of FY 2007-08 has been considered as Rs. 234.52 Crore.

3.178 The opening balance of RRB for FY 2007-08 has been considered as follows:

Table 3.48: Opening balance for RRB for FY 2007-08 (Rs. Crore)

Sl.No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	Reference
A	OCFA Opening balance	865.50	Table 3.33
B	Opening Balance of Working Capital	41.79	Tariff Order
C	Accumulated Depreciation	234.52	
D	Accumulated Consumer Contribution	58.74	Tariff Order
E	RRB Opening	614.03	A+B-C-D

3.179 The Revised RRB for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 due to de-capitalization of assets and change in working capital requirement from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 is as follows:

Table 3.49: Revised RRB from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	Reference
A	RRB Opening	614.03	959.71	1,232.21	1,341.08	1,397.83	1,432.14	Opening for FY 07-08 in table 3.48
B	ΔAB (Change in RRB)	205.43	251.27	121.34	89.07	36.32	(16.92)	C-D+E-F
C	Investments Capitalized	268.17	314.30	197.76	208.58	106.56	23.33	Table 3.34
D	Depreciation (incl AAD)	51.65	43.57	51.98	57.73	62.09	53.93	Table 3.34
E	Accumulated Depreciation on Decapitalised Assets	0.76	0.47	0.44	0.31	2.36	23.12	As submitted by the Petitioner
F	Consumer Contribution	11.84	19.93	24.88	62.09	10.51	9.44	Tariff order dated 31.07.2013
G	Change in WC	140.25	21.23	(12.47)	(32.32)	(2.01)	79.58	Table 3.47
H	RRB Closing	959.71	1,232.21	1,341.08	1,397.83	1,432.14	1,494.80	A+B+G
I	RRB (i)	857.00	1,106.58	1,280.41	1,353.30	1,413.98	1,503.26	A+G/2+H

3.180 Due to revision in RRB and consideration of actual equity available including free

reserves, the revised WACC and RoCE from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 is as follows:

Table 3.50: Revised WACC and RoCE from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Reference
A	RRB (i)	857.00	1,106.58	1,280.41	1,353.30	1,413.98	1,503.26	Table 3.49
B	Normative Equity @ 30% of RRBi	257.10	331.97	384.12	405.99	424.19	450.98	A*30%
C	Average Actual Equity including free reserve	45.90	46.21	112.44	227.56	530.42	768.55	Table 3.4
D	Normative equity towards Capitalisation (2 nd MYT Regulations)	N.A.					393.56	Table 3.38
E	Equity considered for WACC (min of normative equity and actual equity)	45.90	46.21	112.44	227.56	424.19	393.56	Min (B,C,D)
F	Debt - balancing figure	811.10	1,060.37	1,167.98	1,125.74	989.79	1,109.71	A-E
G	Equity available for revenue gap, if any.	-	-	-	-	106.23	374.99	C-E
H	Rate of return on equity (incl. Supply Margin re)	16.00%	16.00%	16.00%	16.00%	16.00%	16.00%	
I	Rate of interest on debt	8.92%	9.29%	9.30%	9.19%	11.32%	9.54%	
J	WACC	9.30%	9.57%	9.89%	10.34%	12.72%	11.23%	
K	ROCE	79.69	105.90	126.61	139.86	179.91	168.83	A*J

3.181 Income tax allowed to the Petitioner is also accordingly revised due to change in Return on Equity as discussed in above. Revised Income tax now allowed is as follows:

Table 3.51: Revised Income Tax from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	Reference
A	Equity Considered for Income Tax	45.90	46.21	112.44	227.56	424.19	393.56	Table 3.50
B	Rate of Return	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	
C	Return on Equity	7.34	7.39	17.99	36.41	67.87	62.97	A*B

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	Reference
D	MAT Rate	11.33%	11.33%	17.00%	19.93%	20.01%	20.01%	
E	Income Tax	0.94	0.94	3.68	9.06	16.98	18.05	C*D
F	Tax Assessed/ Paid	0.00	8.59	0.00	29.83	11.41	5.07	
G	Income Tax Approved	0.00	0.94	0.00	9.06	11.41	5.07	Min(E,F)

Annual Revenue Requirement for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13

Table 3.52: Revised Annual Revenue Requirement and Revenue Gap for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13
(Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	Reference
A	Cost of Power Purchase	1,101.95	1,316.89	1,818.56	2,606.12	3,300.71	3,444.59	
B	Operation & Maintenance Costs	190.47	194.75	220.13	264.78	279.43	329.42	Table 3.45/3.44
C	Impact for 11 months on O&M Expenses	28.43						Table 3.11
D	Depreciation (incl AAD)	51.65	43.57	51.98	57.73	62.09	53.93	Table 3.34
F	Other Expenditure	-	3.68	0.60	1.60	6.92	0.20	As per Tariff Orders
G	Return on Capital Employed (incl Supply Margin)	79.69	105.90	126.61	139.86	179.91	168.83	Table 3.50
H	Adjustment of reactive energy charges	(0.98)						As in Tariff Order
I	Income Tax Provision	-	0.94	-	9.06	11.41	5.07	Table 3.51
J	DTL Claim as treated in TO - Aug 2011			58.59				As in Tariff Order
K	DVB Arrears	27.40						As in Tariff Order
L	Less: Interest & Other Expenses Capitalized	2.31						As per Tariff Order
M	Less: Non Tariff Income	75.91	129.86	227.87	158.08	153.89	142.36	Table 3.31
N	Aggregate Revenue Requirement	1,400.40	1,535.88	2,048.60	2,921.07	3,686.60	3,859.73	
O	Revenue Available towards ARR	1,424.73	1,706.62	1,841.57	2,064.73	2,486.78	3,325.27	Respective Tariff Orders
P	Impact of Net LPSC	(0.30)	0.08	0.45	0.80	(0.92)		Table 3.30
Q	Impact for zero billing				57.98			
R	Revised Revenue Available towards ARR	1,424.43	1,706.70	1,842.02	2,123.51	2,485.86	3,325.27	O+P+Q
S	Revenue Surplus/(Gap) for the year	24.03	170.82	(206.58)	(797.56)	(1,200.74)	(534.46)	N-R

Carrying cost up to FY 2006-07

3.182 The carrying cost for the Policy Direction Period is to be applied on the opening

balance of the revenue gap at the rate of 9%. The Commission in its tariff order dated 23.07.2014 had computed the carrying cost on average balance instead of opening balance. The carrying cost for the Policy Direction period is now revised on opening balance. The summarized impact of true-up up-to FY 2006-07 as per policy direction period based on APTEL judgments, de-capitalization, actual equity available and various other adjustments as discussed above along with carrying cost is as follows:

Table 3.53: Impact of true-up from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	Remarks
A	Opening Balance	-	(6.70)	(28.35)	(47.23)	(81.53)	
B	R&M and A&G expenses - as allowed in July 2014 Order			8.73	0.02	(2.14)	July 2014 Order
C	Depreciation	0.00	0.00	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.28)	Table 3.35
D	Return on Equity	(6.70)	(21.05)	(25.05)	(30.07)	(28.03)	Table 3.36
E	Adjustment in reactive energy charges					0.98	
F	Total	(6.70)	(21.05)	(16.33)	(30.05)	(29.47)	Sum (A to E)
G	Rate of Carrying Cost	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	T.O. dated 23.02.2008
H	Amount of Carrying Cost	-	(0.60)	(2.55)	(4.25)	(7.34)	A*G
I	Closing Balance	6.70	28.35	47.23	81.53	118.34	A+F+H

(Reduction)/Increase in revenue gap

Carrying cost from FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13

3.183 The Carrying cost for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 has also been revised based on actual equity available for funding of revenue gap as per Hon'ble APTEL's judgment in Appeal No. 153 of 2009 subject to a maximum 30% of the equity and outcome of Civil Appeal No. 884 of 2010 before Hon'ble Supreme Court.

3.184 The opening balance of the revenue gap for FY 2007-08 has been considered at Rs. 158.50 Crore. Various adjustments as discussed in above paragraphs have been considered and the revised ARR and the Revenue Gap for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 along with carrying cost is as follows:

Table 3.54: Revenue Gap and carrying cost for FY 2007-08 to FY 2012-13 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	Remarks
A	Opening balance for FY 07-08	(158.50)	(19.20)	159.68	(40.06)	(880.40)	(2,278.96)	As per T.O. dated July 2013
B	Adjustment in Opening balance of RG on account of PDP adjustments	118.34						Table 3.53
C	Adjustment of Contingency reserve on Revenue Gap				7.43			As per Tariff Order 13.07.12
D	Opening Balance of revenue gap	(35.17)	(13.67)	165.88	(25.68)	(872.64)	(2,270.17)	A+B+C
E	Revenue surplus/(Gap) during the year	24.03	170.82	(206.58)	(797.56)	(1,200.74)	(534.46)	Table 3.52
F	Adjustment on account of 8% surcharge						237.32	Tariff Order 23.07.2014
G	Net RG requirement during the year	24.03	170.82	(206.58)	(797.56)	(1,200.74)	(297.14)	E+F
H	Closing Revenue gap	(11.14)	157.16	(40.70)	(823.23)	(2,073.38)	(2,567.32)	D+G
I	Average balance of Revenue Gap	(23.16)	71.74	62.59	(424.45)	(1,473.01)	(2,418.74)	(D+H)/2
J	Actual equity Available towards RG (above Capitalisation and WC)	-	-	-	-	106.23	374.99	
K	Equity as 30% of total funds required	-	(21.52)	(18.78)	-	106.23	374.99	Min (J, I)*30%
L	Balancing figure - Debt	23.16	(50.22)	(43.81)	424.45	1,366.78	2,043.75	-I-K
M	Rate of return on equity	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	16.00%	
N	Rate of interest on debt	10.90%	11.38%	11.33%	11.64%	13.31%	9.54%	
O	Rate of carrying cost	10.90%	12.17%	12.13%	11.64%	13.36%	10.54%	$((M*K)+(N*L))/(K+L)$
P	Carrying cost	(3.07)	8.06	6.84	(50.22)	(197.82)	(255.81)	O*I
Q	Closing balance	(19.20)	159.68	(40.06)	(880.40)	(2,278.96)	(2,831.92)	H+P

True Up for FY 2013-14**ENERGY SALES****Petitioner's Submission**

3.185 The Petitioner has submitted total sales of 5215 MU (including assessed sales on account of enforcement) for FY 2013-14 in its True up Petition as against 5545 MU approved by the Commission in its Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013.

3.186 The Petitioner has submitted the audited statement of sales against enforcement as 29 MU in FY 2013-14. However, the Petitioner has calculated the enforcement units by dividing the total revenue collected on account of enforcement during FY 2013-14

by twice the Average Billing Rate of other categories observed during FY 2013-14 and derived the enforcement units at 13 MU as per the following table:

Table 3.55: Enforcement Units considered for truing up for FY 2013-14

Sl. No.	Category	UoM	Amount	Reference
A	Total Energy Billed	MU	5215	
B	Less: enforcement Units (Actual)	MU	29	
C	Net Energy Billed	MU	5185	A-B
D	Amount billed w/o enforcement	Rs. Cr	3535	
E	Amount collected on account of enforcement	Rs. Cr	18	
F	Average Billing Rate	Rs./kWh	6.82	D/C*10
G	Units on account of enforcement	MU	13	E/(2*F)
H	Amount billed including Enforcement on normative basis	Rs. Cr	3552	D+E

Commission's Analysis

- 3.187 The Commission has analyzed category-wise monthly sales data submitted by the Petitioner for each month of FY 2013-14.
- 3.188 The validation of billing database was done at SAP Centre of the Petitioner, wherein the data was extracted from billing server of the Petitioner. The Commission directed the Petitioner to verify the sales details submitted from their billing data base for FY 2013-14. The data extracted from the system was analyzed vis-à-vis sales details submitted by the Petitioner.
- 3.189 It is observed that the Petitioner has submitted the audited statement of sales against enforcement as 29.42 MU in FY 2013-14. However, the Petitioner has calculated the enforcement units by dividing the total revenue collected on account of enforcement by twice the Average Billing Rate of other categories during FY 2013-14 and derived the enforcement units at 13 MU.
- 3.190 As per the Electricity Act, 2003 in all cases of enforcement/theft, energy has to be billed at twice the rate of the normal tariff. The Petitioner has divided the total payment received against enforcement cases by twice average billing rate for the year to arrive at realistic estimate of sales due to enforcement and so the same is accepted and the sales against enforcement are considered at 13 MU in FY 2013-14.
- 3.191 The Petitioner has submitted the own consumption as 24 MU in FY 2013-14. During the validation session, it was indicated by the Petitioner that all its installations are metered and the Own Consumption of 24.12 MU pertains to FY 2013-14 only.

However, the Commission has observed in Form 2.1(a) that the Petitioner has adjusted sales of 7.7 MU against total own consumption of 24.12 MU (16.42+7.70). The Commission enquired from the Petitioner that in spite of 100% metering at their own premises how the own consumption adjustment can be so high.

3.192 The Petitioner vide its letter dated 23.03.2015 has submitted the reply to the above said query as follows:

“The self consumption for the month of November 2013, consists of the actual metered consumption for the month and the assessment billing in few cases where the consumption could not be recorded due to non installation of meter in the past. The assessment units corresponding to these cases are approx 7.7 MUs.”

3.193 Further, the Petitioner vide its letter dated 09.04.2015 has submitted as follows:

“.....as per the directive 6.7 of the tariff order dated 31 July, 2013, BYPL have installed meters in its premises. The assessment of 7.7 MU is on account of period prior to FY 14 for the cases where the consumption could not be recorded due to non installation of meter in the past. The assessed units were not accounted for in the previous years and same is now considered in FY 14.”

3.194 As per directive 6.12 in 2nd MYT Order:

“6.12. The Commission directs DISCOMs to meter self consumption in their own premises.”

As per directive 6.7 in Tariff Order 31 July 2013:

“6.7. The Commission directs DISCOMs to meter self consumption in their own premises.”

3.195 The Commission for truing up of FY 2013-14 considers the Own Consumption during FY 2013-14 only, Thus the Commission has considered own consumption as 16.42 MU by reducing 7.7 MU pertaining to past period from the own consumption.

3.196 In the 2nd MYT Order, the Commission vide directive 6.12 has directed all DISCOMs to meter self consumption in their own premises and to raise the bills at appropriate tariff for actual consumption based on meter reading every month and the licensee may avail credit at zero tariff to the extent of the normative self consumption approved by the Commission at the end of the financial year.

3.197 It is observed that the Hon'ble APTEL in its judgement in Appeal No. 195 of 2013 (BYPL v/s A.K. Dutta) has directed the Commission to re-determine the Own Consumption for FY 2010-11 based on metered data only. The relevant extract of the said judgment is as follows:

"13.4

Accordingly, we direct the State Commission to re-determine the self consumption based on the metered data only."

3.198 By re-determining the Own Consumption based on the metered data, there will be impact in AT&C Loss figures. However, Hon'ble APTEL has clearly specified in the same judgment on the same issue that there is no direction to the Commission regarding procedure for determination of AT&C loss in the true-up of FY 2010-11. The relevant extract of the said judgment is as follows:

"13.5 As regards contention of the Appellant for determination of AT&C loss, we feel that if the self consumption is deducted from energy sales figures then corresponding reduction has to be effected in the energy input into the distribution system also. In view of our directions in para 13.4, we do not want to give any direction with regard to procedure for determination of AT&C loss in the true-up of FY 2010-11."

3.199 Therefore, the Commission decides to adhere to its past methodology regarding computation of Own consumption based on the decision vide Para 2.79 of the 2nd MYT Order that the self consumption shall be 0.25% of total sales for FY 2010-11 and shall be escalated at the rate of 2% per annum up to FY 2014-15. Accordingly, the Commission has arrived at the normative own consumption for the Petitioner as 12.20 MU (11.96*1.02) for FY 2013-14 by escalating the own consumption approved for FY 2012- 13 at the rate of 2% per annum.

3.200 It is noted that the Own Consumption over and above the normative consumption is 4.22 MU (16.42-12.20). As discussed in Para 3.13 above, the Commission decided to consider this excess own consumption of 4.22 MU at the Average Billing Rate of Rs. 10.71 per unit for FY 2013-14 of non-domestic category assuming all installations for Non-Domestic purpose as given in Form 2.1(a) submitted by the Petitioner and disallowed the same in trueing up for FY 2013-14. The additional amount to be

considered as deemed revenue billed, thus computed is Rs. 4.52 Crore ($4.22 \times 10.71/10$) on account of own consumption.

3.201 The Petitioner has submitted in its Petition that there were units adjusted of 199 MU and amount adjusted of Rs.180 Crore during FY 2013-14. The Commission observed that units adjusted are 3.8% of the total sales of the Petitioner, which is on the higher side. Accordingly, the Commission directs the Petitioner to take readings through AMR only in respect of billing of Own Consumption and also to ensure proper verification of the meter readings before generating the bill and avoid adjustment of the bills.

3.202 The trued up energy sales for FY 2013-14 as approved by the Commission are indicated in the table as follows:

Table 3.56: Trued Up Energy Sales for FY 2013-14 (MU)

Sl. No.	Category	Approved in T.O. dated 31.07.2013	Actuals as per Petitioner's Submission	Trued Up Sales for FY 2013-14	Reference
A	Domestic	2864	2804	2804	
B	Non-Domestic	1638	1614	1614	
C	Industrial	434	288	288	
D	Public Lighting	113	103	103	
E	Irrigation and Agricultural	0	0	0	
F	Railway Traction	-	-	-	
G	DMRC	192	173	173	
H	Delhi Jal Board	137	140	140	
I	DIAL	-	-	-	
J	Others	167*	92 ^{\$}	92 ^{\$}	
K	Total	5545	5215	5215	
L	Less: Enforcement	-	16	16	
M	Less: Own Consumption			7.70	
N	Approved sales	5545	5199	5191.30	(K-L-M)

\$ includes own consumption, Theft etc but exclude DIAL & DJB etc.

AT&C LOSSES

Petitioner's Submission

3.203 The Petitioner requested for revision of AT&C loss trajectory stipulated by the Commission for the Control Period from FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15 because as per MYT Regulations, 2011 the AT&C loss target for 2nd MYT Control Period ought to be set on the basis of losses at the beginning of the 2nd MYT Control Period and not on the basis of loss level on the date of privatization when the policy direction period

began. Giving various explanations, the Petitioner requested to consider the revised AT&C loss trajectory as given below:

Table 3.57: Revised AT&C loss trajectory for FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15 proposed by the Petitioner

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
1	AT&C Loss approved in 2 nd MYT Order dated July 13, 2012	18.00%	-	-	-
2	Reduction year-over-year		1.18%	1.15%	1.16%
3	AT&C Loss approved in TO dated 31.07.2013	22.07%			
4	Revised AT&C Loss target Requested		20.91%	19.75%	18.59%

- 3.204 The Petitioner has submitted that it has achieved the AT&C loss level of 21.04% for FY 2013-14 as against the target AT&C loss level of 15.66% prescribed in the Tariff Order dated 13.07.2012.
- 3.205 The Petitioner has submitted that total energy received for the consumption during the FY 2013-14 is 6577 MU at Petitioner periphery.
- 3.206 The revenue billed as submitted by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14 is Rs. 3832.00 Crore which includes 8% surcharge amount of Rs. 280.00 Crore. The Petitioner has considered Rs. 3530.00 Crore for AT&C loss calculation i.e. after excluding 8% surcharge of Rs. 280.00 Crore and other adjustment due to bad debts of Rs. 22.00 Crore.
- 3.207 The revenue collection as submitted by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14 is Rs. 3954.00 Crore which includes Electricity Duty of Rs. 157.00 Crore, and 8% surcharge of Rs. 270.00 Crore. The Petitioner has considered the collection of Rs. 3527.00 Crore for AT&C loss calculation (i.e. excluding 8% surcharge amount of Rs.27.00 Crore, and Electricity Duty of Rs 157.00 Crore 2013-14)
- 3.208 The Petitioner has computed the AT&C loss level of 21.04% during FY 2013-14 as summarized below:

Table 3.58: AT&C loss for FY 2013-14 as submitted by the Petitioner

Sl. No.	Particulars	UoM	FY 2013-14
A	Units received at BYPL periphery	MU	6577
B	Units Billed	MU	5199
C	Amount Billed	Rs. Crore	3530
D	Average Billing Rate	Rs./kWh	6.79
E	Distribution Loss	%	20.96%

Sl. No.	Particulars	UoM	FY 2013-14
F	Amount Collected	Rs. Crore	3527.00
G	Collection Efficiency	%	99.90%
H	Units Realised	MU	5194
I	AT&C Loss Level	%	21.04%

3.209 The Petitioner has requested to approve 21.04% as the AT&C loss during FY 2013-14.

Commission's Analysis

3.210 The Hon'ble APTEL has directed the Commission in Appeal No 14 of 2012, Appeal No 61 & 62 of 2012 and Appeal No. 177 & 178 of 2012, to reconsider the AT&C Loss target from FY 2011-12 to FY 2014-15. The Commission has filed a clarificatory application before Hon'ble APTEL on various issues including AT&C Loss Target, decided in above mentioned appeals on account of different judgments by Hon'ble APTEL on the same issues. The clarificatory application is sub-judice before Hon'ble APTEL and the same shall be considered after the final Order. Therefore, the Commission is considering the AT&C Loss target for FY 2013-14 as approved in 2nd MYT Order.

3.211 The Commission directed the Petitioner to show the relevant back up data with respect to energy billed (in MU), revenue billed and revenue collected (in Rs. Crore) for FY 2013-14 during the validation.

3.212 For the purpose of the validation, the Petitioner was required to bring supporting data to substantiate sales details and also to bring evidence in support of the entries, which have gone into calculation of AT&C loss. The Petitioner was also directed to bring all such evidence which it wants to rely upon to substantiate their AT&C loss calculations.

3.213 In order to conduct the prudence check to verify the reliability of sales data, the Petitioner was directed to produce month-wise billing and daily collection details for FY 2013-14. During the course of validation exercise, Petitioner's officials brought the daily collection details and billing database for FY 2013-14.

3.214 Further, Petitioner's officials have also shown their daily collection details and billing database for FY 2013-14 at their SAP Centre.

3.215 Regulation 4.7(c) of DERC (Terms and conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 specifies that collection efficiency

shall be measured as ratio of total revenue realized to the total revenue billed in the same year and that revenue realization from electricity duty and late payment surcharge shall not be included for computation of collection efficiency.

- 3.216 The Commission has decided that revenue collection on account of 8% surcharge will not be considered for computation of achievement of AT&C loss targets and also communicated the same to the Distribution licensees vide letter dated 09.05.2013.
- 3.217 The Petitioner submitted in the Petition that revenue billed during FY 2013-14 was Rs. 3530 Crore which Excludes Rs. 161 Crore on account of Electricity Duty, Rs.280 Crore on account of 8% surcharges and Rs. 22 Crore on account of other adjustment (bad debts).
- 3.218 The Petitioner in its Petition has reduced the Revenue Billed by Rs 22 Crore on account of Bad Debts written off and shown the net amount billed as Rs. 3530 Crore. The Commission is of the view that bad debts written off pertains to bills raised but not paid in the past period and the said bad debts of Rs. 22 Crore was not part of the revenue billed during FY 2013-14. Therefore, the Commission has decided not to reduce this amount from revenue billed of FY 2013-14.
- 3.219 The Petitioner has also submitted an auditor certificate in respect of Form 2.1 (a) for FY 2013-14 indicating the revenue billed as Rs. 4004.66 Crore including Electricity Duty of Rs. 161.24 Crore and Rs. 280.03 Crore on account of 8% surcharge.
- 3.220 The Commission has noted that the amount billed on account of enforcement, as included in the revenue billed in Form 2.1(a), is Rs.32.96 Crore. As per the methodology followed in the earlier tariff orders the revenue collected against enforcement during the year is only considered in the revenue billed during the year. The amount collected against enforcement as indicated in the audited financial statements is Rs.21.73 Crore.
- 3.221 The Commission has considered the revenue billed during FY 2013-14 for the purpose of AT&C Loss computation detailed in the Table as follow:

Table 3.59 Revenue billed for AT&C Loss Computation for FY 2013-14 as approved by the Commission (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Remarks
A	Revenue Billed as per Audited Form 2.1 (a)	4004.66	4004.66	
B	Add: Revenue Billed on		4.52	

Sl. No	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Remarks
	account of excess Own consumption			
C	Less: Electricity Duty	161.24	161.24	
D	Less: 8% Surcharge	280.03	280.03	
E	Less: Revenue billed on account of enforcement	32.96	32.96	
F	Add: Revenue collected on account of enforcement	21.73	21.73	Schedule 37 (m) of Audited Accounts
G	Less: Bad Debts	22		Schedule 32 of Audited Accounts
H	Net Amount Billed	3530.16	3556.68	A+B-C-D-E+F-G

3.222 The Petitioner has submitted that the revenue collected during FY 2013-14 on sale of electricity is Rs. 3527 Crore excluding Electricity Duty of Rs. 157 Crore and Rs. 270 Crore on account of 8% surcharge.

3.223 During the validation session, the Petitioner was able to match daily collection details shown to the Commission with the bank statements. Further, the collection derived from the system of the Petitioner was Rs. 3953.85 Crore which includes Electricity Duty of Rs. 156.99 Crore, LPSC earned Rs 20.06 Crore and Rs. 270.32 Crore on account of 8% surcharge.

3.224 The audited annual account for FY 2013-14 submitted by the Petitioner also indicate the revenue collected during FY 2013-14 is Rs. 3953.85 Crore which including LPSC of Rs. 20.06 Crore Electricity Duty of Rs. 156.99 Crore and 8% surcharge of Rs. 270.32 Crore.

3.225 It is observed from the Audited Accounts that revenue billed under Temporary category for FY 2013-14 was Rs. 48.07 Crore. However, no revenue collection is indicated under Temporary category in Note-37(m) of the Audited Account for FY 2013-14. The Petitioner was asked to submit the reconciliation, if any, for collection against temporary bill of 48.07 Crore during the prudence check process. The Petitioner vide its letter dated 18.03.2015 has submitted as follows:

“ It may be noted that temporary connections are created in database with starting digit of “3” in the CA number and reporting of sales against temporary connections have been done accordingly for respective months. However, while extracting corresponding collections for entire financial year for all CA number starting with “3” the total collection may be on the higher side due to cases

where some CA's might have been billed on temporary only during certain period during the financial year. There are also cases where collection has been realized against past arrears".

3.226 In view of the above, the Commission has considered the collection on account of Temporary connections as submitted by the Petitioner. However, the Commission directs the Petitioner to indicate separate line item for revenue collection under Temporary category in its Audited Accounts henceforth.

3.227 The net revenue collected during FY 2013-14 as arrived at by the Commission for calculation of AT&C loss purpose is given below:

Table 3.60: Revenue Collection during FY 2013-14

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Remarks
A	Revenue collected	3954.00	3953.85	Schedule 37 (m) of Audited Accounts
B	Less: Electricity Duty	157.00	156.99	
C	Less : 8% Surcharge	270.00	270.32	
D	Less: LPSC		20.06	
E	Net amount collected	3527.00	3506.48	A-B-C-D

3.228 The Commission has issued directive in the Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013 regarding cash payment collection as follows:

"5.96 The Commission directs the Petitioner, that in case the bill for consumption of electricity is more than Rs. 4000, payment for the bill shall only be accepted by the Petitioner by means of an Account Payee cheque/DD. However, the Commission has considered that the blind consumers shall be allowed to make payment of electricity bills, for any amount, through cash."

3.229 In view of the above, the Petitioner directed to provide the data for cash collection of more than Rs. 4000/-. Petitioner's officials expressed their limitation to get the same data extracted from SAP. Further, they were directed to provide the data from ORACLE which is their primary data collection point. The Petitioner provided the said information in soft copy.

3.230 On analysis on the said information it was observed that there were 4,97,085 numbers of cash collection transactions of more than Rs. 4000/- amounting to total of Rs.445.98 Crore. Further the Commission vide letter dated 19.03.2015 has directed the Petitioner to explain the reason for violation of the said directive. The

Petitioner in its reply in Petition No. 67 & 68 of 2011 has linked the said matter to its I. A. No. 161 of 2015 in Appeal No. 235 of 2014 as an additional ground. However, the Petitioner has not specifically replied in this regard. Accordingly, the Commission has decided to impose penalty of 10% of the total amount collected through cash payment of above Rs. 4000/-. Accordingly, the penalty payment works out to Rs. 44.59 Crore which is reduced from the ARR of FY 2013-14.

3.231 For verification of the energy input, the Commission directed State Load Dispatch Centre (SLDC) to submit the energy input for the Petitioner during FY 2013-14. SLDC submitted to the Commission that energy input to Petitioner for FY 2013-14 was 6577.01 MU. SLDC also indicated that renewable energy input from non-solar at 0.37 MU. Therefore, for calculation of AT&C loss, the Commission has considered energy input at the Petitioner periphery of 6577.38 MU as provided by SLDC instead of 6577.00 MU as submitted by the Petitioner.

3.232 Based on the above, the Commission considers the AT&C loss for FY 2013-14 for truing up purpose as shown below:

Table 3.61: AT&C Loss considered by the Commission for truing up for FY 2013 -14

Sl. No.	Particulars	Units	Approved for FY 2013-14	Remarks
A	Energy Input at Petitioner's Periphery	MU	6577.38	
B	Units Billed	MU	5191.30	Table 3.56
C	Amount Billed	Rs. Crore	3556.68	Table 3.59
D	Average Billing Rate	Rs/kWh	6.85	(C/B)*10
E	Distribution Loss	%	21.07%	(1-B/A)
F	Amount Collected	Rs. Crore	3506.48	Table 3.60
G	Collection Efficiency	%	98.59%	(F/C)
H	Units Realized	MU	5118.03	(B*G)
I	AT&C Loss Level	%	22.19%	(1-H/A)

3.233 Accordingly, the AT&C loss considered by the Commission in truing up for FY 2013-14 is summarized below:

Table 3.62: AT&C loss for FY 2013-14(%)

Particulars	Approved in the Tariff Order dated July 13, 2012	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Remarks
AT&C Loss	15.66%	21.04%	22.19%	
Distribution Loss	15.24%	20.96%	21.07%	
Collection Efficiency	99.50%	99.90%	98.59%	

3.234 The AT&C loss of 22.19% arrived in true up is higher than the target AT&C loss of

15.66% for the Petitioner as specified in the Tariff Order dated July 13, 2012 for FY 2013-14. As per Regulation 4.8 of the MYT Regulations, 2011,

“the Distribution Licensee will be eligible for incentive by the way of higher rate of Return on Equity (to be considered while calculating RoCE) for achieving lower AT&C loss level than specified in the loss reduction trajectory...

.....

...and any financial loss on account of underperformance with respect to AT&C loss targets shall be to the Licensee’s account.”

3.235 Accordingly, the under-recovery in the revenue realized on account of non-achievement of the AT&C loss target of the Petitioner for FY 2013-14 is summarized in the Table as follows:

Table 3.63: Computation of under achievement for FY 2013-14

Sl. No.	Particulars	Unit	As per AT&C loss approved for FY 2013-14 in 2 nd MYT Order	Now Approved	Remarks
A	AT&C Loss	%	15.66%	22.19%	Table 3.62
B	Under achievement	%		6.53%	
C	Energy Input	MU	6577.38	6577.38	Table 3.61
D	Units realised	MU	5547.36	5118.03	Table 3.61
E	Average Billing Rate	Rs/Unit	6.85	6.85	Table 3.61
F	Amount realised	Rs Crore	3800.63	3506.48	Table 3.60
G	Financial impact on account of under achievement which has to be borne by the Petitioner	Rs Crore	(294.15)		(3506.48-3800.63)
H	Total revenue available towards ARR for FY 2013-14 (Excluding Electricity Duty & 8% Surcharge)	Rs Crore	3800.63		

3.236 Hence, the total revenue available towards ARR for FY 2013-14 excluding Electricity Duty and 8% Surcharge has been computed by the Commission at Rs. 3800.63 Crore, which includes additional burden of Rs. 294.15 Crore to be borne by the Petitioner for underachievement of AT&C loss target for FY 2013-14.

LONG-TERM POWER PURCHASE

Petitioner’s Submission

3.237 The Petitioner has submitted that the purchases of almost 90% of the power is from

Government owned companies by virtue of long term power purchase agreement, where have been inherited from DTL (Initially signed by DTL).

3.238 The Petitioner has considered the power purchase cost during FY 2013-14 in the following manner:

- Power Purchase cost including fixed cost, variable cost, arrears, other charges etc. through all long term sources.
- Amount received on account of credit against Regulated Power has been considered and the benefit has been passed to the consumers. The Petitioner has received the credit on account of Regulated Power during FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14.
- Fixed Cost paid to the Generator during FY 2013-14 on account of Regulated Power has been considered.
- Other Payments, i.e., incentive paid to DTL and Reactive Energy Charges have been categorized under Transmission Charges instead of Power Purchase Cost from Generators.
- Late Payment Surcharge paid to the Generators on account of delay in payment of power purchase cost has not been considered.

3.239 The Petitioner further submitted the station wise/source wise quantum of power purchased during FY 2013-14 (duly reconcile with the details furnished by SLDC vide email dated June 18, 2014) during FY 2013-14 along with its cost in the table as follows:

Table 3.64: Details of Power Purchase Station wise during FY 2013-14 (MU)

S. No	Stations	Quantum (MU)	Total Charges (Rs. Cr)	Average Rate (Rs./kWh)
	Central Sector Generating Stations (CSGS)			
A	NTPC			
i	Anta Gas	52	23	4.34
ii	Auraiya Gas	39	22	5.61
iii	Dadri Gas	81	37	4.62
iv	Dadri – I	1123	497	4.43
v	Dadri – II	1472	706	4.79
vi	Farakka	42	18	4.22
vii	Kahalgaon – I	87	37	4.29
viii	Kahalgaon – II	286	119	4.16
ix	Rihand – I	180	43	2.40
x	Rihand – II	223	54	2.41

S. No	Stations	Quantum (MU)	Total Charges (Rs. Cr)	Average Rate (Rs./kWh)
xi	Rihand – III	125	39	3.14
xii	Singrauli	295	52	1.76
xiii	Unchahar – I	45	18	3.95
xiv	Unchahar – II	92	37	3.98
xv	Unchahar – III	55	24	4.30
xvi	Aravali Jhajjar	86	122	14.24
	Sub Total	4284	1847	4.31
B	NHPC			
i	Bairasul	19	4	2.14
ii	Chamera – I	48	9	1.83
iii	Chamera – II	49	18	3.63
iv	Chamera – III	32	14	4.29
v	Dhauliganga	9	5	5.47
vi	Dulhasti	74	50	6.83
vii	Salal	102	35	3.45
viii	Tanakpur	11	3	2.94
ix	Uri	75	23	3.05
x	Sewa – II	18	10	5.70
xi	Parbati – III	0	0	0
xii	Uri – II	13	6	4.31
	Sub Total	448	176	3.93
C	THDC			
i	Tehri HEP	113	52	4.61
ii	Koteshwar	40	13	3.31
	Sub Total	153	65	4.27
D	DVC			
i	Mejia Units -6 (LT-4)	93	56	6.06
ii	DVC Chandrapur 7 & 8 (LT-3)	276	145	5.25
iii	Mejia Units -7	458	337	7.37
	Sub Total	826	538	6.52
E	NPCIL			
i	NAPS	69	17	2.51
ii	RAPP B Units 3&4	0	0	0
iii	RAPP C Units 5&6	119	41	3.47
	Sub Total	188	58	3.11
F	SJVNL			
i	Naptha-Jhakri	137	33	2.39
	Sub Total	137	33	2.39
G	Others			
	Tala HEP	29	6	2.02
	Sasan UMPP	77	5	0.71
	Sub Total	106	11	1.07
H	Total CSGS	6141	2730	4.44
	Delhi Genkerating Stations			
i	BTPS	806	400	4.97
ii	Rajghat	90	59	6.53

S. No	Stations	Quantum (MU)	Total Charges (Rs. Cr)	Average Rate (Rs./kWh)
iii	Gas Turbine	277	146	5.27
iv	Pragati – I	465	195	4.21
v	Pragati -III, BAWANA	126	186	14.78
	Sub Total	1764	987	5.60
I	Credit for Regulated Power		(5.2)	-
J	Grand Total	7906	3711	4.69

3.240 The Petitioner has submitted the inert-state and intra-state Transmission loss of 270 MU and Total Transmission Charges of Rs. 421 Crore which also includes SLDC charges, NRLDC Charges, Reactive Energy Charges etc., during FY 2013-14.

Commission's Analysis

3.241 The Commission, in its Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013, had approved gross power purchase quantum of 9334 MU from all sources including Central and State Sector Generating Stations for FY 2013-14.

3.242 The Commission directed SLDC to verify the figures of Long term Power Purchase and Short term Power purchase/sale. SLDC vide its letter dated 06.04.2015 has submitted that there is variation of 4.36 MU in Long Term power purchase from the Petitioner's Audited certificate. SLDC has submitted that such variation is on account, of different Regional Energy Accounting statement considered by Petitioner & SLDC. Hence the Long term power purchase has been considered as 7905.83 MU as per SLDC clarification and indicated in the Audited Accounts of the Petitioner for FY 2013-14.

3.243 The Renewable Energy figures as verified by SLDC of Thyagraj Solar Power Plant is 0.24 MU.

3.244 The Petitioner has submitted the invoices of power purchase bills for FY 2013-14 received from individual stations which were reviewed with the figures provided in the Petition and in the audited certificate.

3.245 The Commission, in its Tariff Order dated 31.07.2013 had approved Rs. 3717.12 Crore as Gross Power Purchase Cost from Central and State Generating Stations for 9334 MU at an average rate of Rs. 3.98/kWh. The Petitioner has submitted the Gross Power Purchase Cost of Rs. 3711 Crore for purchase of 7906 MU at an average rate of Rs. 4.69/kWh as indicated in the Table 3.10.

3.246 The Commission has verified the station-wise, month-wise power purchase cost shown by the Petitioner for long term sources with the bills of the Petitioner. It is observed that major reason for increase in actual average rate of power purchase cost in comparison to the projected average power purchase cost for major Power Plants is as follows:

Power Plant	Projected Rate for FY 2013-14 (Rs./kWh)	Actual Rate FY 2013-14 (Rs./kWh)
Aravali	5.90	14.24
Rajghat	4.90	6.53
PPS-III Bawana	6.22	14.78

Avoidable Power Purchase Cost from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations

3.247 The Commission has decided that the power purchase cost from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas based station should not be considered into the total power purchase cost after the expiry date of PPA due to their high cost of generation. Further, power from Singrauli has been considered even after the expiry of PPA and its renewal without intimation to the Commission, in the interest of consumers as the generation cost from this station is Rs. 1.76/kWh which is quite less than the average Power Purchase Cost from the Petitioner's portfolio. The Petitioner has also not submitted the proposal for surrender of PPA from Singrauli.

3.248 As physically the power was received from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations in FY 2013-14, the Commission has considered all power scheduled from these stations as it was procured by the Petitioner through short term sources. Therefore, the cost of procurement of this power shall be allowed limited to the monthly average rate of exchange of Northern Region (N2) as per CERC Monthly Market Monitoring Report for FY 2013-14. Accordingly, the difference between the actual rate of power procured and Exchange Rate of Northern Region (N2) amounting to Rs. 37.78 Crore from these stations has not been considered into the power purchase cost of FY 2013-14. The calculation of the avoidable cost of power from these stations based on the above methodology is as follows:

Table 3.65: Amount Disallowed from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations during FY 2013-14

MU Purchased in FY 2012-13													
	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total
Anta Gas	3.42	2.10	2.17	6.17	6.35	2.11	4.23	4.53	5.47	6.19	5.55	4.00	52.28
Auriya Gas	2.72	1.51	2.20	5.62	4.90	2.94	3.22	2.73	2.27	3.88	3.81	2.93	38.73

Dadri Gas	4.65	2.49	4.65	9.18	6.66	8.34	9.89	6.66	5.91	7.27	9.22	5.68	80.61
Rate (Rs./kWh)													
Anta Gas	4.30	7.38	5.32	3.86	3.85	6.34	4.68	3.91	3.97	3.99	3.88	4.48	
Auriya Gas	5.73	10.73	6.86	4.44	3.13	6.43	5.74	5.84	6.77	5.95	5.30	6.21	
Dadri Gas	5.34	1.12	5.35	1.12	4.51	4.84	4.46	4.84	5.08	5.39	4.46	5.35	
N2 Exch. Rate	2.67	2.36	1.96	2.02	1.77	2.94	2.48	2.56	3.06	2.97	3.09	2.80	
Disallowed Cost (Rs. Crore)													
Anta Gas	0.56	1.05	0.73	1.14	1.32	0.72	0.93	0.61	0.50	0.63	0.44	0.67	9.29
Auriya Gas	0.83	1.27	1.08	1.36	0.67	1.02	1.05	0.89	0.84	1.15	0.84	1.00	12.01
Dadri Gas	1.24	1.93	1.58	(0.82)	1.82	1.58	1.96	1.52	1.19	1.76	1.26	1.45	16.48
TOTAL													37.78

Avoidable Power Purchase Cost - Non-Adherence of Merit Order Dispatch

3.249 As per Clause 5.4 of the Terms and Conditions of the Licence granted by the Commission to the Petitioner deals with optimisation of Power Purchase Cost which is as follows:

“The Licensee shall purchase the energy required by the Licensee for Distribution and Retail Supply in an economical manner and under a transparent power purchase or procurement process.....”

3.250 As per the above mentioned clause, the Petitioner is required to procure the power in an economical manner and the principle of Merit Order Dispatch is an integral part of this process. As per Merit Order Dispatch principle, the plants are stacked in least cost approach of their Variable Cost. The demand is then met through stations in ascending order of their Variable Cost subject to various Technical Constraints and the balance power from the left over stations after meeting the required demand, are not scheduled.

3.251 Such balance power from the left over stations could have been backed down considering Technical Constraints and such surplus power could have been avoided. Accordingly, the Commission has analysed the slot-wise data of power procurement for FY 2013-14 received from SLDC. It was observed from Petitioner's letter dtd. 19/05/2015 to SLDC wherein they have requested for back down of the stations for the months of April 2013-October 2013 that the Petitioner has requested back down of CTPS and MTPS only from June'13-Oct'13 whose variable rate were in the range of Rs. 1.58/kWh to Rs. 2.39/kWh. The plants proposed for backing down by the Petitioner to SLDC for the months of June'13-Oct'13 are as follows:

Name of the Plant	Range of Variable Rate (Rs./kWh)
MTPS#7	2.02-2.39
CTPS#7&8	1.69-1.74

3.252 However, it is pertinent to state that in the said letter the Petitioner has not properly indicated Merit Order Dispatch considering all plants in its portfolio in accordance with the variable cost. Further, it is observed from Form F1 submitted with the Petition that the average cost of higher variable cost plants were not considered for backing down in the month of November i.e., the same month in which letter for back down was given to SLDC. The details of few costlier plants which has not been considered for backing down in the months of June'13-Oct'13 are as follows:

Name of the Plant	Range of Variable Rate (Rs./kWh)
Dadri –I	2.97-3.21
Aravali	3.58-3.61
BTPS	3.08-4.54
Dadri-II	2.71-2.98
Pragati-I	2.86-3.46

3.253 Further, the Hon'ble APTEL in its judgment in Appeal No. 160 of 2012 dated 08.04.2015 (R-Infra-D v/s MERC) has ruled for avoided power purchase cost as follows:

“(vii) The Commission felt that it cannot carry out the micro analysis to quantify the exact impact of such imprudent power purchase and avoidable power purchase cost and therefore disallowed 2/3rd of the cost of Rs. 6.35 crores on account of such avoidable power purchase done from costlier firm/Day Ahead contracts which amounts to Rs. 4.23 crores.

(viii) In truing up for FY 2010-11 also the State Commission has given similar findings and disallowed 2/3rd of the cost of Rs. 22.94 crores on account of avoidable power purchase done from costlier firm/DA contracts amounting to Rs. 15.29 crores.

70. We find that the State Commission has given detailed findings and computed avoidable power purchase after analysis of the data furnished by the Appellant.

...Accordingly we do not find any reason to interfere with the findings of the

State Commission in this regard.”

3.254 Therefore, avoided Power Purchase Cost due to scheduling of Power without considering Merit Order Dispatch Principle by the Petitioner is Rs. 101.34 Crore which has been computed based on slot wise and plant wise energy details received from SLDC and considering the actual station wise average Variable rates for FY 2013-14. The said amount has not been considered in the Power Purchase Cost of FY 2013-14.

IMPACT DUE TO REGULATION OF POWER

3.255 The Commission observed that Petitioner's power was regulated from NHPC and some of the NTPC stations during part period of FY 2013-14 due to nonpayment of outstanding dues to the generators. The Petitioner vide letter dated 17.04.2015, has intimated that the fixed cost borne by them against the regulated power during FY 2013-14 was Rs. 155.96 Crore and credit of Rs. 16.76 Crore has been received against regulated power fixed cost. The Commission is of the view that the said cost of Rs. 139.20 Crore borne by the licensee is an additional burden on consumers of Petitioner's area due to non-payment of dues by the Petitioner. Therefore, the Commission has decided to disallow this amount from the power purchase cost. Further, the Petitioner may submit within one month, claim if any along with relevant documents, related to loss on sale of surplus power during the off-peak hours from regulated stations that would have been otherwise imminent in case the power was not regulated.

3.256 The Commission vide its letter dated 28.12.2012 and dated 11.04.2013 communicated its decision to the distribution licensee as follows:

“..in such cases where cheaper power is regulated due to non payment of dues and eventually distribution licensee purchases expensive power to meet the demand, at the time of true-up cost of such expensive power will be restricted to the cost of cheaper power”

3.257 Accordingly, the Commission obtained from SLDC the details of power drawn from other sources during regulation period and also the stations from which power regulation was done along with the quantum of power that would have been available if there was no regulation.

- 3.258 The Commission observed that the Petitioner has purchased 113.48 MU through Exchange, UI and banking during the periods of regulation. If the power was not regulated the Petitioner would have been received 876.84 MU at an average rate of Rs. 4.02/kWh. This weighted average per unit rate of Rs. 4.02/kWh has been arrived at considering current bill details of TPDDL pertaining to the period of regulation. Further, the Petitioner was directed vide email dtd. 06/05/2015 to clarify its Short Term Purchases in Regulation Period which changed from earlier submission of 118 MU to 18 MU as the purchases in case there had been no Regulation. However, the Petitioner had not submitted such reconciliation of information certified by SLDC. Therefore, for the Petitioner, similar treatment is provided for regulation of Power as was considered by the Commission in the Tariff Order dtd. 23/07/2014.
- 3.259 The Commission has analyzed at additional expenditure incurred for procurement of 113.48 MU by considering the average power purchase cost from various sources from which power was purchased during the period of regulation and arrived at weighted average per unit cost of Rs 2.51/kWh for 113.48 MU which were procured by the Petitioner through short term power purchase. The Commission has considered the average per unit rate of long term power procurement cost for arriving at the said weighted average cost of Rs. 4.02 per unit keeping in view that in any case the Petitioner's power is not regulated from these stations. The Commission decides to disallow this differential amount of power procurement for 113.48 MU @ (-1.50) per unit i.e., Rs. (17.05) Crore incurred in the power purchase cost for FY 2013-14.
- 3.260 As discussed above, the additional fixed cost amounting to Rs. 139.17 Crore was borne by the petitioner. In above Para, the Commission has already given the treatment to 113.48 MU out of 876.84 MU which the Petitioner would have received had his power not been regulated. The Commission, therefore, decides to disallow the prorated fixed cost against 763.36 MU (876.84 MU - 113.48 MU) which works out to Rs. 121.18 Crore ($763.36 \times (139.17/876.84)$).
- 3.261 In view of the above the details in respect of the impact amounting to Rs. 104.14 Crore (121.18-17.05) on account of regulated power in Power Purchase Cost of FY 2013-14 has been summarized below:

Table 3.66: Impact on account of Regulated Power

Regulated quantum (MU)	Energy purchased during the period of regulation (MU)	Weighted Average per unit cost of regulated quantum (Rs/KWh)	Weighted Average per unit cost of power purchased during the period of regulation (Rs/kWh)	Additional Power purchase cost (Rs. Crore)	Fixed cost borne on account of regulated power (Rs. Crore)	Total impact (Rs. Crore)
876.84	113.48	4.02	2.51	(17.05) (for 113.48 MUs)	121.18 (for 763.36MUs)	104.14

3.262 The Power Purchase quantum and cost considered by the Commission for FY 2013-14 is as detailed in the Table below:

Table 3.67: Long-Term Power Purchase quantum and cost considered for FY 2013-14

Sl. No	Stations	Quantum	Total Charges	Average Rate
		MU	Rs. Cr.	Rs./ kWh
	Central Sector Generating Stations (CSGS)			
A	NTPC			
i	Anta Gas	52	23	4.34
ii	Auraiya Gas	39	22	5.61
iii	Dadri Gas	81	37	4.62
iv	Dadri – I	1123	497	4.43
v	Dadri – II	1472	706	4.79
vi	Farakka	42	18	4.22
vii	Kahalgaon – I	87	37	4.29
viii	Kahalgaon – II	286	119	4.16
ix	Rihand – I	180	43	2.40
x	Rihand – II	223	54	2.41
xi	Rihand – III	125	39	3.14
xii	Singrauli	295	52	1.76
xiii	Unchahar – I	45	18	3.95
xiv	Unchahar – II	92	37	3.98
xv	Unchahar – III	55	24	4.30
xvi	Aravali Jhajjar	86	122	14.24
	Sub Total	4284	1847	4.31
B	NHPC			
i	Bairasul	19	4	2.14
ii	Chamera – I	48	9	1.83
iii	Chamera – II	49	18	3.63
iv	Chamera – III	32	14	4.29
v	Dhauliganga	9	5	5.47
vi	Dulhasti	74	50	6.83
vii	Salal	102	35	3.45
viii	Tanakpur	11	3	2.94
ix	Uri	75	23	3.05
x	Sewa – II	18	10	5.70

Sl. No	Stations	Quantum	Total Charges	Average Rate
		MU	Rs. Cr.	Rs./ kWh
xi	Parbati – III	0	0	
xii	Uri – II	13	6	4.31
	Sub Total	448	176	3.93
C	THDC			
i	Tehri HEP	113	52	4.61
ii	Koteshwar	40	13	3.31
	Sub Total	153	65	4.27
D	kDVC			
i	DVC Chandrapur 7&8 (LT-3)	93	56	6.06
ii	Mejia Units -6 (LT-4)	276	145	5.25
lii	Mejia Units -7	458	337	7.37
	Sub Total	826	538	6.52
E	NPCIL			
i	NAPS	69	17	2.51
ii	RAPP B Units 3&4	0	0	
iii	RAPP C Units 5&6	119	41	3.47
	Sub Total	188	58	3.11
F	SJVNL			
i	Nathpa-Jhakri	137	33	2.39
	Sub Total	137	33	2.39
G	Others			
	Tala HEP	29	6	2.02
	Sasan UMPP	77	5	0.71
	Sub Total	106	11	1.07
H	Total CSGS	6141	2730	4.44
	Delhi Generating Stations			
i	BTPS	806	400	4.97
ii	Rajghat	90	59	6.53
lii	Gas Turbine	277	146	5.27
iv	Pragati – I	465	195	4.21
v	Pragati -III, BAWANA	126	186	14.78
	Sub Total	1764	987	5.60
	Credit for Regulation of Power		-5.2	
J	Grand Total	7906	3711.47	4.69
K	Less: Avoidable Power Purchase cost from Anta, Auraiya and Dadri Gas stations		(37.78)	
L	Less: Avoidable Power Purchase cost due to Non-Adherence of Merit order Dispatch		(101.34)	
M	Less: Disallowance due to Additional Fixed Cost on account of regulated power		(104.14)	
N	Net Total	7906	3468.21	4.39

3.263 The Commission has noted that the Transmission Charges incurred during FY 2013-14 are 421.26 Crore as submitted by the Petitioner. The Commission considers the Transmission Charges during FY 2013-14 at Rs. 421.26 Crore, indicated in the

Annexure-1 of the Audited Accounts for FY 2013-14, as follows:

i. PGCIL Charges	:	Rs. 259.58 Crore
ii. Delhi Transco Ltd	:	Rs. 121.88 Crore
iii. Other Transmission Charges	:	Rs. 13.32 Crore
iv. Open Access Charges	:	Rs. 25.31 Crore
v. Other Payments	:	Rs. 1.17 Crore
vi. Total	:	Rs. 421.26 Crore

SHORT TERM POWER PURCHASE

Petitioner's Submission

3.264 The Petitioner submitted source wise details of Power purchased on short term basis during FY 2013-14 in order to meet the peak demand as follows:

Sl. No.	Particulars	MU	Amount (Rs. Cr.)	Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
1	Bilateral	30.03	11.17	3.72
2	Banking	437.36	171.18	3.91
3	Exchange	32.94	11.47	3.48
4	Intrastate	1.72	0.72	4.17
5	UI	13.19	4.37	3.32
6	Total	515.24	198.91	3.86

3.265 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to consider the additional UI Charges and Trading Margin paid to the related party i.e., Reliance Energy Trading Limited (RETL) as legitimate cost under short term power purchase cost.

3.266 The Petitioner submitted source wise details of surplus Power sold through short term basis as follows:

Sl. No.	Particulars	MU	Amount (Rs. Crore)	Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
1	Bilateral	30.51	9.35	3.06
2	Banking	475.79	165.66	3.48
3	Exchange	589.86	118.80	2.01
4	Intra state	1.21	0.85	7.06
5	UI	475.92	69.11	1.45
6	Total	1573.29	363.77	2.31

Commission's Analysis

3.267 For the process of prudence check for FY 2013-14 of Short term purchase, the Commission issued detailed formats for short term power purchase vide its letter dated 04.03.2015. The Petitioner has submitted the information in the said formats

on 27.03. 2015.

3.268 The Commission compared the Short Term Power Purchase through different modes in FY 2012-13 with respect to FY 2013-14 as follows:

Table 3.68: Comparison of Short-Term Power Purchase Quantum (MU)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2012-13		FY 2013-14	
		Energy (MU)	(%)	Energy (MU)	(%)
A	Purchase				
1	Bilateral	0	0	30.03	5.82
2	Banking	514	93	437.36	84.89
3	Exchange	20	4	32.94	6.39
4	Intrastate	7	1	1.72	0.33
5	UI	14	3	13.19	2.56
6	Total Purchase	556		515.24	

Table 3.69: Comparison of Short-Term Power Purchase Cost (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2012-13		FY 2013-14	
		Rate per Unit	Amount (Rs. Crore)	Rate per Unit	Amount (Rs. Crore)
	Purchase				
1	Bilateral	-	-	3.72	11.17
2	Banking	3.98	205	3.91	171.18
3	Exchange	4.12	8	3.48	11.47
4	Intra state	4.29	3	4.18	0.72
5	UI	1.37	2	3.32	4.37
	Total Purchase	3.93	218	3.86	198.91

3.269 The Commission observed that the Petitioner has not made its efforts to increase its transactions under Banking mode. The purchase under Banking has decreased from 93% to 85% from FY 2012-13 to FY 2013-14 and also there are higher purchases in UI mode.

3.270 The Commission observed that the Petitioner has sold 1573.29 MU of Surplus Energy under short term arrangements as follows:

Table 3.70: Comparison of Short-Term Power Sale (MU)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2012-13		FY 2013-14	
		Energy (MU)	(%)	Energy (MU)	(%)
A	Sale				
1	Bilateral	347	13	30.51	1.94
2	Banking	648	25	475.79	30.24
3	Exchange	528	20	589.86	37.49
4	Intra state	57	2	1.21	0.08
5	UI	1055	40	475.92	30.25
6	Total of Sale	2634		1573.29	

Table 3.71: Comparison of Short-Term Power Sales (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2012-13		FY 2013-14	
		Rate per Unit	Amount (Rs. Crore)	Rate per Unit	Amount (Rs. Crore)
	Sale				
1	Bilateral	3.58	124	3.06	9.35
2	Banking	3.75	243	3.48	165.66
3	Exchange	2.65	140	2.01	118.80
4	Intra state	4.23	24	7.02	0.85
5	UI	2.75	290	1.45	69.11
	Total of Sale	3.12	821	2.31	363.77

3.271 It is observed from the above table that there is huge quantum of short term sales under UI mode – 30% of total sales. Bilateral has reduced from 13% in FY 2012-13 to 1.94% in FY 2013-14 whereas sales under banking transaction have increased from 25% in FY 2012-13 to 30.24% in FY 2013-14. Further, it has been observed that the Petitioner has sold surplus power of 1573.29 MU and purchased 515.24 MU from short term sources to meet the demand. The Commission is of the view that the Petitioner should enter into increased banking transactions against available surplus power to avoid the short term power purchase requirement.

3.272 The Petitioner has received Rs. 363.77 Crore (@ Rs. 2.31 per unit) on short term power sale of 1573 MU out of which Rs. 9.35 Crore (2.57% @ Rs.3.06 per unit) was sold under bilateral, Rs. 69.11 Crore (19.00% @ Rs. 1.45 per unit) through UI, Rs. 165.66 Crore (45.54% @ Rs. 3.48 per unit) under banking arrangement, Rs. 118.80 Crore (32.66% @ Rs. 2.01 per unit) through exchange and Rs. 0.85 Crore (0.23% @ Rs. 7.06 per unit) under intra-state arrangement.

3.273 It is observed that the rate of sale of surplus power is higher under banking transaction arrangements (Rs. 3.48 per unit) followed by Exchange (Rs. 2.01 per unit) and UI (Rs.1.45 per unit) during FY 2013-14.

3.274 BYPL has sold power of 863 MU in the months of Apr'2013 to September'2013. Out of which 425 MU was sold at UI, 404 MU was sold at Exchanges, 7 MU through Banking and 25 MU through Bilateral. It is observed that majority of Surplus Power is sold in Exchanges and UI rather than Bilateral and Banking as prescribed in Short Term guidelines and direction given by the Commission in various Tariff Orders to optimize Power Purchase Cost.

Excessive Quantum of Transactions in UI mode

3.275 The Commission vide its letter dated 20.01.2010 had already issued directions for procurement and sale of power by Distribution Licensees as follows:

“7..... the Distribution Licensee, for any reason whatsoever, the Licensee may enter into a short-term arrangement or agreement for procurement of power/ sale of power through a transparent process of open tendering and competitive bidding in accordance with these guidelines.”

3.276 UI charges under ABT mechanism were incorporated to maintain Grid Discipline and benefit those entities which support Grid and penalize those which hamper Grid so as to maintain Grid frequency near to 50 Hz. CERC vide its Order dtd. 4/01/2000 has dealt up the reason for implementation of UI Charges under ABT mechanism as follows:

*“...Apart from the two charges, a third charge contemplated in the ABT scheme is for the unscheduled interchange of power (UI charges). The UI charges are payable/receivable depending upon who has deviated from the schedule and also subject to the grid conditions at that point of time. **This is the element, which is expected to bring about discipline in the system.**”*

3.277 It is observed that the Petitioner has sold Surplus Power of 863 MU in the months of Apr '13 to Sept '13 out of which 425 MU were sold in UI, 404 MU was sold at Exchanges, 7 MU through Banking and 25 MU through Bilateral. The month wise details of power sold and rate observed as indicated in the audited accounts for FY 2013-14 is summarized in the table as follows:

Particulars		Apr-13	May-13	Jun-13	Jul-13	Aug-13	Sep-13	Total
Bilateral	MU	0.32	0.21	8.10	13.69	3.18	0.00	25.50
	% of Total ST	0%	0%	6%	8%	3%	0%	3%
Exchange	Total MU	112.60	94.99	42.13	89.42	38.48	26.79	404.41
	% of Total ST	71%	47%	30%	51%	37%	34%	47%
	Total Rate	2.39	2.17	1.82	1.71	1.33	2.66	1.84
Banking	MU	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.43	0.00	6.83
	% of Total ST	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	1%
	Rate	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	3.94
Intra state	MU	0.26	0.03	0.50	0.04	0.14	0.14	1.11
	% of Total ST	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
UI	MU	45.40	108.69	90.59	72.84	56.24	51.32	425.08

Particulars	Apr-13	May-13	Jun-13	Jul-13	Aug-13	Sep-13	Total
% of Total ST	29%	53%	64%	41%	54%	66%	49%
Rate	1.86	1.64	2.46	1.21	1.09	1.76	0.98
Total MU	158.98	203.92	141.32	175.99	104.47	78.25	862.93

3.278 Further, the Petitioner in its Petition has submitted as follows:

“3.5.11 The Petitioner put its all-out-efforts to maximize the revenue through sale of surplus power. However, the Petitioner was able to realize the revenue through sale of surplus power at an average rate of Rs. 2.31 per kWh”

3.279 It is observed from the above that Petitioner has not put its all serious efforts to maximize the revenue through sale of surplus power which is clear from the fact that there has been very less quantum of Sale of Surplus Power in Banking and Bilateral mode for 6 months (Apr '13 to Sept '13). Instead the surplus power during these months was majorly sold in Exchanges and in UI at very low rate ranging from Rs. 1.09/kWh – Rs. 2.46 /kWh.

3.280 The Commission observed that there was scope for better management of the process for short term sale of the surplus power so as to significantly promote the interest of the consumers. The Commission is of the view that Petitioner should endeavor to maximize revenue from sale of surplus power and enter into increased banking, intrastate transactions. Competitive bids by giving wide publication, have to be floated for sale of surplus power at better rate.

3.281 The Commission had directed the Petitioner in Tariff Order dated 31 July, 2013 for short term transactions during FY 2013-14 as follows:

“6.9 All effort shall be made for prudence in short term sale and purchase so as optimize power purchase cost.”

3.282 Further, the Commission vide its letter dated 20 January, 2010 had already issued directions for procurement and sale of power by Distribution Licensee as follows:

“7..... the Distribution Licensee, for any reason whatsoever, the licensee may enter into a short-term arrangement or agreement for procurement of power/sale of power through a transparent process of open tendering and competitive bidding in accordance with these guidelines.

8. Distribution Licensee shall adopt a bid evaluation or scoring system that is

sufficiently comprehensive and transparent to permit a competitive result which identifies the least cost proposal for procurement and highest in case of sale of power.

.....

15. The Distribution Licensees endeavor should be first to dispose off surplus power through banking transaction. Such banking transactions should be tried at first on direct basis."

3.283 Therefore, the Commission is of the view that UI Charges cannot be treated as mode of transaction to dispose off major share of Surplus power at low rate.

3.284 The month wise analysis of ratio of power sold under UI to Gross Power Purchase for various DISCOMs is indicated in the table as follows:

Table 3.72: Percentage of UI Sale v/s. Gross Power Purchase in FY 2013-14

DISCOMs	Apr'13	May'13	Jun'13	Jul'13	Aug'13	Sep'13	Oct'13	Nov'13	Dec'13	Jan'14	Feb'14	Mar'14
BRPL	1.08	0.07	2.21	1.78	1.43	0.32	0.76	2.02	0.14	1.81	0.66	0.00
BYPL	6.52	11.88	10.40	7.75	7.05	6.64	3.06	2.25	0.63	0.95	0.00	1.91
TPDDL	4.18	4.59	2.99	1.91	2.80	1.72	1.27	2.05	1.20	0.47	0.78	1.60

3.285 This ratio is maximum for BYPL during various months on an average basis. Further, sale of power under UI is linked to real time frequency mechanism which cannot be 100% avoided due to dynamic power system. However, there has to be certain contingency limit to dispose of surplus power in UI, which was fixed at 3% on Gross Power Purchase for every month. Thus, percentage sale over and above the contingency limit is set off with the differential rate of Exchange v/s. UI Rate for BYPL. The disallowed cost arrived at is indicated in the Table as follows:

Table 3.73: Disallowed power purchase cost on account of UI sale during FY 2013-14

Particulars	Apr'13	May'13	Jun'13	Jul'13	Aug'13	Sep'13	Oct'13	Nov'13	Dec'13	Jan'13	Feb'13	Mar'13
Gross Power Purchase (MU)	696.19	915.17	870.67	939.73	797.27	773.16	613.33	527.22	556.94	620.03	549.04	564.79
UI Sale (MU)	45.40	108.69	90.59	72.84	56.24	51.32	18.76	11.87	3.53	5.86	0.00	10.77
% Sale through UI	6.52	11.88	10.40	7.75	7.05	6.64	3.06	2.25	0.63	0.95	0.00	1.91
UI Rate (Rs./kWh)	1.86	1.64	2.46	1.21	1.09	1.76	1.12	1.64	3.91	2.82	0.00	(0.07)
Exchange Rate (Rs./kWh)	2.39	2.17	1.82	1.71	1.33	2.66	1.99	1.85	2.08	1.95	1.76	1.95
Disallowed Amount (Rs. Cr.)	1.31	4.35	(4.16)	2.25	0.78	2.55	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.286 Accordingly, as shown in the above table, the Commission has decided to disallow Rs. 7.11 Crore during FY 2013-14.

3.287 In view of the above, the Commission directs the Petitioner should enter into

increased Banking Transactions against available surplus power to avoid the short term power purchase requirement.

- 3.288 On a query from the Commission, the Petitioner has submitted that they had floated/participated in tenders floated by the other utilities and also sold some of the surplus power to other states through traders.
- 3.289 The Commission observed that Petitioner has also sold/purchased power by entering into contracts for which offers were received after telephonic discussions/e-mails. It is observed that the Petitioner has not followed the tendering process in these cases. The Petitioner has also purchased/sold substantial quantum in banking but no tendering process was followed to enter into contracts for this purpose.
- 3.290 The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the details of process followed by the Petitioner for load forecast, projection of surplus/deficit power, procurement/sale of deficit/surplus power. The Petitioner explained the methodology followed by them for short-term purchase/sales. The Petitioner submitted that slot wise estimations for shortages/surplus are made on an on-going basis based on demand projected by SLDC as well as internal projections and availability as per the most recent outages.
- 3.291 The Commission has taken serious view of not following the guidelines issued by the Commission to purchase or sell short-term power. The Commission therefore, directs the Petitioner to strictly adhere to the guidelines for procurement/sale of power through short term as issued by the Commission.
- 3.292 The Petitioner has shown the rebate on power purchase and transmission charges at Rs. 19.00 Crore for FY 2013-14 considering the maximum normative rebate @1% for prompt payment of bills.
- 3.293 In paragraph 5.24 of DERC (Terms and conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011, it is specified that :

“Distribution licensee shall be allowed to recover the net cost of power it procures from sources approved by the Commission, viz. Intra-State and Inter-State Trading Licences, Bilateral Purchases, Bulk Suppliers, State generators, Independent Power Producers, Central generating stations, non-conventional energy generators, generation business of the Distribution Licensee and others,

assuming maximum normative rebate available from each source for payment of bills through letter credit on presentation of bills for supply to consumers of Retail Supply Business”.

3.294 The maximum normative rebate has to be considered in the Power Purchase Cost as per the Regulation mentioned above. The Commission has arrived at the rebate-able amount of Rs. 6087 Crore as provided by the Petitioner. The Commission has considered maximum normative rebate allowed to the Petitioner from long term power purchase and considered rebate at the rate of 2% on transmission charges (excluding open access charges) and arrived at total normative rebate amounting to Rs. 81.56 Crore as shown below:

Table 3.74: Computation of Normative Rebate (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Rebatable Amount	Rebate
Gross Power Purchase Cost from long term sources	3669	73.38
Total Transmission charges (Inter State + Intra State)	409	8.18
Total	4078	81.56

3.295 Hence, the Commission has considered the normative rebate as Rs. 81.56 Crore while computing the net Power Purchase Cost for FY 2013-14. Since the Commission has reduced the power purchase cost by maximum normative rebate available towards payment of bills, actual rebate received by the petitioner during FY 2013-14 will be dealt later in the chapter under non-tariff income.

3.296 The Commission observed that UI charges claimed by the Petitioner also included penal/additional UI charges towards power availed.

3.297 The Commission directed SLDC to specify the penal/additional UI charges (i.e. when the power was drawn while the grid frequency was less than 49.7 Hz) paid on account of additional UI charges during FY 2013-14. SLDC vide its letter dated 06.04.2015 has submitted Rs. 0.65 Crore on account of additional UI charges during FY 2013-14. The Commission as a deterrent action has decided that any penal/additional UI charges will not be allowed in the power purchase cost.

3.298 The Commission has issued directives in Tariff order dated 31.07.2013 as follows:

“6.10. The DISCOM shall become a Trading Member of IEX and purchases on exchange shall not be made through related party / trader.”

3.299 The Petitioner has purchased 25.99 MU and sold 423.19 MU through IEX, engaging

Reliance Energy Trading Limited (RETL) which is a related party and also paid trading margin of Rs. 0.05 Crore on purchase of energy @ Rs.0.0195 per unit and a trading margin of Rs. 0.80 Crore on sale of power @ Rs.0.019 per unit to RETL. The Petitioner has also paid an additional amount of Rs. 1.00 lakh to RETL as client membership fee which is trading on their behalf on IEX. The Commission in accordance with the above directive has decided to disallow this expenditure of Rs. 0.86 Crore.

3.300 With the above observations and considering the principle of avoidable Power Purchase Cost upheld by the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 160 of 2012 dated 08.04.2015, the Commission approves the total power purchase cost for FY 2013-14 , as summarized in the table as follows:

Table 3.75: Trued-up Power Purchase cost for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Approved in Tariff Order Dated 31.7.2013	Petitioner's submission	Now Approved	Reference
A	Gross Power Purchase Cost	3766	3910	3,910.38	
B	Less: Cost of Surplus Power Sold	986	364	363.77	
C	Net Power Purchase Cost	2,780.00	3,546.00	3,546.61	A-B
D	Total Transmission Charges	340.00	422.00	421.26	
E	Total Power Purchase Cost	3,120.00	3,968.00	3967.87	C+D
F	Less: Normative Rebate	(81.00)	(19.00)	(81.56)	
G	Net Power Purchase Cost including Transmission charges	3,039.00	3,949.00	3,886.31	E+F
H	Less: Cost of disallowed power on account of UI	-	-	(7.11)	
I	Less: Additional UI charges disallowed	-	-	(0.65)	
J	Less: Additional costs borne for purchased of power against Regulated quantum	-	-	(104.14)	
K	Less: Trading margin paid to related party RETL	-	-	(0.86)	
L	Less: Avoided Power Purchase Cost from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Stations	-	-	(37.78)	
M	Less: scheduling of power without considering merit order	-	-	(101.34)	
N	Trued up Power Purchase Cost	-	-	3,634.43	G-sum(H,M)

3.301 The Commission as detailed in the above table approves the Power Purchase Cost at

Rs. 3634.43 Crore (including Transmission charges) for FY 2013-14 in truing up.

RENEWABLE PURCHASE OBLIGATION (RPO)

3.302 The Petitioner & BRPL has requested reconsideration of compliance of RPO for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 in Petition No. 30 & 31 of 2015. The Commission will decide regarding levy of penalty, if any, for non-compliance of RPO in the final Order of the Petition No. 30 & 31 of 2015. The impact as per the Order in the said Petition shall be considered in the subsequent Tariff Order and the same will be applicable for the Petitioner as well.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES

Petitioner's Submission

3.303 The Petitioner has submitted that the Commission in Tariff order dated July 23, 2014 ruled as under:

"3.141 The Regulation 5.4 of MYT Regulations, 2011 specifies that "the licensee shall submit the O&M expenses for the Control Period as prescribed in MYT filing procedure. The O&M expenses for the Base year shall be approved by the Commission taking in to account the latest available audited accounts, business plan filed by the licensees, estimates of the actuals for the Base year, prudence check and any other factor considered appropriate by the Commission".

3.142 Further, Regulation 5.5 of MYT Regulations, 2011 specifies the formula for determination of O&M expenses permissible towards ARR for each year of the Control Period.

3.143 The Regulation 4.21(b)(i) of the MYT Regulations, 2011, specify that "any surplus or deficit on account of O&M expenses shall be to the account of the Licensee and shall not be trued up in ARR". The Commission in consonance to the above regulations has determined the employee expenses and A&G expenses of the Petitioner for the Control Period from FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15 in the MYT order dated July 13, 2012. The Commission has discussed in detail the methodology and computation of Employee expenses and A&G expenses in the MYT order dated July 13, 2012. Accordingly, the Commission has considered the

employee expenses and A&G expenses as allowed in the MYT order dated July 13, 2012 for truing up of FY 2012-13”.

3.304 The Petitioner has requested to reconsider the benchmarking of the O&M expenses for the 2nd MYT period in accordance with the judgment of APTEL in Appeal No.171 of 2012.

Table 3.76: O&M Expenses projected by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Approved in Tariff Order of July 31, 2013	Petitioner's submission
Employee Expenses	230.37	235.87
A&G Expenses	56.61	60.89
R&M Expenses	82.51	82.51
Gross O&M Expenses	369.49	379.27
Efficiency Factor %	3.00%	
Less: Efficiency improvement	11.08	
Add: SVRS Pension	4.92	4.92
Net O&M expenses	363.33	384.19

Commission's Analysis

3.305 As per the revision in the methodology pursuant to judgment of Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal 171,177 and 178 of 2012, the Commission has revised the O&M expenses. The revised O&M Expenses, now approved for FY 2013-14 are as below:

Table 3.77: O&M Expenses approved by the Commission for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Approved in Tariff Order of July 13, 2012	Petitioner's submission	Now Approved	Reference
A	Employee Expenses	230.37	235.87	216.79	
B	A&G Expenses	56.61	60.89	70.32	
C	R&M Expenses	82.51	82.51	66.92	
D	Gross O&M Expenses	369.49	379.27	354.03	A+B+C
E	Efficiency Factor %	3.00%	0.00%	3.00%	MYT order dated 13.07.2012
F	Less: Efficiency improvement	11.08	0.00	10.62	D*E
G	Add: SVRS Pension	4.92	4.92	2.97	As actually paid by the Petitioner
H	Net O&M expenses	363.31	384.19	345.88	D-F+G

Other Expenses

3.306 The Petitioner has claimed Rs. 32.00 Crore towards other expenses in the Truing up for FY 2013-14 as detailed in the table below:

Table 3.78: Miscellaneous Expenses claimed in Truing up for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
1	Incremental license fee paid to DERC	0.5
2	Fees for geo-spatial access	0.3
3	Syndication fees / borrowing costs	31.2
4	Total	32.0

Commission's Analysis

3.307 The Petitioner has claimed additional expenses over and above the approved normative O&M expenditure for FY 2013-14 as Other Expenses.

3.308 The Commission has reviewed the other expenses claimed by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14. The A&G expenditure for FY 2013-14 in MYT Order dated July 13, 2012 has been determined based on the actual A&G expenditure incurred by the Petitioner as per the audited financial statements adjusted by certain expenses. The relevant extracts of the Tariff order dated July 13, 2012 are as below:

"4.199 The Commission has removed abnormal expenses such as provision for retirement of fixed assets, Loss on Sale/Discarding of Assets, Provision for Doubtful debts, Inventory of stores and spares written off, bad debts written off, transfer from opening provision of doubtful debts and has added lease rentals transferred from R&M expenses to the total A&G expenses as per submission of the Petitioner.

Revised A&G expenses (Rs. Cr) calculated by the Commission

Particulars	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
A&G expenses as per audited accounts	136.82	157.58	108.28	144.94	109.62
Less: Provision for retirement of fixed assets	-	-	-	14.48	12.29
Less: Loss on Sale/Discarding of Assets	1.18	2.25	2.23	0.22	2.88
Less: Provision for Doubtful Debts	76.05	91.99	41.14	-	20.24
Less: Bad Debts Written off	-	-	-	-	199.59
Less: Inventory of Stores & Spares Written Off	-	-	-	-	-
Less: Transfer from opening provision for doubtful debts	-	-	-	78.24	(199.59)
Less: Fines and Penalties inc under Sundry Expenses				1.68	
Add: Lease Rentals transferred from R&M cost	1.57	1.55	2.42	1.54	1.55
Net A&G Cost	61.16	64.89	67.33	51.86	75.76

3.309 The other expenses claimed by the petitioner are analysed and discussed below:

Licensee fees paid to DERC

Petitioner's Submission

3.310 The Petitioner has claimed Rs. 0.52 Crore towards incremental license fees paid to DERC for FY 2013-14.

Commission's Analysis

3.311 The license fee is applicable on actual sales for the respective years which is uncontrollable. Accordingly, the Commission has considered the difference of normative license fee covered under A&G expenses of Rs.1.19 crore and actual paid amount of Rs.1.71 crore and allowed Rs.0.52 Crore for FY 2013-14.

Fees for geo-spatial access

Petitioner's Submission

3.312 The Petitioner has submitted that in accordance with clause 6(e) of Delhi Geospatial Data Infrastructure Act, 2011, Department of IT, GoNCTD office Memo No. F6(65)/IT/2011/911-942 approved the fees of Rs.0.25 lakhs for usage of Geo-spatial data. The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow the annual fees to be paid on account of geo-spatial access as the same was not factored in the actual base year expenses of FY 2010-11.

Commission's Analysis

3.313 The Petitioner furnished the GoNCTD circular regarding Fees for Geo-Spatial access. During the prudence check, the Petitioner was asked to provide the payment receipt on account of fees paid for Geo-spatial access. The Petitioner has further submitted that the waiver of the fees on account of Geo-Spatial Access is sought from GoNCTD vide letter dated March 4, 2013.

3.314 The Petitioner has not submitted the payment receipt towards fees paid for Geo-Spatial Access to GoNCTD, therefore the same is not considered by the Commission for true up of FY 2013-14. The same will be considered on producing the receipt by the Petitioner but without considering any carrying cost.

Syndication fees / borrowing costs / Documentation**Petitioner's Submission**

3.315 The Petitioner has submitted that the syndication fee has not been considered while projection of A&G expenses for 2nd control period. For the purpose of availing loans, the banks in the ordinary course of its business have charged various bank charges. Additionally, the lead bank in a consortium of lenders charged syndication fee which is advalorem to the quantum of the syndication. The Petitioner has claimed syndication fee on actual basis in the true up for FY 2013-14 since the original projection of expenses did not include any projection on this account. The Petitioner is claiming syndication fees and bank charges as a part of miscellaneous charges and not as a part of capitalisation. It is clarified that the bank charges and syndication charges are claimed as a revenue item and not as a capital expense. Further, these expenses are uncontrollable in nature and directly linked to the increase in Regulatory assets ought to be allowed in the ARR. Accordingly, syndication fees/borrowing cost of Rs.31.19 Crore incurred during FY 2013-14 is claimed as part of miscellaneous expenses.

Commission's Analysis

3.316 As per Regulation 5.6 of the MYT Regulations, 2011, *"Return on Capital Employed (RoCE) shall be used to provide a return to the Distribution Licensee, and shall cover all financing costs, without providing separate allowances for interest on loans and interest on working capital"*.

3.317 As per Accounting standard (AS 16-Borrowing Costs) issued by Institute of Chartered Accountants of India and notified by Companies amendment Act 1999,

"6. Borrowing costs that are directly attributable to the acquisition, construction or production of a qualifying asset should be capitalized as part of the cost of that asset. The amount of borrowing costs eligible for capitalisation should be determined in accordance with this Statement. Other borrowing costs should be recognised as an expense in the period in which they are incurred."

3.318 Conjoint reading of all the three extracts above, the Commission is of the view that the borrowing costs directly related to the capital assets shall be added to the cost of such capital assets.

3.319 The Commission is of the view that only the borrowing cost will be considered at the time of final true up of capitalisation. Accordingly, the Commission has not considered the syndication and documentation charges claimed by the Petitioner. Accordingly, the Commission has not considered syndication fees etc. of Rs.31.19 Crore as part of miscellaneous expenses.

3.320 Based upon the above analysis, the total amount considered under the head “Other Expenses” against the expenses claimed by the Petitioner is given in the table below:

Table 3.79: Other Expenses considered in Truing up for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now approved
1	Incremental license fee paid to DERC	0.52	0.52
2	Fees for geo-spatial access	0.25	
3	Syndication fees / borrowing costs	31.19	
4	Total	31.96	0.52

Non Tariff Income

Petitioner's Submission

3.321 The Petitioner in its true up petition has considered Non Tariff Income of Rs. 90.05 Crore for FY 2013-14, against Rs. 78.95 Crore approved in the Tariff Order for FY 2013-14. The details of Non Tariff Income submitted by the Petitioner are shown below:

Table 3.80: Non Tariff Income submitted by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Petitioners projections
I	As per Audited Accounts	
A	Other Operating revenue	89.15
B	Other Income	68.17
II	Total (A+B)	157.32
C	Income from normative interest on Consumer Security Deposit	32.00
III	Total NTI	189.32
1	Less: Income from other business	20.27
A	Consultancy business	7.68
B	Street light maintenance business	12.59
IV	Net NTI	169.05
1	Less: Financing cost of LPSC	20.00
2	Less: Rebate on Power Purchase and Transmission charges	19.00
3	Less: Write-back of Miscellaneous provisions	6.00
4	Less: Short term gain	5.00
5	Less: Bad debts recovered	3.00

Sl. No	Particulars	Petitioners projections
6	Less: UI interest	21.00
7	Less: Sale of Scrap	5.00
V	Total (1 to 7)	79.00
	Total : Non Tariff Income (IV - V)	90.05

Commission's Analysis

3.322 Regulation 5.36 of the MYT Regulations, 2011 states that

"The amount received by the licensee on account of Non Tariff Income shall be deducted from the aggregate revenue requirement in calculating the net revenue requirement of such licensee".

3.323 Regulation 5.37 of the MYT Regulation, 2011 states:

"where the licensee is engaged in any other business, the income from such business shall be calculated as per DERC Treatment of Income from Other Business of Transmission Licensee and Distribution Licensee Regulation, 2005 and shall be deducted from the aggregate revenue requirement, in calculating the revenue requirement of the Licensee".

3.324 A joint reading of both the above clauses indicates that NTI and other income being an integral part of the revenue requirement shall be trued up at the end of each year of the Control Period.k

3.325 The Commission in the MYT order July 13, 2012 had approved Rs.78.95 Crore towards Non-tariff Income (NTI) for FY 2013-14. Item wise analysis of the income from other business and NTI is given as below:

Income from Other than Licensed business

Consultancy business

Petitioner's Submission

3.326 The Petitioner has submitted that REAP technology has been developed in collaboration with IIT, Delhi and engaged its existing manpower, additional new manpower as well as external technical expertise. The petitioner has received gross amount of Rs.7.68 Crore and has expended Rs.6.46 Crore and earned net profit of Rs.1.22 Crore from the project. The Petitioner has proposed Rs.0.41 Crore being 1/3rd of this amount, may be transferred to the consumers and 2/3rd may be allowed

to be retained by the Petitioner.

Commission's Analysis

- 3.327 As per the Regulation 5.37 of the MYT Regulations, 2011 the income from other business shall be calculated as per "DERC Treatment of Income from other business of Transmission Licensee and Distribution Licensee Regulations, 2005". The Regulation 5 (5) of the said Regulation, specify that the licensee shall retain 20% of the revenues arising on account of other business and pass on the remaining 80% of the revenues to the regulated business.
- 3.328 As per the audited accounts of FY 2013-14, the Non-tariff income includes Rs.7.68 Crore received as income from REAP project and the REAP project expenses of Rs.6.46 Crore is shown under A&G expenses. The Petitioner has received net income of Rs.1.22 Crore (Income from REAP project Rs.7.68 Crore - REAP project expenses Rs.6.46 Crore) from the consultancy services and is treated as income from other business. As per the "Regulation 5.37 of the MYT Regulations 2011" read with "Regulation 5(5) of the DERC Treatment of Income from other business of Transmission Licensee and Distribution Licensee Regulations 2005", the licensee shall retain 20% of the revenue i.e. Rs. 0.24 Crore arising out of such other business and the remaining 80% i.e. Rs. 0.98 Crore shall be considered in the ARR. The Commission allows the Petitioner Rs.6.70 Crore (being Rs.0.24 Crore towards 20% of net income earned and the REAP project expenses of Rs.6.46 Crore which was shown separately under A&G expenses) and reduced the same from Non-tariff income of FY 2013-14.

Street Light maintenance business

Petitioner's Submission

- 3.329 The Petitioner has submitted that the net Income earned from the streetlight maintenance business is other than the distribution business of electricity to the consumers. Further, as per Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Treatment of Income from Other Business of Transmission Licensee and Distribution Licensee) Regulations, 2005 the amount earned by the Petitioner as the Commission paid by MCD may be allowed.
- 3.330 It is further submitted that the Commission vide its Order dated March 5, 2004

recognized the following:

“...The DISCOMS also raised the issue of ownership of the streetlights and had also submitted that since the maintenance of the streetlights was not the core job of the DISCOMs, the DISCOMS should be given some monetary incentive for this assignment.”

3.331 The Petitioner further submitted that the Commission understood that the maintenance of streetlights was not “related to Licensed Business” in terms of DERC Tariff Regulations, 2011. As the streetlights are not owned by the petitioner and moreover in terms of the License granted to the Petitioner and the provisions related to distribution of Electricity under the Electricity Act 2003, the services for maintenance of street light is other than the distribution business of electricity of the Petitioner to its consumers. Accordingly, the Petitioner has claimed Rs.8.92 Crore as income retained from street light business after passing 1/3 (Rs.4.46 Crore) into ARR for FY 2013-14.

Commission’s Analysis

3.332 The Commission in its order dated March 5, 2004 regarding directions for street lighting in the areas of MCD stated,

“11. ... The best way doing this would be to have an in-built system of providing incentives in case of good performance and likewise, impose penalties in case the performance is lower than expectations...”

➤ *The Commission would like to evolve a system whereby good performance is rewarded. Similarly, poor performance also needs to be discouraged and therefore, the Commission directs that full maintenance charges may be paid for 90% performance. Performance higher than 90% shall earn an incentive for the DISCOMS according to the following table:*

Performance level achieved	Incentive	Example
Between 90-95%	1% for each percentage in over achievement from target of 90%	Actual Performance 93% Incentive 93-90= 3%
Between 95 - 97%	1.5% for each percentage in over achievement from target of 95%	Actual Performance 97% Incentive = 5+3 = 8%
Above 97%	2.0% for each percentage in over achievement from target of 97%	Actual Performance 99% Incentive = 8+4 = 12%

Performance less than 90% shall attract disincentive for the DISCOMS according to the following table:

Performance level achieved	Disincentive	Example
<i>Between 80-90%</i>	<i>1% for each percentage in shortfall to achieve target of 90%</i>	<i>Actual Performance 83% Disincentive 90-83 = 7%</i>
<i>Between 70 - 80%</i>	<i>1.5% for each percentage in shortfall to achieve target of 80%</i>	<i>Actual Performance 77% Disincentive = 10+4.5 = 14.5%</i>
<i>Below 70%</i>	<i>2% for each percentage in shortfall to achieve target of 70%</i>	<i>Actual Performance 60% Incentive = 25+20 = 45%</i>

The incentive or disincentive would not be a pass through in the calculation of the Annual Revenue Requirement and the payment would be made by the 15th day of the following month."

- 3.333 The Commission in its Tariff order dated 23.07.2014 has clarified that income from street light maintenance is part of other income of regulated business. Further, the petitioner has not substantiated that whether any incentive is included in revenue of street light maintenance which should not be considered as pass through in the calculation of ARR as per above order. The Petitioner shall be allowed incentive, if any, on account of street light maintenance for FY 2013-14 on production of documentary evidence without any carrying cost.

LPSC

Petitioner's Submission

- 3.334 The Petitioner had collected late payment surcharge (LPSC) of Rs 20.06 Crore in FY 2013-14 from its consumers as per the audited annual accounts. The petitioner requested the Commission to allow entire LPSC as a pass through to the Petitioner for meeting out the difference between the penalties levied by Generating companies.

Commission's Analysis

- 3.335 As per judgment in Appeal No. 14 of 2012 of Hon'ble APTEL :

"135. Delhi Commission has submitted that allowing financing cost for LPSC means allowing of additional working capital for the time period between the due date and the actual date of payment. Hence, financing cost of LPSC has to

be at the same rate as that approved for working capital funding. The view taken by the Delhi Commission is correct and need not be interfered with.”

- 3.336 The Commission has approved the rate of interest of working capital at 9.89% for FY 2013-14. In view of the judgment of Hon’ble APTEL, the Commission considers the financing cost at 9.89% and interest approved for funding of principal amount of LPSC for FY 2013-14 as shown in the table below:

Table 3.81: Approved Funding of LPSC (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2013-14
A	LPSC Collected @ 18 %	20.06
B	Principal amount on which LPSC was charged (A/18%)	111.44
C	Interest Rate for funding of Principal of LPSC	9.89%
D	Interest approved on funding of Principal amount of LPSC (B*C)	11.02

- 3.337 Accordingly, the Commission has reduced Rs.11.02 Crore towards financing cost of LPSC from the gross Non tariff Income for arriving at the Non Tariff Income available towards ARR.

Rebate

Petitioner’s Submission

- 3.338 The Petitioner has submitted that since the actual rebate on power purchase and transmission charges of Rs.18.92 Crore earned on timely payment of power purchase bills ought to be deduction from Non-tariff income. The Petitioner has considered the entire rebate earned on timely payment of power purchase bills and subtracted the same from the Non Tariff Income.

Commission’s Analysis

- 3.339 The Regulation 5.24 of the MYT Regulations, 2011 specify that

“Distribution licensee shall be allowed to recover the net cost of power it procures from sources approved by the Commission,...

...assuming maximum normative rebate available from each source for payment of bills through letter of credit on presentation of bills for supply to consumers of Retail supply business”.

- 3.340 The actual rebate earned by the Petitioner as per the audited financial statements for FY 2013-14 at Rs.18.92 Crore is thus considered to be Petitioner’s income by the

Commission and subtracted from the non tariff income in truing up for FY 2013-14.

Interest on Consumers Security Deposit

Petitioner's Submission

3.341 The Petitioner has projected income from normative interest on Consumers Security deposit at Rs.32.00 Crore as detailed in the table below.

Table 3.82: Interest on Consumer Security Deposit (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's submission
1	Opening Consumer Security Deposit	323
2	Additions	33
3	Closing Consumer Security Deposit	357
4	Average Consumer Security Deposit	340
5	Rate of Interest	15.01%
6	Interest	51
7	Interest paid to the consumers	19
8	Normative interest as part of Non tariff income	32

Commission's Analysis

3.342 The Commission is of the view that the Petitioner has invested the Consumers security deposits in the regulated business. The Commission has considered the normative interest rate as per the rate of interest on carrying cost. The difference in the normative interest and the interest booked on consumer security deposit (at the rate of 6%) for FY 2013-14 as per the audited financial statements has been considered as non tariff income as the funds are already with the DISCOM which is being utilised for the Regulated business. The approved interest on consumer security deposit considered as part of Non tariff income is computed as follows:

Table 3.83: Interest on Consumer Security Deposit (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Now Approved
1	Opening Consumer Security Deposit	316.59
2	Additions	31.65
3	Closing Consumer Security Deposit	348.24
4	Average Consumer Security Deposit	332.42
5	Rate of Interest	10.7%
6	Interest	35.40
7	Interest paid to the consumers	19.00
8	Normative interest as part of Non tariff income	16.40

Sale of Scrap

Petitioner's Submission

3.343 The Petitioner has submitted that scrap is waste discarded material especially metal which can be only used for reprocessing. Scrap is gathered and sold collectively. The scrap from different assets are sold separately. Therefore the amount received from scrap cannot be linked to any scheme or asset and R&M expenses and income from sale of scrap ought not to be considered as non tariff income. Further it is submitted that the depreciation is required to be allowed only on the assets funded through equity and debt subject to maximum value of 90% of the total cost of assets and rest 10% of the value is required to be recovered through income from scrap. The Petitioner has requested not to consider Rs.5.19 Crore received towards sale of scrap as non tariff income.

Commission's Analysis

3.344 As per DERC MYT Regulations 2011, clause 5.35,

"All incomes being incidental to electricity business and derived by the Licensee from sources, including but not limited to profit derived from disposal of assets, rents, net late payment surcharge (late payment surcharge less financing cost of late payment surcharge), meter rent (if any), income from investments, income on investment of consumer security deposit and miscellaneous receipts from the consumers shall constitute Non-Tariff Income of the Licensee."

3.345 In view of the MYT Regulation 2011 as quoted above, all incomes incidental to electricity business and derived by the Licensee from sources including but not limited to profit derived from disposal of assets is to be included in the NTI. Further, the receipts from sale of scrap have not been adjusted while determining O&M expenses of the base year. Therefore, the amount on account of sale of scrap is considered in Non tariff Income.

Short term gain**Petitioner's Submission**

3.346 The Petitioner has submitted that interest on fixed deposits created for the purpose of Debt Service Reserve Account (DSRA). The fixed deposits were invested from the shareholder's funds. It is submitted that the Petitioner is required to maintain fixed

deposits for the purpose of DSRA which is mandatory requirement to meet debt service obligation. The Petitioner has reduced Rs.5.33 Crore towards short term gains from the Non tariff income.

Commission's Analysis

3.347 The Commission has sought clarification regarding short term gains claimed in the Petition. The Petitioner has submitted that Short term gain is on account of interest received on fixed deposits maintained by the Petitioner as margins for loans raised. The relevant documents submitted indicate that these fixed deposits have been created for the purpose of debt service reserve account (DSRA) required to meet debt service obligation and not in lieu of surplus funds. The Commission is of the view that interest on these fixed deposits should be passed into the ARR of the Petitioner as non – tariff income.

Bad debts recovered

Petitioner's Submission

3.348 The Petitioner has submitted that when a consumer does not pay up his energy bills even after disconnection of supply for a considerable period of time, such amount is considered as bad debt and is accordingly written off. The amount pertaining to Bad debts written off appears in the Schedule of A&G Expenses. Since the amount pertaining to bad debts written off appears in A&G Expenses and is taken into consideration for calculation of profit/ (loss) in Audited Accounts, any income recovered on account of bad debts collected in any subsequent year is required to be considered as income in the Audited Accounts so as to net the impact of amount pertaining to bad debts written off. However the income recovered on account of bad debts is collected directly from the consumers and the same forms part of collection. Unlike Regulatory Books, the amount billed is considered for calculation of profit/ (loss) in accordance with Accounting Standard AS-9 in the Audited Accounts. Therefore income recovered on account of bad debts is considered under the head "Other Income" in the Audited Accounts.

3.349 Accordingly, the claim of the Petitioner for the earlier period is as follows:

Table 3.84: Bad debts along with carrying cost as claimed

S. No	Particulars	FY 12	FY 13
1	Opening Balance	0	10
2	Income recovered on account of Bad Debts	9.8	2.9
3	Closing Balance	10	13
4	Average Balance	5	12
5	Rate of carrying cost	14.88%	15.03%
6	Carrying cost	1	2
7	Total Closing Balance	10	15

3.350 The Petitioner has submitted bad debt recovery of Rs. 2.64 Crore to be reduced from Non Tariff Income in the truing up for FY 2013-14.

Commission's Analysis

3.351 As per Regulation 5.35 of MYT Regulations, 2011, all incomes being incidental to electricity business and derived by the Licensee shall constitute non-tariff income of the Licensee.

3.352 The Petitioner has submitted that any amount recovered as bad debts is an energy income which is required to be included in the amount collected during the year as the same is received against the amount billed in the previous years. The amount billed and collected in previous years has already been considered for the purpose of AT&C loss calculation during respective years. However, the petitioner has not indicated separately category wise details of the amount collected on account of bad debts recovered in its audited financial statement for FY 2013-14. Therefore, the bad debts actually recovered by the petitioner under the head 'other income' as indicated in the audited financial statement of FY 2013-14 are considered under non tariff income.

Write back of miscellaneous provisions

Petitioner's Submission:

3.353 The Petitioner has claimed Rs.5.74 Crore as write back of misc. provisions to be reduced from NTI.

Commission's Analysis:

3.354 The A&G expenses for the base year FY 2010-11 have been benchmarked for the purpose of MYT period FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15 without adjusting provision for

miscellaneous expenses. Thus, the Petitioner has been allowed O&M expenses on a normative basis without considering whether actually spent or provisioned. The Commission is of the view that the provisions written back are to be included in the Non Tariff Income.

Service Line-cum-development charges

Commission's Analysis:

- 3.355 The Commission has observed from the audited financial statements (Note 8) that the service line charges received from the consumers amounting to Rs.23.76 Crore is remained unadjusted and kept in deposit account. These service line charges are collected from the consumers and by deferring and not treating as nontariff income will inflate the ARR by the same extent which tantamount to collection of the same from the consumers again through tariffs. Therefore, the Commission has considered Rs.23.76 Crore as nontariff income in truing up for FY 2013-14.
- 3.356 Based on the above analysis and deliberations, the Commission has approved the amount of Non Tariff Income as summarized below:

Table 3.85: Trued-up Non Tariff Income approved by Commission (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Petitioners projections	Now Approved
I	As per Audited Accounts		
A	Other Operating revenue	89.15	89.15
B	Other Income	68.17	68.17
II	Total (A+B)	157.32	157.32
C	Income from normative interest on Consumer Security Deposit	32.00	16.25
D	Service line-cum-development charges		23.76
III	Total NTI (II+C+D)	189.32	197.33
E	Less: Income from other business (a+b)	20.27	6.70
A	Consultancy business	7.68	6.70
B	Street light maintenance business	12.59	
IV	Net NTI (III – E)	169.05	190.78
1	Less: Financing cost of LPSC	20.00	11.02
2	Less: Rebate on Power Purchase and Transmission charges	19.00	18.92
3	Less: Write-back of Miscellaneous provisions	6.00	--
4	Less: Short term gain	5.00	--
5	Less: Bad debts recovered	3.00	--
6	Less: UI interest	21.00	--

Sl. No	Particulars	Petitioners projections	Now Approved
7	Less: Sale of Scrap	5.00	--
V	Total (1 to 7)	79.00	29.94
	Total : Non Tariff Income (IV - V)	90.05	160.69

Capital Expenditure and Capitalisation

Petitioner's Submission

3.357 The Petitioner has submitted that the capital expenditure and capitalisation has been divided into two sections under (a) capital expenditure and capitalisation from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07 and (b) Capital expenditure and capitalisation from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14. The capital expenditure and capitalisation for the period from FY 2002-03 to FY 2006-07 has been further classified into REL purchases and EIC disallowances as already discussed in previous paragraphs.

3.358 The Petitioner has projected the capital expenditure and capitalisation from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 3.86: Capital expenditure and capitalisation from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 submitted (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Capital expenditure	166.5	209.7	177.4	178.8	98.9	133.2	172.7
Capitalisation	249.2	276.7	188.3	208.9	97.0	69.1	148.6

3.359 The Petitioner has revised the GFA from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 and requested the Commission to allow the GFA as detailed in the table below:

Table 3.87: Revised GFA from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 submitted (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
A	Opening GFA	1285.40	1534.60	1811.30	1999.60	2208.50	2305.50	2374.60
B	Capitalisation during the year	249.20	276.70	188.30	208.90	97.00	69.10	148.60
C	De-capitalisation							
D	Closing GFA	1534.60	1811.30	1999.60	2208.50	2305.50	2374.60	2523.20
E	Average GFA	1410.00	1672.95	1905.45	2104.05	2257.00	2340.05	2448.90

Commission's Analysis

3.360 The Petitioner has submitted the true up of capital expenditure and capitalisation from FY 2004-05 to FY 2013-14. The issue has been discussed by Hon'ble APTEL in

Appeal No. 177 of 2012 as follows:

“

10.4 The above assertion of the appellant has not been denied by the learned Counsel for the Commission. We, therefore, direct the State Commission to also carry out the physical verification of the assets capitalised during FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06 through its appointed agency and expedite implementation the decision of this tribunal in Appeal No. 36 of 2008 decided on 06.01.2009.”

- 3.361 In view of the above direction of the Hon'ble APTEL, the Commission has invited tender for appointment of consultant to carry out the physical verification of the assets capitalised during the FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06. The physical verification of assets and true up of capitalisation for FY 2006-07 to FY 2010-11 is already in the process and the Petitioner has also submitted that GIS mapping of the assets has been completed in FY 2014-15. The Commission is yet to receive the final report of the consultant appointed in this regard. Final impact of true up of capitalisation shall be considered based on the report from the consultant. The REL purchases and EIC disallowances are also covered under the asset verification.
- 3.362 As per the audited financial statements of FY 2013-14, the capitalisation is at Rs.148.57 Crore including adjustments against Rs. 230 Crore projected by the Commission for the Capitalisation of FY 2013-14 in its MYT Order dated 13.07.2012. In view of the pending physical verification of the fixed assets of the Petitioner, the Commission has provisionally considered the lower of the projected capitalisation as per the MYT Order dated 13.07.2012 and the actual capitalisation for FY 2013-14 as per the audited financial statements.
- 3.363 The Commission is considering Gross Capitalization for the purpose of determining the tariff. Accordingly, the capitalisation of Rs.148.57 Crore, based on audited financial statements on provisional basis for FY 2013-14.

Table 3.88: GFA for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Now approved	Remarks
A	Opening GFA	1984.19	
B	Additions during the year	148.57	MYT order dated July 13, 2012
C	Retirements	8.25	
D	Closing GFA	2124.51	A+B-C
E	Average GFA	2054.35	(A+C)/2

Means of finance**Petitioner's Submission**

3.364 The Petitioner has furnished the financing of the capitalisation based on Debt : Equity as detailed in the table below:

Table 3.89: Financing of new investment capitalised projected for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's submission
Capitalisation (A)	149
Consumers contributions (B)	27
Balance Capitalisation = C (A-B)	121
- through equity (30% of C)	36
- through Loan (70% of C)	85

Commission's Analysis

3.365 The Commission provisionally considers the consumer contribution capitalised at Rs.27.16 crore for FY 2013-14 as per the audited financial statements and funding of balance capitalisation through equity and debt in the ratio of 30:70 in terms of Regulation 5.11 of the MYT Regulations, 2011 is as follows:

Table 3.90: Consumers Contribution for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Now Approved
Opening Consumers contributions (A) (Tariff Order dated July 31, 2013)	197.43
Addition to Consumer contribution (B) (as per audited financial statements)	27.16
Closing consumers contributions (C = A+B)	224.59
Average consumers contributions (A+C)/2	211.01

Table 3.91: Approved financing of new investment capitalised in FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Now approved
Net Capitalisation (A) (148.57-8.25)	140.32
Consumer contribution (B) (as per audited financial statements)	27.16
Capitalisation net of Consumer Contribution (C = A-B)	113.16
- through equity (30% of C)	33.95
- through Loan (70% of C)	79.21

Depreciation**Petitioner's Submission**

3.366 The Petitioner has submitted that depreciation has been calculated after excluding consumer contribution from the GFA in accordance with MYT Regulations, 2011.

The Petitioner has furnished depreciation for FY 2013-14 as detailed in the table below:

Table 3.92: Computation of Average rate of Depreciation for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's submission
Opening GFA	2227
Closing GFA	2348
Average GFA	2287.50
Depreciation	88
Rate of Depreciation	3.86%

Commission's Analysis

3.367 The Commission has provisionally approved average GFA during FY 2013-14 at Rs.2054.35 Crore and average consumer contributions at Rs.211.01 Crore as discussed in the preceding paragraphs. Further, the Commission has considered the effective rate of depreciation at 4.07% based on the audited financial statements for FY 2013-14.

3.368 The Petitioner has not submitted the detailed calculation of depreciation asset classification wise and assets funded through consumer contributions, capital subsidies/grants, etc. along with the petition and during the course of prudence check/validation. It is pertinent to mention that different class of assets will have different rates of depreciation.

3.369 Accordingly, the depreciation provisionally approved by the Commission for FY 2013-14 as shown below:

Table 3.93: Depreciation for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Now Approved
Average GFA for the year (A)	2054.35
Average Consumer contribution upto FY 2013-14 (B)	211.01
Average GFA net of Consumer contribution (C)	1843.34
Average Depreciation rate (D)	4.07%
Depreciation (C*D)	75.00
Cumulative Depreciation upto FY 2013-14	632.08

Working Capital

Petitioner's Submission

3.370 The Petitioner has submitted that the Working Capital from FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12 has been calculated in accordance with Clause-5.37 of DERC MYT Regulations, 2007. The Working Capital for FY 2012-13 has been calculated in accordance with

Clause-5.14 and Clause-5.15 of DERC MYT Regulations, 2011.

3.371 Further, the Petitioner has submitted that for the purpose of calculation of working capital, ARR may be considered instead of Revenue realized from tariffs. Similarly, for calculation of power purchase cost either revenue from sale of surplus power should be deducted from Gross Power Purchase Cost or revenue from sale of surplus power should be considered as receivables. Also, Transmission charges may not be considered for deduction in Working Capital as per Clause-5.37 of DERC MYT Regulations, 2007.

3.372 Accordingly, the Working Capital Calculation from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 is tabulated below:

Table 3.94: Working Capital Requirement as submitted by the Petitioner (Rs. Crore)

S. No	Particulars	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	Reference
A	O&M Expenses	202	232	359	299	312			
A1	1 / 12 th of O&M Expenses	17	19	30	25	26			A/12
B	Annual Revenues from Tariff & Charges	1365	1563	2348	3076	3504	3325	3527	
B1	Receivables equivalent to two months average	228	260	391	513	584	554	588	B/6
C	Power Purchase Expenses	962	1134	1655	2330	2765	3482	3968	
C1	Less: 1/12th of power purchase expenses	80	95	138	194	230	290	331	C/12
D	Working Capital	164	185	283	343	380	264	257	A1+B1-C1
E	Working Capital-Previous	42	164	185	283	343	380	264	
F	Change in Working Capital	122	21	98	60	36	-115	-7	D-E

Commission's Analysis

3.373 As per Regulation 5.37 of MYT Regulations 2007, Working Capital for Retail Supply of electricity shall consist of

- Receivables for two months of revenue from sale of electricity
- O&M Expenses for One month
- Less: Power purchase costs for one month

3.374 The Receivables from the consumers cannot be generated unless the power is delivered to them for which the transmission cost on such power purchased by the Petitioner is inevitable. Thus, transmission charges forms the part of power purchase cost as considered for computation of Working Capital.

3.375 Regulation 5.14 and 5.15 of the MYT Regulations 2011 specifies that working capital shall consist of:

“For Wheeling business

(a) Receivables for two months of wheeling charges

For Retail supply business

(a) Receivables for two months of revenue from sale of electricity

(b) Less: Power purchase costs for one month

(c) Less: Transmission charges for one month, and

(d) Less: Wheeling charges for two months”

3.376 The Commission has examined the Working capital submitted by the Petitioner for FY 2013-14 which is based on Power Purchase cost (Including transmission charges) and receivable from ARR as submitted in the petition. The Commission has computed the Working Capital considering the net power purchase cost, transmission charges and revenue available towards ARR as approved in the truing up for FY 2013-14.

Table 3.95: Approved Working Capital Requirement for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Now Approved
A	Receivables from sale of electricity (table 3.59)	3556.68
B	Receivables for 2 month of revenue from sale of electricity (A/6)	592.78
C	Power Purchase expenses (incl. transmission charges)	3634.43
D	Power Purchase expenses for 1 Month (C/12)	302.87
E	Total working capital requirement (B-D)	289.91
F	Less: Opening Working Capital (Table 3.47)	236.05
G	Change in working capital for FY 2013-14 (E-F)	53.86

Advance Against Depreciation (AAD)

Petitioner's Submission

3.377 The Petitioner has furnished the computation of AAD in accordance with Clause 5.21 of the MYT Regulations, 2011 as detailed in the table below:

Table 3.96: AAD submitted in Truing up for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
1	1/10 of the loan (A)	95.89
2	Debt Repayment (B)	95.89
3	Minimum of A&B	95.89
4	Less: Depreciation for FY 2012-13 as per ARR routed for repayment of loans	88.34
5	Excess of Min (A,B) over Depreciation (3-4)	7.55
6	Cumulative Repayment (C)	885.96
7	Less: Cumulative Depreciation	811.38
8	Excess of (C) over (D) (6-7)	74.59
9	Advance Against Depreciation	7.55

Commission's Analysis

3.378 As discussed in the past period section of this Tariff Order, the Petitioner has been directed to submit additional information for computation of AAD as per formula specified in the MYT Regulations, 2011 regarding repayment of Loan. The Commission will consider the claim of AAD, if any, after receipt of such information

Return on Capital Employed (RoCE)

3.379 The Commission has analysed the various components used to determining the Return on Capital employed as below:

- Working Capital
- Regulated Rate Base (RRB)
- Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC)

Regulated Rate Base (RRB)**Petitioner's Submission**

3.380 The Petitioner has submitted the Regulated Rate Base, Equity & Debt and RoCE for FY 2013-14 as detailed in the table below:

Table 3.97: Regulated Rate Base submitted for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Petitioner's submission
1	RRB - Base Year (Opening)	1700
A	Opening Balance of Original Cost of Fixed Assets	2375
B	Opening Balance of Working Capital	264
C	Opening Balance of Accumulated Depreciation	790
D	Opening balance of Accumulated Consumer Contribution	148

Sl. No	Particulars	Petitioner's submission
2	RRB - for the year	
E	Investments capitalized	149
F	Depreciation for the year (incl. AAD)	96
G	Consumer Contribution, Grants, etc for the year	27
H	Change in Working Capital	-7
I	Change in RRB $[(E-F-G)/2]+H]$	6
3	RRB – Closing $(1+2E-2F-2G+2H)$	1719
4	RRB (i) $(1+2)$	1706

Commission's Analysis

3.381 Due to change in the working capital requirements, change in GFA due to de-capitalisation, the RRB of the Petitioner is accordingly revised. The RRB has been computed based on the analysis and considering the provisional investment capitalised, depreciation, consumer contribution and working capital requirements for FY 2013-14 as shown below:

Table 3.98: Approved Regulated Rate Base and RoCE for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Now Approved
A	RRB Opening	1,494.80
B	ΔAB (Change in Regulated Base)	41.45
C	Investments Capitalized	140.32
D	Depreciation	75.00
E	AAD	0.00
F	Consumer Contribution	27.16
G	Change in working capital	53.86
H	RRB Closing	1,590.11
I	RRB (i)	1,569.39

Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC)

Petitioner's Submission

3.382 The Petitioner has submitted RoCE and WACC considering the Rate of interest @ 14.52% and Return on equity @ 16% for FY 2013-14 as given in the table below:

Table 3.99: Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) submitted for FY 2013-14

Particulars	Petitioners submission
Average Debt (Rs. Crore)	950
Average Equity (Rs. Crore)	679
Total (Rs. Crore)	1629
Cost of Debt %	14.52%

Return on Equity %	16.00%
WACC	15.14%

Commission's Analysis

3.383 The Commission has considered available equity for FY 2013-14 as submitted by the Petitioner for the purpose of computation of WACC as follows:

Table 3.100: Normative equity for FY 2013-14

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2014	Remarks
A	Opening Equity	378.95	Closing balance for FY 2012-13 as in Table 3.38 is opening balance for FY 2013-14
B	Addition during the year – Capitalisation	33.95	Table 3.91
C	Closing Balance	412.90	A+B
D	Average Equity	395.92	(A+C)/2

3.384 The Commission has considered RoCE and WACC for FY 2013-14 based on required equity and actual available equity and free reserves as follows:

Table 3.101: Approved Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) for FY 2013-14

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2013-14	Reference
A	RRB (i)	1,569.39	Table 3.98
B	Equity (limiting to 30% of RRBi)	470.82	30% of A
C	Normative equity as considered	395.92	Table 3.100
D	Average Equity balance as per net worth of the Petitioner	796.50	Table 3.4
E	Equity now considered for WACC	395.92	Minimum (B,C,D)
F	Debt - balancing figure	1,173.46	A-E
G	Rate of return on equity (re)	16.00%	As per regulations
H	Additional re on account of AT&C incentive	-	
I	Rate of interest on debt (rd)	9.89%	As per MYT Order
J	WACC	11.43%	$[(G*E)+(I*F)]/(F+E)$
K	RoCE	179.40	A*J

Income Tax

Petitioner's Submission

3.385 The Petitioner stated that the MYT Regulations, 2011 do not provide the lower of the two (grossed up RoE or actual tax payable) approach. The Commission is allowing expenses on normative basis and income tax is allowed based on P&L account which ought to be allowed by grossing up RoE considering same as normative profit.

3.386 It is further submitted that Hon'ble ATE in its judgment dated November 28, 2013 (Appeal No. 104, 105 and 106 of 2012) has ruled as under:

"56. It is also to be noted that for difference in book depreciation and tax depreciation, the tax laws provide for creating Deferred Tax Liability (DTL) which gets amortised with time when tax depreciation becomes lower than book depreciation. However, in regulated business DTL is not considered as it is not the current tax liability. Thus in case the benefit of accelerated tax depreciation for one year in regulated business may result in lower overall tax on overall book profit (due to MAT) and may seem to subsidise other businesses. However, in subsequent years the overall tax liability may be more than tax on overall book profit, which would seem to give subsidy from other businesses to regulated business. In both these situations, the methodology of standalone tax computation and allowance would give correct picture.

..

58. The Tribunal in Appeal No.251 of 2006 has laid down the ratio that the income tax assessment of the licensee must be done on standalone basis. In Appeal No. 173 of 2011 the Tribunal has provided the methodology for assessing the income tax liability of the licensee. The State commission did not follow these directions and got carried away with the observations that the utility must not gain or lose on account of income tax made in the context of grossing up of income tax. It simply allocated the actual tax paid by the Appellant for the company as a whole, in proportion to their respective book profit".

3.387 The Petitioner has submitted ideally the ARR ought to have been so determined that the income generated from retail business is equal to all expenses, RoE and tax payable and in the absence of cost reflective tariff such situation does not exist. Therefore, the income tax ought to be allowed on RoE approach and not on comparative approach between RoE and actual income tax basis. The Petitioner has claimed the Income Tax for FY 2013-14 as given in the table below:

Table 3.102: Income Tax claimed in Truing up for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Reference	Petitioners submission
1	Equity (Average)	A	679
2	Debt (Average)	B	950

Sl. No.	Particulars	Reference	Petitioners submission
3	% Equity	$C=A/(A+B)$	42%
4	RRB (i)	D	1706
5	Amount of Equity considered for income tax	$E = C*D$	711
6	Rate of Return	F	16%
7	Return on equity	$G = E*F$	114
8	MAT / Income Tax Rate	H	20.01%
9	Income Tax	$I = (G/(1-H))-G$	28

Commission's Analysis

- 3.388 Regulation 5.32 of MYT Regulation 2011 specify that *the income tax, if any liable to be paid on the licensed business of the distribution licensee shall be limited to tax on return on equity component of capital employed. Any additional tax other than this shall not be a pass through and it shall be payable by the Distribution licensee itself.*
- 3.389 Regulation 5.33 specify that *the actual assessment of income tax should take into account benefits of tax holiday and the credit for carry forward losses applicable as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961 shall be passed on to the consumers.*
- 3.390 Regulation 5.40 specify that *truing up shall be carried out in accordance with Regulation 4.21, for each year based on the actual/audited information and prudence check by the Commission.*
- 3.391 Conjoint reading of the above regulations explicitly specify that tax shall be considered in true up based on actual payment, subject to prudence check, duly taking into consideration the benefits of tax holiday and shall be limited tax on RoE.
- 3.392 The petitioner has submitted the actual payment of Income Tax (MAT) of Rs.4.24 Crore for FY 2013-14 as per the audited accounts. However, as per the cash flow statement, it is observed that there in cash inflow on account of refund of income tax to the amount of Rs. 30.56 Crore. The Commission has considered the inflow on account of such refund of income tax and adjusts it towards the Annual revenue requirement of the Petitioner.

Aggregate Revenue Requirement approved in the Truing up for FY 2013-14

Petitioner's Submission:

- 3.393 The Petitioner's Submission for Truing up for FY 2013-14 is as below.

Table 3.103: Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Approved for FY 2013-14 in MYT order July 2012	Petitioners submission
Power Purchase cost (incl. Transmission charges)	3146.65	3949.00
O&M Expenses	363.32	384.19
Other expenses/Statutory levies	0.00	31.96
Depreciation	93.47	88.31
Advance against depreciation (AAD)	70.83	7.58
Return on Capital Employed (RoCE)	219.63	257.82
Income Tax	14.19	28.50
Sub-total	3908.09	4747.36
Less: Non-tariff income	78.95	94.92
Aggregate Revenue Requirement	3829.14	4652.44

Commission's Analysis

3.394 The annual revenue requirement now approved by the Commission in the Truing up for FY 2013-14 is summarized in the table below.

Table 3.104: ARR approved for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Approved for FY 2013-14 in MYT order July 2012	Petitioners submission	Now Approved	Reference
A	Power Purchase cost (incl. Transmission charges)	3146.65	3949.00	3634.43	Table 3.75
B	O&M Expenses	363.32	384.19	345.88	Table 3.77
C	Other expenses/Statutory levies	0.00	31.96	0.52	Table 3.79
D	Depreciation	93.47	88.31	75.00	Table 3.93
E	Advance against depreciation (AAD)	70.83	7.58	0.00	
F	Return on Capital Employed (RoCE)	219.63	257.82	179.40	Table 3.101
G	Income Tax	14.19	28.50	(30.56)	
H	Sub-total	3908.09	4747.36	4204.67	Sum(A-H)
I	Less: Non-tariff income	78.95	94.92	160.69	Table 3.85
J	Less: Penalty due to non compliance of			44.59	

Sl. No.	Particulars	Approved for FY 2013-14 in MYT order July 2012	Petitioners submission	Now Approved	Reference
	directive				
K	Aggregate Revenue Requirement	3829.14	4652.44	3999.39	H-I-J

Revenue available towards ARR

Petitioner's Submission

3.395 The Petitioner has submitted the net revenue from sale of power to be considered towards Aggregate Revenue Requirement as Rs. 4652.44 Crore available for FY 2013-14 as summarized below:

Table 3.105: Revenue details submitted by the Petitioner (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
1	Total Amount Realized	3964
2	Less: E-Tax	157
3	Less: 8% surcharge	280
4	Less: Late Payment surcharge	--
3	Revenue Available for Expenses	3527

Commission's Analysis

3.396 The Commission has considered the total revenue available towards ARR for FY 2013-14 at Rs.3800.63 Crore including the impact of under achievement in AT&C loss reduction trajectory of Rs.294.15 Crore.

Revenue (Gap) / Surplus

3.397 The revenue (gap)/ surplus for FY 2013-14 as submitted by the Petitioner and trued up by the Commission is summarized below:

Table 3.106: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	MYT order July 2012	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved
A	ARR for FY 2013-14	3829.14	4652.44	3999.39
B	Revenue available towards ARR		3527.00	3,800.63
C	Revenue (Gap) / Surplus for FY 2013-14 (B-A)		(1125.44)	(198.76)

Table 3.107: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus upto FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2013-14	Remarks
A	Opening balance	(2,831.92)	Table 3.54
B	Revenue surplus/(Gap) during the year	(198.76)	Table 3.106
C	8% surcharge	280.03	Table 3.59
D	Net Revenue Surplus/(gap) during the year	81.27	
E	Closing Revenue Gap (without carrying cost)	(2,741.02)	
F	Average balance of Revenue Gap	(2,781.65)	
G	Actual equity Available towards RG (above Capitalisation and WC)	400.58	
H	Equity as 30% of total funds required	400.58	
I	Balancing figure - Debt	2,390.71	
J	Rate of return on Equity (re)	16.00%	
K	Rate of interest on debt (rd)	9.89%	
L	Rate of carrying cost	10.77%	
M	Carrying cost	(300.53)	
N	Closing balance	(3,051.19)	

A4: Analysis of Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for FY 2015-16**INTRODUCTION**

- 4.1 The Petitioner has filed the petition for determination of Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for FY 2015-16. The Commission has analysed the petition submitted by the Petitioner for ARR for FY 2015-16 under the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 which is extended for another year i.e., up to FY 2015-16.
- 4.2 In the process of ARR determination, the Commission held several technical validation sessions with the Petitioner's representatives to validate the information and wherever required, sought clarification on various issues. The Commission has considered all information submitted by the Petitioner as part of the Tariff Petition, audited accounts, response to queries raised during discussions and public hearing for determination of ARR and tariff for FY 2015-16.
- 4.3 This chapter contains detailed analysis of the Petition submitted by the Petitioner and the various parameters approved by the Commission for determination of ARR for FY 2015-16.

ENERGY SALES**Petitioner's Submission**

- 4.4 The Petitioner has submitted the projected sales for FY 2015-16 which are based on:
- (a) Actual consumer category-wise energy sales during FY 2013-14 have been taken considering it as the base year.
 - (b) Growth rates for category-wise energy sales during FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 are considered as follows:
 - (i) 3 Year CAGR has been considered for projection of energy sales to various consumer categories except agriculture, Mushroom, Self-consumption and DMRC.
 - (ii) 3 Year CAGR in respect of consumer category of Worship and Hospital has been calculated separately based on the past sales data for these categories and then added to the estimated sales of Domestic Category.
 - (iii) In case of agriculture, mushroom and self-consumption consumer

categories is zero growth rate has been considered.

- (iv) In case of DMRC, 10% growth rate has been considered in view of the proposed metro lines expected to operate in the licensed area of the Petitioner in upcoming year.

4.5 The Petitioner has applied the above growth rates on the actual category-wise sales during FY 2013-14 to arrive at the energy sales during FY 2014-15 and similarly the above growth rates have been applied on category-wise energy sales estimated during FY 2014-15 to arrive at the energy sales during FY 2015-16. The category-wise sales from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 and category wise CAGR of 1 year to 6 years are given in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 below:

Table 4.1: Actual Sales from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 (MU)

Sl. No.	Category	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14
A	Domestic	1,784	1,988	2,261	2,492	2,558	2,675	2,804
i	Domestic –Other than A (ii)	1,769	1,974	2,248	2,479	2,545	2,661	2,789
ii	Single Deliver Point on 11 KV CGHS	15	14	13	13	13	14	15
B	Non Domestic	1,077	1,293	1,281	1,367	1,421	1,540	1,614
i	Non Domestic Lower Tension (NDLT)	753	927	984	1,071	1,102	1,198	1,256
ii	Non Domestic High Tension (NDHT)	324	366	296	296	319	341	358
C	Industrial	434	449	455	443	434	337	288
i	Small Industrial Power (SIP)	384	404	410	399	391	297	250
ii	Industrial Power on 11kV SPD for Group of SIP Consumers	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
iii	Large Industrial Power (LIP)	50	45	45	43	43	39	37
D	Agriculture	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
E	Mushroom Cultivation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	Public Lighting	76	85	92	102	106	105	103
i	Metered	76	85	92	102	106	105	39
ii	Unmetered							64
G	Delhi Jal Board (DJB)	-	-	95	119	121	131	140
i	DJB-Supply at LT						7	10
ii	DJB (Supply at 11 kV and above)			95	119	121	124	129

Sl. No.	Category	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14
H	Railway Traction							
I	DMRC	50	65	81	92	125	127	173
J	Advertisement and Hoardings						0	1
K	Temporary	-		0	1	0	1	38
L	Others	97	84	65	92	79	87	54
i	Enforcement	76	63	41	61	46	35	29
ii	Self Consumption	21	21	24	30	33	52	24
M	Total	3,518	3,965	4,330	4,707	4,844	5,002	5,215

Table 4.2: Category-wise CAGR for Various Years (%)

Sl. No.	Category	6 Year	5 Year	4 Year	3 Year	2 Year	1 Year
A	Domestic	7.83%	7.13%	5.53%	4.01%	4.71%	4.84%
i	Domestic –other than A (ii)	7.88%	7.16%	5.54%	4.01%	4.69	4.81
li	Single Delivery Point on 11 KV CGHS	0.74%	2.07%	4.58%	5.22%	9.41%	10.99%
B	Non Domestic	6.98	4.53%	5.95%	5.70%	6.58%	4.84%
i	Non Domestic Low Tension (NDLT)	8.91%	6.26%	6.28%	5.47%	6.76%	4.83%
ii	Non Domestic High (NDHT)	1.68%	-0.43%	4.84%	6.51%	5.97%	4.86
C	Industrial	-6.63%	-8.52%	-10.83%	-13.40%	-18.60%	-14.59%
i	Small Industrial Power (SIP)	-6.89%	-9.10%	-11.57%	-14.41%	-20.01%	-15.80%
ii	Industrial Power on 11kV SPD for Group of SIP Consumers						
lii	Large Industrial Power (LIP)	-4.72%	-3.90%	-4.81%	-5.04%	-6.67%	-5.28%
D	Agriculture	-15.70%	-9.59%	-15.72%	-23.81%	-21.70%	1.39%
E	Mushroom Cultivation	19.44%	15.70%	16.20%	24.06%	37.36%	37.70%
F	Public Lighting	5.18%	3.92%	2.92%	0.54%	-0.99%	-1.24%
i	Metered						
ii	Unmetered						
G	Delhi Jal Board (DJB)			10.05%	5.58%	7.31%	6.72%
i	DJB-Supply at LT						
ii	DJB (Supply at 11 KV and above)			7.99%	2.96%	3.34%	4.36%
H	Delhi International Airport Limited (DIAL)						
I	Railway Traction						
J	DMRC	22.99%	21.62%	20.93%	23.58%	17.93%	36.43%
K	Advertisement and Hoardings						79.90%
L	Temporary Supply			248.45%	301.02%	842.03%	7075.99%
M	Others	-9.41%	-8.60%	-4.62%	-16.36%	-17.57%	-38.44%
i	Enforcement	-14.70%	-14.12%	-7.71%	-21.74%	-19.64%	-14.73%
ii	Self Consumption	2.27%	2.85%	-0.02%	-7.15%	-14.81%	-54.03%
	Total	6.78%	5.63%	4.76%	3.47%	3.76%	4.26%

4.6 The Petitioner has projected the number of consumers, growth rate, sanctioned load and energy sales for FY 2015-16 as indicated in the following Table:

Table 4.3: Projected number of consumers, sanctioned load and sales for FY 2015-16

Sl. No	Category	Number of Consumers	Growth Rate	Sanctioned load (MW)	Sales (MU)
A	Domestic	1,162,161	4.13%	3,584	3,040
i	Domestic -other than A (ii)	1,162,144	4.10%	3,563	3,023
ii	Single Delivery Point on 11 kV CGHS	17	8.56%	20	17
B	Non Domestic	386,272	5.70%	1,955	1,803
i	Non Domestic Low Tension (NDLT)	385,967	5.67%	1,664	1,406
ii	Non Domestic High Tension (NDHT)	305	5.79%	291	397
C	Industrial	8,231	-13.40%	193	216
i	Small Industrial Power (SIP)	8,208	-13.36%	167	188
ii	Industrial Power on 11kV SPD for SIP Group				
iii	Large Industrial Power (LIP)	23	-13.66%	26	27
D	Agriculture	49	0.00%	0	0
E	Mushroom Cultivation	6	0.00%	0	0
F	Public Lighting	3,033	0.54%	28	104
i	Metered	2,994	4.16%	28	43
ii	Unmetered	39	-1.84%	0	62
G	Delhi Jal Board (DJB)	940	3.16%	98	149
i	DJB-Supply at LT	861	5.70%	14	11
ii	DJB (Supply at 11 KV and above)	79	2.96%	84	137
H	Delhi International Airport Limited (DIAL)				
I	Railway Traction				
J	DMRC	1	10.00%	21	210
K	Advertisement and Hoardings	334	5.70%	1	1
L	Temporary Supply	3,540	0.00%	24	38
M	Others	2,294	0.00%	11	54
i	Enforcement	2,099	0.00%	5	29
ii	Self Consumption	195	0.00%	6	24
	Total	1,566,862	3.86%	5,915	5,615

Commission's Analysis

4.7 The Petitioner has submitted the category wise energy sales and CAGR from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 in their tariff petition which were as per audited accounts. The Commission has sought the actual sales for FY 2014-15 vide email dated 22.04.2015. Hence the Commission has approved sales for FY 2015-16 considering trued up sale for the period FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 after analysing and reducing quantum of sales under enforcement, Misuse, Own Consumption etc. and actual sales of FY 2014-15. The base year for projection of sales of FY 2015-16 is considered

as FY 2014-15. The category-wise sales from FY 2007-08 to FY 2014-15 are shown in the Table as follows:

Table 4.4: Actual Sales from FY 2007-08 to FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15

Sl. No	Category	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15*
1	Domestic	1714	1917	2205	2404	2466	2581	2714	2904
2	Non-Domestic	1077	1293	1260	1367	1421	1540	1614	1639
3	Industrial	434	449	453	443	434	337	288	282
4	Agriculture	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Mushroom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Public Lighting	76	85	92	91	100	92	104	101
7	DJB	0	0	95	119	121	131	140	141
8	DMRC	50	65	81	92	125	127	173	161
9	Adv. & Hoardings	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
10	Others	166	155	102	90	127	164	158	176
	Total	3518	3964	4288	4605	4794	4972	5191	5405

* Based on Petitioners submission

4.8 The category-wise CAGR of 1 year to 7 years (FY 2007-08 to FY 2014-15) are shown in the Table as follows:

Table 4.5: Various Years CAGR (FY 2007-08 to FY 2014-15) (%)

Sl. No	Category	CAGR for 7 Years	CAGR for 6 Years	CAGR for 5 Years	CAGR for 4 Years	CAGR for 3 years	CAGR for 2 years	CAGR for YoY
1	Domestic	7.82	7.17	5.66	4.84	5.60	6.08	7.03
2	Non-Domestic	6.18	4.03	5.40	4.64	4.87	3.17	1.54
3	Industrial	(5.95)	(7.43)	(9.01)	(10.64)	(13.34)	(8.42)	(1.93)
4	Agriculture	(20.61)					(4.96)	(0.63)
5	Mushroom							
6	Public Lighting	4.16	2.93	1.91	2.76	0.43	4.90	(2.31)
7	DJB			8.15	4.25	5.12	3.65	0.67
8	DMRC	18.19	16.33	14.74	15.03	8.82	12.60	(7.05)
9	Adv. & Hoardings						11.98	(28.35)
10	Others	0.83	2.12	11.53	18.29	11.41	3.51	11.15

ESTIMATED SALES FOR FY 2015-16

4.9 The Commission has adopted an Adjusted Trend Analysis method for demand forecasting in FY 2015-16 which assumes the underlying factors driving the demand for electricity to follow the same trend as in the past. Hence, the forecast is also based on the assumption that the past consumption trend will continue in the

future.

- 4.10 The trend based approach has to be adjusted based on judgment on the characteristics of the specific consumer groups/categories. The strength of the method, when used with balanced judgment, lies in its ability to reflect recent changes and therefore, probably best suited as a basis for short-term projection as used for the ARR/Tariff in the context of ARR determination. The category-wise sale forecast for FY 2015-16 is as discussed below:

Domestic Consumers

- 4.11 The consumption of energy by Domestic category constitutes about 54% of total sales in FY 2014-15. The Petitioner has projected sales of 3040 MU for FY 2015-16 at a growth rate of 4.13%. The growth rate for this category ranges from 4.84% (4 Year CAGR) to 7.82% (7 Year CAGR) from FY 2007-08 to FY 2014-15. Thus, the Commission considers a growth rate of 4.84% (4 Year CAGR of FY 2010-11 to FY 2014-15) for projecting the sales of 3044.79 MU for FY 2015-16 as it is considered to be realistic for Domestic consumer's category.

Non-Domestic Consumers

- 4.12 The consumption of energy by Non-Domestic category constitutes about 30% of total sales in FY 2014-15. The Petitioner has projected sales of 1803 MU for FY 2015-16 at a growth rate of 4.64% (3 Year CAGR of FY 2010-11 to FY 2013-14). The Commission considers the growth rate of 4.64% (4 year CAGR of FY 2010-11 to FY 2014-15) as it is considered reasonable in view of the trend during the last four years. Therefore, the Commission approves the sales of 1714.85 MU for FY 2015-16 for Non-Domestic consumer category. Thus, the Commission approves the sales of 1714.85 MU for FY 2015-16 for Non-domestic consumer's category for FY 2015-16.

Industrial Consumers

- 4.13 The consumption of energy by Industrial consumers category constitute 5% of total sales in FY 2014-15. The Petitioner has projected the sales as 216 MU at a growth rate of (-)13.40% (3 Year CAGR for FY 2010-11 to FY 2013-14) for FY 2015-16. Decline

in the sale has been observed in this category for last five years. The decline during recent years has been due to relocation of some of the industries from Petitioner area to other areas in Delhi. Thus, the Commission approves the sales of 282.45 MU for FY 2015-16 for Industrial consumers at the same level of actual sales during FY 2014-15.

Public Lighting

4.14 The consumption in Public Lighting category constitutes about 2% of the total sales during FY 2014-15. The Petitioner has projected the sales of 104 MU at a growth rate of 0.54% (3 year CAGR of FY 2010-11 to FY 2013-14) for FY 2015-16. The consumption of the category is almost same during FY 2011-12 to FY 2014-15. However, the Commission considers the growth rate of 2.76% (4 year CAGR of FY 2010-11 to FY 2014-15) to this category. Thus, the Commission approves the sale at 103.91 MU for FY 2015-16 for Public Lighting.

Agriculture & Mushroom Cultivation

4.15 The power consumption for these two categories has been almost 'Nil' during the last 6 years. The Petitioner has projected zero consumption for FY 2015-16. The Commission considers the sales for FY 2015-16 at 0.22 MU for these two categories during FY 2015-16 at the same level as in FY 2014-15.

Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC)

4.16 The sale to DMRC constitutes about 3% of total sales by the Petitioner during FY 2014-15. The Petitioner has projected energy sales of 210 MU for FY 2015-16 at a growth rate of 10.00% in view of the proposed metro lines in Petitioners licensed area.

The Commission had inquired from DMRC about its projected quantum of purchase in the Petitioner's area of supply. DMRC vide its letter No. DMRC/O&M/Tr./VK/T-4/DERC dated 22.04.2015 has intimated the projected purchase of 165 MU during FY 2015-16. Thus the Commission has considered the quantum of sale at 165 MU as projected by DMRC for FY 2015-16.

Delhi Jal Board (DJB)

4.17 The consumption of energy by DJB constitutes 2.60% of total sales in FY 2014-15 at 140.54 MU. The Petitioner has projected the sales at 149 MU during FY 2015-16 at a growth rate of 3.16% (3 year CAGR of FY 2010-11 to FY 2014-15).

The Commission had inquired from DJB about its projected quantum of purchase in the Petitioner's area of supply. DJB vide its letter dated 20.04.2015 has intimated the projected purchase of 140.96 MU during FY 2015-16. Thus, the Commission has considered the quantum of sale at 140.96 MU as projected by DJB for FY 2015-16.

Other Categories

4.18 Other categories consist of places of worship, hospitals, enforcement, own consumption, temporary supply, advertisement and hoardings, etc.

4.19 It is observed that the growth in CAGR varies from 0.83% (7 Year CAGR) to 18.29% (4 Year CAGR). The nature of sales in other categories may not follow the past CAGR trends in the future. Thus, the Commission has considered the quantum of sales to such other categories at 176.34 MU at the same level of actual units sold during FY 2014-15.

4.20 On the basis of above analysis, the Commission approves the energy sales for the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 as indicated in the Table as follows:

Table 4.6: Approved Sales for FY 2015-16 by the Commission (MU)

Category	Petitioner's Submission	Now approved for FY 2015-16	Remarks
Domestic	3040	3044.79	Para 4.13
Non-Domestic	1803	1714.85	Para 4.14
Industry	216	282.45	Para 4.15
Public Lighting	105	103.91	Para 4.16
Agriculture and Mushroom	0.22	0.22	Para 4.17
DMRC	210	165.00	Para 4.18
DJB	149	140.96	Para 4.19
Others ^{\$}	93	176.34	Para 4.21
Total	5615	5628.52	

^{\$}-Others include 11 kV Worship/Hospital, Staff, Enforcement, Own consumption, Temporary Supply and Advertisement & Hoardings.

REVENUE IN FY 2015-16 AT EXISTING TARIFF**Petitioner's Submission**

4.21 The Petitioner has projected the revenue billed Rs. 4128 Crore for FY 2015-16 at

existing tariff on projected quantum of sales of 5615 MU.

Commission's Analysis

- 4.22 As per the two-part tariff principle followed in the NCT of Delhi, the tariff for each category consists of fixed/demand charges as well as energy charges. The fixed/demand charges are specified for different categories as a fixed amount per month or as a fixed amount per kW of sanctioned load per month. The energy charges, on the other hand, are always usage-based and are specified per unit of electricity consumed.
- 4.23 For Domestic consumers with sanctioned load less than 5 kW, the revenue from fixed charges is calculated by multiplying the corresponding fixed charge with the number of consumers in that particular tariff slab. For Domestic consumers with sanctioned load exceeding 5 kW, the revenue from fixed charges is calculated by multiplying the specified fixed charge with the sanctioned load (in kW) of the category. For calculation of revenue from energy charges, the actual usage is multiplied by the applicable tariff category slab.
- 4.24 For the Non-Domestic, Industrial, Railway Traction, DMRC and DJB categories, billing is done either on kW or kVA basis, as specified in the approved tariff schedule for FY 2014-15. Since projections for FY 2015-16 are done only on kW basis for sanctioned load and on kWh basis for energy sales, wherever the tariff is specified in kVA/kVAh terms, the relevant kW/kWh projection is divided by the Power Factor in order to obtain the corresponding kVA/kVAh projection. Thereafter, revenue from demand charges is calculated by multiplying the demand charge of each tariff slab with the sanctioned load of that slab, while revenue from energy charges is calculated by multiplying the energy charges specified for each tariff slab with the energy consumption projected for that slab.
- 4.25 The Power Factor considered by the Commission for different categories is shown below:

Table 4.7: Power Factor considered by the Commission

Sl. No.	Consumer slab	Power Factor	Remarks
1	Non Domestic Low Tension (NDLT)		Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014
A	Up to 10 kW	0.89	
B	10-100 kW	0.93	

Sl. No.	Consumer slab	Power Factor	Remarks
C	Above 100 kW	0.93	
2	Non Domestic High Tension (NDHT)	0.95	
3	Small Industrial Power (SIP)		
A	10-100 kW	0.91	
B	Above 100 kW	0.93	
C	Large Industrial Power (LIP)	0.97	
4	Railway Traction (other than DMRC)	0.94	
5	DMRC	1.00	
6	DJB	0.88	

4.26 Based on the Petitioner's data of Sanctioned Load, Number of Consumers, Sales and the Power Factor, the Commission has estimated the total revenue of Rs. 4216.06 Crore to be billed in FY 2015-16. The category-wise break up of revenue estimated by the Commission on sale of 5628.52 MU for FY 2015-16 is as shown below:

Table 4.8: Revenue estimated for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Category	Fixed Charges	Energy Charges	Total Revenue
Domestic	109.64	1543.27	1652.91
Non-Domestic	268.87	1,565.65	1,834.52
Industrial	23.16	241.39	264.55
Agriculture		0.05	0.05
Mushroom		0.01	0.01
Public Lighting		75.85	75.85
DJB	15.98	116.17	132.15
DMRC	3.15	100.65	103.80
Others	3.46	148.75	152.21
Total Revenue	424.26	3,791.79	4,216.05
Revenue at 99.5% Collection Efficiency			4194.98

AT&C LOSS

Petitioner's Submission

4.27 The Petitioner has sought for revision of AT&C loss trajectory from FY 2015-16. The Petitioner has considered the following AT&C loss during FY 2015-16.

Table 4.9: AT&C Loss considered by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	Formula	FY 2015-16
1	Opening AT&C Loss approved for FY 2011-12	A	22.07%
2	Closing AT&C Loss for FY 2013-14 (Actuals)	B	21.04%
3	Redn. trajectory approved in the Tariff Order July 2013	C	1.16%
4	Closing AT&C Loss level for FY 2014-15	D=B-C	19.88%
5	Redn. trajectory considered for FY 2015-16	E=(C/A)*D	1.04%
6	AT&C Loss target for FY 2015-16	F=D-E	18.83%

Commission's Analysis

- 4.28 The Commission has fixed the targets for Distribution Loss, Collection efficiency and AT&C loss for the Petitioner in the 2nd MYT Order provided in the Table as follows:

Table 4.10: Approved AT&C Loss for FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15

Particulars	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15
Distribution loss target	16.49%	15.24%	14.07%
Collection efficiency target	99.50%	99.50%	99.50%
AT&C Loss Target	16.82%	15.66%	14.50%

- 4.29 The Commission has extended the applicability of MYT Control Period from FY 2014-15 to FY 2015-16 for MYT Regulations, 2011. Accordingly, the Commission has considered the AT&C loss and the Distribution Loss reduction targets following the same trajectory as specified in the 2nd MYT Order for projection of AT&C loss target for FY 2015-16.

Table 4.11: Approved AT&C Loss for FY 2015-16

Particulars	FY 2014-15	%Reduction Considered	FY 2015-16
Distribution loss target	14.07%	1.17%	12.90%
Collection efficiency target	99.50%		99.50%
AT&C Loss Target	14.50%	1.17%	13.33%

ENERGY REQUIREMENT**Petitioner's Submission**

- 4.30 The Petitioner has estimated the energy requirement of 6814 MU at Distribution Periphery against projected sales of 5615 MU. The Petitioner has considered distribution loss at 17.60% against distribution loss target of 14.07% approved by the Commission in the 2nd MYT Order. The energy requirement proposed by the Petitioner is given below:

Table 4.12: Energy requirement proposed by the petitioner for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	Unit	Proposed Energy requirement	Remarks
A	Energy sales	MU	5615	
B	Distribution loss	%	17.60%	Para 4.6 of Petition
C	Energy Requirement	MU	6814	A/(1-B)
D	Distribution Loss	MU	1199	C-A

Commission's Analysis

- 4.31 The Commission has computed the energy requirement at the Distribution Periphery of the Petitioner for FY 2015-16, considering the sales approved for FY 2015-16 and distribution loss of 12.90%. The approved energy requirement for FY 2015-16 is summarized in the Table as follows:

Table 4.13: Energy requirement approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	Unit	Approved Energy requirement	Remarks
A	Energy sales	MU	5628.52	Table 4.6
B	Distribution loss	%	12.90%	Table 4.11
C	Energy requirement	MU	6462.14	A/(1-B)
D	Distribution Loss	MU	833.62	C-A

POWER PURCHASE

- 4.32 Power purchase cost is the single largest component of the ARR of a distribution company. It is pertinent to estimate the power purchase cost with utmost care based on the optimum method of procuring power from the generating stations.

ALLOCATION OF POWER FROM CENTRAL AND STATE GENERATING STATIONS**Petitioner's submission**

- 4.33 The Petitioner has submitted that it has considered the quantum of power as provided by SLDC vide email dated 17.10.2014.
- 4.34 Further, the Petitioner has also submitted that in case of Aravali Power Plant SLDC has not projected any quantum during FY 2015-16. However, the Petitioner has considered 211 MU based on Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014.

Commission's Analysis

- 4.35 Delhi has a firm allocated share in Central Sector Generating Stations (CSGS), State Generating Stations (SGS) and other stations. The Commission has considered allocation of firm power as per the allocation specified in revised Notification no. NRPC/OPR/103/02/2014-15 dated 31.03.2015 of Northern Regional Power Committed (NRPC).
- 4.36 NRPC had allocated 0% firm share of M/s. Aravali Power Company Pvt. Ltd. (APCPL) to Delhi vide its notification No. NRPC/OPR/103/02/2014-15 dated 31.03.2015.

However, NRPC reallocated the firm share to Delhi as 20.27% from this plant in revision No. 2 w.e.f 00:00 hrs of 01.07.2015 vide its notification no. NRPC/OPR/103/02/2015-16 dated 29.06.2015. The same has been considered by the Commission as well as SLDC.

4.37 The distribution of unallocated quota from the various plants varies from time to time and is based on power requirement and power shortage in different States. The Commission has noted from the REA of March 2013, notified vide notification No. NRPC/OPR/103/02/2014-15 dated 31.03.2015 that no additional allocation of power to Delhi was made from the unallocated quota from Central Sector Generating Stations (CSGS) and State Generating Stations (SGS). Therefore, the Commission has not considered any power from unallocated quota for FY 2015-16.

4.38 The firm share, unallocated share and total share from the Central Generating Stations to Delhi as per NRPC notification is summarized in the Table below:

Table 4.14: Allocation of Power to Delhi from Central Generating Stations

Sl. No.	Stations	Installed Capacity (MW)	Firm share of Delhi (%)	Unallocated Share of Delhi (%)	Capacity share (MW)
A	NTPC Plants				
1	Anta Gas	419	10.50%	0%	44
2	Auraiya Gas	663	10.86%	0%	72
3	Dadri Gas	830	10.96%	0%	91
4	Dadri – I	840	68.57%	0%	576
5	Dadri – II	980	75.00%	0%	735
6	Farakka	1600	1.39%	0%	22
7	Kahalgaon – I	840	6.07%	0%	51
8	Kahalgaon – II	1500	10.49%	0%	157
9	Rihand – I	1000	10.00%	0%	100
10	Rihand – II	1000	12.60%	0%	126
11	Rihand – III	1000	13.19%	0%	132
12	Singrauli	2000	7.50%	0%	150
13	Unchahar – I	420	5.71%	0%	24
14	Unchahar – II	420	11.19%	0%	47
15	Unchahar – III	210	13.81%	0%	29
16	Aravali Jhajjar	1500	20.27%	0%	304
	Sub Total	15222			2660
B	NHPC Plants				
1	Baira Siul	180	11.00%	0%	20
2	Chamera – I	540	7.90%	0%	43
3	Chamera – II	300	13.33%	0%	40

Sl. No.	Stations	Installed Capacity (MW)	Firm share of Delhi (%)	Unallocated Share of Delhi (%)	Capacity share (MW)
4	Chamera – III	231	12.73%	0%	29
5	Dhauliganga	280	13.21%	0%	37
6	Dulhasti	390	12.83%	0%	50
7	Salal	690	11.62%	0%	80
8	Tanakpur	94	12.81%	0%	12
9	Uri	480	11.04%	0%	53
10	Sewa – II	120	13.33%	0%	16
11	Parbati-II	520	12.73%	0%	66
12	URI-II	240	13.45%	0%	32
	Sub Total	4065			478
C	Others				
1	Tehri HEP	1000	10.30%	0%	103
2	Koteshwar	400	9.86%	0%	39
3	NJPC (Satluj)	1500	9.47%	0%	142
4	Tala HEP	1020	2.94%	0%	30
	Sub Total	3920			314
D	NPCIL				
1	NAPS	440	10.68%	0%	47
2	RAPP C Units 5 & 6	440	12.69%	0%	56
	Sub Total	880			103
	Total	24087			3555

4.39 The total share allocation of State GENCOs and Bawana is summarised in the table below as provided by SLDC:

Table 4.15: Allocation of Power to Delhi from State Generating Stations

Stations	Assigned Capacity (MW)	Allocation to Delhi (%)	Delhi's Share for FY 2015-16 (MW)
Rajghat [#]	135	100	135.00
GT ^{##}	270	100	270.00
Pragati-I ^{###}	330	100	330.00
Pragati-III, Bawana	1371.2	80	1096.96
Total	2106.2		1831.96

[#] Total installed capacity of Rajghat is 135MW. 1MW has been allocated to IP stations for auxiliary Consumption.

^{##}The capacity of Gas Turbine has been de-rated from 282 MW to 270 MW.

^{###} Total installed capacity of Pragati 330 MW. However, 230MW is allocated to BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL. Remaining 100 MW is allocated to NDMC.

ENERGY AVAILABILITY FROM THE CENTRAL SECTOR, STATE SECTOR AND OTHER GENERATING STATIONS

Petitioner's Submission

- 4.40 The Petitioner sources the power through mix of long term and short term sources to meet the demand of Delhi. Long term sources include Central Generating Stations which are owned by Central Government and State Generating Stations which are owned by State Government. The Petitioner has been assigned the share based on the PPAs which have been inherited from Delhi Transco Limited. The allocation of power within Delhi is being done by the Commission.
- 4.41 The Petitioner has requested the SLDC to provide the estimates for the power purchase quantum expected to be received during FY 2015-16. The SLDC vide email dated 17.10.2014 provided the station-wise details of the power purchase quantum expected to be received during FY 2015-16. In case of Aravali power plant, the SLDC has not projected any quantum during FY 2015-16. However the plant has been surrendered only upto 31.03.2015. Therefore the Petitioner has considered energy from Aravali Power Plant during FY 2015-16. The Petitioner has calculated its effective share from APCPL based on Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 as follows:

Table 4.16: Energy Quantum from APCPL during FY 2015-16 (%)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Reference	UoM	Quantum
1	Total Effective capacity	A	MW	1,500
2	PLF considered	B	%	45%
3	Power Generated	$C=A*B$	MU	5,913
4	Auxiliary consumption	D	%	7.75%
5	Power at ex-bus bar	$E=C*(1-D)$	MU	5455
6	Effective Share of Delhi	F	%	3.86%
7	Share from APCPL	$G=E*F$	MU	211

- 4.42 Further SLDC has not estimated energy from 335 kW Rooftop Solar Power Plant. The Petitioner has considered the quantum of Power during FY 2015-16 same as approved by Commission for FY 2014-15 in Tariff Order dated July, 2014. The Petitioner has projected energy available as given in the Table below:

Table 4.17 Energy Availability Projected for 2015-16

Sl. No	Stations	Installed Capacity (MW)	Total Energy Available in Delhi (MU)	Petitioner Share (MU)
A	NTPC			
1	ANTA GAS	419	189	48
2	AURAIYA GAS	663	308	78
3	DADRI GAS	830	428	109
4	Dadri-1	840	4651	490

Sl. No	Stations	Installed Capacity (MW)	Total Energy Available in Delhi (MU)	Petitioner Share (MU)
5	Dadri-II	980	5021	1275
6	FARAKKA	1600	152	39
7	KAHALGAON STAGE-I	840	348	88
8	KAHALGAON STAGE-II	1500	1075	273
9	RIHAND –I	1000	683	174
10	RIHAND –II	1000	861	219
11	Rihand-III	1000	901	229
12	SINGRAULI	2000	1025	508
13	UNCHAHAR-I	420	164	42
14	UNCHAHAR-II	420	321	82
15	UNCHAHAR-III	210	198	50
16	Aravali Power Corporation Ltd	1500	362	41
	Sub Total	15222	16688	3744
B	NHPC			
1	BAIRA SIUL	180	67	17
2	CHAMERA-I	540	180	46
3	CHAMERA-II	300	181	46
4	CHAMERA-III	231	117	30
5	DHAULIGANGA	280	38	10
6	DULHASTI	390	269	68
7	SALAL	690	371	94
8	TANAKPUR	94	41	10
9	URI	480	269	68
10	SEWA-II	120	64	16
11	Parbati III	520	216	55
12	Uri-II	240	73	19
	Sub Total	4065	1886	479
C	THDC			
1	Tehri	1000	414	105
2	KOTESHWAR	400	148	38
	Sub Total	1400	563	143
D	DVC			
1	Mejia Units# 6	250	608	154
2	Mejia Units# 7	500	630	630
3	CTPS 7 & 8	500	1520	386
	Sub Total	1250	2758	1171
E	NPCIL			
1	NAPS	440	253	64
2	RAPP B Units 3&4			0
3	RAPP 5&6	440	437	111
	Sub Total	880	690	175
1	SJVNL	1500	800	203
	Others	1500	800	203

Sl. No	Stations	Installed Capacity (MW)	Total Energy Available in Delhi (MU)	Petitioner Share (MU)
1	TALA	1020	99	25
2	Sasan	3960	3044	1508
3	Solar	0		1
	Sub Total	4980	3143	1534
	Delhi Generating Stations			
1	BTPS	705	4250	807
2	Rajghat	135	600	152
3	GAS TURBINE	270	1079	273
4	Pragati-I	330	1983	349
5	Bawana	500	1377	310
	Sub Total	1940	9289	1890
	Grand Total	31238	35817	9340

Commission's Analysis

- 4.43 The Commission has examined the quantum of power purchase proposed by the Petitioner from each of the generating stations of CSGS, SGS and others.
- 4.44 The Commission has considered the notification No. NRPC/OPR/103/02/2014-15 dated 31.03.2015 of NRPC on the availability of power from various Generating Stations for FY 2015-16.
- 4.45 The Commission vide its letter dated 10.03.2015 had directed SLDC to provide the availability of Energy from various generating stations from which the DISCOMs of Delhi purchase power. SLDC has projected the Energy available from each of the stations for purchase by DISCOMs in Delhi during FY 2015-16.
- 4.46 The Commission convened a meeting with SLDC and DISCOMs on 25.03.2015 to discuss the availability of power. In the meeting, the Commission has directed to reconcile the availability of energy from those energy stations where the projection of Petitioner was different from that of SLDC.
- 4.47 SLDC submitted the reconciled availability vide its letter dated 06.04.2015. The availability of energy has been considered taking into consideration the reduction in generation at PPS-III (Bawana) based on actual availability during FY 2014-15.
- 4.48 As per Clause 5.2(a) of the Terms and Conditions of the Licence granted by the Commission to the Petitioner deals with approval of the Commission for purchase of power which is as follows:

"The Licensee shall not, without the general or special approval of the

Commission:

- a. Purchase or otherwise acquire electricity for distribution and retail supply except in accordance with this License and on the tariffs and terms and conditions as may be approved by the Commission."*

- 4.49 During the Technical Validation Session, it was observed from the internal audit report of the Petitioner that validity of PPA from Anta, Auriya and Dadri stations have expired on 31.03.2012 and Singrauli's PPA has expired on 30.04.2013. These PPAs have been renewed by the Petitioner without intimating or getting approval from the Commission. As per internal report of the Petitioner for FY 2013-14, Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas based stations are costlier than their average power purchase cost. The Commission has also sought clarification vide its letter dated 19.03.2015 from the Petitioner regarding renewal of PPA from these stations without getting the approval of the Commission.
- 4.50 The Petitioner has submitted that the renewal of PPA has been extended on existing terms and conditions. Therefore, approval of the same from the Commission is not required.
- 4.51 The Petitioners submission regarding renewal of PPA is factually incorrect because whenever the analysis for projected demand and supply is considered, the supply from each station is being considered up to the date of validity of existing PPA. Therefore, before extending the existing PPA for further periods Petitioner should have:
- undertaken demand analysis i.e., whether power from the source under question is required or not over such extended period;
 - done cost benefit analysis for procurement from such sources, and
 - obtained prior approval from the Commission as per it's license conditions.
- 4.52 It is observed that actions as brought out at in the above para, have not been done by the Petitioner. This is also evident from the fact that the Petitioner vide its letters dated 15.06.2015, 23.06.2015, 26.06.2015, 30.06.2015, 13.07.2015 has submitted its proposal to surrender its allocation from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations forever from their portfolio due to high cost of generation from these stations. The said letters were also submitted to GoNCTD by the Petitioner.

- 4.53 In view of the above, the Commission has decided that the power purchase cost from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas based station should not be considered into the total power purchase cost on and from the expiry date of respective PPA's due to their high cost of generation as well as Petitioner's proposal for surrendering power from these stations. As regards power from Singrauli, same has been considered by the Commission even after the expiry of PPA and its renewal without intimation to the Commission, in the interest of consumers as the generation cost from this station is Rs. 1.76/kWh which is quite less than the average Power Purchase Cost from the Petitioner's portfolio and the Petitioner has also not submitted any proposal for surrender of Power from Singrauli.
- 4.54 In view of above, the Commission has not considered the energy allocation from Anta, Auriya and Dadri Gas Stations during FY 2015-16 due to expiry of its PPA on 31.03.2012 as the renewal of these PPAs has not been approved by the Commission.
- 4.55 NRPC has reallocated the firm share to Delhi at 20.27% of 1500 MW (304 MW) from Indira Gandhi STPS plant of M/s. APCPL in revision No 2 w.e.f from 00:00 hrs of 01.07.2015 vide its notification No. NRPC/OPR/103/02/2015-16 dated 29.06.2015. The projected scheduled energy from APCPL by SLDC to the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 is 183.27 MU.
- 4.56 It is observed that SLDC has not considered quantum from SJVNL for BYPL and also not considered energy of 180 MW of Dadri-I which will be reallocated to TPDDL from September'15 onwards. However, the Commission has considered the allocation of power to BYPL from SJVNL for FY 2015-16 and 180 MW of Dadri-I to TPDDL from September'15 to March'16.
- 4.57 The Petitioner vide its letter dated 03.06.2015 has submitted that PPA for RPH has expired after serving its useful life and expressed their unwillingness to renew the same considering their high generation cost & future demand-supply scenario.
- 4.58 Further, the Petitioner vide its letter dated 13.07.2015 has submitted its willingness not to extend the PPA for Sewa-II of NHPC after its expiry on 24.07.2015. Accordingly, the Commission vide its letter dated 11.08.2015 has directed the Petitioner that in case they decide not to renew the PPA of Sewa-II they have to ensure that there should be availability of sufficient power to meet the demand in

future. In case of any shortage of power attributable due to termination of the PPA, should be met through procurement at rates lower than that of the above mentioned station.

- 4.59 In view of above, the Commission has considered 2 months of power allocation from Rajghat Power Station (i.e., up to May'2015) and 4 months of power allocation from Sewa-II of NHPC (i.e., up to July'2015).
- 4.60 The Commission is of the view that Average Billing Rate (ABR) of BYPL is lower compared to BRPL and TPDDL due to different consumer mix in the area of the distribution of each DISCOM. To offset the gap between Power Purchase Cost and revenue of BYPL, it is felt necessary that either power purchase cost should be reduced for BYPL or the consumer mix needs to be modified. As the consumer mix cannot be altered, therefore the Commission has decided to divert the costly power from BYPL to BRPL & TPDDL and cheaper power from BRPL & TPDDL to BYPL. The summary of re-assigned power stations for BYPL is as follows:

Sl. No.	Station	Earlier Allocation	Revised Allocation	Remarks
1	Sasan	1508.38 MU	1758.38	10.71% of TPDDL allocation shifted to BYPL & 24.94% of BRPL allocation shifted to BYPL
2	BTPS	656.39 MU	556.39 MU	15.23% of BYPL allocation shifted to TPDDL
3	Gas Turbine	227.35 MU	77.35 MU	65.94% of BYPL allocation shifted to BRPL

- 4.61 Based on the foregoing analysis, the availability of power to the Petitioner from Central, State and Other Generating Stations as approved by the Commission is given in the Table below:

Table 4.18: Energy availability from Central, State and Other Generating Stations as approved for FY 2015-16

Source	Plant Capacity (MW)	Delhi's Share %	Delhi's Share (MW)	Projected Energy to be Scheduled by Delhi (MU)	Energy to be scheduled by BYPL (MU)
Central Generating Stations					
NTPC					
BTPS	705	100	705	3456.69	556.39
FARAKKA	1600	1.39	22	151.94	38.59
KAHALGAON STAGE-I	840	6.07	51	348.34	88.48
NCPP – DADRI	840	68.57	756	4639.57	488.69

Source	Plant Capacity (MW)	Delhi's Share %	Delhi's Share (MW)	Projected Energy to be Scheduled by Delhi (MU)	Energy to be scheduled by BYPL (MU)
RIHAND-I	1000	10	100	683.18	173.53
RIHAND-II	1000	12.6	126	860.80	218.64
RIHAND-III	1000	13.191	132	901.18	228.90
SINGRAULI	2000	7.5	150	1024.76	507.87
UNCHAHAR-I	420	5.71	24	163.84	41.62
UNCHAHAR-II	420	11.19	47	321.08	81.55
UNCHAHAR-III	210	13.81	29	198.13	50.32
KAHALGAON STAGE-II	1500	10.49	157	1074.98	273.04
DADRI EXTENSION	980	48.37	474	3238.43	1275.49
APCPL	1500	20.27	304	1603.38	183.27
NTPC Total	14015		3077	18666.36.44	4306.38
NHPC					
BAIRASIUL	180	11	20	77.60	19.71
CHAMERA-I	540	7.9	43	190.10	48.29
CHAMERA-II	300	13.33	40	188.47	47.87
CHAMERA-III	231	12.734	29	122.77	31.18
DHAULIGANA	280	13.21	37	93.48	23.74
DULHASTI	390	12.83	50	266.96	67.81
SALAL	690	11.62	80	377.52	95.89
TANAKPUR	94.2	12.81	12	39.99	10.16
URI	480	11.04	53	315.38	80.11
SEWA-II	120	13.33	16	23.12	5.87
Uri-II	240	13.452	32	160.77	40.84
Parbati III	520	12.73	66	80.00	20.32
NHPC Total	4065.2		479	1936.16	491.78
Others					
TEHRI HEP	1000	10.3	103	310.00	78.74
NJPC (SATLUJ)	1500	9.47	142	480.00	121.92
KOTESHWAR	400	9.86	39	120.00	30.48
Mejia Unit-6			170	680.00	172.72
Mejia Unit-7			119	630.00	630.00
DVC Chandrapur (7&8)			230	1600.00	406.40
TALA	1009.8	2.94	30	100.00	25.40
Sasan	2481.6	11.25	446	3043.55	1758.38
MPL DVC			281	1810.00	0.00
Haryana CLP Jhajjar			124	350.00	0.00
Others Total	6391.4		1684	9123.55	3124.04
NUCLEAR					
RAPS – 5 & 6	440	12.69	56	315.00	80.01
NPCIL – NAPS	440	10.68	47	275.00	69.85
Nuclear Total	880		103	590.00	149.86
State Generating Stations					
Rajghat	135	100	135	58.33	14.74
GAS TURBINE	270	100	270	900.00	77.35
Pragati-I	330	100	330	1742.00	306.69

Source	Plant Capacity (MW)	Delhi's Share %	Delhi's Share (MW)	Projected Energy to be Scheduled by Delhi (MU)	Energy to be scheduled by BYPL (MU)
PRAGATI-III, BAWANA	1371.2	80	1097	1750.00	393.75
SGS Total	2106.2		1832	4450.33	792.53792.53
Renewable					
TOWMCL	16			112.00	0.00
Thyagaraj Solar				1.12	-
Rooftop Solar				0.50	0.50
TPDDL's Solar				1.95	-
SOLAR (SECI)	3.79			95.00	30.23
Renewable Total	19.79			210.57	30.73
TOTAL PURCHASE FROM LONG TERM				34977.05	8895.33

4.62 Accordingly, the anticipated availability of energy estimated by SLDC for all Delhi DISCOMs is about 34977.05 MU and out of which the share for the Petitioner is 8895.33 MU as against requirement of 6462.14 MU based on the allocation as indicated in the table above.

POWER PURCHASE COST

COST OF POWER PURCHASE FROM EXISTING STATIONS

Petitioner's Submission

4.63 The Petitioner has considered the fixed Cost and Energy Charge Rate (ECR) as estimated by the Central Generating Stations in their Petitions submitted before CERC for approval of Tariff for the period FY 2014-15 to FY 2018-19. The energy charges in case of Hydro Power Plants have been calculated in accordance with the formula given in Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.

4.64 In case of those Central Generating Stations which are yet to submit the Petition for determination of Tariff before CERC, the Petitioner has considered the fixed charges and energy charges as per the bills.

4.65 The Power Purchase Cost as proposed by the Petitioner for various stations during FY 2015-16 is given in the Table as follows:

Table 4.19: Power Purchase Cost proposed by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16

Sl. No	Stations	Petitioners Share	Fixed Charge	Variable Charge	Total Charge	Average Rate
		(MU)	(Rs. Cr.)	(Rs. Cr.)	(Rs. Cr.)	(Rs./kWh)

Sl. No	Stations	Petitioners Share (MU)	Fixed Charge (Rs. Cr.)	Variable Charge (Rs. Cr.)	Total Charge (Rs. Cr.)	Average Rate (Rs./kWh)
1	2	3	4	5	6=4+5	7=6/3
A	NTPC					
i	Anta Gas	48	6	13	19	4.03
ii	Auraiya Gas	78	10	26	36	4.58
iii	Dadri Gas	109	9	36	45	4.17
iv	Dadri – I	490	49	161	209	4.27
v	Dadri – II	1275	207	410	617	4.84
vi	Farakka	39	3	11	15	3.82
vii	Kahalgaon - I	88	9	26	35	3.96
viii	Kahalgaon - II	273	32	77	109	4.01
ix	Rihand – I	174	15	24	40	2.29
x	Rihand - II	219	20	31	50	2.30
xi	Rihand - III	229	35	32	67	2.93
xii	Singrauli	508	31	63	94	1.86
xiii	Unchahar - I	42	4	12	16	3.94
xiv	Unchahar - II	82	8	24	32	3.88
xv	Unchahar - III	50	7	15	22	4.36
xvi	Aravali Jhajjar	41	14	15	29	
	Sub Total	3744	461	976	1437	3.84
B	NHPC					
i	Bairasul	17	2	2	3	1.97
ii	Chamera - I	46	3	5	8	1.69
iii	Chamera - II	46	6	6	12	2.54
iv	Chamera - III	30	7	6	13	4.33
v	Dhauliganga	10	5	1	6	6.55
vi	Dulhasti	68	15	20	35	5.11
vii	Salal	94	4	5	9	0.97
viii	Tanakpur	10	2	1	3	3.15
ix	Uri	68	5	5	10	1.50
x	Sewa – II	16	4	4	9	5.38
xi	Parbati - III	55	6	17	23	4.27
xii	Uri – II	19	8	4	13	6.71
	Sub Total	479	67	77	144	3.01
C	THDC					
i	Tehri HEP	105	15	24	39	3.68
ii	Koteshwar	38	5	7	12	3.26
	Sub Total	143	20	32	51	3.57
D	DVC					
i	Mejia Units -6	154	25	43	69	4.44
ii	Mejia Units -7	630	147	140	287	4.55
iii	DVC Chandrapur 7 & 8 (LT-3)	386	95	78	173	4.48
	Sub Total	1171	267	261	528	4.51
E	NPCIL					
i	NAPS	64	0	15	15	2.39

Sl. No	Stations	Petitioners Share	Fixed Charge	Variable Charge	Total Charge	Average Rate
		(MU)	(Rs. Cr.)	(Rs. Cr.)	(Rs. Cr.)	(Rs./kWh)
ii	RAPP B Units 3&4	0	0	0	0	
iii	RAPP C Units 5&6	111	0	38	38	3.41
	Sub Total	175	0	53	53	3.03
F	SJVNL					
i	Nathpa- Jhakri	203	20	28	48	2.38
	Sub Total	203	20	28	48	2.38
G	Others					
	Tala HEP	25	0	5	5	2.02
	Sasan UMPP	1508	25	173	198	1.31
	Rooftop Solar	0.50	0.00	0.32	0.32	6.44
	Sub Total	1534	25	179	203	1.33
H	Delhi Generating Stations					
i	BTPS	807	76	356	432	5.35
ii	Rajghat	152	40	51	91	7.77
iii	Gas Turbine	273	49	115	163	6.15
iv	Pragati – I	349	38	160	197	5.22
v	Pragati -III, BAWANA	310	267	98	365	13.13
	Sub Total	1890	470	779	1249	6.61
I	Total	9340	1329	2386	3714	3.98

Commission's Analysis

4.66 The following methodology has been adopted by the Commission for estimation of Power Purchase Cost for FY 2015-16:

- (a) The Commission has considered the Fixed Charges and Energy Charges based on the Tariff Petitions filed by NTPC, NHPC (except Parbati-III) and Tehri HEP before CERC which is in line with the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 for the control period FY 2014-15 to FY 2018-19. In case of Hydro Stations, the Fixed Cost submitted in the Tariff Petitions by NHPC & Tehri has been divided equally in order to compute Fixed and Energy Charges as per Regulations 31 of the CERC Tariff Regulations 2014, indicated as follows:

“31. Computation and Payment of Capacity charge and Energy Charge for Hydro Generating Stations:

(2) The capacity charge (inclusive of incentive) payable to a hydro generating station for a calendar month shall be:

$AFC \times 0.5 \times NDM / NDY \times (PAFM / NAPAF)$ (in Rupees)

Where, AFC = Annual fixed cost specified for the year, in Rupees

...

(5) Energy charge rate (ECR) in Rupees per kWh on ex-power plant basis, for a hydro generating station, shall be determined up to three decimal places based on the following formula...

$ECR = AFC \times 0.5 \times 10 / \{DE \times (100 - AUX) \times (100 - FEHS)\}$

- (b) The Commission has considered an escalation of 5% on the Energy Charge for Coal based stations of CSGS.
- (c) For State Generating Stations, the Commission has considered the rate as approved in respective Tariff Orders of IPGCL and PPCL for FY 2015-16.
- (d) The cost of power purchase from Sasan UMPP is considered at Rs. 1.19/kWh which is the levelised tariff approved for the plant.
- (e) For rest of the stations, the Commission has considered the rate derived from actual generation, fixed cost and variable cost for FY 2014-15.
- (f) The cost of power purchase from Solar Energy Corporation of India (SECI) has been considered at Rs. 5.50/kWh based on the allocation letter.
- (g) The Water Cess Charges are annual expenditure raised by Hydro GENCOs of Jammu & Kashmir region based on the Jammu and Kashmir Water Resources (Regulation and Management) ACT 2010, to their beneficiaries. The Petitioner has paid Rs. 21.94 Crore in the FY 2014-15 to such Hydro GENCO stations of NHPC namely Salal, Uri, Uri-II, Dulhasti and Sewa-II. The Commission has verified the same from the bills raised by NHPC to the Petitioner and considered the same as the legitimate expenses in the Power Purchase Cost for FY 2015-16. The consideration of the same in Power Purchase Cost for FY 2015-16 as Base Cost will avoid PPAC in future on account of same.

4.67 The total Power Purchase Cost approved by the Commission is summarized in the Table as follows:

Table 4.20: Approved Power Purchase Cost for various generating stations for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	Energy (MU)	Fixed Cost (Rs. Cr.)	F.C/Unit (Rs./kWh)	V.C/unit (Rs./kWh)	Variable Cost (Rs. Cr.)	Total Charges (Rs. Cr.)	Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
A	NTPC							

Sl. No.	Particulars	Energy (MU)	Fixed Cost (Rs. Cr.)	F.C/Unit (Rs./kWh)	V.C/unit (Rs./kWh)	Variable Cost (Rs. Cr.)	Total Charges (Rs. Cr.)	Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
1	BTPS	556.39	64.60	1.16	4.62	257.05	321.66	5.78
2	FARAKKA	38.59	3.45	0.89	3.08	11.87	15.32	3.97
3	KAHALGAON - I	88.48	8.93	1.01	3.10	27.41	36.33	4.11
4	NCPP - DADRI	488.69	34.08	0.70	3.44	168.30	202.39	4.14
5	RIHAND - I	173.53	15.37	0.89	1.47	25.51	40.88	2.36
6	RIHAND - II	218.64	19.58	0.90	1.47	32.14	51.72	2.37
7	RIHAND - III	228.90	35.42	1.55	1.45	33.17	68.59	3.00
8	SINGRAULI	507.87	31.41	0.62	1.29	65.59	97.00	1.91
9	UNCHAHAR - I	41.62	4.18	1.00	3.08	12.80	16.98	4.08
10	UNCHAHAR - II	81.55	7.79	0.96	3.07	25.00	32.79	4.02
11	UNCHAHAR - III	50.32	7.23	1.44	3.07	15.43	22.66	4.50
12	KAHALGAON - II	273.04	32.40	1.19	2.94	80.27	112.68	4.13
13	DADRI EXTENSION	1275.49	206.61	1.62	3.38	431.24	637.85	5.00
14	ARAVALI	183.27	45.43	2.48	3.72	68.12	113.55	6.20
	Sub-Total NTPC	4206.38	516.51	1.23	2.98	1253.92	1770.43	4.21
B	NHPC							
1	BAIRA SIUL	19.71	1.78	0.90	0.90	1.78	3.55	1.80
2	CHAMERA - I	48.29	3.00	0.62	0.62	3.00	6.00	1.24
3	CHAMERA - II	47.87	5.72	1.19	1.19	5.72	11.44	2.39
4	CHAMERA - III	31.18	6.58	2.11	2.11	6.58	13.16	4.22
5	DHAULIGANGA	23.74	4.88	2.06	2.06	4.88	9.77	4.11
6	DULHASTI	67.81	15.42	2.27	2.27	15.42	30.85	4.55
7	SALAL	95.89	4.17	0.44	0.44	4.17	8.35	0.87
8	TANAKPUR	10.16	1.81	1.78	1.78	1.81	3.61	3.56
9	URI	80.11	4.93	0.62	0.62	4.93	9.86	1.23
10	SEWA -II	5.87	1.43	2.44	2.44	1.43	2.87	4.88
11	Uri - II	40.84	8.03	1.97	1.97	8.03	16.07	3.93
12	Parbati - III	20.32	3.56	1.75	3.18	6.45	10.01	4.93
	Sub-Total NHPC	491.78	61.32	1.25		64.21	125.53	2.55
C	NCPP							
1	RAPS - 5 & 6	80.01	0.00	0.00	3.41	27.27	27.27	3.41
2	NPCIL - NAPS	69.85	0.00	0.00	2.37	16.55	16.55	2.37
	NUCLEAR Total	149.86	0.00	0.00	2.92	43.82	43.82	2.92
D	Other Stations							
1	TEHRI HEP	78.74	19.27	2.45	2.45	19.27	38.54	4.89
2	NJPC (SATLUJ)	121.92	20.22	1.66	1.66	20.22	40.44	3.32
3	KOTESHWAR	30.48	5.18	1.70	1.93	5.89	11.07	3.63
4	Mejia Unit-6	172.72	23.82	1.38	2.60	44.85	68.67	3.98
5	Mejia Unit-7	630.00	126.81	2.01	2.08	130.98	257.79	4.09
6	Chandrapur (Ext-7&8)	406.40	67.25	1.65	2.06	83.62	150.86	3.71
7	TALA	25.40	0.00	0.00	2.02	5.13	5.13	2.02
8	Sasan	1758.38	0.00	0.00	1.19	209.25	209.25	1.19

Sl. No.	Particulars	Energy (MU)	Fixed Cost (Rs. Cr.)	F.C/Unit (Rs./kWh)	V.C/unit (Rs./kWh)	Variable Cost (Rs. Cr.)	Total Charges (Rs. Cr.)	Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
	Others Total	3224.04	262.55	0.81	1.61	519.20	781.76	2.42
	Total CSGS Excluding BTPS	7515.68					2399.97	3.19
E	State Generating Station							
1	IP Station							
2	Rajghat	14.74	4.50	3.06	3.38	4.99	9.49	6.44
3	Gas Turbine	77.35	15.78	2.04	4.70	36.35	52.13	6.74
4	Pragati - I	306.69	35.39	1.15	4.16	127.52	162.91	5.31
5	Pragati - III, BAWANA	393.75	194.93	4.95	3.08	121.38	316.31	8.03
	SGS TOTAL	792.53	251.05	3.17	3.77	298.86	549.91	6.94
6	Roof Top Solar	0.50	0.00	0.00	5.50	0.28	0.28	5.50
7	Solar	30.23	0.00	0.00	5.50	16.62	16.62	5.50
	Total Solar	823.26	251.05	3.05	3.84	315.76	566.81	6.89
	Total SGS including Renewable and BTPS	1379.65					888.47	6.44
	Water Cess Charges						21.94	
	Grand Total	8895.33	1091.43	1.23	2.47	2196.91	3310.28	3.72

COST OF POWER FROM OTHER SOURCES (SHORT-TERM PURCHASE)

Petitioner's submission

4.68 The Petitioner has proposed to purchase 477 MU of power from the other sources under short term purchase at Rs. 3.61/kWh.

Commission's Analysis

4.69 The Commission has not considered any power purchase cost from short term sources due to following reasons:

- As indicated in Table 4.30, there is a surplus power available with the Petitioner.
- The Petitioner has neither bifurcated the short term power purchase into various modes month wise viz. Banking, Bilateral, Exchange, Inter DISCOM transfer and UI nor provided the detail of previous Banked energy (forward/backward) which is scheduled to be received in FY 2015-16 in support of their claim.
- The Commission has already directed the Petitioner to enter into banking arrangement during the off peak hours which should be scheduled during the peak hours to meet the demand.

RENEWABLE POWER PURCHASE OBLIGATION (RPO)**Petitioner's Submission****Solar**

- 4.70 The Petitioner has submitted that as per DERC RPO Regulations, 2012, the Petitioner is required to purchase 0.30% of total energy sales through solar energy sources during FY 2015-16. In the absence of adequate availability of solar energy, the Petitioner proposes to achieve the RPO target through purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). For calculation of cost through RECs, the Petitioner has considered the forbearance rate approved by CERC in the order dated 23.08.2011. The cost for meeting RPO target through solar energy is tabulated as under:

Table 4.21: Cost of REC Purchase Projected Petitioner for meeting Solar RPO during FY 2015-16

Sl. No	Particulars	UoM	FY 2015-16
A	Energy Sales	MU	5615
B	RPO Target- Solar	%	0.30%
C	RPO Target- Solar	MU	17
D	Availability from Rooftop Solar	MU	0.5
E	Required to be met through REC	MU	16
F	REC Rate	Rs./unit	13
G	Cost of REC Purchase	Rs. Crore	22

Non-Solar:

- 4.71 As regards non-solar RPO target during FY 2015-16, the Petitioner is required to purchase 7.30% of total energy sales through non-solar energy sources during FY 2015-16. The Petitioner has calculated the RECs required to be purchased for meeting non-solar targets after deducting the energy availability projected through TOWMCL during FY 2014-15. The Petitioner has considered forbearance rate approved by CERC in the order dated 23.08.2011. The cost of meeting the RPO target through non-solar energy is tabulated as under:

Table 4.22: Cost of REC Purchase for meeting Non-Solar RPO during FY 2015-16

Sl. No	Particulars	UoM	FY 2015-16
A	Energy Sales	MU	5615
B	RPO Target- Non Solar	%	7.30%
C	RPO Target- Non Solar	MU	410
D	Availability	MU	
E	Required to be met through REC	MU	410
F	REC Rate	Rs/unit	3.30
G	Cost of REC Purchase	Rs Crore	135

Commission's Analysis

4.72 The Commission has notified the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Renewable Purchase Obligation and Renewable Energy Certificate Framework Implementation) Regulations, 2012 with effect from October, 2012 and it states as follows:

“Every obligated entity shall meet its RPO target by way of its own generation or by way of purchase from other licensee(s) or by way of purchase of Renewable Energy Certificate(s) or by way of combination of any of the above options.”

4.73 The Commission has prescribed the following year-wise Solar and Non-solar Renewable Obligations for the Distribution Companies for the period FY 2012-13 to FY 2016-17 in the Regulations.

Financial Year	Solar	Total
2012-13	0.15%	3.40%
2013-14	0.20%	4.80%
2014-15	0.25%	6.20%
2015-16	0.30%	7.60%
2016-17	0.35%	9.00%

4.74 The percentage (%) indicated is the minimum quantum of purchase from Renewable Energy Sources (in terms of energy equivalent in kWh of total consumption).

4.75 As per the above said RPO Regulations of the Commission, the Distribution companies have to purchase 7.60% of total Energy Sales approved by the Commission during FY 2015-16 including 0.30% from the solar sources.

4.76 The Commission has approved the total energy sales of 5628.52 MU for Petitioner for FY 2015-16. Based on the sales approved, the Petitioner has to purchase a minimum of 427.77 MU from renewable energy sources for FY 2015-16 given as follows:

Table 4.23: Renewable Energy to be Procured

Power Source	Approved Energy Sales (MU)	% of Total approved energy sales in Regulations	Renewable Energy to be Procured
Solar	5628.52	0.30%	16.89
Non-solar		7.30%	410.88
Total			427.77

4.77 The Petitioner therefore has to purchase 427.77 MU from renewable energy sources

during FY 2015-16 to meet RPO. The Petitioner has submitted that it proposes to meet the obligation through purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates.

4.78 The Commission has noted that the Petitioner is getting 0.50 MU Solar power only from solar roof top.

4.79 SLDC has estimated that BYPL will be receiving 30.23 MU of solar energy as per the Letter of Intent (LoI) with SECI during FY 2015-16. The rate of Solar (SECI) and roof top Solar sources is considered at Rs. 5.50/kWh which is the per unit rate of SECI.

4.80 The Commission, therefore, considers that the Petitioner has to procure the balance of Renewable Energy or purchase Renewable Energy Certificate(s) or combination of both to meet the RPO obligation for FY 2015-16.

4.81 CERC has fixed Floor Price and Forbearance Price for Solar and Non Solar sources vide Order dated 30.12.2014, as indicated in the Table as follows:

Sl. No	Particulars	Floor Price	Forbearance Price
1	Non-Solar	Rs. 1500/MWh	Rs. 3500/MWh
2	Solar	Rs. 3300/MWh	Rs. 5800/MWh

4.82 The cost of renewable energy/REC to be purchased by Petitioner for FY 2015-16 is as follows:

Table 4.24: Approved Cost of power purchases for RPO

Sl. No	Sources of Renewable Energy	Quantity to be Purchased (MU)	Avg. Rate (Rs/kWh)	Total Cost (Rs. Crore)	Remarks
1	Roof Top Solar	0.50	5.50	0.28	Table 4.18
2	Solar (SECI)	30.23	5.50	16.62	
4	Non Solar RECs to be purchased	397.04	1.50	59.56	
	Total	427.77		76.46	

4.83 The Commission approves the REC Purchase cost to the extent of Rs.59.56 Crore for FY 2015-16 to meet the Renewable Power Purchase Obligation.

TRANSMISSION LOSS AND CHARGES

Petitioner's Submission

Intra state Transmission

4.84 The Petitioner has considered the Intra State Transmission loss at 1.29% during FY 2015-16, as per the email of SLDC dated 18.06.2014.

4.85 The Petitioner has considered the Intra-state Transmission charges for FY 2015-16 equivalent to that estimated for FY 2014-15 in Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014.

Inter-state Transmission

4.86 The Petitioner has submitted that they have considered an increase of 0.25% (in absolute terms) the interstate transmission losses approved at 3.59% for FY 2014-15.

The interstate transmission loss have been considered at 3.84% for FY 2015-16

4.87 The Petitioner has considered during FY 2015-16 equivalent to that estimated in Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014.

4.88 The Intra-state and Inter-state Transmission losses and charges projected by the Petitioner are summarized below:

Table 4.25: Transmission loss, charges projected by Petitioner for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2015-16	Remarks
1	2	3	4
A	Transmission losses (MU)		
i	Inter-State Transmission	286	0.25% increase over Transmission losses as estimated in Tariff Order dated July 23, 2014 for FY 15
ii	Intra-State Transmission	89	DTL letter dated June 18, 2014
iii	Total Transmission losses (MU)	375	
B	Transmission Charges (Rs. Crore)		
i	Inter-State Transmission	252	As per DERC Tariff Order dated July 23, 2014
ii	Intra-State Transmission (including SLDC)	172	
iii	Contribution towards pension fund	110	
iv	Total Transmission Charges (Rs. Crore)	533	

Commission's Analysis

Transmission loss

Intra-State Losses

4.89 The Commission sought Intra-State Transmission Losses for FY 2014-15 from Delhi SLDC. Delhi SLDC vide its email dated 10.07.2015 has submitted the Intra-State Transmission losses of 0.70% for FY 2014-15. The Commission has considered the same Intra-State Transmission losses of 0.70% for FY 2015-16 for projection purpose.

Inter-State Losses

4.90 The Commission has considered the weighted average Inter-State Transmission loss

in the Northern region and Eastern Region at 3.14% for FY 2015-16 based on the actual Point of Connection (PoC) losses during April 2015 to July 2015.

Transmission Charges

- 4.91 The Commission has considered the Transmission charges for Interstate Transmission Licensee as projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 in the Petition amounting to Rs. 252.00 Crore.
- 4.92 The Intra-State Transmission charges has been considered based on:
- DTL Order for FY 2015-16 in which the approved ARR for FY 2015-16 is Rs. 726.68 Crore, Carrying Cost is Rs. 99.49 Crore, Expenses towards Public Grievance Cell for Meter Testing and Consumer Advocacy of Rs. 0.70 Crore and 20% of recovery amount to liquidate past period Gap of DTL amounting to Rs. 192.24 Crore. Therefore, the total DTL ARR for FY 2015-16 including Carrying Cost and 20% of past year Arrear is Rs. 1019.11 Crore.
 - The Commission sought actual consumption pattern of all Delhi Distribution Licensees from SLDC for FY 2014-15. Accordingly, Rs. 238.97 Crore has been considered for the Petitioner as Intra State Transmission Charges based on its share of 23.45% in the total consumption for FY 2014-15.
 - Proportionate share (based on consumption pattern of FY 2014-15) of Rs. 142.79 Crore from the Petitioner towards its contribution in Pension fund of Rs. 573.23 Crore for FY 2015-16 has been considered **(as recommended by Department of Power to the Commission vide its letter No. F.11(33)/2015-16/1763 dated 03.06.2015)**.
- 4.93 The Commission has considered SLDC charges for FY 2015-16 as per ARR approved by the Commission vide its Order dated 05.12.2013 for Petition No.38/2012 for FY 2011-12.
- 4.94 The Inter State and Intra State transmission losses and transmission charges as approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16 are summarized below:

Table 4.26: Transmission loss, charges approved for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	Approved FY 2015-16	Remarks
A	Transmission losses (%)		
1	Inter-State Transmission	3.14	

Sl. No.	Particulars	Approved FY 2015-16	Remarks
2	Intra-State Transmission (DTL)	0.70	
	Total Transmission Losses (MU)		
B	Transmission Charges (Rs Crore)		
1	Inter-State Transmission	252.00	Para 4.91
2	Intra-State Transmission (DTL)	238.97	
3	SLDC Charges	2.57	
4	Contribution towards Pension fund	142.79	
	Total Transmission Charges (Rs. Crore)	636.33	Sum (1 to 4)

ENERGY BALANCE

Petitioner's Submission

4.95 The energy balance submitted by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 is summarized below:

Table 4.27: Energy Balance Projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16

Sl. No	Particulars	UoM	FY 2015-16	Remarks
A	Energy Availability			
i	Total Energy available (excluding BTPS, SGS & Solar)	MU	7449	
ii	Inter-State Transmission Losses	MU	286	i*ii
iii	Energy Available from BTPS, SGS Short Term & Solar	MU	2368	
iv	Energy Available at State transmission Periphery	MU	9531	i-ii+iii
B	Energy Requirement			
i	Energy Sales	MU	5615	
ii	Distribution loss	%	17.60%	
		MU	1199	
iii	Energy requirement at distribution periphery	MU	6814	i+ii
iv	Intra-State transmission Loss	%	1.29%	
		MU	89	
v	Energy Requirement at Transmission Periphery	MU	6903	iii+iv
C	Surplus Energy	MU	2628	Aiv-Bv

Commission's Analysis

4.96 Based on the energy sales, distribution loss, Intra-state and Inter-state transmission losses approved by the Commission in Para's above, the energy required as approved by the Commission is summarized in Table below:

Table 4.28: Energy Balance approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	UoM	FY 2015-16	Remarks
	Energy Availability			

Sl. No.	Particulars	UoM	FY 2015-16	Remarks
A	Total energy available (excluding BTPS, SGS, TOWMCL & Solar)	MU	7515.68	Table 4.18
B	Inter-State Transmission Losses	%	3.14%	Table 4.23
		MU	235.99	
C	Energy available from BTPS, SGS TOWMCL & Solar	MU	1379.65	Table 4.18
D	Energy available at State Transmission Periphery	MU	8659.33	(A-B+C)
	Energy Requirement			
E	Energy sales	MU	5628.52	Table 4.6
F	Distribution loss	%	12.90%	Table 4.8
		MU	833.62	
G	Energy requirement at distribution periphery	MU	6462.14	
H	Intra-State Transmission Loss	%	0.70%	Table 4.23
		MU	45.55	
I	Energy Requirement at Transmission Periphery	MU	6507.69	(G/(1-0.70%))
J	Surplus Energy	MU	2151.64	(D-I)

SALE OF SURPLUS POWER

Petitioner's Submission

4.97 The Petitioner has proposed the sale of estimated surplus power of 2628 MU at Rs 2.08/kWh as given below:

Table 4.29: Projected sale of surplus power for FY 2015-16

Particulars	Surplus energy (MU)	Average Sale Price (Rs. / kWh)	Total Cost (Rs. Crore)
Sale of Surplus Power	2628	2.08	545

* Weighted average actual rate through interstate, bilateral PIEs etc.

Commission's Analysis

4.98 The Petitioner has Long term Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) from Central Generating Stations based on allocation made by the Ministry of Power, Government of India.

4.99 During the prudence check for Short term Power Purchase and Sale for FY 2013-14, it has been observed that DISCOMs did not follow the best method for optimisation of Power Purchase Cost on account of reasons indicated as follows:

- The DISCOMs entered into various Single Day Bilateral Purchase contracts (very less quantum i.e., 1-2 MU) and at the same time there were Bilateral Sale contracts for full month for the same time period. Thus, the short term Purchase could have been easily avoided by revising the Open access schedule

or limiting the sale of power to minimum off take or supply (80%-90%) indicated in the Bilateral Contracts itself. Such revision in Open Access Schedule or limiting the off-take/supply to minimum percentage do not levy any penalty to the either party.

- b. DISCOMs have disposed off their Surplus power in UI at very low rate rather than selling the same in Banking/Bilateral/Exchanges as prescribed in the Commission's Short Term Power Purchase & Sale guidelines issued to the DISCOMs on 20.01.2010. It is observed that UI charges under ABT mechanism were incorporated to maintain Grid Discipline and they cannot be treated as a mode of transaction to dispose off huge quantum of Surplus Power. For few of the months of FY 2013-14, UI sale was around 10%-12% of the Gross Power Purchase during that month for few DISCOMs.

4.100 In view of the above, the Commission has decided to impose a Contingency Limit of 3% per month on Gross Power Purchase to dispose off Surplus Power in UI. Percentage sale of surplus power over and above the Contingency Limit will be set off with differential rate of Exchange/Bilateral as decided by the Commission. The Commission may review the contingency limit in next Tariff Orders depending upon the Short Term Market dynamics and other parameters.

4.101 Further, it is observed that the DISCOMs have not made serious efforts to avoid short term Power Purchase/Sale which was observed due to overlapping in Banking transactions (forward/backward) and non-scheduling of power without considering Merit Order dispatch. It is pertinent to state that in case of backing down of generation plants due to scheduling done by Distribution Licensee, the short term Sale of Surplus power could have been avoided leading to optimisation of power purchase cost. The Commission observed that DISCOM wise scheduling is already in place in Delhi SLDC.

4.102 The rate of Surplus Power realised by DISCOMs varies from Rs.2.31/kWh to Rs.3.42/kWh during last four (4) years as indicated in the Table as follows:

Table 4.30: Quantum of surplus energy sold and unit price realised from FY 2011-12 to FY 2014-15

Sl. No.	Year	BRPL		BYPL		TPDDL		Wt. Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
		Energy Sold (MU)	Price Realised (Rs./kWh)	Energy Sold (MU)	Price Realised (Rs./kWh)	Energy Sold (MU)	Price Realised (Rs./kWh)	

Sl. No.	Year	BRPL		BYPL		TPDDL		Wt. Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
		Energy Sold (MU)	Price Realised (Rs./kWh)	Energy Sold (MU)	Price Realised (Rs./kWh)	Energy Sold (MU)	Price Realised (Rs./kWh)	
1	FY 2011-12	2393	3.23	1708	3.19	1680	2.94	3.13
2	FY 2012-13	1867	3.31	2634	3.12	2535	2.91	3.07
3	FY 2013-14	2123	2.80	1572	2.31	2721	3.08	2.80
4	FY 2014-15	1057	3.22	1051	3.41	1578	3.42	3.36

4.103 The Commission observed during the true up of FY 2013-14, that there was scope for better management of the process for short term sale of the surplus power so as to significantly protect the interest of the consumers. The Commission is of the view that Petitioner should endeavour to maximise revenue from sale of surplus power and enter into more banking, intrastate and bilateral transactions. Therefore, the Commission has considered the rate of sale of surplus power at Rs. 3.50/kWh for FY 2015-16 based on the per unit cost of sale of surplus power by BYPL & TPDDL during FY 2014-15.

4.104 Accordingly, the Commission approves the total sale of Surplus Power of 2151.64 MU at Rs. 3.50/kWh as indicated in the Table as follows:

Table 4.31: Approved Sale of Surplus Power for FY 2015-16

Particulars	Surplus Energy (MU)	Avg. Sale Price (Rs /kWh)	Total Cost (Rs. Crore)
Sale of Surplus Power	2151.64	3.50	753.07

4.105 Further, the Commission directs the Petitioner to follow best possible practices as indicated in this Tariff Order so as to optimise its Power Purchase Cost from Long Term and Short Term sources.

REBATE ON POWER PURCHASE AND TRANSMISSION CHARGES

4.106 With regard to rebate on power purchase and transmission charges the MYT Regulations, 2011 states that -

“Distribution Licensee shall be allowed to recover the net cost of power it procures from sources approved by the Commission viz. Intra-state and Inter-state Trading Licensees, Bilateral Purchases, Bulk Suppliers, State generators, Independent Power Producers, Central generating stations, non-conventional energy generators, generation business of the Distribution Licensee and others, assuming maximum normative rebate available from each source for payment of

bills through letter of credit on presentation of bills for supply to consumers of Retail Supply Business."

4.107 Accordingly, the Commission has considered power purchase rebate @ 2% of the gross power purchase cost and transmission rebate @ 2% of the total transmission and SLDC charges for projection of the normative rebate on the power purchase cost.

Table 4.32: Rebate on Power Purchase and Transmission charges approved for FY 2015-16

Particulars	Amount (Rs. Cr.)	Rebate %	Rebate (Rs. Cr.)
Power Purchase Rebate	3310.28	2%	66.21
Rebate on transmission charges	490.97	2%	9.82
Total	3801.25		76.03

TOTAL POWER PURCHASE COST

4.108 Based on the analysis above the total power purchase cost for FY 2015-16 approved by the Commission is summarized below:

Table 4.33: Total Power Purchase Cost approved for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	Quantity (MU)	Amount (Rs. Crore)	Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)	Remarks
1	Power Purchase from CSGS*	7515.68	2399.87	3.19	Table 4.20
2	Inter-State Losses	235.99	252.00		Table 4.26
3	Power Purchase from Delhi Stations [#]	1379.65	888.47		
4	Cost towards REC [^]	0.00	59.56		Table 4.20
5	Power Available at Delhi Periphery	8659.33	3599.90	4.16	
6	Intra-state Loss & Charges (Including SLDC charges)	45.55	241.54		
7	Pension Trust Charges		142.79		
8	Water Cess Charges		21.94		
9	Less: Power Purchase Rebate		66.21		Table 4.32
10	Less: Rebate on Transmission Charges		9.82		
11	Power Available to DISCOM	8613.78	3930.14	4.56	
12	Sales	5628.52			
13	Distribution Loss	833.62			
14	Energy Requirement at Distribution Periphery	6462.14	3177.07	4.92	
15	Sale of Surplus power	2151.64	753.07	3.50	Table 4.31

*Includes NTPC, NHPC, SJVNL, THDC, Dadri TPS, and future stations (excluding BTPS, SGS & Solar).

[#] Includes PPCL, Rajghat, GTPS and BTPS

[^] includes Total cost from Non Solar REC & Solar REC

POWER PURCHASE COST ADJUSTMENT CHARGES (PPAC)

Petitioner's Submission

4.109 The Petitioner has submitted in its Petition for revision of PPAC formula and requested the Commission to consider the following in the revised formula:

- a) Fixed Cost for Regulated Plants in Power Purchase Cost
- b) Transmission Charges.
- c) Arrears billed and payable to GENCOs/TRANSCOs on account of retrospective adjustment of tariff
- d) Loss in Sale of Surplus Power and
Any under/over recovery of Power Purchase variations on account of uncountable sales in next quarter

Commission's Analysis

4.110 The Commission has analysed the above submissions of the Petitioner and has considered:

- 1. Variation in Transmission Charges,
- 2. Arrears payable to GENCOs/TRANSCOs and
- 3. No Fixed Cost on account of Regulated power in the revised PPAC formula.

4.111 The Commission does not intend to include the variation on account of short term Power Purchase adjustment at this stage, since it would require prudence check.

4.112 The Petitioner has also proposed to consider the Loss in Sale of Surplus Power in the PPAC formula. The Commission observes that the Sale of Surplus power provides income to the Distribution Licensee and PPAC is linked to variation in Purchase Cost of power to the Distribution Licensee. The Hon'ble APTEL in its judgment in OP No. 1 of 2011 dated 11.11.2011 has also directed SERCs to provide PPAC in order to compensate the Distribution Companies for the increase in cost of power procurement during the financial year and to consider Loss on Sale of Surplus Power is not indicated in the said judgment. The relevant extract of the said Judgment is as follows:

"In view of the present precarious financial conditions of the distribution companies, it would be necessary that the State Commissions also to provide for Power Purchase Cost Adjustment Formula as intended in the section 62(4) of the Act to compensate the distribution companies for the increase in cost of power procurement during the financial year."

4.113 In view of above, the Commission has not considered loss on Sale of Surplus power in the PPAC formula.

4.114 Therefore, the PPAC formula would remain unchanged as approved in the Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 as follows

Power Purchase Adjustment (PPA) formula

$$\text{PPA for } n^{\text{th}} \text{ Qtr. (\%)} = \frac{(A-B)*C + (D-E)}{\{Z * (1 - \frac{\text{Distribution losses in \%}}{100})\} * \text{ABR}}$$

Where,

A = Total units procured in (n-1)th Qtr (in kWh) from power stations having long term PPAs – (To be taken from the bills of the GENCOs issued to distribution licensees)

B = Proportionate bulk sale of power from Power stations having long term PPAs in (n-1)th Qtr (in kWh)

$$\frac{\text{Total bulk sale in (n-1)}^{\text{th}} \text{ Qtr (in kWh)} * A}{\text{Gross Power Purchase including short term power in (n-1)}^{\text{th}} \text{ Qtr (in kWh)}}$$

Total bulk sale and gross power purchase in (n-1)th Qtr to be taken from provisional accounts to be issued by SLDC by the 10th of each month.

C = Actual average Power Purchase Cost (PPC) from power stations having long term PPAs in (n-1)th Qtr (Rs./ kWh) – Projected average Power Purchase Cost (PPC) from power stations having long term PPAs (Rs./ kWh) (from tariff order)

D = Actual Transmission Charges paid in the (n-1)th Qtr

E = Base Cost of Transmission Charges for (n-1)th Qtr = (Approved Transmission Charges/4)

Z = $\frac{[\{\text{Actual Power purchased from Central Generating Stations having long term PPA in (n-1)}^{\text{th}} \text{ Qtr (in kWh)} * (1 - \frac{\text{INTERSTATE TRANSMISSION LICENSEE losses in \%}}{100}) + \text{Power from Delhi GENCOs}]}{100}$

including BTPS (in kWh))* $(1 - \frac{\text{Intra state losses in \%}}{100} - B]$ in kWh

ABR = Average Billing Rate for the year (to be taken from the Tariff Order)
Distribution Losses (in %) = Target Distribution Losses (from Tariff Order)

INTER STATE TRANSMISSION LICENSEE Losses = $\frac{100 * \text{Approved INTER STATE TRANSMISSION LICENSEE losses in Tariff Order (kWh)}}{\text{Approved long term power purchase from central generating stations having long term PPA in the Tariff Order (kWh)}}$

(in %) DTL Losses (in %) = $\frac{100 * \text{Approved DTL Losses (from the Tariff Order) Power}}{\text{available at Delhi periphery (from energy balance table tariff order)}}$

4.115 The base power purchase cost computation based upon quantum and cost of power purchased from various generating stations over which any increase has to be taken for the purpose of PPAC during FY 2015-16 is given below:

Table 4.34: Schedule – Base cost for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	Energy (MU)	Total Charges (Rs. Cr.)	Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
1	BTPS	556.39	321.66	5.78
2	FARAKKA	38.59	15.32	3.97
3	KAHALGAON - I	88.48	36.33	4.11
4	NCPP - DADRI	488.69	202.39	4.14
5	RIHAND - I	173.53	40.88	2.36
6	RIHAND - II	218.64	51.72	2.37
7	RIHAND - III	228.90	68.59	3.00
8	SINGRAULI	507.87	97.00	1.91
9	UNCHAHAR - I	41.62	16.98	4.08
10	UNCHAHAR - II	81.55	32.79	4.02
11	UNCHAHAR - III	50.32	22.66	4.50
12	KAHALGAON - II	273.04	112.68	4.13
13	DADRI EXTENSION	1275.49	637.85	5.00
14	ARAVALI	183.27	113.55	6.20
	Sub-Total NTPC	4206.38	1770.43	4.21
1	BAIRA SIUL	19.71	3.55	1.80
2	CHAMERA - I	48.29	6.00	1.24

Sl. No.	Particulars	Energy (MU)	Total Charges (Rs. Cr.)	Avg. Rate (Rs./kWh)
3	CHAMERA - II	47.87	11.44	2.39
4	CHAMERA – III	31.18	13.16	4.22
5	DHAULIGANGA	23.74	9.77	4.11
6	DULHASTI	67.81	30.85	4.55
7	SALAL	95.89	8.35	0.87
8	TANAKPUR	10.16	3.61	3.56
9	URI	80.11	9.86	1.23
10	SEWA -II	5.87	2.87	4.88
11	Uri - II	40.84	16.07	3.93
12	Parbati - III	20.32	10.01	4.93
	Sub-Total NHPC	491.78	125.53	2.55
1	RAPS – 5 & 6	80.01	27.27	3.41
2	NPCIL – NAPS	69.85	16.55	2.37
	NUCLEAR Total	149.86	43.82	2.92
1	TEHRI HEP	78.74	38.54	4.89
2	NJPC (SATLUJ)	121.92	40.44	3.32
3	KOTESHWAR	30.48	11.07	3.63
4	Mejia Unit-6	172.72	68.67	3.98
5	Mejia Unit-7	630.00	257.79	4.09
6	Chandrapur (Ext-7&8)	406.40	150.86	3.71
7	TALA	25.40	5.13	2.02
8	Sasan	1758.38	209.25	1.19
	Others Total	3224.04	781.76	2.42
1	IP Station			
2	Rajghat	14.74	9.49	6.44
3	Gas Turbine	77.35	52.13	6.74
4	Pragati - I	306.69	162.91	5.31
5	Pragati - III, BAWANA	393.75	316.31	8.03
	SGS TOTAL	792.53	549.91	6.94
6	Roof Top Solar	0.50	0.28	5.50
7	Solar	30.23	16.62	5.50
	Total Solar	823.26	566.81	6.89
	Water Cess Charges		21.94	
	Grand Total	8895.33	3310.28	3.72

4.116 DISCOMs may claim the increase in the power purchase cost in accordance with the formula approved by the Commission and accordingly recover from its consumers after necessary approval of the Commission.

4.117 In order to give effect to PPAC on a quarterly basis the following is being implemented:

- a) The PPAC will be charged to all categories of consumers.
- b) The PPAC for any quarter would be charged only after it is approved by the Commission.
- c) The weighted average base cost in Rs/kWh shall be as approved in this Tariff Order for FY 2014-15, Rs. 3.72 for BYPL. Detailed computation is given in the Table above. The Schedule will be revised in every subsequent Tariff Order.
- d) The Distribution licensee shall submit to the Commission the details in respect of changes in power purchase cost of plants having long term PPAs, as listed in Table for (n-1)th quarter. Further, Auditor's Certificate along with statement indicating plant-wise details of fixed charges, variable charges, other charges and units purchased from each plant having long term PPAs, as listed in Table for (n-1)th quarter along with actual transmission charges for (n-1)th quarter shall be furnished along with the proposal of PPAC surcharge submitted for the Commission's approval. Further, similar information in respect of current bills should also be furnished in the Auditor's certificate.
- e) The percentage of PPAC will be rounded off to two decimal places.
- f) The percentage increase on account of PPAC will be applied as a surcharge on the total energy and fixed charges (excluding arrears, LPSC, Electricity Duty etc.) billed to a consumer of the utility. Further, PPAC surcharge should not be levied on the 8% surcharge and also the 8% surcharge towards recovery of past accumulated deficit is not to be levied on PPAC.
- g) The bill format shall clearly identify the PPAC percentage and amount of PPAC billed as separate entries.
- h) The PPAC calculated for any quarter, shall be applied prospectively for 3 months after receiving approval from the Commission.
- i) In view of the fact that PPAC computed for any quarter will be applied after a time delay for a subsequent 3 month period, there could be a difference between the actual power purchase cost increase and the recovery by the DISCOM through the quarterly adjustments. The difference, if any, will thus be adjusted at the time of annual true-up undertaken by the Commission for that year.
- j) The PPAC claim of any quarter submitted by the Petitioner shall be examined by the Commission. In view of public interest, the Commission will endeavour

that while approving the PPAC, there is no Tariff shock and at the same time reasonable PPAC is provided to the DISCOMs. The Commission may take appropriate view to carry forward or spread some amount of PPAC in the subsequent quarters.

- k) This PPAC formula shall remain applicable till it is **amended**, reviewed, revised or **otherwise amended**.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (O&M) EXPENSES

Petitioner's Submission

4.118 The Petitioner has submitted that Employee and A&G expenses for FY 2015-16 have been calculated in line with the methodology followed by the Commission in Tariff Order dated 13.07.2012 and by applying inflation factor calculated based on actual data available from FY 2008-09 to FY 2013-14. The Petitioner has computed inflation factor for FY 2015-16 based on the average increase in CPI and WPI index over last 5 years at 9.09%.

4.119 R&M expenses have been computed by applying "k" factor on opening GFA for FY 2015-16. It is submitted that as per clause 5.5 of DERC MYT Regulations, 2011, "K" is constant (could be expressed in %) and the petitioner has considered "K" factor equivalent to that approved for first control period i.e., @ 3.70%. The Petitioner requested the Commission to factor inflation percentage based on CPI – WPI index along with "K" factor so as to protect the petitioner against increase in R&M expenses. The Petitioner has not considered efficiency factor for FY 2015-16. The total O&M expenses claimed by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 are given in the Table below:

Table 4.35: O&M Expenses submitted by Petitioner for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's submission
Employee Expenses	278
A&G Expenses	72
R&M Expenses	102
Gross O&M Expenses	452
Efficiency Improvement	0.00%
Add: SVRS Pension	5
Net O&M expenses	456

Commission's Analysis

- 4.120 The Commission vide order dated 22.10.2014 has extended the MYT period of FY 2012-13 to FY 2014-15 for a further period of one year i.e. FY 2015-16.
- 4.121 The Commission has revised the methodology to determine the O&M Expenses for the Petitioner in view of direction of Hon'ble APTEL in No 171, 177 and 178 of 2012 as discussed in chapter A3.
- 4.122 The Commission provisionally considers the SVRS pension Rs.4.92 Crore for FY 2015-16 at the same level as approved for FY 2014-15 in the 2nd MYT Order.
- 4.123 As per Regulation 5.5 of the MYT Regulations 2011, the R&M expense is linked to $GFA_{(n-1)}$ and the 'k' factor. The Commission has revised the 'k' factor at 3.37% for 2nd MYT Control Period for determination of R&M expenses in view of the direction of Hon'ble APTEL.
- 4.124 The Commission has considered the opening GFA based on the true up for FY 2013-14 and further added capitalisation for FY 2014-15 as approved in the 2nd MYT Order for the purpose of computation of opening GFA for FY 2015-16 to determine the R&M expenses for FY 2015-16. The revised R&M expenses for FY 2015-16 are given in the Table below:

Table 4.36: R&M Expenses approved by Commission for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission (FY 2015-16)	Now Approved for FY 2015-16	Reference
Opening GFA (A)	2753.00	2354.51	
'K' Factor (B)	3.70%	3.37%	Table 3.42
Gross R&M Expenses	101.86	79.41	A*B

- 4.125 The Petitioner has not factored the efficiency improvement on the O&M expenses for FY 2015-16. The APTEL in Appeal No. 52 of 2008 in the matter of NDPL v/s DERC upheld the efficiency factors fixed by the DERC. Accordingly, the Commission has applied the efficiency factor of 4% for FY 2015-16 on the O&M expenses at the same level as approved for FY 2014-15 in the 2nd MYT Order.
- 4.126 Thus, the Commission considers the O&M Expenses for FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 as given in the Table below:

Table 4.37: O&M Expenses approved by Commission for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission (FY 2015-16)	Now Approved for FY 2015-16	Reference

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission (FY 2015-16)	Now Approved for FY 2015-16	Reference
Employee Expenses (A)	277.85	252.86	Escalated by 8% over FY 2014-15 Table 4.35
A&G Expenses (B)	72.46	82.02	
R&M Expenses (C)	101.86	79.41	
Gross O&M Expenses (D)	452.17	414.29	A+B+C
Efficiency Factor (%) (E)	0.00%	4.00%	
Less: Efficiency Improvement (F)	0.00	16.57	D x E
SVRS Pension (G)	4.92	4.92	
Net O&M expenses (H)	457.08	402.64	D-F+G

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE AND CAPITALIZATION

Petitioner's Submission

4.127 The Petitioner has proposed Capital expenditure and Capitalization for FY 2015-16 as given in the table below:

Table 4.38: Capital expenditure and Capitalization projected for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
Capital expenditure	430.00
Capitalisation	370.00

Commission's Analysis

4.128 The Commission provisionally allows Rs.230 Crore as capital expenditure and capitalisation for FY 2015-16 as given in the table below:

Table 4.39: Capital expenditure and Capitalization approved for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's submission	Now approved for FY 2015-16
Investment during the year	430.00	230.00
Capitalisation	370.00	230.00

DEPRECIATION

Petitioner's Submission

4.129 The Petitioner has submitted that assets added during FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 has been classified into different categories of assets based on asset addition as per audited accounts of FY 2013-14. The Petitioner has projected the Depreciation at Rs.105 Crore for FY 2015-16 in accordance with DERC MYT Regulations for calculation of depreciation as given in the table below:

Table 4.40: Depreciation projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioners submission
Opening GFA (Net of consumer contribution and grants)	2554
Additions during the year (net of consumer contribution)	302
Closing GFA	2856
Average GFA	2705
Depreciation	105
Rate of Depreciation	3.89%

Commission's Analysis

4.130 The Commission has considered closing GFA approved after True up of FY 2013-14 as opening balance of FY 2014-15 and added the GFA addition during FY 2014-15 as approved in MYT Order dated 13.07.2012 for determining the closing balance of GFA for FY 2014-15. Accordingly, the average GFA for the purpose of computation of depreciation for FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 is as follows:

Table 4.41: GFA considered by the Commission for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner submission	Now approved	Reference
Opening GFA (for FY 2014-15) (A)	2523.00	2124.51	Table 3.88
Add: Capitalisation for FY 2014-15 (B)	230.00	230.00	Table 4.39
Closing GFA for FY 2014-15/opening GFA for FY 2015-16 (C)	2753.00	2354.51	A+B
Add: Capitalisation for FY 2015-16 (D)	370.00	230.00	Table 4.42
Closing GFA for FY 2015-16 (E)	3123.00	2584.51	C+D
Average GFA (F)	2938.00	2469.51	(C+E)/2

MEANS OF FINANCE FOR NEW INVESTMENTS

4.131 For the purpose of projecting future funding requirement, the Commission has considered normative debt-equity ratio of 70:30 on the asset capitalised each year after utilizing the consumer contribution. The Commission has considered capitalisation of Capex for FY 2015-16 at Rs.230 Crore and accordingly, the funding requirement of capitalisation is considered in line with the methodology adopted in the 2nd MYT Order as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.42: Means of Finance considered for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Projection	Now approved	Reference
Capitalisation of fresh investment (A)	370.00	230.00	Table 4.42

Particulars	Petitioner's Projection	Now approved	Reference
Means of Finance			
Consumers Contributions (B)	68.00	23.69	As per petition
Internal accruals (C)	90.60	61.89	(A-B)*30%
Debt (D)	211.40	144.42	(A-B)*70%

CONSUMER CONTRIBUTION

4.132 The Commission has considered average Consumer Contribution/grants for the purpose of computation of depreciation of FY 2015-16 as follows:

Table 4.43: Consumer Contributions approved to be capitalized for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's projections	Now approved	Reference
Opening Consumer's Contributions/Grants for FY 2014-15 (A)	175.00	224.59	Table
Addition during FY 2014-15 (B)	24.00	23.69	As per petition
Closing consumer contribution for FY 2014-15/Opening Consumer's Contributions/ Grants for FY 2015-16 (C)	199.00	248.28	A+B
Additions during FY 2015-16 (D)	68.00	23.69	As per petition
Closing Consumer's Contributions/Grants (E)	267.00	271.97	C+D
Average Consumer's Contributions/Grants (F)	233.00	260.13	(C+E)/2

4.133 The Commission has considered average rate of depreciation @ 3.70% in the 2nd MYT Order and the same rate of depreciation is considered for FY 2015-16. Based on the GFA and Consumer's Contributions, the depreciation on GFA net of Consumer's Contributions has been computed as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.44 Depreciation approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's submission	Now approved	Reference
A	Average GFA	2938.00	2469.51	Table 4.41
B	Average consumer contribution	233.00	260.13	Table 4.43
C	Average Assets	2705.00	2209.39	A-B
D	Average Rate of Depreciation	3.89%	3.70%	2 nd MYT Order
E	Depreciation	105.00	81.75	C *D

ADVANCE AGAINST DEPRECIATION

Petitioner's Submission

4.134 The Petitioner has computed AAD in accordance with Clause 5.21 of DERC MYT Regulations 2011 for FY 2015-16 as given in the Table below.

Table 4.45: Advance Against Depreciation projected for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
1	1/10 of Opening project/Capex loans (A)	104.00
2	Debt Repayment (B)	104.00
3	Minimum of A & B	104.00
4	Depreciation as per ARR routed for repayment of loans	105.00
5	Excess of Min (A,B) over Depreciation	--
6	Cumulative Repayment (C)	1084.00
7	Cumulative Depreciation (D)	1012.00
8	Excess of repayment (C) over Depreciation (D)	72.00
9	Advance Against Depreciation (AAD)	--

Commission's Analysis

4.135 The Petitioner has not claimed any amount towards AAD for FY 2015-16.

Accordingly, the Commission has not considered any amount towards AAD for FY 2015-16.

WORKING CAPITAL**Petitioners' submission**

4.136 The Petitioner has submitted that working capital has been calculated in accordance with Clause 5.14 and 5.15 of DERC MYT Regulations, 2011. It is stated that for calculation of Working capital, the revenue and power purchase cost has been considered by including Transmission charges. The Petitioner has calculated the working capital for FY 2015-16 as given in the Table below:

Table 4.46: Working capital projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
Receivables from Sale of power	4066.00
Receivables equivalent to 2 months	677.67
Power purchase expenses	4031.00
Less: 1/12th Power purchases expenses	335.92
Total Working Capital	341.75
Less: Opening WC	303.25
Change in Working Capital	38.50

Commissions' Analysis

4.137 The Regulation 5.14 and 5.15 of the MYT Regulations 2011 specifies that working capital shall consist of:

For wheeling business

(a) *Receivables for two months of wheeling charges*

For Retail supply business

(a) *Receivables for two months of revenue from sale of electricity*

(b) *Less: Power purchase costs for one month*

(c) *Less: Transmission charges for one month, and*

(d) *Less: Wheeling charges for two months*

4.138 The Commission has examined the working capital computations furnished by the Petitioner which is based on the sale of electricity including surcharge and power purchase expenses including transmission charges, REC purchases and power sold to other sources. With revision in O&M Expenses for the 2nd MYT Control period as discussed in Chapter 3, the working capital requirement for the earlier years has revised, thus leading to change in the opening balance of working capital for FY 2015-16. The opening balance of the working capital is estimated at Rs.409.93 Crore for FY 2015-16.

4.139 The Commission has not considered 8% surcharge allowed to the Petitioner as revenue from sale of electricity for the purpose of computation of working capital. The Commission has considered the power purchase net of rebate and power sold to others. Accordingly, the Commission has computed the working capital based on the receivables from sale of electricity i.e. ARR and power purchases considered for FY 2015-16 as given in the Table below.

Table 4.47: Working Capital considered for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Reference
Receivables from sale of electricity (A)	4066.00	4,216.06	Table 4.8
Receivables equivalent to 2 Months of revenue from sale of electricity (B)	677.67	702.68	A/6
Net Power purchase expenses (incl. Transmission charges) (C)	4031.00	3,177.07	Table 4.33
Less: 1/12 th Power purchase Expenses (D)	335.92	264.26	C/12
Total Working Capital (E)	341.75	437.92	B-D
Less: Opening WC (F)	303.25	409.93	
Change in Working Capital (G)	38.50	27.99	E-F

Regulated Rate Base (RRB)**Petitioner's Submission**

4.140 The Petitioner has submitted RRB computations for FY 2015-16 as given in the Table below:

Table 4.48: RRB projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
1	RRB – Base	
a.	Opening Balance of OCFA	2753
b.	Opening Balance of working capital	303
c.	Opening Balance of Depreciation (incl. AAD)	981
d.	Opening Balance of Consumers contributions/grants	199
	Opening RRB [(a+b) - (c+d)]	1876
2	RRB - for the Year	
f.	Investments capital expenditure during the year	370
g.	Depreciation for the year (incl. AAD)	105
h.	Advance Against Depreciation	
i.	Consumers contributions, grants, etc. for the year	68
j.	Change in working capital	38
3	Change in Regulated Rate Base [(f - (g+h+i)/2) + j]	137
4	Regulated Rate Base – Closing (1+2f+2j) - (2g+2h+2i)	2112
5	Regulated Rate Base (i) (1)+ (3)	2013

Commission's Analysis

4.141 The RRB has been considered based on investment capitalised, Depreciation, Advance against depreciation and working capital requirements for FY 2015-16 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.49: RRB considered by the Commission for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Reference
A	Opening RRB	1875.74	1842.32	
B	RRB - for the Year		124.56	a-b-c
a	Investments capital expenditure during the year	370.00	230.00	Table 4.42
b	Depreciation for the year (incl. AAD)	105.27	81.75	Table 4.44
c	Consumers contributions, grants etc. for the year	68.00	23.69	Table 4.44
C	Change in working capital	38.50	27.99	Table 4.47
D	Closing RRB	2110.97	1994.88	A+B+C
E	Regulated Rate Base (i)	2012.60	1932.60	A+B/2+C

Weighted Average Cost of Capital**Petitioner's Submission**

4.142 The Petitioner has submitted that the rate of interest for FY 2015-16 is considered @14.15% equivalent to the actual rate of interest during FY 2013-14 and RoE is considered @16% as per DERC Tariff Regulations, 2011. The Petitioner has computed the WACC as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.50: WACC projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
1	Average Equity	805
2	Average Debt	1111
3	Cost of debt	14.52%
4	Return on Equity	16.00%
5	Weighted average cost of Capital	15.14%

Commissions' Analysis

4.143 As per the Regulation 5.11 of the MYT Regulations 2011, *for the purpose of determination of tariff, debt equity ratio for the asset capitalised shall be 70:30. Where equity employed is in excess of 30%, the amount of equity for the purpose of tariff shall be limited to 30% and balance amount shall be considered as notional loan. Where actual equity employed is less than 30%, the actual equity and debt shall be considered. The working capital shall be considered 100% debt financed for the calculation of Weighted Average Cost of Capital.*

4.144 The Commission has computed average rate of interest based on the rate of interest approved by the Commission in 2nd MYT order and the rate of interest on new loans to be availed by the Petitioner during FY 2015-16 at 10.25%. The Commission has accordingly, computed the weighted average cost of capital as shown in the Table below:

Table 4.51: Approved Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Reference
A	RRB(i)		1932.60	Table 4.49
B	Equity @ 30% of RRB(i)		579.78	30% of A
C	Debt (balance of RRB(i))		1,352.82	70% of A

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Reference
D	Return on Equity		16.00%	MYT Regulations 2011
E	Cost of Debt		10.25%	
F	Weighted Average Cost of Capital	15.14%	11.98%	$((B * E) / A) + (D * F) / A$

Return on Capital Employed (RoCE)

Petitioner's Submission

4.145 The Petitioner has projected the RoCE in the ARR for FY 2015-16 as given in the Table below:

Table 4.52: RoCE Projected by Petitioner for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
1	Equity	805
2	Debt	1111
3	Total (1+2)	1916
4	Rate of Return on Equity	16.00%
5	Rate of Return on Debt	16.00%
6	RRB (i)	2013
7	WACC	15.14%
8	RoCE (6*7)	305
9	Working Capital	38
10	SBI PLR	14.58%
11	Interest on working capital	6
12	Total ROCE (8+11)	310

Commissions' Analysis

4.146 The Commission has computed the RoCE for FY 2015-16 as given in the Table below:

Table 4.53: RoCE considered for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Now approved	Reference
1	RRB(i)	1932.60	Table 4.52
2	WACC	11.98%	Table 4.54
3	RoCE	231.43	1 x 2

Income Tax

Petitioner's Submission

4.147 The Petitioner has projected the Income Tax in the ARR for FY 2015-16 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.54: Income Tax Projected in the RE for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's submission
RRB average	2013
Equity average	805
Debt average	1111
% Equity	42%
RRB(i)	2013
Equity considered for Income Tax	846
Rate of Return	16.00%
Return on equity	135
MAT/Income Tax rate	20.01%
Income Tax	34

Commission's Analysis

4.148 Regulation 5.22 of DERC MYT Regulations, 2011 specified that Tax on Income, if any liable to be paid on the licensed business of the distribution Licensee shall be limited to tax on return on the equity component of capital employed.

4.149 The Commission considers the Income tax (gross up) based on revised RoE subject to true up on submission of actual/audited accounts for FY 2015-16 as given in the table below:

Table 4.55: Income Tax approved by the Commission for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioner's submission	Now approved	Reference
A	Equity considered for Income Tax	845.94	579.78	Table 4.51
B	Rate of Return	16.00%	16.00%	As per regulations
C	Return on Equity	135.35	92.76	A*C
D	MAT/Income Tax rate	20.01%	20.96%	MAT rate as per act
E	Income Tax	33.86	24.60	$\{C/(1-D)\}-C$

Non – Tariff Income**Petitioner's Submission**

4.150 The Petitioner has submitted that Non Tariff Income has been considered at the same level of FY 2014-15 allowed in the MYT order dated July 13, 2012 as detailed in the table below:

Table 4.56: Non tariff Income projected for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission
Non Tariff Income	79

Commission's Analysis

4.151 The Commission has analysed Non-Tariff Income of the Petitioner from FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14 for projection of NTI for FY 2015-16. The Non Tariff Income trued-up from FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14 and average Non tariff income is as given below:

Table 4.57: Non Tariff Income approved for FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Financial Year	Non-Tariff Income	Reference
2009-10	227.87	Table 3.31
2010-11	158.08	
2011-12	153.89	
2012-13	142.36	
2013-14	160.69	Table 3.85
Average	168.58	

4.152 The average of trued-up NTI from FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14 of Rs. 168.58 Crore has been considered as NTI for FY 2015-16 as given in the table below:

Table 4.58: Non Tariff Income approved for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's Submission	Now Approved	Reference
Non Tariff Income	79	168.58	Table 4.57

Aggregate Revenue Requirement without Carrying cost

4.153 ARR claimed by the Petitioner and ARR considered by the Commission for FY 2015-16 are summarized in the table below:

Table 4.59: Approved Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's submission	Now Approved	Reference
Power Purchase cost (incl. Transmission charges) (A)	4031.00	3177.07	Table 4.33
O&M Expenses (B)	457.10	402.64	Table 4.37
Depreciation (C)	105.27	81.75	Table 4.44
Advance against Depreciation	-	-	
Return on Capital Employed (RoCE) (D)	310.00	231.43	Table 4.53
Income Tax (E)	33.86	24.60	Table 4.55
Sub-total (F)	4937.26	3917.46	SUM(A to E)
Less: Non-tariff income (G)	79.00	168.58	Table 4.58
Aggregate Revenue Requirement (H)	4858.26	3748.91	F – G

Carrying Cost on Revenue Gap**Petitioner's submission:**

4.154 The Petitioner has submitted the Commission has allowed carrying cost @ 11.92% on the Regulatory Asset recognised till FY 2012-13. The Hon'ble ATE in judgment dated July 30, 2010 (Appeal 153 of 2009) ruled as under:

"47. The State Commission, instead of applying the principle of allowing the prevalent market rate for debt for the carrying cost, has allowed the rate of 9% on the strength of the Tribunal judgment even though the present interest rate has increased significantly. As pointed out by the Counsel for the Petitioner, the State Commission in the earlier case had decided tariff on 9.6.2004 and that on commercial borrowings an interest rate of 9% had been applied considering the then prevalent prime lending rates. Therefore, the State Commission before fixing the rate of carrying cost, has to find out the actual interest rate as per the prevailing lending rates. Admittedly, this has not been done.

51..... Therefore, the State Commission should have allowed the carrying cost at the prevailing market lending rate for the carrying cost so that the efficiency of the distribution company is not affected..... Therefore, the fixation of 9% carrying cost, in our view is not appropriate. Therefore, the State Commission is hereby directed to reconsider the rate of carrying cost at the prevailing market rate and the carrying cost also to be allowed in the debt/equity of 70:30."

4.155 The Petitioner has submitted that as per the above ruling carrying cost ought to be allowed in debt equity ratio of 70:30 with SBI PLR @14.58% as rate of interest and 16% as return on equity, which is worked out to 15.01% for FY 2013-14.

4.156 The Petitioner has calculated the carrying cost for FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.60: Carrying cost projected by the Petitioner for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioners submission
A	Opening Gap for FY 2013-14	6800
B	Revenue requirement for FY 2013-14	4653
C	Revenue during FY 2013-14	3527
D	Gap / (Surplus) for FY 2013-14	1126
E	Surcharge for FY 2013-14	270
F	Net Gap / (Surplus) for FY 2013-14	1126
G	Rate of carrying cost for the year	15.01%
H	Carrying cost	1105

Sl. No.	Particulars	Petitioners submission
I	Closing balance of Gap / (Surplus) at the end of the year 2013-14	8761
a	Revenue Gap / (Surplus) for FY 2014-15	1020
b	Rate of carrying cost for FY 2014-15	15.01%
c	Carrying cost	1391
d	Recovery through 8% surcharge	306
e	Closing balance of Gap / (Surplus) at the end of the year 2014-15	10867
J	Revenue requirement for FY 2015-16	4859
K	Rate of carrying cost for the year	15.01%
L	Total revenue requirement including 8% surcharge and carrying cost for FY 2015-16	6489
M	Carrying cost	1631

Commission's Analysis:

- 4.157 The Commission has submitted to the Hon'ble APTEL, the proposal for liquidation of Revenue Gap in the matter of I.A. No. 365 of 2013 in Appeal No. 266 of 2013 of the Petitioner. This proposal has also been submitted before Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 884 of 2010. As per the proposal, the Carrying Cost on Regulatory asset will be considered in the year on year ARR.
- 4.158 The Commission has considered available equity for the purpose of funding of the revenue gap at the end of FY 2013-14 and RoE accruing to the Petitioner during FY 2014-15 which is expected to be re-invested into the business.
- 4.159 The Commission had projected the carrying cost for FY 2014-15 on closing balance of revenue gap up to FY 2012-13, which has been revised in the truing up of FY 2013-14 as discussed in chapter 3 of this Order. Therefore, the amount of revenue gap and carrying cost for the purpose of allowance of carrying cost in ARR of FY 2015-16 has been provisionally adjusted with the expected reduction in the revenue gap in FY 2014-15 of Rs. 153.90 Crore on account of carrying cost, depreciation and RoCE of FY 2014-15 due to impact of decapitalisation and actual equity available.
- 4.160 The Carrying Cost on Revenue Gap has been considered based on the Hon'ble APTEL's directions in Appeal No. 142 of 2009 in the ratio of Debt:Equity (70:30) which is subject to final outcome of Civil Appeal No. 9003 & 9004 of 2011 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It is observed that as per revenue at existing tariff, the Petitioner has surplus revenue towards the ARR. Such revenue surplus along

with 8% surcharge is utilised towards liquidation of revenue gap which is as follows:

Table 4.61: Carrying Cost on Revenue Gap for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Now Approved	Reference
A	Closing balance of (Gap) / Surplus at the end of the year FY 2013-14	(3,051.19)	Table 3.101
B	Estimated amortization of revenue in FY 2014-15	483.30	Rs. 329.40 Crore as 8% Surcharge + Rs. 153.90 Crore as expected reduction in gap
B	Revenue requirement for FY 2015-16	3748.91	
C	Rate of carrying cost for FY 2015-16	11.27%	
D	Total Revenue Requirement including 8% Surcharge and carrying cost for FY 2015-16	4,020.14	$(B+(A*C))/(1+(8\%/2)*C)$
E	Carrying cost	271.23	D – B

Aggregate Revenue Requirement with Carrying cost

4.161 ARR claimed by the Petitioner and ARR considered by the Commission for FY 2015-16 are summarized in the table below:

Table 4.62: Approved Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Petitioner's submission	Now Approved	Reference
Aggregate Revenue Requirement	4858.26	3748.91	
Carrying cost (I)		271.23	Table 4.61
ARR with carrying cost (J)	4858.26	4,020.14	
Revenue at Existing Tariff		4194.98	
Surplus/(Gap) during the year		176.02	

4.162 The Commission therefore approves Aggregate Revenue Requirement of Rs. 4018.96 Crore for FY 2015-16.

4.163 Based on the allocation of different expenses in accordance with the methodology followed in the 2nd MYT Order, the approved ARR for Wheeling and Retail Supply business of Petitioner indicated in the table as follows:

Table 4.63: Approved ARR for Wheeling business for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2015-16
O&M Expenses	253.03
<i>Employee expenses</i>	158.90
<i>A&G Expenses</i>	51.55

Particulars	FY 2015-16
<i>R&M expenses</i>	49.90
<i>SVRS Pension</i>	3.09
Less: Efficiency improvement	(6.54)
Depreciation including AAD	65.47
Return on Capital Employed (RoCE)	161.11
Income Tax	17.13
Sub-total	496.74
Less: Non-tariff income	(24.66)
Aggregate Revenue Requirement	472.07

Table 4.64: Approved ARR for Retail business for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2015-16
Purchase of power	3,177.07
O&M Expenses	149.62
<i>Employee expenses</i>	93.96
<i>A&G Expenses</i>	30.48
<i>R&M expenses</i>	29.51
<i>SVS Pension</i>	1.83
Less: Efficiency improvement	-2.29
Depreciation	16.28
Return on Capital Employed (RoCE)	70.31
Income Tax	7.47
Carrying cost	271.23
Sub-total	3691.98
Less: Non-tariff income	143.92
Aggregate Revenue Requirement	3,548.06

A5: TARIFF DESIGN**COMPONENTS OF TARIFF DESIGN**

5.1 The Commission has considered the following components for designing tariff of the Distribution Licensees.

- a. Consolidated Sector Revenue (Gap)/Surplus.
- b. Cost of service
- c. Cross-subsidization in tariff structure

Consolidated Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for the Sector**Revenue (Gap)/Surplus till FY 2013-14**

5.2 The Commission has approved the Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for the Petitioner for FY 2013-14 as discussed in detail in Chapter A3 of this Order. The Revenue (Gap)/Surplus till end of FY 2012-13 as determined in the Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 and the cumulative (Gap)/Surplus till the end of FY 2013-14 is summarized in the table as follows:

Table 5.1: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of BYPL till FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Approved in Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 for FY 2012-13	Revised in past period Truing up in FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	Remarks
a	Opening level of (Gap) / Surplus	(2,946.61)	(2,278.96)	(2,831.92)	
b	Revenue Requirement for the year	3,966.76	3,859.73	3,999.39	
c	Revenue realised	3,325.27	3,325.27	3,800.63	
d	(Gap) / Surplus for the year	(641.49)	(534.46)	(198.76)	c-b
e	8% Surcharge for the year	158.90	237.32	280.00	
f	Net (Gap)/Surplus	(482.59)	(297.14)	81.24	d+e
g	Rate of Carrying Cost	11.48%	10.54%	10.77%	
h	Amount of carrying cost	(365.97)	(255.81)	(300.53)	$((a*g)+(f*g)/2)$
i	Closing Balance of (Gap)/Surplus	(3,795.17)	(2,831.92)	(3,051.19)	a+f+h

5.3 The summary of Revenue (Gap)/Surplus approved for BRPL and TPDDL till FY 2013-14 is summarized in the table as follows:

Table 5.2: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of BRPL till FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Approved in Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 for FY 2012-13	Revised in past period Truing up in FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	Remarks
a	Opening level of (Gap) / Surplus	(5,337.49)	(4,974.15)	(5,384.23)	
b	Revenue Requirement for the year	6,393.16	6,232.50	6,572.94	
c	Revenue realised	6,048.65	6,048.65	6,877.19	
d	(Gap) / Surplus for the year	(344.51)	(183.85)	304.25	c-b
e	8% Surcharge for the year	298.50	298.50	507.45	
f	Net (Gap)/Surplus	(46.01)	114.65	811.70	d+e
g	Rate of Carrying Cost	11.79%	10.70%	10.82%	
h	Amount of carrying cost	(632.16)	(524.73)	(537.54)	$((a*g)+(f*g)/2)$
i	Closing Balance of (Gap)/Surplus	(6,015.67)	(5,384.23)	(5,110.07)	a+f+h
j	Penalty due to delay in implementation of GIS mapping			4.79	Table 3.53 b
k	Net Closing Balance of (Gap)/Surplus			(5,105.28)	

Table 5.3: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of TPDDL till FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	Approved in Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 for FY 2012-13	Revised in past period Truing up in FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	Remarks
a	Opening level of (Gap) / Surplus	(3,370.56)	(3,060.25)	(3,375.83)	
b	Revenue Requirement for the year	4,748.32	4,630.92	4,976.41	
c	Revenue realized	4,436.00	4,436.00	4,987.37	
d	(Gap) / Surplus for the year	(312.32)	(194.92)	10.96	c-b
e	8% Surcharge for the year	237.32	237.32	390.70	
f	Net (Gap)/Surplus	(75.00)	42.40	401.66	d+e
g	Rate of Carrying Cost	11.78%	11.78%	11.88%	
h	Amount of carrying cost	(401.47)	(357.97)	(377.32)	$((a*g)+(f*g)/2)$
i	Closing Balance of (Gap)/Surplus	(3,847.03)	(3,375.83)	(3,351.48)	a+f+h

5.4 The Revenue Gap for FY 2013-14 as determined by the Commission is as indicated as follows:

Table 5.4: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of the three DISCOMS till FY 2013-14 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Up to FY 2013-14	Remarks
BRPL	(5,105.28)	Table 5.2
BYPL	(3,051.19)	Table 5.1
TPDDL	(3,351.48)	Table 5.3
Total	(11,507.95)	

5.5 It can be seen from the above that the accumulated Revenue Gap till FY 2013-14 for all the three DISCOMs is Rs. 11,507.95 Crore.

Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for FY 2015-16 at Existing & Revised Tariffs for BYPL

5.6 The summary of net revenue (gap)/surplus approved for BYPL at Existing Tariff for the current year, FY 2015-16 is as follows:

Table 5.5: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of BYPL at Existing Tariffs for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2015-16
Revenue requirement for the year (including Carrying Cost)	4,020.14
Revenue at existing tariff	4,194.98
Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for the year	174.84

5.7 The summary of net revenue (gap)/surplus for BRPL and TPDDL at Existing Tariff for the current year, FY 2015-16 is as follows:

Table 5.6: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of BRPL at Existing Tariffs for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2015-16	Remarks
Revenue requirement for the year (including Carrying Cost) (A)	7,963.62	Tariff Order of BRPL
Revenue at Existing tariff @ 99.50% Collection Efficiency (B)	8,041.89	
Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for the year (C)	78.27	

Table 5.7: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of TPDDL at Existing Tariffs for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2015-16	Remarks
Revenue requirement for the year (including Carrying Cost)	5,874.36	Tariff Order of TPDDL
Revenue at existing tariff	6,200.47	
Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for the year	326.11	

Table 5.8: Revenue (Gap)/Surplus of all the three DISCOMs at Existing Tariff for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2015-16	Remarks
BRPL	78.27	Table 5.5
BYPL	174.84	Table 5.6
TPDDL	326.11	Table 5.7
Total	579.22	

- 5.8 As there is surplus revenue for BRPL, BYPL & TPDDL which will additionally liquidate the principal amount of the accumulated revenue gap, **the Commission has decided to retain the tariff for FY 2015-16 at prevailing levels, with minor structural changes indicated in para below, based on the stakeholders' suggestions/inputs.**
- 5.9 The Commission has rationalised Composite Tariff for Group Housing Societies (GHS) at Rs.6.00/kWh based on Average Billing Rate of the domestic consumers against earlier tariff. The Tariff for Non Domestic, Industrial and DJB category consumers having sanctioned load of 10kW (11kVA) - 100kW (108kVA) has been extended to 10kW (11kVA) - 140kW (150kVA). Any surplus/(deficit) on account of such rationalisation of Tariff will be considered by the Commission during True up of FY 2015-16.
- 5.10 The summary of revenue billed at existing tariffs, excluding 8% surcharge, for FY 2015-16 is shown below:

Table 5.9: Revenue at Existing & Revised tariffs for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Category	Fixed Charges	Energy Charges	Total Revenue
Domestic	109.64	1543.27	1652.91
Non-Domestic	268.87	1,565.65	1,834.52
Industrial	23.16	241.39	264.55
Agriculture		0.05	0.05
Mushroom		0.01	0.01
Public Lighting		75.85	75.85
DJB	15.98	116.17	132.15
DMRC	3.15	100.65	103.80
Others	3.46	148.75	152.21
Total Revenue	424.26	3,791.79	4,216.05
Revenue at 99.5% Collection Efficiency			4194.98

- 5.11 The revenue for FY 2015-16 projected by Commission at Existing and Revised tariff with Collection efficiency of 99.50% is Rs. 4194.98 Crore (excluding 8% surcharge).
- 5.12 The Commission has also decided to continue with the existing surcharge at 8% over the revised tariff for liquidating the regulatory assets in line with proposed road map and this 8% Surcharge is estimated to result in an additional inflow of Rs. 334.83 Crore.

COST OF SERVICE MODEL

5.13 While determining the revenue requirement, various sectors of services, viz. generation, transmission and the distribution costs contribute to the total cost of service. The relative burden of constituent consumer categories is assessed and on the basis of the cost imposed on the system, it is decided as to how much share is due to which category of consumers. Although, it shall be equitable to have the embedded cost in designing the tariff for different consumer categories, it calls for a detailed database of allocated costs. Such allocations in the determination of embedded cost are done on the basis of following factors:

- (a) Voltage of supply;
- (b) Power factor;
- (c) Load factor;
- (d) Time of use of electricity;
- (e) Quantity of electricity consumed,
- (f) AT&C Loss etc.

5.14 As the detailed information regarding all the above factors except AT&C loss is not available, it would be difficult to assess the cost of service with reference to all the above factors except AT&C loss.

5.15 The Commission has carried out a study for calculating the voltage wise cost of supply for all the three DISCOMs for FY 2015-16. The approach adopted by the Commission for determining the cost of supply for different voltage levels has been described in the following paragraphs.

5.16 The approved ARR of the Wheeling and Retail Supply business is allocated to different voltage levels and the same has been considered along with the energy sales to the respective voltage level to arrive at the per unit Wheeling charge and Retail Supply Charge for that voltage level (detailed methodology discussed ahead).

Allocation of Wheeling ARR

5.17 The Commission has considered the gross energy sales (MU) approved for the DISCOM for the year and has allocated the same to different voltage levels in the proportion of energy sales (MU) to these voltages to total sales in that year as submitted by the respective DISCOMs. Both BRPL and BYPL have not indicated any

energy sales above 66 kV level in their distribution areas and therefore, no energy sales has been considered above 66 kV level while computing the cost of supply. The voltage wise energy sales approved for FY 2015-16 is as shown in the table below:

Table 5.10: Approved Energy Sales for FY 2015-16 (MU)

Particulars	BRPL	BYPL	TPDDL
Sales above 66 kV level	0	0	105.81
Sales at 33/66 kV level	871.50	296.71	156.37
Sales at 11 kV level	1850.41	810.95	1251.17
Sales at LT level	7961.16	4520.86	6474.55
Total	10683.07	5628.52	7987.90

- 5.18 The Commission has, thereafter, grossed up the energy sales (MU) at the specific voltage level with the respective distribution losses (%) at that level to arrive at the Energy Input (MU) for that level. Since the accurate baseline data for the voltage wise distribution losses is not available, the Commission has considered the distribution losses at various voltage levels except LT Level as projected for FY 2014-15 in 2nd MYT Order with same differential level as from FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15 for FY 2015-16. Keeping the overall distribution losses same as approved by the Commission and considering the losses at 33/66 kV and at 11 kV as projected, the LT voltage level losses are derived. The summary of the voltage wise distribution losses considered by the Commission are as follows.

Table 5.11: Distribution Loss for FY 2015-16 (%)

Particulars	BRPL	BYPL	TPDDL
Loss above 66 kV level	0.00	0.00	0.00
Loss at 33/66 kV level	1.35	0.90	1.25
Loss at 11 kV level	2.25	2.00	3.96
Loss at LT level	10.16	12.24	6.66

- 5.19 The Commission would like to reiterate that the voltage wise distribution losses considered above are estimates and may not reflect the actual picture. The Commission, in this regard directed the three DISCOMs (BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL) earlier to carry out energy audit so that the actual data of distribution losses at different voltage levels could be used to calculate the cost of supply. A study made to assess the technical losses and commercial losses segregated voltage wise is yet to be submitted by the Petitioner. The summary of Energy Input (MU) for the

respective voltage levels are shown below:

Table 5.12: Approved Energy Input for FY 2015-16 (MU)

Particulars	BRPL	BYPL	TPDDL
Input for 66 kV level	0.00	0.00	105.81
Input for 33/66 kV level	883.43	299.41	158.35
Input for 11 kV level	1919.51	835.17	1319.94
Input for LT level	9231.61	5327.56	7346.92
Total	12034.55	6462.13	8931.02

5.20 The Wheeling ARR for the year has been apportioned in proportion of the energy input at different voltage levels. The wheeling cost allocated to different voltage levels is tabulated as follows:

Table 5.13: Wheeling cost allocated to different voltages for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	BRPL	BYPL	TPDDL
Above 66 kV level	0.00	0.00	7.01
At 33/66 kV level	53.57	21.87	10.49
At 11 kV level	116.40	61.01	87.43
At LT level	559.83	389.19	488.20
Total	729.81	472.07	593.42

5.21 Based on the energy sales at the respective voltage levels the Commission has determined Wheeling Charge per unit for different voltages for FY 2015-16 as below.

Table 5.14: Wheeling Charges for FY 2015-16 (Rs/Unit)

Particulars	BRPL	BYPL	TPDDL
Above 66 kV level	0.00	0.00	0.66
At 33/66 kV level	0.61	0.74	0.67
At 11 kV level	0.63	0.75	0.70
At LT level	0.70	0.86	0.75
Average	0.68	0.84	0.74

Allocation of Retail Supply ARR

5.22 The Commission has allocated the Retail Supply ARR in the ratio of energy input determined above for different voltage levels. The Commission has thereafter, determined the Retail Supply charge for a particular voltage level by considering energy sales at that voltage level. The summary of Retail supply ARR Allocation to different voltage levels for FY 2015-16 is given below:

Table 5.15: Retail Supply cost Allocated to different voltages for FY 2015-16 (Rs. Crore)

Particulars	BRPL	BYPL	TPDDL
Above 66 kV level	0.00	0.00	62.59
At 33/66 kV level	531.02	164.34	93.67
At 11 kV level	1153.79	458.40	780.76
At LT level	5549.00	2925.33	4345.79
Total	7233.81	3548.06	5282.80

5.23 Based on the energy sales at the respective voltage levels, the Commission has determined retail supply charges per unit for different voltages for FY 2015-16 as below:

Table 5.16: Retail Supply Charges at different voltages for FY 2015-16 (Rs./Unit)

Particulars	BRPL	BYPL	TPDDL
Above 66 kV level	0.00	0.00	5.92
At 33/66 kV level	6.09	5.54	5.99
At 11 kV level	6.24	5.65	6.24
At LT level	6.97	6.47	6.71
Average	6.77	6.30	6.61

5.24 The cost of supply determined by the Commission for the different voltage levels is shown below:

Table 5.17: Cost of Supply for BRPL (Rs./Unit)

Particulars	Wheeling	Retail Supply	Total
Above 66 kV level	0.00	0.00	0.00
At 33/66 kV level	0.61	6.09	6.71
At 11 kV level	0.63	6.24	6.86
At LT level	0.70	6.97	7.67
Average	0.68	6.77	7.45

Table 5.18: Cost of Supply for BYPL (Rs. /Unit)

Particulars	Wheeling	Retail Supply	Total
Above 66 kV level	0.00	0.00	0.00
At 33/66 kV level	0.74	5.54	6.28
At 11 kV level	0.75	5.65	6.40
At LT level	0.86	6.47	7.33
Average	0.84	6.30	7.14

Table 5.19: Cost of Supply for TPDDL (Rs. /Unit)

Particulars	Wheeling	Retail Supply	Total
Above 66 kV level	0.66	5.92	6.58
At 33/66 kV level	0.67	5.99	6.66
At 11 kV level	0.70	6.24	6.94
At LT level	0.75	6.71	7.46
Average	0.74	6.61	7.35

CROSS-SUBSIDISATION IN TARIFF STRUCTURE

5.25 The Electricity Act, 2003 provides for reduction of cross subsidies by moving the category wise tariffs towards cost of supply. The Commission also recognises the need for reduction of cross subsidy. However, it is equally incumbent on the Commission to keep in mind the historical perspective for the need to continue with cross-subsidy for some more time.

5.26 Regarding Cross subsidy, clause 8.3 of the National Tariff Policy states,

“Direct subsidy is a better way to support the poorer categories of consumers than the mechanism of cross subsidizing the tariff across the board. Subsidies should be targeted effectively and in transparent manner. As a substitute of cross subsidies, the State Government has the option of raising resources through mechanism of electricity duty and giving that subsidy to only needy consumers. This is a better way of targeting subsidies effectively.”

5.27 In line with the above provision of the National Tariff Policy, Clause 9.1 of the MYT Regulations states that any consumer desirous of getting subsidized tariff shall approach the State Government and if the request for subsidy is found justified, the State Government may give subsidy to that class of consumers so that these consumers get electricity at concessional tariff.

5.28 At present, there are a number of consumer classes such as some slabs of domestic consumers, Agriculture and Mushroom Cultivation, Government Schools/Colleges, Hospitals, etc. which are being cross subsidized by other consumers. Several stakeholders have raised serious concern over cross subsidization of some categories and argued that after privatization, electricity distribution is purely commercial operation and there is no justifications for making some consumers pay for others. If any class of consumers is to be given concessional tariff on socio-economic ground,

the State government shall bear the cost on this count as supporting weaker sections of society is the responsibility of the government.

5.29 The Commission is of the view that ideally the electricity tariff for all categories of consumers should be fixed on cost to serve basis. However, in view of the high level of prevailing regulatory assets and the liquidation plan submitted to the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Commission has continued with a policy of subsidizing the Domestic consumers below the cost of supply and shifted part of the burden vide reasonable hike above Cost of supply for all other categories except for agriculture, public lighting and DMRC, since these areas directly impact the consumers.

5.30 The Commission has computed category wise revenue based on latest available data of Sales Mix, Consumers and Connected Load provided by the Petitioner. Therefore, the category wise ABR projected in the Tariff Order dtd. 23.07.2014 will vary from the projected in this Tariff Order. The Ratio of ABR to Average Cost of Supply and category-wise tariff hike approved for FY 2015-16 is indicated in the Table as follows:

Table 5.20: Ratio of ABR to Average Cost of Supply and category-wise approved for FY 2015-16

Sl. No.	Category	ABR At Existing Tariff	ABR at Revised Tariff	Average Cost of Supply (ACoS)	Ratio of ABR at Revised Tariff to ACoS	% Hike in Tariff
1	Domestic	5.43	5.43	7.14	76.03%	0.00%
2	Non-Domestic Low Tension	10.70	10.70	7.14	149.83%	0.00%
a	<i>Up to 10 kW</i>	10.68	10.68	7.14	149.52%	0.00%
b	<i>> 10 kW to 100 kW</i>	11.06	11.06	7.14	154.87%	0.00%
c	<i>>100 kW</i>	12.27	12.27	7.14	171.78%	0.00%
3	Non Domestic High Tension	9.98	9.98	7.14	139.78%	0.00%
4	Small Industrial Power (SIP)	9.46	9.46	7.14	132.44%	0.00%
a	<i>up to 10 kW</i>	9.32	9.32	7.14	130.47%	0.00%
b	<i>10-100 kW</i>	0.59	0.59	7.14	8.21%	0.00%
c	<i>>100 kW</i>	12.17	12.17	7.14	170.38%	0.00%
5	Large Industrial Power (LIP)	8.75	8.75	7.14	122.52%	0.00%
6	Agriculture	5.50	5.50	7.14	77.03%	0.00%
7	Public Lighting	7.30	7.30	7.14	102.24%	0.00%
8	DMRC	6.29	6.29	7.14	88.11%	0.00%
9	DJB	9.38	9.38	7.14	131.31%	0.00%
10	Advertisement and Hoarding	15.20	15.20	7.14	21.82%	0.00%

TARIFF STRUCTURE**Domestic Tariff**

- 5.31 Domestic tariff is applicable for power consumption of residential consumers, hostels of recognized/aided educational institutions and staircase lighting in residential flats, compound lighting, lifts and water pumps or drinking water supply and fire-fighting equipment, etc. bonafide domestic use in farm houses, etc. as per the revised tariff schedule.
- 5.32 All the Cattle/ Dairy Farms and Dhobi Ghat across Delhi with a total consumption of not more than 400 units in a month. However, in case the consumption in a month exceeds 400 units, the total consumption including the first 400 units shall be charged non- domestic rates as applicable to the consumers falling under the Non Domestic category.
- 5.33 The Commission in its Tariff Order dated June 26, 2003 introduced two part tariff for domestic consumers, i.e., fixed charges and energy charges and abolished minimum charges and meter rent. The fixed charge in two-part tariff represents the fixed component of charges, which is independent of consumption level and depends on the fixed cost incurred by the Utility in supplying electricity.
- 5.34 The Commission has considered the views expressed by the stakeholders and after considering various options, the Commission has decided to continue with the existing methodology of levying fixed charges on slab system, based on the sanctioned load till sanctioned load of 5 kW and for sanctioned load above 5 kW, the fixed charges shall be applicable in Rs/kW terms.

Domestic single delivery point for Group Housing Societies (GHS)

- 5.35 In last Tariff Order dated 23.07.2014 the Commission had revised the slab structure for co-operative group housing societies (CGHS) complexes and considered first 40% of the consumption at the rate of 201-400 units slab rate of Domestic Category,, next 30% of the consumption at the rate of 401-800 units slab rate of Domestic Category,, next 20% of the consumption at the rate of 801-1200 units slab rate of Domestic Category, and balance 10% of the consumption at the rate of 1201 units slab rate of Domestic Category. Further the Commission had clarified that the energy charges for

independent connection for common facilities through separate shall be billed as per respective slabs of CGHS instead of highest of the Domestic rates as in the earlier Tariff Schedule.

5.36 In this Tariff Order, the Tariff for Group Housing Societies (GHS) for supply at 11kV has been rationalized as follows:

- a) Composite Tariff for GHS has been fixed at Rs.6.00/kWh based on Average Billing Rate of the domestic consumers.
- b) Individual Consumers availing the supply at single delivery point through Group Housing Society may claim the benefit of subsidy, applicable if any, as per the Order of GoNCTD. Group Housing Society shall submit the details of eligible consumers with consumption details and lodge claims for subsidy on behalf of individual members from DISCOMs
- c) The definition of GHS has been broadened to cover all the GHS including residential complex developed by a developer as follows:

“Group Housing Society(GHS) shall mean a residential complex owned/managed by a Group Housing Society registered with Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Delhi / registered under Societies Act, 1860 and for sake of brevity the definition shall include residential complex developed by a Developer and approved by appropriate authority “

- d) The Single Point Delivery Supplier (GHS) shall charge the Domestic tariff as per slab rate of Tariff Schedule 1.1 to its Individual Members. Any Deficit/Surplus due to sum total of the billing to the Individual Members as per slab rate of Tariff Schedule 1.1 and the billing as per the Tariff Schedule 1.2 including the operational expenses of the Single Point Delivery Supplier shall be passed on to the members of the Group Housing Societies on pro rata basis of consumption.

Non-Domestic Tariff

5.37 Non-domestic category of consumers comprises two sub-categories viz., Supply on low Tension and Supply on High Tension (11 kV and above).

Non-Domestic Low Tension (NDLT)

5.38 This category covers LT Non-Domestic consumers having contract demand or

sanctioned load (whichever is applicable) up to 140 kW/150 kVA.

- 5.39 For the consumers with sanctioned load up to 10 kW in this category, the Commission had specified the kWh based tariff only. The Commission has decided to continue with the existing practice.
- 5.40 For Non-Domestic low tension (NDLT) category, the slab between 10 kW (11 kVA) and up to 140 kW (150 kVA), the Commission has specified kVAh based energy charges.
- 5.41 The Commission believes that with gradual movement towards voltage linked tariff, irrespective of load of the consumer, the tariff for consumption at higher voltages will be lower than that for lower voltages, which will encourage consumers to opt for HT connections particularly for loads higher than 140 kW.
- 5.42 For existing consumers having sanctioned load/contract demand, whichever is applicable, in kW, the actual power factor of the consumer in the relevant billing cycle shall be considered for converting kW to kVA for computing the fixed charges. For new consumers, the sanctioned load/contract demand shall be in terms of kVA only.

Non-Domestic High Tension (NDHT)

- 5.43 Non-domestic consumers with contract demand or sanctioned load more than 100 kW/108 kVA can also avail supply at 11 kV or above.
- 5.44 Non domestic consumers availing supply on 33 kV/66 kV or 220 kV will be entitled for rebate of 2.5% and 4% respectively on the applicable energy charges on 11 kV tariff.
- 5.45 For existing consumers having sanctioned load/contract demand, whichever is applicable, in kW, the actual power factor of the consumer in the relevant billing cycle shall be considered for converting kW to kVA for computing the fixed charges. For new consumers, the sanctioned load/contract demand shall be in terms of kVA only.

Industrial Tariff

- 5.46 Industrial category of consumers consists of two sub-categories, viz., Small Industrial Power (SIP) and Large Industrial Power (LIP).

Small Industrial Power (SIP)

- 5.47 This category covers industrial consumers having contract demand or sanctioned load, whichever is applicable, up to 200kW/215kVA.
- 5.48 For the consumers with sanctioned load up to 10 kW in this category, the Commission had specified the kWh based tariff only. The Commission has decided to continue with the existing practice.
- 5.49 For Small Industrial Power (SIP less than 200 kW/215 kVA) category, the slab between 10 kW (11 kVA) up to 140 kW (150 kVA), the Commission has specified the kVAh based tariff.
- 5.50 For existing consumers of 10 kW and above having sanctioned load/contract demand, whichever is applicable, in kW, the actual power factor of the consumer in the relevant billing cycle shall be considered for converting kW to kVA for computing the fixed charges. For new consumers, the sanctioned load/contract demand shall be in terms of kVA only.

Large Industrial Power (LIP)

- 5.51 Industrial consumers with contract demand or sanctioned load more than 108 kVA shall avail supply on 11 kV.
- 5.52 The Commission believes that with gradual movement towards voltage linked tariff, irrespective of load of the consumer, the tariff for consumption at higher voltages will be lower than that for lower voltages, which will discourage consumers to opt for LT connections particularly for loads higher than 100 kW.
- 5.53 For supply at 33/66 kV, consumers will get a rebate of 2.5% on the energy charges applicable for supply at 11 kV and a rebate of 4% for supply at 220 kV.
- 5.54 For existing consumers having sanctioned load/contract demand, whichever is applicable, in kW, the actual power factor of the consumer in the relevant billing cycle shall be considered for converting kW to kVA for computing the fixed charges. For new consumers, the sanctioned load/contract demand shall be in terms of kVA only.

Agriculture

- 5.55 Agriculture connections are available for tube wells for irrigation, threshers and

kutty cutting in conjunction with pumping load for irrigation purpose for loads up to 10 kW and lighting load for bonafide use in “kothra”.

Mushroom Cultivation

5.56 This category is applicable to the consumers who are engaged in mushroom cultivation/processing.

Public Lighting

5.57 Tariff for this category is applicable to all street light consumers including MCD, DDA, PWD/CPWD, CGHS, Slums, DSIIDC and certain civilian pockets of MES. The share of MCD, however is dominating as most of the street lights in the city are owned by the MCD.

5.58 The Commission has decided that tariff for public lighting which is metered will be lower than tariff for public lighting which is unmetered. Therefore, the Commission has prescribed different tariff for metered and unmetered public lighting.

5.59 As regard to the maintenance charges for street lighting, the maintenance charges and other conditions of maintenance of street lights as approved in the Commission's Order dated September 22, 2009 will continue till such time it is amended. These maintenance charges are exclusive of applicable taxes and duties.

Railway Traction

5.60 This category is applicable to Indian Railways for traction purposes for loads more than 100 kW/108 kVA.

5.61 The Commission has decided to withdraw the Capacity Blockage Charges which was applicable on Railways w.e.f. 01/10/2015.

DMRC

5.62 This category is available to Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC) to run its operations (other than construction projects). The Commission has decided to increase the applicable energy charges for DMRC to meet the cost of supply. The commercial load at DMRC stations shall be metered and billed separately as per the relevant tariff category.

Delhi Jal Board (DJB)

- 5.63 In the Tariff Order dated July 13, 2012, the Commission has added DJB supply under LT also in this category.
- 5.64 For the purpose of conversion of kW to kVA, the actual power factor of the relevant billing cycle shall be considered for the computation of fixed charges.

Delhi International Airport Limited (DIAL)

- 5.65 The Commission, in the Tariff Order for FY 2009-10, has already created a separate category to cover the consumption for the infrastructure facilities at the airport. The Commission has decided to give DIAL, a tariff, which shall be higher than that of DJB which is providing essential services to all consumers including the lowest strata of the society but lower than that of Non Domestic HT consumers. The commercial load at DIAL premises shall be metered and billed separately as per the relevant tariff category.

Advertisement and Hoardings

- 5.66 The Commission, in its last Tariff Order dated July 31, 2013 has created a separate category to cover the consumption for the advertisements and Hoardings. This category will be applicable for supply of electricity for lighting external advertisements, external hoardings and displays at departments stores, malls, multiplexes, theatres, clubs, hotels, bus shelters, Railway/Metro Stations, Airport and shall be separately metered and charged at the tariff applicable for "Advertisements and Hoardings" category, except such displays which are for the purpose of indicating/displaying the name and other details of the shop, commercial premises itself. Such use of electricity shall be covered under the prevailing tariff for such shops or commercial premises.

Temporary Supply

- 5.67 The Commission does not propose any major change in the existing tariff methodology for temporary supply as mentioned in the Tariff Schedule. The 10 days restriction for availing temporary supply for religious functions under clause 12.3 of the other terms and conditions of the Tariff Schedule has been withdrawn.

Time of Day (ToD) Tariff

- 5.68 It is observed that the cost of power purchase during peak hours is quite high. Time of Day (ToD) tariff is an important Demand Side management (DSM) measure to flatten the load curve and avoid such high cost peaking power purchases. Accordingly, the Commission had introduced Time of Day (ToD) tariff wherein peak hour consumption is charged at higher rates which reflect the higher cost of power purchase during peak hours. At the same time, a rebate is being offered on consumption during off-peak hours. This is also meant to incentivise consumers to shift a portion of their loads from peak time to off-peak time, thereby improving the system load factor and flatten the load curve. The ToD tariff is aimed at optimizing the cost of power purchase, which constitutes over 80% of the tariff charged from the consumers. It also assumes importance in the context of propagating and implementing DSM and achieving energy efficiency. This is important in Delhi situation where wide variations in load especially in summer causes problem of shortages during Peak hours and surplus during Off peak hours.
- 5.69 Introduction of higher peak hour tariff would initially generate additional revenue which would compensate for the reduction in revenue on account of lower tariff during off-peak hours.
- 5.70 In the long run, this would provide signals to the consumers to reduce load during peak hours and, wherever possible, shift this consumption to off-peak hours. Any loss of revenue to the utility on account of shifting of load from peak to off-peak hours in the long run would by and large get compensated by way of reduction of off-peak surplus to the extent of increase in off-peak demand.
- 5.71 The ToD Tariff would thus have immediate as well as long term benefits for both, consumers as well as the utility and contribute towards controlling the rise in power purchase costs.
- 5.72 The Commission in its MYT Order for second Control Period dated July 13, 2012 had decided to introduce ToD Tariff on a pilot basis for large industrial and non domestic consumers (300 kW and above). This was targeted to the consumer segment which has capacity to bear a higher burden for peak hour consumption and also at least partly (if not fully) offset the impact of this increase through higher off-peak

consumption at lower rates. The Commission as a progressive step in this direction and to further encourage demand shift from peak hours to off-peak hours has decided to lower the applicability limit for ToD Tariff.

- 5.73 In the Tariff order dated July 31, 2013, the Time of Day (ToD) Tariff# - ToD Tariff was made applicable on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) is 100kW / 108 kVA and above.
- 5.74 In the Tariff order dated July 23, 2014, the Time of Day (ToD) Tariff# - ToD Tariff was made applicable on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) is 50kW / 54 kVA and above. Also Optional TOD tariff was made available for all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) was between 25kW/27kVA to 50kW/54kVA.
- 5.75 In this Tariff Order, the Commission has decided changes in Time of Day (ToD) Tariff# as follows:
- TOD tariff shall be applicable on all consumers (other than Domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) is 25kW/27kVA and above as shown in the table below.
 - Option of TOD tariff shall also be available for all consumers (other than Domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) is 11kW/12kVA to 25kW/27kVA. If the consumer who has opted for TOD of sanctioned load between 11kW/12kVA to 25kW/27kVA, the charges for up-gradation of meters , if any, shall be borne by respective consumers.
 - The Commission has decided to reduce the Rebate during the Off Peak hours from 25% to 20% whereas for Peak hours Surcharge shall continue at 20%. Optional ToD Consumers will have the option to move back to non-ToD regime only once within one Financial Year.
 - The Commission has reviewed the ToD time slots as per the suggestions/comments received from various stakeholders including GoNCTD and the latest available trend for demand and supply of power. It is observed that during the months of October - April, the maximum demand is less than the available base supply of power. Accordingly, the revised the time slots for Peak and Off-Peak hours is as follows:

Months	Peak Hours	Surcharge on Energy Charges	Off-Peak Hours	Rebate on Energy Charges
May-September	1300-1700 hrs and 2100-2400 hrs	20%	0300-0900 hrs	20%

For other than peak and off-peak hours, normal energy charges will be applicable.

Note: The additional impact due to ToD tariff on the bill received by the management of commercial complexes may be recovered by the SPD manager by spreading this component of tariff on pro-rata basis on the users of the complex.

TARIFF SCHEDULE:

	CATEGORY	FIXED CHARGES ¹	ENERGY CHARGES ²
1	DOMESTIC		
1.1	INDIVIDUAL CONNECTIONS		
A	Up to 2 kW Sanctioned Load		
	0-200 units	40 Rs/month	400 Paisa/kWh
	201-400 units	40 Rs/month	595 Paisa/kWh
	401 – 800 units	40 Rs/month	730 Paisa/kWh
	801-1200 Units	40 Rs/month	810 Paisa/kWh
	Above 1200 Units	40 Rs/month	875 Paisa/kWh
B	Between 2kW and 5 kW Sanctioned Load		
	0-200 units	100 Rs/month	400 Paisa/kWh
	201-400 units	100 Rs/month	595 Paisa/kWh
	401-800 units	100 Rs/month	730 Paisa/kWh
	801-1200 Units	100 Rs/month	810 Paisa/kWh
	Above 1200 Units	100 Rs/month	875 Paisa/kWh
C	Above 5 kW Sanctioned Load		
	0-200 units	25 Rs /kW/month	400 Paisa/kWh
	201-400 units	25 Rs /kW/month	595 Paisa/kWh
	401-800 units	25 Rs /kW/month	730 Paisa/kWh
	801-1200 Units	25 Rs /kW/month	810 Paisa/kWh
	Above 1200 Units	25 Rs /kW/month	875 Paisa/kWh
1.2	SINGLE DELIVERY POINT FOR GROUP HOUSING SOCIETY (GHS) (GHS as defined in para 1.2 of other terms & conditions of the Tariff Schedule herewith)		
	Supply at 11kV		600 Paisa/kWh
	<i>The Single Point Delivery Supplier (Group Housing Societies) shall charge the Domestic tariff as per slab rate of 1.1 to its Individual Members.</i> <i>Any Deficit/Surplus due to sum total of the billing to the Individual Members as per slab rate of tariff schedule 1.1 and the billing as per the tariff schedule 1.2 including the operational expenses of the Single Point Delivery Supplier shall be passed on to the members of the Group Housing Societies on pro rata basis of consumption.</i>		
2	NON-DOMESTIC		
2.1	NON- DOMESTIC LOW TENSION (NDLT)		
	Up to 10 kW	100 Rs/kW/month	880 Paisa/kWh
	Between 10 kW/11kVA - 140 kW/150 kVA	115 Rs/kVA/month	850 Paisa/kVAh
	Greater than 140 kW / 150 kVA (400 volts) (No Supply on LT for load > 200kW/215 kVA)	150 Rs/kVA/month	995 Paisa/kVAh
2.2	NON-DOMESTIC HIGH TENSION (NDHT)		
	For supply at 11 kV and above (for load greater than 100kW/108 kVA)	125 Rs/kVA/month	840 Paisa/kVAh ³
	<i>The Single Point Delivery Supplier shall charge the NDHT tariff to its LT consumers and in addition shall be entitled to charge an extra upto 5% of the bill amount at NDHT tariff to cover losses and all its expenses.</i>		
3	INDUSTRIAL⁵		
3.1	Small Industrial Power (SIP) [less than 200kW/215 kVA]		
	Up to 10 kW	80 Rs/kW/month	845 Paisa/kWh

	CATEGORY	FIXED CHARGES ¹	ENERGY CHARGES ²
	Between 10 kW/11kVA - 140 kW/150 kVA	90 Rs/kVA/month	790 Paisa/kVAh
	Greater than 140 kW / 150 kVA (400 volts) (No Supply on LT for load > 200kW/215 kVA)	150 Rs/kVA/month	950 Paisa/kVAh
3.2	Industrial Power on 11 kV Single Point Delivery for Group of SIP Consumers	90 Rs/kVA/month	710 Paisa/kVAh ³
3.3	Large Industrial Power (LIP) (Supply at 11 kV and above)	125 Rs/kVA/month	740 Paisa/kVAh ³
4	AGRICULTURE	20 Rs/kW/month	275 Paisa/kWh
5	MUSHROOM CULTIVATION	40 Rs /kW/month	550 Paisa/kWh
6	PUBLIC LIGHTING		
6.1	Metered		
A	Street Lighting ⁴		730 Paisa/kWh
B	Signals and Blinkers		730 Paisa/kWh
6.2	Unmetered		
A	Street Lighting ⁴		780 Paisa/kWh
B	Signals and Blinkers		780 Paisa/kWh
7	DELHI JAL BOARD (DJB)		
7.1	Supply at LT		
A	Up to 10 kW	80 Rs/kW/month	800 Paisa/kWh
B	Between 10 kW/11kVA - 140 kW/150 kVA	90 Rs/kVA/month	780 Paisa/kVAh
C	Greater than 140 kW / 150 kVA (400 volts) (No Supply on LT for load > 200kW/215 kVA)	150 Rs/kVA/month	930 Paisa/kVAh
7.2	Supply at 11 kV and above	125 Rs/kVA/month	720 Paisa/kVAh ³
8	DELHI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED (DIAL)	150 Rs/kVA/month	790 Paisa/kVAh ³
9	RAILWAY TRACTION	150 Rs/kVA/month	680 Paisa/kVAh ³
10	DELHI METRO RAIL CORPORATION (DMRC) (SUPPLY AT 220 kV AND 66 kV)	125 Rs/kVA/month	610 Paisa/kVAh ³
11	ADVERTISEMENTS AND HOARDINGS	500 Rs/month/hoarding	1120 Paisa/kVAh
12	TEMPORARY SUPPLY		
12.1	For a total period of		
A	Less than 16 days	50% of the relevant category other than the Domestic category	Higher by 30% (temporary surcharge) of the relevant category of tariff other than the Domestic category
B	More than or equal to 16 days	Same as that of relevant category other than the Domestic category	Higher by 30% (temporary surcharge) of the relevant category of tariff other than the Domestic category

	CATEGORY	FIXED CHARGES ¹	ENERGY CHARGES ²
12.2	For residential Group Housing connections and other residential connections	Same as that of relevant category without any temporary surcharge	Same as that of relevant category without any temporary surcharge
12.3	For religious functions of traditional and established characters and cultural activities	Same as 1.1	Same as 1.1 without temporary surcharge
12.4	For construction projects	Same as that of relevant category	Same as that of relevant category with temporary surcharge of 30%
12.5	For threshers		
A	During the threshing season for 30 days	Electricity Tax of MCD : Rs 270 per connection	Flat rate of Rs 5,400
B	For extended period		On pro-rata basis for each week or part thereof

Notes on Superscripts

- For all categories other than Domestic, Fixed/demand charges are to be levied on billing demand on per kW/kVA or part thereof, basis. Where the MDI reading exceeds sanctioned load/contract demand a surcharge of 30% shall be levied on the fixed charges corresponding to excess load in kW/kVA for such billing cycle only. Wherever, sanctioned load/ contract demand is in kW/HP, the kVA shall be calculated on basis of actual power factor of the consumer, for the relevant billing cycle.
- Time of Day (TOD) Tariff[#]
 - TOD tariff shall be applicable on all consumers (other than Domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) is 25kW/27kVA and above as shown in the table below.
 - Option of TOD tariff shall also be available for all consumers (other than Domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI (whichever is higher) is 11kW/12kVA to 25kW/27kVA. If the consumer who has opted for TOD of sanctioned load between 11kW/12kVA to 25kW/27kVA, the charges for up-gradation of meters, if any, shall be borne by respective consumers.
 - The Commission has decided to reduce the Rebate during the Off Peak hours from 25% to 20%, whereas, for Peak hours Surcharge shall continue at 20%. Optional ToD Consumers will have the option to move back to non-ToD regime only once within one Financial Year.
 - Further, the Commission has reviewed the latest available Demand and Supply of Delhi and has revised the time slots for Peak and Off-Peak hours as follows:

Months	Peak Hours	Surcharge on Energy Charges	Off-Peak Hours	Rebate on Energy
May-September	1300-1700 hrs and 2100-2400 hrs	20%	0300-0900 hrs	20%

For other than Peak and Off-Peak hours normal Energy Charges shall be applicable.

Note: The additional impact due to ToD tariff on the bill received by the management of commercial complexes may be recovered by the Single Point Delivery (SPD) manager by spreading this component of tariff on pro-rata basis on the users of the complex.

- Additional rebate of 2.5% on the Energy Charges for supply at 33/66 kV and 4% for supply at 220 kV shall be admissible.
- Maintenance Charges on street lights would be additional to the specified tariff @ Rs. 84/light point/month and material cost at the rate of Rs.19/light point/month as per the Commission's Order

dated 22 September 2009 till further Orders. These charges will be payable to the DISCOM only if maintenance services are provided by the DISCOM and these are exclusive of applicable taxes and duties.

5. The Tariff Schedule under category 3 shall be applicable to Industrial consumers having valid Factory License.

Note:

- i. The above tariff rates shall be subject to an additional surcharge of 8% on the Fixed Charges and Energy charges (excluding LPSC, Arrears, Electricity Tax/Duty, PPAC, etc.) towards recovery of past accumulated deficit to the consumers.
- ii. The 8% surcharge is not to be levied on PPAC and PPAC should not be levied on 8% surcharge.
- iii. The 8% surcharge is not to be levied on the load violation surcharge as the penalty of 30% is already inherent in the load violation surcharge.
- iv. The distribution licensee should levy PPAC after considering relevant rebate/surcharge on energy charges available to the consumers.
- v. In case of prepaid consumers, the rebate is applicable on the basic Energy Charges, Fixed Charges and all other charges should be calculated on the tariff applicable after rebate.
- vi. The single phase domestic consumer up to 10 kW load is to be given a rebate by the DISCOMs depending on the number of bills raised in a year to the consumer as under:

Number of Bills raised during the Financial Year	% of Rebate
6	Nil
7	0.2
8	0.4
9	0.6
10	0.8
11	1.0
12	1.2

This rebate shall be given on the total amount billed in the financial year and shall be allowed in the first bill of the ensuing year. However, this rebate will not be pass through in ARR of the DISCOMs.

- vii. Individual Consumers availing the supply at single delivery point through Group Housing Society, shall claim the benefit of subsidy, applicable if any, as per the Order of GoNCTD. Group Housing Society shall submit the details of eligible consumers with consumption details and lodge claim of subsidy on behalf of individual members from DISCOMs.

- viii. The Commercial Consumers of DMRC and DIAL who have sanctioned load above 215 kVA but served at LT (415 Volts) such consumers shall be charged the tariff applicable to Non-domestic LT (NDLT) category greater than 100kW/108kVA (415 Volts).

Other Terms and Conditions of the Tariff Schedule

Category		Availability	Character of Service
1. Domestic	1.1 Domestic Lighting/Fan and Power (Single Delivery Point and Separate Delivery Points/Meters)	A) Available to following categories of consumers a. Residential consumers b. Hostels of recognized/ aided institutions which are being funded more than 90% by Municipal Corporation of Delhi or Government of the NCT of Delhi or any other Government/local bodies [local bodies include NDMC and MCDs (North, South & East)]. c. Staircase lighting in residential flats separately metered. d. Compound lighting, lifts and water pumps etc., for drinking water supply and fire-fighting equipment in residential complexes, if separately metered. e. In group housing societies etc. for bonafide use of lighting/fan and power, subject to the provision that the supply is at single delivery point for combined lighting/fan & power. B) Available to following consumers: a. Dispensary/Hospitals/Public Libraries/School/College/ Working Women's Hostel/ Orphanage/ Charitable homes run and funded by more than 90% by Municipal Corporation of Delhi or Government of the NCT of Delhi or any other Government/local bodies. b. Small Health Centre's approved by the Department of Health, Government of NCT	AC 50 Hz, single phase, 230 Volts for load up to 10 kW & AC 50 Hz, three phase, 400 Volts for loads beyond 10 kW AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 11 kV beyond 140 kW/150 kVA

Category	Availability	Character of Service
		of Delhi for providing Charitable Services only. c. Recognized Centre's for welfare of blind, deaf and dumb, spastic children, physically handicapped persons, mentally retarded persons, as approved by the Government of NCT of Delhi and other Government. d. Public parks except temporary use for any other purpose. C) Bed and Breakfast Establishments (Residential Premises) registered u/s 3 of the National Capital Territory of Delhi (Incredible India) Bed and Breakfast Establishments (Registration & Regulations) Act, 2007. D) Places of worship. E) Cheshire homes/orphanage F) Shelter Homes (including Night Shelters) approved by Delhi Urban Shelter Improvement Board, GoNCTD G) Electric crematoriums H) Professionals i.e. individuals engaged in those activities involving services based on professional skills, viz Doctor, Lawyer, Architect, Chartered Accountant, Company Secretary, Cost & Works Accountant, Engineer, Town Planner, Media Professional and Documentary Film Maker may utilize the domestic connection at their residence for carrying out their professional work in the nature of consultancy without attracting non-domestic tariff for the electricity consumed,

Category		Availability	Character of Service
		provided the area used for professional activity does not exceed the area permitted to be used for such activity in residential area under the Master Plan for Delhi, 2021 (MPD-2021), which as per MPD-2021 is permissible on any one floor only but restricted to less than 50% of the permissible or sanctioned FAR whichever is less on that plot or dwelling unit. I) Available, for loads up to 21 kW, to farm houses for bonafide domestic self use. J) The consumers running small commercial establishments from their households in JJ Clusters shall be charged domestic tariff provided that the total consumption of electricity does not exceed 400 units/month. K) Cattle / Dairy Farms / Dhobi Ghat with a total consumption of not more than 400 units/month.	
	1.2 Domestic Connection on 11 kV single delivery point	Same as 1.1(A) - For GHS flats and for individuals having sanctioned load above 100 kW/108kVA Group Housing Society(GHS) shall mean a residential complex owned/managed by a Group Housing Society registered with Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Delhi / registered under Societies Act, 1860 and for sake of brevity the definition shall include residential complex developed by a Developer and approved by appropriate authority.	AC 50 Hz, three phase, 11 kV; on single delivery point
2.Non-Domestic	2.1 Non-Domestic (Low Tension) – NDLT	A) Available to all consumers having load (other than the industrial load) up to 140 kW/150 kVA for lighting, fan & heating/cooling power appliances in all non-domestic establishments as defined below: B) Hostels/Schools/Colleges (other	AC 50 Hz, single phase, 230 Volts up to 10 kW load; AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 400 Volts for loads above 10 kW and up to 140kW/150 kVA

Category	Availability	Character of Service
		than those covered under domestic category) C) Auditoriums, Lawyer Chambers in Court Complexes, Hospitals, nursing homes/diagnostic Centres other than those run by Municipal Corporation of Delhi or the Government of NCT of Delhi. D) Railway's (other than traction) Hotels and restaurants E) Cinemas F) Banks/Petrol pumps G) All other establishments, i.e., shops, chemists, tailors, washing, dyeing etc. which do not come under the Factories Act. H) Cattle farms, fisheries, piggeries, poultry farms, floriculture, horticulture, plant nursery I) Farm houses being used for commercial activity J) DMRC for its commercial activities other than traction. K) DIAL for commercial activities other than aviation activities. L) Ice-cream parlors. M) Any other category of consumers not specified/covered in any other category in this Schedule

Category		Availability	Character of Service
	2.2 Non-Domestic High Tension (NDHT) Non-Domestic Power on 11 kV Single Delivery Point NDHT for Commercial Complexes	A) Available to consumers having load (other than industrial load) above 100 kW/108 kVA Non-Domestic establishments including pumping loads of Delhi Jal Board /DDA/MCD and supply to Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC) Ltd. for their on-going construction projects etc and for commercial purposes other than traction. B) Available to commercial complexes having load more than 100kW/108kVA for group of consumers for non-domestic use.	AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 11 kV
3. Industrial	3.1.Small Industrial Power (SIP)	Available to Industrial consumers with load up to 140 kW/150 kVA including lighting, heating and cooling load.	AC 50 Hz, single phase, 230 Volts; AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 400 Volts
	3.2 Industrial Power (SIP) on 11 kV Single Delivery Point for Group of SIP Consumers	On single delivery point for group of SIP consumers provided load of any individual consumer does not exceed 100 kW/108kVA	AC 50 Hz, 3 Phase, 11 kV
	3.3 Large Industrial Power (LIP) a) Supply on 11 kV b) Supply on LT (400 Volts)	Available as primary power to large industrial consumers having load above 100 kW/108kVA including lighting load. Supply at extra high voltage (33 kV and more) may also be given	AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 11 kV; AC 50 Hz, 3 Phase, 400 Volts
4. Agriculture		Available for load up to 10 kW for tube wells for irrigation, threshing, and kutti-cutting in conjunction with pumping load for irrigation purposes and lighting load for bonafide use in Kothra.	AC 50 Hz, Single / Three Phase, 230/400 Volts
5. Mushroom cultivation		Available for mushroom growing/cultivation up to 140 kW/150 kVA.	AC 50 Hz, 3 Phase, 400 Volts up to 140 kW/ 150 kVA
6. Public Lighting	Street lighting	Available to all street lighting consumers including MCD, DDA, PWD/CPWD, Slums department/DSIIDC /MES/GHS etc.	AC 50 Hz, Single /three Phase, 230/400 Volts
	Signals & Blinkers	Available for traffic signals and blinkers of Traffic Police	AC 50 Hz, Single Phase, 230 Volts
7. Delhi Jal	DJB- LT	Available to DJB for pumping load &	AC 50 Hz, 3

Category		Availability	Character of Service
Board		Water Treatment Plants	Phase, 400 Volts up to 100 kW
	DJB-HT	Available to DJB for pumping load & Water Treatment Plants	AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 11 kV for loads above 100 kW
8. Delhi International Airport Limited		Available to DIAL	AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 220/66/33 kV
9. Railway Traction (other than DMRC)		Available for railway traction for sanctioned load above 100 kW/108 kVA.	AC 50 Hz, Three phase, 220/66/33 kV
10. Delhi Metro Rail Corporation		Available to Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC) (not for construction projects)	AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 220/66/33 kV
11. Advertisement / Hoardings		Electricity for lighting external advertisements, external hoardings and displays at departments stores, malls, multiplexes, theatres, clubs, hotels, bus shelters, Railway/Metro Stations, airport which shall be separately metered and charged at the tariff applicable for "Advertisements and Hoardings" category, except such displays which are for the purpose of indicating/displaying the name and other details of the shop, commercial premises itself. Such use of electricity shall be covered under the prevailing tariff for such shops or commercial premises.	AC 50 Hz, single phase, 230 Volts for loads up to 10 kW; AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 400 Volts for loads more than 10 kW and up to 140 kW/150 kVA
12. Temporary Supply	12.1(A) for less than 16 days	Available as temporary connection under the respective category	AC 50 Hz, single phase, 230 Volts; AC 50 Hz, 3 phase, 400 Volts; AC 50 Hz, three phase, 11 kV
	12.1(B) for more than or equal to 16 days		
	12.2 for residential group housing connections	Same as that of relevant category	
	12.3 for religious functions of traditional and established characters and cultural activities	Provided for religious functions of traditional and established characters like Ramlila, Dussehra, Janmashtami, Nirankari Sant Smagam, Gurupurb, Durga Puja, Eid, Christmas celebrations, Easter, Pageants and cultural activities like NCC camps, scouts & guides camps etc.	
	12.4 for construction projects	With loads more than 10 kW	
	12.5 for threshers	During the threshing season	

NOTE**ELECTRICITY DUTY AND OTHER LEVIES**

1. The rates stipulated in the Schedule are exclusive of electricity duty and other taxes and charges, as levied from time to time by the Government or any other competent authority, which are payable extra.

SURCHARGE

2. All surcharges shall be levied on the basic tariff applicable to the category of use or category of sanction, whichever has higher tariff.

PAYMENT

3. In the event of the electricity bill rendered by the Distribution licensee, not being paid in full within the time specified on the bill, a surcharge @ 1.5% per month shall be levied. The LPSC shall be charged for the number of days of delay in receiving payment from the consumer by the Distribution Licensee, until the payment is made in full without prejudice to the right of the licensee to disconnect the supply after due date, in the event of non-payment in accordance with section 56 of Electricity Act, 2003. This will also apply to temporary connections, where payment of final bill amount after adjustment of consumption deposit, is not made by due date.
4. The Commission directs the Petitioner, that in case the bill for consumption of electricity is more than Rs. 4000/-, payment for the bill shall only be accepted by the Petitioner by mode other than cash. Violation of this directive shall attract penalty to the level of 10% of total Cash collection exceeding Rs. 4000/-.
However, the Commission has considered that the blind consumers shall be allowed to make payment of electricity bills, for any amount, through cash.

BILLING IN kVAh

5. Wherever the fixed or energy charges are specified in Paisa per kVAh, for the purpose of billing, the kVAh as read from the meter in the relevant billing cycle shall be used.

INTERPRETATION/CLARIFICATION

6. In case of doubt or anomaly, if any, in the applicability of tariff or in any other respect,

the matter will be referred to the Commission and Commissions decision thereon shall be final and binding.

A6: DIRECTIVES

- 6.1. The Commission directs the Petitioner to make timely payment of bills/dues to central & state generating stations and transmission utilities. No Late Payment Surcharge shall be allowed as a pass through in the ARR, on account of delayed payments.
- 6.2. The Commission directs the Petitioner to optimise its cost of a procurement of power. No fixed cost on account of regulated power will be allowed as a pass through in the ARR.
- 6.3. If the distribution licensee purchases any expensive power to meet the demand during any time zone for which cheaper power has been regulated due to non-payment of dues, in such an eventuality, the cost of such expensive power purchases will be restricted to the cost of regulated cheaper power to that extent at the time of true up.
- 6.4. In case the power is regulated by DTL/Interstate Transmission Licensee due to non-payment of their dues, then in that case the transmission charges borne by the Petitioner besides the treatment of regulated power as detailed in above directive will also not be allowed.
- 6.5. The Commission directs the Petitioner to ensure that asset capitalization takes place within a reasonable time and the approved cost so that IDC does not increase disproportionately. Before start of work, the utility is aware of the actual approved cost of completion of the scheme. As a norm, the Commission would consider the completion period indicated by the utility at the time of seeking approval of the scheme from the Commission at the approved capital cost by the Commission. In exceptional cases where completion of a project gets delayed or there is a change in cost of completion beyond 15% of approved cost, for reasons beyond the control of the utility, the utility will take prior approval of the Commission of any additional amount that needs to be capitalized in excess of the cost of completion. This can only be an exception but not the rule and the utility would need to justify delay in capitalization in each case where delay and/or cost overrun takes place. Failing this or pending receipt of satisfactory explanation, the Commission would go by the completion period indicated in the Commission's approval to the scheme

and provide for IDC accordingly.

- 6.6. The Commission directs the Petitioner to ensure availability of power supply for meeting the demand. The licensee shall ensure that the electricity which could not be served due to any reason what-so-ever shall not exceed 1% of the total energy supplied in units (kWh) in any particular month except in the case of force-majeure events which are beyond the control of the Petitioner.
- 6.7. The Commission directs the Petitioner that there will be a cash limit of Rs.4000/- while accepting billing dues from consumers. Any bill above Rs.4000/- must be paid by any mode other than cash. This limit is also applicable in case of recovery of all types of dues including LPSC, Misuse charges, theft charges etc. No authority in the DISCOM is permitted to waive this condition pertaining to cash collection. Violation of this directive shall attract penalty to the level of 10% of total Cash collection exceeding Rs. 4000/-.
- 6.8. The Commission directs the Petitioner that for DMRC, Railways, DJB and DIAL, the Security deposit charges against contract demand shall be allowed to deposit through irrevocable bank guarantee to be renewed/revised, as and when required depending on the billing demand as against prevailing practice of actual payment.
- 6.9. The Commission directs the Petitioner that RPO requirements for green power for the year 2015-16, must be met along with requirements carried over from the previous year, and if so required by way of purchase of REC's from the exchange. Non compliance of Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO) shall attract penalty of 10% of the cost of REC for quantum of shortfall in RPO.
- 6.10. In case the consumer's cheque is dishonoured, then he may be warned and given a final opportunity for payment of cheque along with LPSC. If a second case of dishonouring of the cheque occurs with the same consumer within next three months, it shall be stipulated that payment in future will be received only by DD up to a period of next six months.
- 6.11. The Commission has already decided to provide relief to those consumers whose industries are non-functional for the period when it is either under shut down or not functional and who utilize up to 5% of the sanctioned load (not available for part use of the load), then the conversion from kW to kVA for the purpose of

calculation of fixed charges may be done considering 0.9 power factor.

- 6.12. The Commission directs the distribution licensee not to undertake any transactions relating to purchase/sale of power without open tendering process. If any purchases/sales are affected through agent/ middleman or a trader through related parties other than the power exchange (s), then any trading margin paid to such agents/ middleman or trader will also not be admissible as a pass through in the ARR.
- 6.13. The Commission further directs the distribution licensee
- a. to conduct a safety audit and carry out preventive maintenance as per schedule and submit a compliance report within three months;
 - b. to submit the information in respect of Form 2.1 (a) as per revised format issued by the Commission to the utilities on monthly basis latest by 21st day of the following month;
 - c. to submit the compliance report of 100% consumer metering within a month from the issuance of the said Tariff Order.
 - d. to submit the energy audit report in respect of their network at HT level and above within three months.
 - e. to submit the Detailed Project Report (DPR) for energy Audit at LT level within six months of the issuance of the said Order.
 - f. to submit the Auditor's certificate in respect of Form 2.1(a) on quarterly basis within the following month;
 - g. to submit monthly report to the Commission giving details of category wise consumer addition and their details latest by 21st day of the following month;
 - h. to submit monthly report to the Commission giving details of number of connections disconnected / reconnected and their details latest by 21st day of the following month;
 - i. to submit monthly report to the Commission on change of consumer category latest by 21st day of the following month;
 - j. to incorporate the following information in the annual audited financial statements:-

- i. Category-wise Revenue billed and Collected,
 - ii. Category-wise Surcharge billed and Collected,
 - iii. Category-wise PPAC billed and collected,
 - iv. Category- wise Electricity Duty billed and collected
 - v. Category-wise subsidy passed on to the consumers during the financial year, if any,
 - vi. Category-wise details of the surcharge billed on account of ToD,
 - vii. Category-wise details of the rebate given on account of ToD,
 - viii. Revenue billed on account of Own Consumption,
 - ix. Revenue collected on account of enforcement/theft cases,
- k. to submit annual auditor certificate in respect of power purchase details of the previous year by 30th July of the next financial year. The power purchase invoices received upto April month of the next financial year but pertaining to the previous year only will be considered towards power purchase cost of the said financial year;
- l. to submit the reconciliation statement in respect of power purchase cost/Transmission cost on a quarterly basis with respective Generation/Transmission companies;
- m. to strictly adhere to the guidelines on short-term power purchase/sale of power issued by the Commission from time to time and to take necessary steps to restrict the cost of power procured through short term contracts at Rs.5 per kWh. Further in case of short term power purchase at a rate higher than the above ceiling rate (of Rs.5 per kWh), the impact of such purchase on total short term power purchase shall not exceed 10 Paise /kWh during the financial year. In case the cost of power proposed to be procured exceeds the above limits, this may be brought to the notice of the Commission within 24 hours detailing the reasons or exceptional circumstances under which this has been done. The Commission reserves the right to restrict allowance to the permissible limit if proper justification is not provided;
- n. to raise the bills for their own consumption of all their installations

including offices at the Non-Domestic tariff for actual consumption recorded every month. The licensee may avail credit at zero tariffs to the extent of the normative self consumption approved by the Commission at the end of the financial year;

- o. to submit the quarterly progress reports for the capital expenditure schemes being implemented during each year of the Control Period within 15 days of the end of each quarter.
- p. to submit the actual details of capitalization for each year for the Control Period by June 30 of the following year for consideration of the Commission. All information regarding capitalization of assets is to be furnished in the formats prescribed by the Commission. These formats are to be submitted along with the requisite statutory clearances/ certificates of the appropriate authority/ Electrical Inspector, etc. as applicable for all EHV & HV works etc., and certificate of SLDC for commissioning/ commercial operation.
- q. to submit the capital expenditure schemes strictly in accordance with the Commission's "Guidelines for approval of Capital Investment Schemes" dated April 23, 2012.
- r. to ensure that the petitions are filed in the prescribed format.
- s. to maintain segment wise audit report for each identifiable business segment other than the regulated business in the audited financial statement of the Petitioner.

6.14. Save and except the penalty as specifically provided in these directives, in all other cases, the Petitioner shall be liable to pay penalty, at the rate of Rs. one lakh for violation of any of the directions or part thereof. In addition, the Petitioner shall also be liable to pay a penalty at the rate of Rs 10,000 per day for each day of delay with respect to the time schedule stated herein above.

Annexure-I

Admission Order dated 11.02.2015

**DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi- 110017.

F.11(1177)/DERC/2014-15/

Petition No. 13/2015

In the matter of: **Petition for Truing up of Expenses up to FY 2013-14, Review & Provisional True up for FY 2014-15, and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for Distribution (Wheeling & Retail Supply) Business for FY 2015-16.**

BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
Through its: **CEO**
Shakti Kiran Building,
Karkardooma,
Delhi 110 032.

...Petitioner/Licensee

Coram:

Sh. P. D. Sudhakar, Chairperson,
Sh. J. P. Singh, Member.
Sh. B.P. Singh, Member

ORDER

(Date of Order 11.02.2015)

1. M/s. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL) filed a Tariff Petition for approval of Truing up of Expenses up to FY 2013-14, Review & Provisional True up for FY 2014-15, and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for Distribution (Wheeling & Retail Supply) Business for FY 2015-16 with the Commission on 19.12.2014. The said Petition was scrutinised and found generally in order as per the DERC Comprehensive (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2001. Clarifications/additional information, if any, would be sought from time to time.
2. The Commission admits the Petition.
3. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B.P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(J. P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(P. D. Sudhakar)
Chairperson

Hindustan Times (English) dated 02nd March, 2015

P-4

HINDUSTAN TIMES, NEW DELHI
MONDAY, MARCH 02, 2015



BSES
BSES Yamuna Power Limited
Regd. Off.: Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, New Delhi-110032
www.bsesdelhi.com

Date: 02.03.2015

PUBLIC NOTICE
REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RESPONSE
Petition for approval of True-Up for FY 2013-14,
Review of FY 2014-15 and
Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16

1. Under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000 to the extent applicable, and the DERC (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 issued by the Commission vide Order dated December 2, 2011 and DERC Order dated October 22, 2014 for extension of Multi Year Tariff (MYT) Regulations 2011 by one year for FY 2015-16 and DERC (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2007 dated May 30, 2007 applicable, BSES Yamuna Power Limited (hereinafter referred to as 'BYPL') has filed a Petition on December 19th, 2014 before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC or the Commission) for approval of True Up for FY 2013-14, Review of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and corresponding Tariff adjustments for FY 2015-16. The Commission has admitted the Petition vide Order dated February 11th, 2015.

2. The salient features of the Petition are:

		MU	6577	6541	6514
A	Energy Input	MU	6577	6541	6514
B	Energy Billed	MU	5199	5406	5616
C	AT&C Loss for the year*	%	21.04%	18.59%	18.83%
D	Average Power Purchase Rate	Rs./kWh	6.00	6.41	5.92
E	Average Billing Rate (Excl E Tax and Surcharge)	Rs./kWh	6.79	7.35	7.35
F	Power Purchase Cost (includes transmission charges)	Rs. Crore	3949	4067	3874
G	Cost of RPO			124	157
H	OSM Expenses	Rs. Crore	364.19	414.78	456.43
I	Depreciation including AAO	Rs. Crore	96	96	105
J	ROCE (Return + Interest)	Rs. Crore	257	283	310
K	Other Expenses	Rs. Crore	32	0	0
L	Income Tax	Rs. Crore	28	31	34
M	Less: Non Tariff Income	Rs. Crore	94	79	75
N	Aggregate Revenue Requirement (Sum of F to L - M)	Rs. Crore	4653	4936	5256
O	Revenue available at existing tariff	Rs. Crore	3527	3915	4056
P	Revenue Gap at existing Tariff (O-N)	Rs. Crore	-1126	-1020	-792
Q	8% surcharge for the year	Rs. Crore	270	306	326
R	Carrying Cost during the year	Rs. Crore	-835	-1391	-1621
S	Total Revenue (Gap)/Surplus during the year incl. carrying cost (P+R)	Rs. Crore	-1561	-2411	-2423
T	Opening balance (GAP) / Surplus	Rs. Crore	-6800	-8765	-10652
U	Closing balance of (GAP)/Surplus for the year	Rs. Crore	-8361	-10667	-12173

* Revised AT&C Loss targets sought for FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 as per Regulations.

3. Capex Proposal

Particulars	Unit	FY 2015-16
Estimated Capex to be incurred	Rs. Crore	430
Capitalization	Rs. Crore	370

4. Revenue Gap proposed to be recovered through Tariff Hike during FY 2015-16

Particulars	Unit	FY 2015-16
Annual Revenue Requirement	Rs. Crore	4858
Revenue at existing tariff	Rs. Crore	4056
Revenue (Gap)/ Surplus	Rs. Crore	-792
Tariff increase/reduction from existing level	Percentage	19%

5. Modification in Power Purchase Price Adjustment mechanism
As regards Revenue gap arising due to variation in Power Purchase and Transmission cost, a revised formula for power purchase price adjustment (PPPA) has been suggested for recovery of monthly Revenue Gap during FY 2015-16.

6. Tariff Rationalisation measures proposed

- Slip rationalisation for Domestic Consumers opting for net metering.
- Increase in cash limit for payment of electricity bills from Rs. 4000 per month to Rs. 20000 per month.
- Extension of Time of Day (ToD) Tariffs for loads upto 10 Kw as a Demand Side Management Measure which will enable consumers to plan usage of load.
- Adjustment of Consumer Security Deposit based on consumption profile and respective tariff applicable to individual consumer.
- Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) to include the impact of recovery of Regulatory Assets for Open Access Consumers.
- Open Access to 1 MW and above consumers: Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) to include the impact of recovery of Regulatory Assets for Open Access Consumers.

7. Recovery of Revenue Gap upto FY 2013-14
DERC has recognised Revenue Gap of Rs. 3755.17 Crore upto FY 2012-13 in its Tariff Order dated July 23, 2014. DERC is yet to give effect to various ATE Judgments, True-up of FY 2013-14 and Review of FY 2014-15. The Petitioner's ARR Petition has prayed for a time bound amortisation plan for recovery of accumulated Regulatory Assets in terms of Hon'ble ATE Judgment given in O.P. 1 of 2011, Tariff Policy and applicable DERC MYT Regulations, 2011.

8. Performance of BYPL during FY 2013-14

	Overall Benchmark for Performance	Performance during FY 2013-14
Normal Fuse-off calls	99%	99.7
Line Breakdown	95%	99.92
Distribution Transformer Failure	95%	100
Scheduled outage	95%	100
Billing Complaints wrt Total bills issued	Shouldn't be greater than 0.2%	0.05
Faulty Meter wrt Meters in service	Shouldn't be greater than 3%	0.62

9. Augmentation of Distribution Network during FY 2013-14

Particulars	Unit	FY 2013-14
No. of Power Transformers	Nos.	5
EHV Capacity	MVA	116
Shunt Capacitors	MVAR	3
No. of Distribution Transformers	Nos.	254
Distribution Transformer Capacity	MVA	225.74
No. of 11 kV Feeders	Nos.	5
Length of 11 kV Cables	Kms.	9
No. of LT Feeders	Nos.	143
Length of LT Lines laid	Kms.	39

10. Peak Demand of Delhi - 5653 MW was met on 06.06.2013 during FY 2013-14

11. Reliability Indices

SAIFI	SAIDI	MAIFI
1.584	2.488	0.0019

12. In accordance with the provisions of the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission Comprehensive (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2001 notified by the Commission, the consumers and stakeholders are requested to submit the response on the above Petition. The response may be sent to the Secretary of the Commission at the following address by 30.03.2015. The response may be submitted personally or by post to the Commission at the address given below. The response can also be e-mailed to the Secretary of the Commission at the e-mail address mentioned below.

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Vijayalakshmi Bhawan, C-Block, Shivaji, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 110 017.
Email id: secy@derc.gov.in Telephone: 011-26673608

13. The Commission would hold public hearings with the responding stakeholders subsequently. The date of the public hearings shall be notified separately by the Commission.

14. A copy of the Petition can be purchased from the head office of BYPL located at Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, New Delhi-110032 on any working day, from Monday to Friday between 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. on payment of Rs. 100/- either by cash or by Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of "BSES Yamuna Power Limited" payable at New Delhi.

15. The complete Petition is available on our website (<http://www.bsesdelhi.com>) as well as the website of the Commission (<http://www.derc.gov.in>). Copy of the Petition is available for inspection at our Head Office as well as the Commission's office at the addresses provided herewith, on any working day between 11 a.m. to 4 p.m.

For BSES Yamuna Power Limited

Aditya Pyasi
Head (Regulatory Affairs)

Issued as per direction of Hon'ble DERC

Regd. Off.: BSES Yamuna Power Limited, Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, New Delhi-110032, Corporate Identification No. Telephone No.: 1 Fax: 1 Website: www.bsesdelhi.com

Mint (English), 02nd March, 2015



BSES Yamuna Power Limited
Regd. Off.: Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, New Delhi- 110032.
www.bsesdelhi.com

PUBLIC NOTICE Date: 02.03.2015
REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RESPONSE
Petition for approval of True-Up for FY 2013-14,
Review of FY 2014-15 and
Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16

1. Under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000 to the extent applicable, and the DERC (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 issued by the Commission vide Order dated December 2, 2011 and DERC Order dated October 22, 2014 for extension of Multi Year Tariff (MYT) Regulations 2011 by one year for FY 2015-16 and DERC (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Wheeling Tariff and Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2007 dated May 30, 2007 applicable for FY 2013-14, BSES Yamuna Power Limited (hereinafter referred to as 'BYPL') has filed a Petition on December 10th, 2014 before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC or the Commission) for approval of True Up of FY 2013-14, Review of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and corresponding Tariff adjustments for FY 2015-16. The Commission has admitted the Petition vide Order dated February 11th, 2015.

2. The salient features of the Petition are:

Sl. No.	Particulars	Unit	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
A	Energy Input	MU	6577	6541	6814
B	Energy Billed	MU	5199	5406	5615
C	AT&C Loss for the year	%	21.04%	18.59%	18.83%
D	Average Power Purchase Rate	Rs/kWh	6.00	8.41	5.92
E	Average Billing Rate (Excl. E-Tax and Surcharge)	Rs/kWh	6.79	7.35	7.35
F	Power Purchase Cost (Includes transmission charges)	Rs. Crore	3949	4067	3674
G	Cost of RPO			124	157
H	O&M Expense	Rs. Crore	384.19	414.78	450.43
I	Depreciation including AAD	Rs. Crore	96	95	105
J	ROCE (Return + Interest)	Rs. Crore	257	263	310
K	Other Expenses	Rs. Crore	32	0	0
L	Income Tax	Rs. Crore	28	31	34
M	Less: Non Tariff Income	Rs. Crore	94	79	79
N	Aggregate Revenue Requirement (Sum of F to L-M)	Rs. Crore	4653	4936	4856
O	Revenue available at existing tariff	Rs. Crore	3527	3915	4065
P	Revenue Gap at existing Tariff (O-N)	Rs. Crore	-1126	-1020	-792
Q	8% surcharge for the year	Rs. Crore	270	308	326
R	Carrying Cost during the year	Rs. Crore	-535	-1381	-1831
S	Total Revenue (Gap)/Surplus during the year incl. carrying cost (P+Q)	Rs. Crore	-1981	-2411	-2423
T	Opening balance (GAP) / Surplus	Rs. Crore	-6800	-8761	-10857
U	Closing balance of (Gap)/Surplus for the year	Rs. Crore	-8781	-10857	-12173

* Revised AT&C Loss targets sought for FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 as per Regulations

3. Capex Proposal

Particulars	Rs. Crore	430
Estimated Capex to be incurred		
Capitalization	Rs. Crore	370

4. Revenue Gap proposed to be recovered through Tariff Hike during FY 2015-16

Particulars	Rs. Crore	4558
Annual Revenue Requirement		
Revenue at existing tariff	Rs. Crore	4065
Revenue (Gap)/ Surplus	Rs. Crore	-792
Tariff increase (reduction) from existing level	Percentage	19%

5. Modification in Power Purchase Price Adjustment mechanism
As regards Revenue gap arising due to variation in Power Purchase and Transmission cost, a revised formula for power purchase price adjustment (PPPA) has been suggested for recovery of monthly Revenue Gap during FY 2015-16.

6. Tariff Rationalisation measures proposed

- Slab rationalisation for Domestic Consumers opting for net metering.
- Increase in cash limit for payment of electricity bills from Rs. 4000 per month to Rs 20000 per month.
- Extension of Time of Day (ToD) Tariffs for loads upto 10 Kw as a Demand Side Management Measure which will enable consumers to plan usage of load.
- Adjustment of Consumer Security Deposit based on consumption profile and respective tariff applicable to individual consumer.
- Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) to include the impact of recovery of Regulatory Assets for Open Access Consumers.
- Open Access to 1 MW and above consumers: Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) to include the impact of recovery of Regulatory Assets for Open Access Consumers.

7. Recovery of Revenue Gap upto FY 2013-14
DERC has recognised Revenue Gap of Rs. 3795.17 Crore upto FY 2012-13 in its Tariff Order dated July 23, 2014. DERC is yet to give effect to various ATE Judgments, True-up of FY 2013-14 and Review of FY 2014-15. The Petitioner in its ARR Petition has prayed for a time bound amortisation plan for recovery of accumulated Regulatory Assets in terms of Hon'ble ATE Judgment given in O.P. 1 of 2011, Tariff Policy and applicable DERC MYT Regulations, 2011.

8. Performance of BYPL during FY 2013-14

Performance Indicator	Target	Actual
Normal Fuse-off calls	99%	99.7
Line Breakdown	95%	99.92
Distribution Transformer Failure	95%	100
Scheduled outage	95%	100
Billing Complaints wrt. total bills issued	Shouldn't be greater than 0.2%	0.05
Faulty Meter wrt. Meters in service	Shouldn't be greater than 3%	0.82

9. Augmentation of Distribution Network during FY 2013-14

Particulars	Unit	5
No. of Power Transformers	Nos.	
EHV Capacity	MVA	116
Shunt Capacitors	MVAR	3
No. of Distribution Transformers	Nos.	284
Distribution Transformer Capacity	MVA	225.74
No. of 11 kV Feeders	Nos.	5
Length of 11 kV Cables	Kms.	9
No. of LT Feeders	Nos.	143
Length of LT Lines laid	Kms.	39

10. Peak Demand of Delhi - 5655 MW was met on 06.08.2013 during FY 2013-14

11. Reliability Indices

SL	SAIDI	SAIFI	MAIFI
1.584	2.466	0.0015	

12. In accordance with the provisions of the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission Comprehensive (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2001 notified by the Commission, the consumers and stakeholders are requested to submit the response on the above Petition. The response may be sent to the Secretary of the Commission at the following address by 30.03.2015. The response may be submitted personally or by post to the Commission at the address given below. The response can also be e-mailed to the Secretary of the Commission at the e-mail address mentioned below.

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Vinayak Shwari, C-Block, Shivaji, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 110 017.
Email id: secydelhi@ncl.in Telephone: 011-26873608

13. The Commission would hold public hearings with the responding stakeholders subsequently. The date of the public hearings shall be notified separately by the Commission.

14. A copy of the Petition can be purchased from the head-office of BYPL located at Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, New Delhi-110032 on any working day, from Monday to Friday between 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. on payment of Rs. 100/-, either by cash or by Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of "BSES Yamuna Power Limited" payable at New Delhi.

15. The complete Petition is available on our website (<http://www.bsesdelhi.com>) as well as the website of the Commission (<http://www.derc.gov.in>). Copy of the Petition is available for inspection at our Head Office as well as the Commission's office at the addresses provided herewith, on any working day between 11 a.m. to 4 p.m.

For BSES Yamuna Power Limited
Aditya Prasi
Head (Regulatory Affairs)
Issued as per direction of Hon'ble DERC

Regd. Off.: BSES Yamuna Power Limited, Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, New Delhi- 110032. Corporate Identification No. Telephone No.: 1 Fax: 1 Website: www.bsesdelhi.com

Hindustan (Hindi) dated 03rd March, 2015

09 • नई दिल्ली • मंगलवार • 03 मार्च 2015 • हिन्दुस्तान

[illegible]

Milap (Urdu) dated 03rd March, 2015

[illegible]

[illegible]

Hindustan Times (English) dated 08th March, 2015

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Ministry Enclave, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 110 017.
Website : www.derc.gov.in, Telefax : 26673603

PUBLIC NOTICE

Petitions for True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Distribution Licensees, viz., BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL) and Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL) (collectively referred to as the Petitioners or DISCOMS).

- BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL have filed their Petitions for approval of True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, APR of FY 2014-15 and ARR & Tariff for FY 2015-16 before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC or The Commission).
- The Petitioners have filed their respective Petitions under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000, the DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff & Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations dated 30 May, 2007, and DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff & Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2014 issued by the Commission vide Order dated 22 October, 2014. Further, the Commission vide its Order dated 22.10.2014 has extended the MYT Regulations, 2011 for further period of one year upto 31st March, 2016. The Commission has since admitted the Petitions subject to clarifications/additional information, if any, that may be sought from time to time.
- The Petitioners have, subsequent to, the admission of their petitions by the DERC, issued Public Notice in the following newspapers of NC for Delhi:

Petitioner	Newspapers	Language	Date of Issue of Public Notice
BRPL	The Indian Express	English	02.03.2015
	The Times of India	English	02.03.2015
	Nav Bharat Times	Hindi	03.03.2015
	Punjab Tribune	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Millat	Urdu	03.03.2015
BYPL	Hindustan Times	English	02.03.2015
	Mint	English	02.03.2015
	Hindustan	Hindi	03.03.2015
	Quami Patrika	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Millat	Urdu	03.03.2015
TPDDL	Hindustan Times	English	28.02.2015
	The Times of India	English	28.02.2015
	Hindustan	Hindi	01.03.2015
	Quami Patrika	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Millat	Urdu	03.03.2015

- The Petitioners have summarised their Petition in the respective Public Notices issued by them. The Public Notice has been posted on the website of the Petitioners as well as that of the Commission.
- In accordance with the provisions of the DERC (Comprehensive Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2011, Consumers and other stakeholders of Delhi are invited to file their written submission on the Tariff Petitions and the Executive Summaries of the DISCOMS placed on the Commission's website, to the Secretary of the Commission at the above address latest by 06:00 PM on 07.04.2015. The comments/suggestions may be submitted personally or by post to the Commission and may also be e-mailed to the Secretary of DERC at the e-mail address sec@derc.gov.in.
- The stakeholders who wish to present their views personally, may convey their expression of interest at the time of filing their written submissions. Based on the above, the Commission may allow a suitable time for making such submissions.
- Besides the comments on the Tariff Petitions filed by the Petitioners, all the stakeholders are requested to submit their view on Tariff Rationalization Proposals given by the Petitioners as indicated in the subsequent paragraphs. The Commission shall deliberate on these matters while deciding on the tariff for various classes of consumers.

1. PETITIONERS PROPOSALS

- Time of day (ToD) Metering**
The Commission in its MYT Order for the second Control Period dated 13 July, 2012 had decided to introduce ToD Tariff on a pilot basis for large industrial and non-domestic consumers (300 kW and above).
The Commission as a progressive step in this direction, up to, further encourage demand shift from peak hours to off-peak hours had decided to lower the applicability limit for ToD Tariff in the Tariff Order for FY 2013-14 dtd. 31 July, 2013 on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI is 100kW/108 kVA (whichever is higher) and above. Further, in the Tariff Order for FY 2014-15 dtd. 23.07.2014, ToD Tariff is now applicable on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI is 50kW/54 kVA (whichever is higher) and above. Further ToD Tariff is optional for all consumers (Other than domestic) whose sanctioned loads/MDI is between 25kW/27 kVA and 50 kW/54kVA as shown below:

Month	Peak House	Surcharge on Energy Charges	Off-Peak Hours	Rebate on Energy Charges
April to September	15:00 - 00:00 Hrs.	20%	00:00 - 06:00 Hrs.	25%
October to March	17:00 - 23:00 Hrs.	20%	23:00 - 05:00 Hrs.	25%

The Petitioners are of the view that the coverage of ToD Tariff needs to be progressively increased for smaller loads, which will ensure that the tariff provides appropriate signals to reduce peak hour consumption and increase consumption during off-peak hours, through higher peak hour surcharge and higher rebates for consumption during off-peak hours, in order to flatten the load curve.
The Petitioners have proposed to extend ToD Tariff for all consumers having sanctioned load/MDI of 10kW (whichever is higher) and above.

- Slab rationalisation for Domestic Consumers opting for net metering**
The Petitioners have proposed that domestic consumers who would be opting for net metering should have a single slab for energy consumption upto 300 units, which should be charged at rates defined for 401-600 units of normal domestic consumers. This will ensure that the higher domestic consumers do not avail the benefit of both, i.e. slab rate as well as net-metering.
- Exemption of Rs. 4000/- Each transaction limit on theft bills**
The Petitioners have submitted that collections of theft bills are not carried out through any contractor or agent and all payments have to be made only at the collection counters of the company only. Hence, the Petitioners have requested the Commission to exempt theft collections from the direction of no revenue collection above Rs. 4000/- through cash.
- Waive-off / Carry forward of Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO)**
The Petitioners in their current Tariff Petitions have requested to defer the RPO for subsequent years.
- Time bound recovery of regulatory assets/revenue cap**
The Petitioners have requested for recovery of regulatory assets in a time bound manner of not exceeding 3 years in line with the judgment of Hon'ble ATC as well as National Tariff Policy.
- Revision of Power Purchase Adjustment Charges (PPAC) formula**
The Petitioners have proposed revised formula for timely recovery of power purchase cost by the DISCOMS by considering change in Fixed Cost charges on account of Regulated Power, Fixed and Variable Charges of Long Term Contracts, Transmission Charges, Short Term Power, Loss on Sale of Surplus Power, Arrears payable to Gencoes and Transcoes etc.
- Enhancement of Security Deposit in line with current Tariff**
The Petitioners have proposed for Revision of Security Deposit / Advance consumption rates and has to be linked with the consumption of individual consumer the prevailing tariff as well billing cycle.
- Uniform fixed charges upto the load of 5.0 kW**
The Petitioners have proposed restructuring of the fixed charges for the domestic category so that uniform fixed charges are levied upto the load of 5.0 kW.
- Upward revision in Credit Card / Debit Card / Cash Payment Limit**
The Petitioners have submitted that for payments through Debit Card / Credit Card by the Consumers, no processing fees should be charged for payments upto Rs. 20,000.00 and the cost of same should be allowed as pass through in the ARR.
- Separate Tariff Rates for E-vehicles**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to announce separate tariff rate category for purpose of charging of E-vehicles considering its huge involvement in recent past and its increasing acceptability.
- Uniform Tariff for Industrial, mushroom cultivation and commercial categories**
The Petitioners have submitted that the tariffs of industrial, mushroom cultivation and commercial categories should be rationalized to have a uniform tariff.
- Modification of norms for O&M Expenses**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to modify the norms for allowance of O&M expenses so as to meet the actual costs required to provide and maintain better service to the consumers.
- Flat rate Tariff for Pre-paid connections (Domestic Category)**
The Petitioners have proposed separate tariff for billing pre-paid consumer under domestic category due to complex slab based tariff structure for domestic category.
- Open Access to 1 MW and above consumer**
The Petitioners have requested to include recovery of Regulatory Assets even from consumers, who are opting power through Open Access either by considering its effect in tariff and then fixing Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) or as a separate charge.
- Introduction of Online Spot Billing**
The Petitioner requested the Commission to issue suitable directions for implementation of spot billing by all DISCOMS.
- Levy of Surcharge on all residential connections under temporary supply**
The Petitioner has requested to consider levy of surcharge on all residential connections under temporary supply category.
- Street Light maintenance charges on market prices**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow DISCOMs to decide and finalize the maintenance charges based on prevalent market conditions due to regular increase in minimum wages and also considering other inflation factors.
- Value added services on paid basis**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow the DISCOMs to initiate such value added services on paid basis.
- Power Banking should be allowed at the average procurement cost instead of normal rates of Rs. 4/- per unit**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to consider the Power Banking transaction at the average procurement cost of the energy per unit in that respective year.

8. The Commission will conduct Public Hearings with the stakeholders and the date for the same shall be notified separately.

9. The Commission will scrutinize the Petitions and seek further clarifications from the Petitioners, if required. By way of an Order, the Commission shall approve the ARR for each of the Petitioner. The Orders on the Petitions shall be issued after considering the suggestions received from various stakeholders.

10. In the past, there have been requests that the Commission may extend assistance to consumers in understanding the Petitions and also help them to file their comments in this regard. The Commission has accordingly prepared Executive Summaries on the Petitions filed by the Petitioners, which is available on the website of the Commission (www.derc.gov.in). The Commission has also nominated the following officers to extend necessary assistance to all such consumers, who may so desire. Discussions with these officers may be held after seeking prior appointment.

Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) Phone no: 011 41601656
Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engineering) Phone no: 011 41601657

11. The complete Petitions filed by the Petitioners can be downloaded from the website of the Commission (www.derc.gov.in) or the Petitioners. A soft copy of the Petition may be purchased from the respective Petitioner's Head Office on any working day from today between 11:00 AM and 4:00 PM or payment of Rs. 100/- either by cash or by Demand Draft/Pay Order payable at New Delhi as per the details given below:
BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, New Delhi - 110032. Website: www.bsesdelhi.com Phone: 011-39999204. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of BSES Yamuna Power Limited.
BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place, New Delhi - 110019. Website: www.bsesdelhi.com Phone: 011-3999912. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of BSES Rajdhani Power Limited.
Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. 12th Floor, 12th Floor, Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp, New Delhi - 110 005. Website: www.tatapower-dl.com Phone: 011-66112222. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited.

Secretary

DIP/2206/14-15 Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

The Hindu (English) dated 08th March, 2015

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Vijay Bhaskar Bhawan, C-Block, Shivaji, Mahaviya Nagar, New Delhi - 110 017.
Website : www.derc.gov.in, Telefax : 26673603

PUBLIC NOTICE

Petitions for True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Distribution Licensees, viz., BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL) and Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL) (collectively referred to as the Petitioners or DISCOMs).

- BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL have filed their Petitions for approval of True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, APR of FY 2014-15 and ARR & Tariff for FY 2015-16 before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC) on the Commission).
- The Petitioners have filed their respective Petitions under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000, the DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff & Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations dated 30 May, 2007, and DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff & Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 issued by the Commission vide Order dated 22 October, 2014, further the Commission vide its Order dated 22.10.2014 has extended the MYT Regulations 2011 for further period of one year upto 31st March, 2016. The Commission has since admitted the Petitions subject to clarifications/additional information, if any, that may be sought from time to time.
- The Petitioners have, subsequently, to the admission of their petitions by the DERC, issued Public Notice in the following newspapers of NCT of Delhi:

Petitioner	Newspapers	Language	Date of Issue of Public Notice
BRPL	The Indian Express	English	02.03.2015
	The Times of India	English	02.03.2015
	Nav Bharat Times	Hindi	03.03.2015
	Punjab Tribune	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015
BYPL	Hindustan Times	English	02.03.2015
	Mint	English	02.03.2015
	Hindustan	Hindi	03.03.2015
	Quam Patrika	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015
TPDDL	Hindustan Times	English	28.02.2015
	The Times of India	English	28.02.2015
	Hindustan	Hindi	01.03.2015
	Quam Patrika	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015

- The Petitioners have summarised their Petition in the respective Public Notices issued by them. The Public Notice has been posted on the website of the Petitioners as well as that of the Commission.
- In accordance with the provisions of the DERC (Comprehensive Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2001, Consumers and other stakeholders of Delhi are invited to file their written submission on the Tariff Petitions and the Executive Summaries of the DISCOMs placed on the Commission's website to the Secretary of the Commission at the above office address latest by 5.00 PM of 07.04.2015. The complete submissions may be submitted personally or by post to the Commission and may also be e-mailed to the Secretary, DERC at the e-mail address secretary@derc.nic.in.
- The stakeholders who wish to present their views personally, may convey their expression of interest at the time of filing their written submissions. Based on the above, the Commission may allow a suitable time for making such submissions.
- Besides the comments on the Tariff Petitions filed by the Petitioners, all the stakeholders are requested to submit their view on Tariff Rationalization Proposals given by the Petitioners as indicated in the subsequent paragraphs. The Commission shall deliberate on these matters while deciding on the tariff for various classes of consumers.

1. PETITIONERS' PROPOSALS

a) **Time of Day (ToD) Metering**
The Commission in its MYT Order for the second Control Period dated 13 July, 2012 had decided to introduce ToD Tariff on a pilot basis for large industrial and non domestic consumers (300 kW and above).
The Commission as a progressive step in this direction and to further encourage demand shift from peak hours to off-peak hours had decided to lower the applicability limit for ToD Tariff in the Tariff Order for FY 2013-14 dtd. 31 July, 2013 on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI is 100kW/108 kVA (whichever is higher) and above. Further, in the Tariff Order for FY 2014-15 dtd. 23.07.2014, ToD Tariff is now applicable on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI is 90kW/95 kVA (whichever is higher) and above. Further ToD Tariff is optional for all other categories (Other than domestic) whose sanctioned loads/MDI is between 25kW/27 kVA and 90kW/95 kVA as shown below:

Month	Peak House	Surcharge on Energy Charges	Off-Peak Hours	Rebate on Energy Charges
April to September	15:00 - 00:00 Hrs.	20%	00:00 - 06:00 Hrs.	25%
October to March	17:00 - 23:00 Hrs.	20%	23:00 - 06:00 Hrs.	25%

The Petitioners are of the view that the coverage of ToD tariff needs to be progressively increased for smaller loads, which will ensure that the tariff provides appropriate signals to reduce peak hour consumption and increase consumption during off-peak hours, through higher peak hour surcharge and higher rebate for consumption during off-peak hours, in order to flatten the load curve.
The Petitioners have proposed to extend ToD tariff for all consumers having sanctioned load/MDI of 10kW (whichever is higher) and above.

b) **Slab rationalisation for Domestic Consumers opting for net metering**
The Petitioners have proposed that domestic consumers who would be opting for net metering should have a single slab for energy consumption upto 800 units, which should be charged at a rate defined for 401-800 units of normal domestic consumers. This will ensure that the high end consumers do not avail the benefit of both, i.e. slab rate as well as net-metering.

c) **Exemption of Rs. 400/- Cash transaction limit on theft bills**
The Petitioners have submitted that collections of theft bills are not carried out through any contractor or agent and all payments have to be made only at the collection counters of the company only. Hence, the Petitioners have requested the Commission to exempt theft collections from the direction of no revenue collection above Rs. 400/- through cash.

d) **Waive-off/Carry forward of Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO)**
The Petitioners in their current Tariff Petitions have requested to defer the RPO for subsequent years.

e) **Time bound recovery of regulatory assets/revenue gap**
The Petitioners have requested for recovery of regulatory assets in a time bound manner of not exceeding 3 years in line with the judgment of Hon'ble ATE as well as National Tariff Policy.

f) **Revision of Power Purchase Adjustment Charges (PPAC) formula**
The Petitioners have proposed revised formula for timely recovery of power purchase cost by the DISCOMs by considering change in Fixed Cost charges on account of Regulated Power, Fixed and Variable Charges of Long Term Contracts, Transmission Charges, Short Term Power, Loss on Sale of Surplus Power, Arrears payable to Genco and Transco etc.

g) **Enhancement of Security Deposit in line with current tariff**
The Petitioners have proposed for Revision of Security Deposit, Advance consumption rate and has to be linked with the consumption of individual consumer the prevailing tariff as well as billing cycle.

h) **Uniform fixed charges upto the load of 5.0 kW**
The Petitioners have proposed restructuring of the fixed charges for the domestic category so that uniform fixed charges are levied upto the load of 5.0 kW.

i) **Upward revision in Credit Card/Debit Card/cash Payment Limit**
The Petitioners have submitted that for payments through Debit Card/Credit Card by the Consumers, no processing fees should be charged for payments upto Rs. 20,000.00 and the cost of same should be allowed as pass through in the ARR.

j) **Separate Tariff Rates for E-vehicles**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to announce separate tariff rate category for purpose of charging of E-vehicles considering its huge growth in the recent past and its increasing acceptability.

k) **Uniform Tariff for Industrial, mushroom cultivation and commercial categories**
The Petitioners have submitted that the tariffs for industrial, mushroom cultivation and commercial categories should be rationalized to have a uniform tariff.

l) **Modification of norms for O&M Expenses**
The Petitioners have requested the Commission to modify the norms for allowance of O&M expenses so as to meet the actual costs required to provide and maintain better service to the consumers.

m) **Flat rate Tariff for Pre-paid connections (Domestic Category)**
The Petitioners have proposed separate tariff for billing pre-paid consumer under domestic category due to complex slab based tariff structure for domestic category.

n) **Open Access to 1 MW and above consumer**
The Petitioners have requested to include recovery of Regulatory Assets availed from consumers who are getting power through Open Access, either by considering its effect in tariff and then fixing Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) or as a separate charge.

o) **Introduction of Online Spot Billing**
The Petitioner requested the Commission to issue suitable directions for implementation of spot billing by all DISCOMs.

p) **Levy of Surcharge on all residential connections under temporary supply**
The Petitioner has requested to consider levy of surcharge on all residential connections under temporary supply category.

q) **Street light maintenance charges on marketplaces**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow DISCOMs to decide and finalize the maintenance charges based on prevalent market conditions due to regular increase in minimum wages and also considering other inflation factors.

r) **Value added services on paid basis**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow the DISCOMs to initiate such value added services on paid basis.

s) **Power Banking should be allowed at the average procurement cost**
The Petitioner has requested the Commission to consider the Power Banking transaction at the average procurement cost of the energy per unit in that respective year.

t) **The Commission will conduct Public Hearings with the stakeholders and the date for the same shall be notified separately.**

u) **The Commission will scrutinize the Petitions and seek further clarifications from the Petitioners, if required. By way of an Order, the Commission shall approve the ARR for each of the Petitioners. The Orders on the Petitions shall be issued after considering the suggestions received from various stakeholders.**

v) **In the past, there have been requests that the Commission may extend assistance to consumers in understanding the Petitions and also help them to file their comments in this regard. The Commission has accordingly prepared Executive Summaries on the Petitions filed by the Petitioners, which is available on the website of the Commission (www.derc.gov.in). The Commission has also nominated the following officers to extend necessary assistance to all such consumers, who may, so desire. Discussions with these officers may be held after seeking prior appointment.**
Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) Phone no: 011 41601666
Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engineering) Phone no: 011 41601657

w) **The complete Petitions filed by the Petitioners can be downloaded from the website of the Commission (www.derc.gov.in) or the website of the Petitioners. A soft copy of the Petition may be obtained in CD or on payment of Rs. 25/- per CD or a copy of the Petition may be purchased from the respective Petitioners' Head Offices on any working day from today between 11:00 AM and 4:00 PM on payment of Rs. 100/- online by cash or by Demand Draft/Pay Order payable at New Delhi as per the details given below.**
BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. Shakti Krant Building, Karamdola, New Delhi - 110042. Website: www.bsedypl.com Phone: 011-39999204. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of BSES Yamuna Power Limited.
BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. BSES Bhawan, Kirti Place, New Delhi - 110019. Website: www.bsedelhi.com Phone: 011-39999912. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of BSES Rajdhani Power Limited.
Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. TDS Operation Building, Hudson Lines, Kirti Place, New Delhi - 110009. Website: www.tatapower-deli.com Phone: 011-26122222. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited.

Secretary

DIP/2206/14-15 Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

The Pioneer (English) dated 08th March, 2015

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
 Vinayak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 110 017.
 Website : www.derc.gov.in, Telefax : 26673693

PUBLIC NOTICE

Petitions for True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Distribution Licensees, viz., BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL) and Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL) (collectively referred to as the Petitioners or DISCOMS)

- BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL have filed their Petitions for approval of True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, APR of FY 2014-15 and ARR & Tariff for FY 2015-16 before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC or the Commission).
- The Petitioners have filed their respective Petitions under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000, the DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff & Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations dated 30 May, 2007, and DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff & Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2013 issued by the Commission vide Order dated 22 October, 2014, further, the Commission vide its Order dtd. 22.10.2014 has extended the MYT Regulations 2011 for further period of one year upto 31st March, 2016. The Commission has since admitted the Petitions subject to clarifications/additional information, if any, that may be sought from time to time.
- The Petitioners have, subsequent to, the admission of their petitions by the DERC, issued Public Notice in the following newspapers of NCT of Delhi:

Petitioner	Newspapers	Language	Date of issue of Public Notice
BRPL	The Indian Express	English	02.03.2015
	The Times of India	English	02.03.2015
	Nav Bharat Times	Hindi	03.03.2015
	Punjab Tribune	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015
BYPL	Hindustan Times	English	02.03.2015
	Mint	English	02.03.2015
	Hindustan	Hindi	03.03.2015
	Quami Patrika	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015
TPDDL	Hindustan Times	English	28.02.2015
	The Times of India	English	28.02.2015
	Hindustan	Hindi	01.03.2015
	Quami Patrika	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015

- The Petitioners have summarised their Petition in the respective Public Notices issued by them. The Public Notice has been posted on the website of the Petitioners as well as that of the Commission.
- In accordance with the provisions of the DERC (Comprehensive Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2001, Consumers and other stakeholders of Delhi are invited to file their written submission on the Tariff Petitions and the Executive Summaries of the DISCOMS placed on the Commission's website to the Secretary of the Commission at the above address latest by 5.00 PM of 07.04.2015. The comments/suggestions may be submitted personally or by post to the Commission and may also be e-mailed to the Secretary, DERC at the e-mail address secretary@derc.nic.in.
- The stakeholders who wish to present their views personally, may convey their expression of interest at the time of filing their written submission. Based on the above, the Commission may select a suitable time for making such submissions.
- Besides the comments on the Tariff Petitions filed by the Petitioners, all the stakeholders are requested to submit their view on Tariff Rationalization Proposals given by the Petitioners as indicated in the subsequent paragraphs. The Commission shall deliberate on these matters while deciding on the Tariff for various classes of consumers.

PETITIONERS REQUESTS

- Time of day (ToD) Metering**
 The Commission in its MYT Order for the second Control Period dated 13 July, 2012 had decided to introduce ToD Tariff on a pilot basis for large industrial and non domestic consumers (300 kW and above).
 The Commission as a progressive step in this direction and to further encourage demand shift from peak hours to off-peak hours had decided to lower the applicability limit for ToD Tariff in the Tariff Order for FY 2013-14 dtd. 31 July, 2013 on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI is 100kW/108 kVA (whichever is higher) and above. Further, in the Tariff Order for FY 2014-15 dtd. 23.07.2014, ToD Tariff is now applicable on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDI is 90kW/95 kVA (whichever is higher) and above. Further ToD Tariff is optional for all consumers (Other than domestic) whose sanctioned loads/MDI is between 25kW/27 kVA and 50 kW/54 kVA as shown below:

Month	Peak House	Surcharge on Energy Charges	Off-Peak Hours	Rebate on Energy Charges
April to September	15:00 - 00:00 Hrs.	20%	00:00 - 06:00 Hrs.	25%
October to March	17:00 - 23:00 Hrs.	20%	23:00 - 05:00 Hrs.	25%

The Petitioners are of the view that the coverage of ToD tariff needs to be progressively increased for smaller loads, which will ensure that the tariff provides appropriate signals to reduce peak hour consumption and increase consumption during off-peak hours, through higher peak hour surcharge and higher rebates for consumption during off-peak hours, in order to flatten the load curve.

The Petitioners have proposed to extend ToD tariff for all consumers having sanctioned load/MDI of 10kW (whichever is higher) and above.

- Slab rationalisation for Domestic Consumers opting for metering**
 The Petitioners have proposed that domestic consumers who would be opting for metering should have a single slab for energy consumption upto 800 units, which should be charged at rates defined for 401-800 units of normal domestic consumers. This will ensure that the high end consumers do not avail the benefit of both, i.e. slab rate as well as net-metering.
- Exemption of Rs. 400/- Cash transaction limit on electricity bills**
 The Petitioners have submitted that collections of electricity bills are not carried out through any contractor or agent and all payments have to be made only at the collection counters of the company only. Hence, the Petitioners have requested the Commission to exempt their collections from the direction of no revenue collection above Rs. 400/- through cash.
- Waive-off/Carry forward of Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO)**
 The Petitioners in their current Tariff Petitions have requested to defer the RPO for subsequent years.
- Time bound recovery of regulatory assets/revenue cap**
 The Petitioners have requested for recovery of regulatory assets in a time bound manner of not exceeding 3 years in line with the judgment of Hon'ble ATC as well as National Tariff Policy.
- Revision of Power Purchase Adjustment Charges (PPAC) formula**
 The Petitioners have proposed revised formula for timely recovery of power purchase cost by the DISCOMS by considering changes in Fixed Cost charges on account of Regulated Power, Fixed and Variable Charges of Long Term Contracts, Transmission Charges, Short Term Power, Loss on Sale of Surplus Power, Arrears payable to Generators and Transco etc.
- Enhancement of Security Deposit in line with current tariff**
 The Petitioners have proposed for Revision of Security Deposit/Advance consumption rates and has to be linked with the consumption of individual consumer the prevailing tariff as well billing cycle.
- Uniform fixed charges upto the load of 50 kW**
 The Petitioners have proposed for Uniformity of the fixed charges for the domestic category so that uniform fixed charges are levied upto the load of 50 kW.
- Upward revision in Credit Card/Debit Card/Cash Payment Limit**
 The Petitioners have submitted that for payments through Debit Card/Credit Card by the Consumers, no processing fees should be charged for payments upto Rs. 20,000/00 and this cost of same should be allowed as pass through in the ARR.
- Separate Tariff Rates for E-vehicles**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to announce separate tariff rate category for purpose of charging of E-vehicles considering the huge increase in the recent past and its increasing acceptability.
- Uniform Tariff for Industrial, mushroom cultivation and commercial categories**
 The Petitioners have submitted that the tariffs of industrial, mushroom cultivation and commercial categories should be rationalized to have a uniform tariff.
- Modification of norms for O&M Expenses**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to modify the norms for allowance of O&M expenses so as to meet the actual costs required to provide better service to the consumers.
- Flat rate Tariff for Pre-paid connections (Domestic Category)**
 The Petitioners have proposed separate tariff for billing pre-paid consumer under domestic category due to complex slab based tariff structure for domestic category.
- Open Access to 1 MW and above consumer**
 The Petitioners have requested to include recovery of Regulatory Assets availed from consumers who are getting power through Open Access, either by considering effect in tariff and then fixing Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) or as a separate charge.
- Introduction of Online Spot Billing**
 The Petitioner requested the Commission to issue suitable directions for implementation of spot billing by all DISCOMS.
- Levy of Surcharge on all residential connections under temporary supply**
 The Petitioner has requested to consider levy of surcharge on all residential connections under temporary supply category.
- Street Light maintenance charges on marketplaces**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow DISCOMS to decide and finalize the maintenance charges based on prevalent market conditions due to regular increase in minimum wages and also considering other inflation factors.
- Value added services on paid basis**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow the DISCOMS to initiate such value added services on paid basis.
- Power Banking should be allowed at the average procurement cost instead of the cost of Rs. 4/- per unit**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to consider the Power Banking transaction at the average procurement cost of the energy per unit in that respective year.
- The Commission will conduct Public Hearings with the stakeholders and the date for the same shall be notified separately.
- The Commission will scrutinize the Petitions and seek further clarifications from the Petitioners, if required. By way of an Order, the Commission shall approve the ARR for each of the Petitioner. The Orders on the Petitions shall be issued after considering the suggestions received from various stakeholders.
- In the past, there have been requests that the Commission may extend assistance to consumers in understanding the Petitions and also help them to file their comments in this regard. The Commission has accordingly prepared Executive Summaries on the Petitions filed by the Petitioners, which is available on the website of the Commission (www.derc.gov.in). The Commission has also nominated the following officers to extend necessary assistance to such consumers who may so desire. Discussions with these officers may be held after seeking prior appointment.
Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) Phone no: 011 41601656
Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engineering) Phone no: 011 41601657

The complete Petitions filed by the Petitioners can be downloaded from the website of the Commission (www.derc.gov.in) or the website of the Petitioners. A copy of the Petition may be obtained in CD on payment of Rs. 25/- per CD or copy of the Petition may be purchased from the respective Petitioner's Head Offices on any working day from today between 11:00 AM and 4:00 PM on payment of Rs. 100/- either by cash or by Demand Draft/Pay Order payable at New Delhi as per the details given below:
BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. Shakti Kiran Building, Karol Bagh, New Delhi - 110002. Website: www.bseshd.com Phone: 011-39995204. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. BSES Bhawan, Kirti Bhawan, New Delhi - 110019. Website: www.bseshd.com Phone: 011-39995112. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.
Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. Substation Building, Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp, New Delhi - 110 009. Website: www.tatapower-dtl.com Phone: 011-66122222. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited.

Sd/
Secretary

DIP/2206/14-15
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Times of India (English) dated 08th March, 2015

File Reference No. : 0754815016

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
 Janyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivaji, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 110 017.
 Website : www.derc.gov.in, Telefax : 26673603

PUBLIC NOTICE

Petitions for True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Distribution Licensees, viz., BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL) and Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL) (collectively referred to as the Petitioners or DISCOMs).

- BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL have filed their Petitions for approval of True Up of expenses for FY 2013-14, APR of FY 2014-15 and ARR & Tariff for FY 2015-16 before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC or The Commission).
- The Petitioners have filed their respective Petitions under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Delhi Electricity Reform Act, 2000, the DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff & Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011, Regulations dated 30 May, 2007, and DERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Wheeling Tariff & Retail Supply Tariff) Regulations, 2011 issued by the Commission vide Order dated 22 October, 2014. Further, the Commission vide its Order dtd. 22.10.2014 has extended the MYT Regulations 2011 for further period of one year upto 31st March, 2016. The Commission has since admitted the Petitions subject to clarifications/additional information, if any, that may be sought from time to time.
- The Petitioners have, subsequent to, the admission of their petitions by the DERC, issued Public Notice in the following newspapers of NCT of Delhi:

Petitioner	Newspapers	Language	Date of issue of Public Notice
BRPL	The Indian Express	English	02.03.2015
	The Times of India	English	02.03.2015
	Nav Bharat Times	Hindi	03.03.2015
	Punjab Tribune	Punjabi	03.03.2015
BYPL	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015
	Hindustan Times	English	02.03.2015
	Mint	English	02.03.2015
	Hindustan	Hindi	03.03.2015
TPDDL	Quami Patrika	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015
	Hindustan Times	English	28.02.2015
	The Times of India	English	28.02.2015
	Hindustan	Hindi	01.03.2015
	Quami Patrika	Punjabi	03.03.2015
	The Daily Milap	Urdu	03.03.2015

- The Petitioners have summarised their Petition in the respective Public Notices issued by them. The Public Notice has been posted on the website of the Commission as well as that of the DISCOMs.
- In accordance with the provisions of the DERC (Comprehensive Code of Business) Regulations, 2001, Consumers and other stakeholders of Delhi are invited to file their written submission on the Tariff Petitions and the Executive Summaries of the DISCOMs placed on the Commission's website to the Secretary of the Commission at the above office address latest by 3:00 PM of 07.04.2015. The comments/suggestions may be submitted personally in writing or by post to the Commission and may also be e-mailed to the Secretary, DERC at the e-mail address sec@derc.gov.in.
- The stakeholders who wish to present their views personally, may convey their expression of interest at the time of filing their written submissions. Based on the above, the Commission may seek a suitable time for making such submissions.
- Besides the comments on the Tariff Petitions filed by the Petitioners, all the stakeholders are requested to submit their view on Tariff Rationalization Proposals given by the Petitioners as indicated in the subsequent paragraphs. The Commission shall deliberate on these matters while deciding on the tariff for various classes of consumers.

1. PETITIONER'S PROPOSALS

a) **Time of day (ToD) Metering**
 The Commission in its MYT Order for the second Control Period dated 13 July, 2012 had decided to introduce ToD Tariff on a pilot basis for large industrial and non domestic consumers (300 kW and above).
 The Commission as a progressive step in this direction, and to further encourage demand shift from peak hours to off-peak hours had decided to lower the applicability limit for ToD Tariff in the Tariff Order for FY 2013-14 dtd. 31 July, 2013 on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDL is 100kW/100 kVA (whichever is higher) and above. Further, in the Tariff Order for FY 2014-15 dtd. 23.07.2014, ToD Tariff is now applicable on all consumers (other than domestic) whose sanctioned load/MDL is 50kW/50 kVA (whichever is higher) and above. Further ToD Tariff is optional for all consumers (Other than domestic) whose sanctioned loads/MDL is between 25kW/25 kVA and 50 kW/50 kVA as shown below:

Month	Peak House	Surcharge on Energy Charges	Off-Peak Hours	Rebate on Energy Charges
April to September	15:00 - 00:00 Hrs.	20%	00:00 - 06:00 Hrs.	25%
October to March	17:00 - 23:00 Hrs.	20%	23:00 - 06:00 Hrs.	25%

The Petitioners are of the view that the coverage of ToD tariff needs to be progressively increased for smaller loads, which will encourage the tariff providers appropriate signals to reduce peak hour consumption and increase consumption during off-peak hours, through higher peak hour surcharge and higher rebates for consumption during off-peak hours, in order to flatten the load curve.
 The Petitioners have proposed to extend ToD tariff for all consumers having sanctioned load/MDL of 10kW (whichever is higher) and above.

b) **Sub-rationalisation for Domestic Consumers opting for net metering**
 The Petitioners have proposed that domestic consumers who would be opting for net metering should have a single slab for energy consumption upto 800 units, which should be charged at rates defined for 401-800 units of formal domestic consumers. This will ensure that the higher end consumers do not avail the benefit of both, i.e. slab rate as well as net-metering.

c) **Exemption of Rs. 4000/- Cash transaction limit on utility bills**
 The Petitioners have submitted that collections of utility bills are not carried out through any contractor or agent and all payments have to be made only at the retail outlets of the company only. Hence, the Petitioners have requested the Commission to exempt their collections from the direction of no revenue collection above Rs. 4000/- through cash.

d) **Waive-off / Carry forward of Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO)**
 The Petitioners in their current Tariff Petitions have requested to defer the RPO for subsequent years.

e) **Time bound recovery of regulatory assets/revenue gap**
 The Petitioners have requested for recovery of regulatory assets in a time bound manner of not exceeding 3 years in line with the judgment of Hon'ble ATE as well as National Tariff Policy.

f) **Revision of Power Purchase Adjustment Charges (PPAC) formula**
 The Petitioners have proposed revised formula for timely recovery of power purchase cost by the DISCOMs by considering change in Fixed Cost charges on account of Regulated Power, Fixed and Variable Charges of Long Term Contracts, Transmission Charges, Short Term Power, Loss on Sale of Surplus Power, Arrears payable to Generator and Transco etc.

g) **Enhancement of Security Deposit in line with current tariff**
 The Petitioners have proposed for Revision of Security Deposit / Advance consumption rate and has to be linked with the consumption of individual consumer, the prevailing tariffs as well billing cycle.

h) **Uniform fixed charges upto the load of 5.0 kW**
 The Petitioners have proposed restructuring of the fixed charges for the domestic category so that uniform fixed charges are levied upto the load of 5.0 kW.

i) **Upward revision in Credit Card / Debit Card / Cash Payment Limit**
 The Petitioners have submitted that for payments through Debit Card / Credit Card by the Consumers, no processing fees should be charged for payments upto Rs. 20,000.00 and the cost of same should be allowed as pass through in the ARR.

j) **Separate Tariff Rates for E-vehicles**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to announce separate tariff rate category for purpose of charging of E-vehicles considering its huge growth in the recent past and its increasing acceptability.

k) **Uniform Tariff for Industrial, mushroom cultivation and commercial categories**
 The Petitioners have submitted that the tariffs of industrial, mushroom cultivation and commercial categories should be rationalized to have a uniform tariff.

l) **Modification of norms for O&M Expenses**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to modify the norms for allowance of O&M expenses so as to meet the actual costs required to provide maintain better service to the consumers.

m) **Flat rate Tariff for Pre-paid connections (Domestic Category)**
 The Petitioners have proposed separate tariff for billing pre-paid consumer, under domestic category due to complex slab based tariff structure for domestic category.

n) **Open Access to 1 MW and above consumer**
 The Petitioners have requested to include recovery of Regulatory Assets apart from consumers who are opting power through Open Access; either by considering its effect in tariff and then fixing Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) or as a separate charge.

o) **Introduction of Online Spot Billing**
 The Petitioner requested the Commission to issue suitable directions for implementation of spot billing by all DISCOMs.

p) **Levy of Surcharge on all residential connections under temporary supply**
 The Petitioner has requested to consider levy of surcharge on all residential connections under temporary supply category.

q) **Street Light maintenance charges on market prices**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow DISCOMs to decide and finalize the maintenance charges based on prevalent market conditions due to regular increase in minimum wages and also considering other inflation factors.

r) **Value added services on paid basis**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to allow the DISCOMs to initiate such value added services on paid basis.

s) **Power Banking should be allowed at the average procurement cost instead of normative price of Rs. 4/- per unit**
 The Petitioner has requested the Commission to consider the Power Banking transaction at the average procurement cost of the energy per unit in that respective year.

t) **The Commission will conduct Public Hearings with the stakeholders and the date for the same shall be notified separately.**
 The Commission will continue the Petitions and seek further clarifications from the Petitioners, if required. By way of an Order, the Commission shall approve the ARR for each of the Petitioners. The Orders on the Petitions shall be issued after considering the suggestions received from various stakeholders.

u) **In the past, there have been requests that the Commission may extend assistance to consumers in understanding the Petitions and also help them to file their comments in this regard. The Commission has accordingly prepared Executive Summaries on the Petitions filed by the Petitioners, which is available on the website of the Commission (www.derc.gov.in). The Commission has also nominated the following officers to extend necessary assistance to all such consumers, who may so desire. Discussions with these officers may be held after seeking prior appointment.**
Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) Phone no. : 011 41601656
Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engineering) Phone no. : 011 41601657
 The complete Petitions filed by the Petitioners can be downloaded from the website of the Commission (www.derc.gov.in) or the website of the Petitioners. A soft copy of the Petition may be obtained in CD on payment of Rs. 25/- per CD or a copy of the Petition may be purchased from the respective Petitioner's Head Offices on any working day from today between 11:00 AM and 4:00 PM on payment of Rs. 100/- either by cash or by Demand Draft/Pay Order payable at New Delhi as per the details given below:
BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, New Delhi - 110002. Website : www.bsedelhi.com Phone: 011-39999204. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of BSES Yamuna Power Limited.
BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. BSES Bhawan, Kirti Place, New Delhi - 110019. Website : www.bsedelhi.com Phone: 011-39999312. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of BSES Rajdhani Power Limited.
Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. Substation Building, Hudson Lines Kingsway Camp, New Delhi - 110 009. Website : www.tatapower-dtl.com Phone: 011-86122222. Demand Draft/Pay Order in favour of Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited.

Sd/-
 Secretary
 Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

DIP/2206/14-15

Dainik Jagaran (Hindi) dated 08th March, 2015

दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग
विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवाजी, मालविया नगर, नई दिल्ली-110017
वेबसाइट : www.derc.gov.in, टेलीफ़ोन : 26673608

आम सूचना

वितरण लाइसेंस धारियों को, अर्थात्, बीएसईएस राजधानी पॉवर लि. (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पॉवर लि. (बीवाईपीएल) और टाटा पॉवर देहली डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन लि. (टीपीडीडीएल) (सामूहिक याचिकाकर्ता या डिस्कॉम्स के रूप में) दायर वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के खर्च का सत्यापन, वित्तीय वर्ष 2014-15 की वार्षिक प्रदर्शन समीक्षा (एपीआर) और कुल राजस्व जरूरत एवं वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के टैरिफ हेतु याचिकाएं।

- बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल और टीपीडीडीएल द्वारा दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग (डीईआरसी या आयोग) के समक्ष वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के लिए व्यय समायोजन, वित्तीय वर्ष 2014-15 की एपीआर और वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता एआरआर व प्रशुल्क के अनुमोदन के लिए अपनी याचिकाएं दायर की गई हैं।
- याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा विद्युत अधिनियम, 2003, दिल्ली विद्युत सुधार अधिनियम, 2000, डीईआरसी (हीलिंग प्रशुल्क और खुदरा आपूर्ति प्रशुल्क निर्धारण के लिए नियम व शर्तों) विनियमन विनॉक 30 मई, 2007, और आयोग के आदेश विनॉक 2 दिसम्बर 2011 द्वारा जारी डीईआरसी (हीलिंग प्रशुल्क और खुदरा आपूर्ति प्रशुल्क निर्धारण के लिए नियम व शर्तों) विनियमन, 2011 के प्रावधान के अंतर्गत अपनी संबंधित याचिकाएं दायर की गई हैं। इसके अतिरिक्त, आयोग के आदेश विनॉक 22 अक्टूबर, 2014 में आगामी एक वर्ष अवधि 31 मार्च 2016 तक एमवाईटी विनियमन 2011 में विस्तार किया गया है। आयोग द्वारा उन याचिकाओं को भी स्वीकार किया गया है जिसमें समय-समय पर स्पष्टीकरण/अतिरिक्त जानकारी मांगी जा सकती है।
- याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा अपनी याचिकाओं को डीईआरसी द्वारा अनुमोदन के बाद, एनसीटी दिल्ली के निम्नलिखित समाचार-पत्रों में आम सूचना जारी की गई:

याचिकाकर्ता	समाचार-पत्र	भाषा	आम सूचना जारी होने की तिथि
बीआरपीएल	द इंडियन एक्सप्रेस	अंग्रेजी	02.03.2015
	द टाइम्स ऑफ इंडिया	अंग्रेजी	02.03.2015
	नव भारत टाइम्स	हिन्दी	03.03.2015
	पंजाबी ट्रिब्यून	पंजाबी	03.03.2015
	द डेली मिलाप	उर्दू	03.03.2015
बीवाईपीएल	हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स	अंग्रेजी	02.03.2015
	मिन्ट	अंग्रेजी	02.03.2015
	हिन्दुस्तान	हिन्दी	03.03.2015
	कौमी पत्रिका	पंजाबी	03.03.2015
	द डेली मिलाप	उर्दू	03.03.2015
टीपीडीडीएल	हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स	अंग्रेजी	28.02.2015
	द टाइम्स ऑफ इंडिया	अंग्रेजी	28.02.2015
	हिन्दुस्तान	हिन्दी	01.03.2015
	कौमी पत्रिका	पंजाबी	03.03.2015
	द डेली मिलाप	उर्दू	03.03.2015

- याचिकाकर्ता द्वारा जारी संबंधित आम सूचना में अपनी संक्षिप्त याचिका प्रस्तुत की गई है। आम सूचना को याचिकाकर्ता और आयोग की वेबसाइट पर उाली गई है।
- डीईआरसी (व्यापक कारोबार संहिता) विनियमन, 2001 प्रावधान के अनुरूप, दिल्ली के उपभोक्ता और अन्य हितधारक, आयोग की वेबसाइट पर स्थित डिस्कॉम्स की प्रशुल्क याचिकाएं और कार्यकारी सारांश पर आयोग सचिव के उपर्युक्त नवीनतम पते पर दिनांक 07.04.2015 को सायं 5.00 बजे तक अपनी लिखित प्रस्तुती दर्ज कर सकते हैं। आयोग में टिप्पणियाँ और सुझावों को व्यक्तिगत या डाक द्वारा जमा की जा सकती है और डीईआरसी सचिव के ईमेल पते secvderc@nic.in पर ईमेल भी किया जा सकता है।
- जो हितधारक अपने दृष्टिकोण को व्यक्तिगत रूप से पेश करना चाहते हैं, वे अपनी लिखित प्रस्तुती दर्ज करते समय इच्छा अभिव्यक्ति व्यक्त कर सकते हैं। उपर्युक्त तथ्यों के आधार पर, आयोग द्वारा इस तरह की प्रस्तुती के लिए उपयुक्त समय आवंटित की जा सकती है।
- याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा दर्ज प्रशुल्क याचिकाओं पर टिप्पणियों के अतिरिक्त, सभी हितधारक, आगामी पैरामाफ में सूचित याचिकाकर्ता द्वारा प्रदत्त प्रशुल्क मुक्तिकरण प्रस्तावों पर अपने विचार प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। आयोग द्वारा विभिन्न उपभोक्ता वर्गों के लिए प्रशुल्क निर्धारित करते समय इन मामलों पर विचार किया जाएगा।

- घोरी के बिलों पर 4000/- रुपये नगद लेने-देने की छूट**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा निवेदन है कि किसी भी संवेदक या एजेंट द्वारा घोरी के बिलों की वसूली नहीं की जाती है और सभी भुगतान कम्पनी के संग्रह काउंटर में ही करना होता है। इसलिए, याचिकाकर्ताओं ने आयोग के अनुरोध किया है कि बिना राजस्व संग्रहण की दिशा में नगद 4000/- रुपये से अधिक घोरी की वसूली से मुक्त किया जाए।
- नवीकरणीय खरीद दायित्व (आरपीवी) को माफ करना/आगे बढ़ाना**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा अपनी मौजूद प्रशुल्क याचिकाओं में आरपीवी को आगामी वर्षों तक टालने के लिए अनुरोध किया गया है।
- विनियामक परिसंपत्तियाँ/राजस्व अंतराल की समयबद्ध वसूली**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा माननीय एटीई और राष्ट्रीय प्रशुल्क नीति के फंसले के सम्मान में विनियामक परिसंपत्तियों को 3 वर्ष से कम समयसीमा में वसूली करने का अनुरोध किया गया है।
- बिजली खरीद समायोजन शुल्क (पीपीएसी) संशोधन सूत्र**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा विनियमित बिजली, दीर्घकालीन संवेदाओं के स्थिर और अस्थिर प्रसार, ट्रांसमिशन शुल्क, अल्पकालीन बिजली, अतिशेष बिजली के विक्रय पर हानि, जेनेकोस और ट्रांसकोस इत्यादि को देय बकाया राशि के कारण निर्धारित लागत शुल्कों के परिवर्तन को ध्यान में रखते हुए, डिस्कॉम्स के माध्यम से विद्युत खरीद लागत की समय पर वसूली के लिए संशोधित सूत्र का प्रस्ताव किया गया है।
- मौजूद प्रशुल्क के समान प्रतिभूति जमा राशि में वृद्धि**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा प्रतिभूति जमा राशि/अग्रिम उम्मीद संशोधन, जिसे व्यक्तिगत उपभोक्ता के सफाई, प्रचलित प्रशुल्क और बिल चक्र से जोड़ने का प्रस्ताव किया गया है।
- 5.0 केवी भार तक समरूप निर्धारित शुल्क**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा घरेलू संवर्ग के लिए निर्धारित शुल्कों को पुनर्गठित करने के लिए प्रस्ताव किया गया है ताकि 5.0 केवी भार तक समरूप निर्धारित शुल्क लिया जा सके।
- क्रेडिट कार्ड/डेबिट कार्ड/नगद भुगतान सीमा में चर्चगुली संशोधन**
याचिकाकर्ताओं ने प्रस्तुत किया है कि उपभोक्ताओं द्वारा डेबिट कार्ड/क्रेडिट कार्ड के माध्यम से 20,000.00/- रुपये तक भुगतान करने के लिए कोई प्रक्रमण शुल्क नहीं हो जाएगी और इसकी लागत एआरआर में निकासी के रूप में अनुमत होगी।
- ई-वाहनों के लिए पृथक प्रशुल्क दर**
याचिकाकर्ताओं ने आयोग से अनुरोध किया है कि आजकल ई-वाहनों अत्यधिक प्रचलन और इसकी बढ़ती स्वीकार्यता को ध्यान में रखते हुए ई-वाहनों के प्रसार प्रयोजन के लिए पृथक प्रशुल्क दर संवर्ग की घोषणा की जाए।
- उद्योग, मरारूम की खेती और व्यावसायिक संवर्ग के लिए एकसमान प्रशुल्क**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा निवेदन है कि उद्योग, मरारूम की खेती और व्यावसायिक संवर्ग के प्रशुल्कों का एकसमान प्रशुल्क बनाने के लिए पुनर्गठन किया जाए।
- ओ ऑफ एम व्यय के लिए मानदण्डों का रूपान्तरण**
याचिकाकर्ताओं ने आयोग से अनुरोध किया है कि ओ व एम व्यय छूट के लिए मानदण्डों को रूपान्तरित किया जाए ताकि उपभोक्ताओं को बेहतर सेवा प्रदान करने/बनाये रखने के लिए अपेक्षित वास्तविक लागत को पूरा किया जा सके।
- प्री-पेड कनेक्शनों के लिए एकसमान प्रशुल्क (घरेलू संवर्ग)**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा घरेलू संवर्ग के लिए कॉन्सेक्स स्लैब आधारित प्रशुल्क संरचना के कारण घरेलू संवर्ग के अंतर्गत प्री-पेड उपभोक्ताओं को बिल के लिए पृथक प्रशुल्क बनाने का प्रस्ताव किया गया है।
- 1 एमडब्ल्यू और अधिक उपभोक्ताओं तक खुला उपयोग (ओपन एसएस)**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा खुले उपयोग (ओपन एसएस) के माध्यम से बिजली लेने वाले उपभोक्ताओं से, प्रशुल्क में इसके प्रभाव और फिर पारस्परिक अनुदान अभिशुल्क (सीएसएस) या पृथक शुल्क के रूप में निर्धारण को ध्यान में रखते हुए विनियामक परिसंपत्तियों की वसूली को सम्मिलित करने के लिए अनुरोध किया गया है।
- ऑनलाइन तत्काल बिल-भुगतान की सुझाव**
याचिकाकर्ताओं ने आयोग से अनुरोध किया है कि सभी डिस्कॉम्स द्वारा तत्काल बिल-भुगतान के क्रियान्वयन के लिए उचित दिशानिर्देश जारी किया जाए।
- अस्थायी आपूर्ति के अंतर्गत सभी आवासीय कनेक्शनों पर अधिशुल्क लगाना**
याचिकाकर्ताओं द्वारा अस्थायी आपूर्ति संवर्ग के अंतर्गत सभी आवासीय कनेक्शनों पर अधिशुल्क लगाने पर विचार करने हेतु अनुरोध किया गया है।
- बाजार मूल्य संकट लाइट ररखरखाव शुल्क**
याचिकाकर्ताओं ने आयोग से निवेदन किया है कि स्थूलतः मजदूरी में नियमित वृद्धि और अन्य मुद्रास्फिति कारकों के कारण व्याप्त बाजार स्थितियों के आधार पर रखरखाव शुल्क के निर्णय और अंतिम रूप देने के लिए डिस्कॉम्स को अनुमति दी जाए।
- भुगतान के आधार पर मूल्यवर्धित सेवाएं**
याचिकाकर्ताओं ने आयोग से निवेदन किया है कि भुगतान के आधार पर मूल्यवर्धित सेवाओं को चार्ज करने के लिए डिस्कॉम्स को अनुमति दी जाए।
- पॉवर बैंकिंग को 4/- रुपये प्रति यूनिट मानक कीमत की बजाय औसत खरीद लागत पर अनुमति दी जाए**
याचिकाकर्ताओं ने आयोग से निवेदन किया है कि संबंधित वर्ष में प्रति यूनिट ऊर्जा की औसत खरीद लागत पर पॉवर बैंकिंग लेने-देने पर विचार किया जाए।

[illegible]

Hindustan Times dated 07th April, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Vinayamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar,
New Delhi – 110 017, www.derc.gov.in

CORRIGENDUM

Reference DERC advertisement dated 08.03.2015 regarding Public Notice of Petitions for True Up of Expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by Distribution Licensees.

In this connection, the contact numbers of Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) and Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) in para-10 may be read as under:-

1. Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) - 9599311648
2. Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) - 9718925400

Rest of the contents of the advertisement published on 08.03.2015 remains same.

Secretary

DIP/2230/14-15 **Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission**

The Hindu dated 10th March, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Vinayamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar,
New Delhi – 110 017, www.derc.gov.in

CORRIGENDUM

Reference DERC advertisement dated 08.03.2015 regarding Public Notice of Petitions for True Up of Expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by Distribution Licensees.

In this connection, the contact numbers of Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) and Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) in para-10 may be read as under:-

1. Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) - 9599311648
2. Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) - 9718925400

Rest of the contents of the advertisement published on 08.03.2015 remains same.

Secretary

DIP/2230/14-15 **Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission**

Times of India dated 07th April, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Viniyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar,
New Delhi – 110 017, www.derc.gov.in

CORRIGENDUM

Reference DERC advertisement dated 08.03.2015 regarding Public Notice of Petitions for True Up of Expenses for FY 2013-14 Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by Distribution Licensees.

In this connection, the contact numbers of Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) and Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) in para-10 may be read as under:-

1. Mr. Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) - 9599311648
2. Mr. Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) - 9718925400

Rest of the contents of the advertisement published on 08.03.2015 remains same.

Secretary
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

DIP/2230/14-15

Dainik Jagaran dated 10th March, 2015



दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग
विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवालिक, मातवीय नगर,
नई दिल्ली-110017, www.derc.gov.in

शुद्धिपत्र

डीईआरसी के विज्ञापन दिनांक 08.03.2015 के सचन में टैरिफ वितरण लाइसेंसधारियों द्वारा वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के लिए व्यय के दू.अप के लिए वित्तीय वर्ष 2014-15 की वार्षिक प्रदर्शन की समीक्षा (एपीआर) तथा सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) तथा वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए टैरिफ की दायरे याचिका की सार्वजनिक सूचना के बारे में।

इस सचन में पैरा 10 में श्री प्रशांत कुमार, संयुक्त निदेशक (टैरिफ-वित्त) तथा श्री अमित शर्मा, संयुक्त निदेशक (टैरिफ-इंजी.) के संपर्क नंबर निम्न प्रकार पढ़े जाएं:-

1. श्री प्रशांत कुमार, संयुक्त निदेशक (टैरिफ-वित्त) - 9599311648
2. श्री अमित शर्मा, संयुक्त निदेशक (टैरिफ-इंजी.) - 9718925400

दिनांक 08.03.2015 को प्रकाशित विज्ञापन के अन्य विवरण पूर्ववत् रहेंगे।

सचिव
दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

DIP/2230/14-15

Jadid in Dinon dated 07th April, 2015

این قومی ایس سی، دہلی

دہلی الیکٹرک ریگولیٹری کمیشن
 ویٹا سبک بھون، سٹی، بلاک، شوالک، مانوہ نگر،
 نئی دہلی 110017, www.dere.gov.in

تصحیح نامہ

ڈی ای آر کے اشتہار بتاریخ 08.03.2015 کے سلسلے میں میرف ڈسٹری بیوشن لائسنس یافتگان کے ذریعہ مالی سال 2013-14 کے اخراجات کے ٹرواپ کے لئے، مالی سال 2014-15 کی سالانہ مظاہرہ کا تجزیہ (اے پی آر) اور اجمالی ریونیو ضرورت (اے آر آر) اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے میرف کی دائرہ پیش کی پبلک نوٹس کے بارے میں۔ اس سلسلے میں، پیر 10 مئی شری پریشان کمار، جواکٹ ڈائریکٹر (میرف - فائٹس) اور شری است شرم، جواکٹ ڈائریکٹر (میرف - انجینئرنگ) کے رابطہ نمبر ذیل کے مطابق پڑھے جائیں۔

1. شری پریشان کمار، جواکٹ ڈائریکٹر (میرف - فائٹس) - 9599311648
 2. شری است شرم، جواکٹ ڈائریکٹر (میرف - انجینئرنگ) - 9718925400

تاریخ 08.03.2015 کو شائع اشتہار کی دیگر تفصیلات حسب سابق رہیں گی۔

سیکریٹری
 دہلی الیکٹرک ریگولیٹری کمیشن

DIP/2230/14-15

Quami Patrika dated 10th March, 2015

پارلہ
 دہلی
 سب
 ن

دہلی الیکٹرک ریگولیٹری کمیشن
 ویٹا سبک بھون، سٹی، بلاک، شوالک، مانوہ نگر،
 نئی دہلی 110017, www.dere.gov.in

سبھی پڑھو

ڈی ای آر کے اشتہار بتاریخ 08.03.2015 کے سلسلے میں میرف ڈسٹری بیوشن لائسنس یافتگان کے ذریعہ مالی سال 2013-14 کے اخراجات کے ٹرواپ کے لئے، مالی سال 2014-15 کی سالانہ مظاہرہ کا تجزیہ (اے پی آر) اور اجمالی ریونیو ضرورت (اے آر آر) اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے میرف کی دائرہ پیش کی پبلک نوٹس کے بارے میں۔ اس سلسلے میں، پیر 10 مئی شری پریشان کمار، جواکٹ ڈائریکٹر (میرف - فائٹس) اور شری است شرم، جواکٹ ڈائریکٹر (میرف - انجینئرنگ) کے رابطہ نمبر ذیل کے مطابق پڑھے جائیں۔

1. شری پریشان کمار، جواکٹ ڈائریکٹر (میرف - فائٹس) - 9599311648
 2. شری است شرم، جواکٹ ڈائریکٹر (میرف - انجینئرنگ) - 9718925400

تاریخ 08.03.2015 کو شائع اشتہار کی دیگر تفصیلات حسب سابق رہیں گی۔

سیکریٹری
 دہلی الیکٹرک ریگولیٹری کمیشن

ڈی ای آر/2230

Times of India dated 07th April, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
 Vinayam Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110017.
 Website: www.derc.gov.in, Telefax: 26673606

(PUBLIC NOTICE)

LAST DATE FOR RECEIPT OF OBJECTIONS/COMMENTS ON TARIFF PETITIONS FOR FY 2015-16 EXTENDED TO 17th April, 2015.

1. Petition for True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Distribution Licensees, viz. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL) and New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True Up of expenses for FY 2012-13 to FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Generation Licensees, viz., Indraprastha Power Generation Company Limited (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Limited (PPCL) and Transmission Licensee, viz., Delhi Transco Limited (DTL) before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission.
2. The last date for receipt of objections/comments from Stakeholders for BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL was 07th April, 2015 and for NDMC, IPGCL, PPCL and DTL was 10th April, 2015.
3. The Commission has decided to extend the last date for receipt of objections/comments from Stakeholders to 17th April, 2015 upto 5.00 p.m. due to various request/representations received from the Stakeholders.
4. The petitions filed by the licensees and Executive Summary on the salient features of Petitions can be downloaded from the website of the Commission i.e. www.derc.gov.in. Copies of the petitions are also available for inspection at the Commission's Office.

DIP/0025/15-16

Secretary
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Hindustan Times dated 07th April, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
 Vinayam Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110017
 Website: www.derc.gov.in, Telefax: 26673606

PUBLIC NOTICE

LAST DATE FOR RECEIPT OF OBJECTIONS/COMMENTS ON TARIFF PETITIONS FOR FY 2015-16 EXTENDED TO 17th April, 2015.

1. Petition for True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Distribution Licensees, viz. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL) and New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True Up of expenses for FY 2012-13 to FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Generation Licensees, viz., Indraprastha Power Generation Company Limited (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Limited (PPCL) and Transmission Licensee, viz., Delhi Transco Limited (DTL) before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission.
2. The last date for receipt of objections/comments from Stakeholders for BRPL, BYPL and TPDDL was 07th April, 2015 and for NDMC, IPGCL, PPCL and DTL was 10th April, 2015.
3. The Commission has decided to extend the last date for receipt of objections/comments from Stakeholders to 17th April, 2015 upto 5.00 p.m. due to various request/representations received from the Stakeholders.
4. The petitions filed by the licensees and Executive Summary on the salient features of Petitions can be downloaded from the website of the Commission i.e. www.derc.gov.in. Copies of the petitions are also available for inspection at the Commission's Office.

DIP/0025/15-16

Secretary
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Hindustan (Hindi) dated 07th April, 2015



दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, सिविलिंग, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली-110017
वेबसाइट: www.derc.gov.in, टेलीफोन: 26679606

सार्वजनिक सूचना

वित्त वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए टैरिफ संबंधी याचिकाओं पर आपत्तियों/टिप्पणियों को प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तारीख बढ़ा कर 17 अप्रैल, 2015 कर दी गई है।

1. वितरण लाइसेंसधारकों यथा बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमिटेड (बीवाईपीएल), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन लिमिटेड (टीपीडीडीएल) और नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका परिषद (एनडीएमसी) द्वारा वित्त वर्ष 2013-14 के व्ययों के सत्यापन और वित्त वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता और टैरिफ का निर्धारण करने और जनरेशन लाइसेंसधारक यथा इन्द्रप्रस्थ पावर जनरेशन कंपनी लिमिटेड (आईपीजीसीएल) और प्रगति पावर जनरेशन कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (पीपीजीएल) तथा ट्रांसमिशन लाइसेंसधारक यथा दिल्ली ट्रांसको लिमिटेड (डीटीएल) द्वारा वित्त वर्ष 2012-13 से 2013-14 के व्ययों के सत्यापन और वित्त वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता और टैरिफ का निर्धारण करने की याचिका दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग के समक्ष प्रस्तुत की गई है।
2. हितधारकों से आपत्तियां/टिप्पणियां प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तारीख बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल और टीपीडीडीएल के लिए 7 अप्रैल, 2015 और एनडीएमसी, आईपीजीसीएल, पीपीजीएल और डीटीएल के लिए 10 अप्रैल, 2015 निर्धारित की गई थी।
3. आयोग ने हितधारकों से मिले विभिन्न अनुरोधों/प्रतिवेदन करने के आधार पर हितधारकों से आपत्तियां/टिप्पणियां प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तारीख को 17 अप्रैल, 2015 को शाम 05.00 बजे तक बढ़ाने का निर्णय लिया है।
4. लाइसेंसधारकों द्वारा प्रस्तुत याचिकाओं और याचिकाओं की मुख्य विशेषताओं का कार्यकारी सारांश, आयोग की वेबसाइट अर्थात् www.derc.gov.in से डाउनलोड किए जा सकते हैं। याचिकाओं की प्रतियां निरीक्षण/देखने के लिए आयोग के कार्यालय में भी उपलब्ध हैं।

DIP/0025/15-16

सचिव
दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

Daily Educator, New Delhi (Punjabi) dated 07th April, 2015



ਦਿੱਲੀ ਬਿਜਲੀ ਰੈਗੂਲੇਟਰੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ

ਚਿਨਿਆਮਰ ਭਵਨ, ਸੀ. ਬਲਾਕ, ਸਿਵਾਲਿਕ ਮਾਲਵੀਆ ਨਗਰ, ਨਵੀਂ ਦਿੱਲੀ-110017
ਵੈਬਸਾਈਟ: www.derc.gov.in , ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ: 26673606

ਜਨਤਕ ਸੂਚਨਾ

ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2015-16 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਾਂ 'ਤੇ ਇਤਰਾਜ਼/ਟਿੱਪਣੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਆਖਰੀ ਮਿਤੀ ਵਧਾ ਕੇ 17 ਅਪ੍ਰੈਲ, 2015 ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ।

1. ਵੰਡ ਲਾਇਸੈਂਸਧਾਰਕਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਬੀਐਸਈਐਸ ਰਾਜਧਾਨੀ ਪਾਵਰ ਲਿਮਟਿਡ (ਬੀਆਰਪੀਐਲ), ਬੀਐਸਈਐਸ ਯਮੁਨਾ ਪਾਵਰ ਲਿਮਟਿਡ (ਬੀਵਾਈਪੀਐਲ), ਟਾਟਾ ਪਾਵਰ ਦਿੱਲੀ ਡਿਸਟ੍ਰੀਬਿਊਸ਼ਨ ਲਿਮਟਿਡ (ਟੀਪੀਡੀਡੀਐਲ) ਅਤੇ ਨਵੀਂ ਦਿੱਲੀ ਨਗਰ ਪਾਲਿਕਾ ਪ੍ਰੀਸ਼ਦ (ਐਨਡੀਐਮਸੀ) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2013-14 ਦੇ ਖਰਚਿਆਂ ਦੀ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਅਤੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2015-16 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਕੁਲ ਮਾਲੀਆ ਲੋੜ ਅਤੇ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਦਾ ਨਿਰਧਾਰਣ ਕਰਨ ਅਤੇ ਜਨਰੇਸ਼ਨ ਲਾਇਸੈਂਸ ਧਾਰਕ ਅਤੇ ਇੰਦਰਪ੍ਰਸਥ ਪਾਵਰ ਜਨਰੇਸ਼ਨ ਕੰਪਨੀ ਲਿਮਟਿਡ (ਆਈਪੀਜੀਸੀਐਲ) ਅਤੇ ਪ੍ਰਗਤੀ ਪਾਵਰ ਜਨਰੇਸ਼ਨ ਕਾਰਪੋਰੇਸ਼ਨ ਲਿਮਟਿਡ (ਪੀਪੀਜੀਐਲ) ਅਤੇ ਟ੍ਰਾਂਸਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਲਾਇਸੈਂਸਧਾਰਕ ਅਤੇ ਦਿੱਲੀ ਟਰਾਂਸਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਕੰਪਨੀ ਲਿਮਟਿਡ (ਡੀਟੀਐਲ) ਦੁਆਰਾ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2012-13 ਤੋਂ 2013-14 ਦੇ ਖਰਚਿਆਂ ਦੀ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਅਤੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2015-16 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਕੁਲ ਮਾਲੀਆ ਲੋੜ ਅਤੇ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਦਾ ਨਿਰਧਾਰਣ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨ ਦਿੱਲੀ ਬਿਜਲੀ ਰੈਗੂਲੇਟਰੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਦੇ ਸਨਮੁੱਖ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ।
2. ਹਿੱਤਧਾਰਕਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਇਤਰਾਜ਼/ਟਿੱਪਣੀਆਂ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਆਖਰੀ ਮਿਤੀ ਬੀਆਰਪੀਐਲ, ਬੀਵਾਈਪੀਐਲ ਅਤੇ ਟੀਪੀਡੀਡੀਐਲ ਦੇ ਲਈ 7 ਅਪ੍ਰੈਲ, 2015 ਅਤੇ ਐਨਡੀਐਮਸੀ, ਆਈਪੀਜੀਸੀਐਲ, ਪੀਪੀਜੀਐਲ ਅਤੇ ਡੀਪੀਐਲ ਦੇ ਲਈ 10 ਅਪ੍ਰੈਲ, 2015 ਨਿਰਧਾਰਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਸੀ।
3. ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਨੇ ਹਿੱਤਧਾਰਕਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਮਿਲੀਆਂ ਵੱਖ-ਵੱਖ ਅਪੀਲਾਂ/ਬਿਨੈ ਕਰਨ ਦੇ ਆਧਾਰ 'ਤੇ ਹਿੱਤਧਾਰਕਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਇਤਰਾਜ਼/ਟਿੱਪਣੀਆਂ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਆਖਰੀ ਮਿਤੀ ਨੂੰ 17 ਅਪ੍ਰੈਲ, 2015 ਨੂੰ ਸ਼ਾਮ 05.00 ਵਜੇ ਤੱਕ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਲਿਆ ਹੈ।
4. ਲਾਇਸੈਂਸਧਾਰਕਾਂ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਪੇਸ਼ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਮੁੱਖ ਵਿਸ਼ੇਸ਼ਤਾਵਾਂ ਦਾ ਕਾਰਜਕਾਰੀ ਸਾਰੰਸ਼, ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਦੀ ਵੈਬਸਾਈਟ ਭਾਵ www.derc.gov.in ਤੇ ਡਾਊਨਲੋਡ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾ ਸਕਦਾ। ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਾਂ ਦੇ ਉਤਾਰੇ ਨਿਰੀਖਣ/ਦੇਖਣ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਦੇ ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਵਿਚ ਵੀ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਹਨ।

DIP/0025/15-16

ਸਕੱਤਰ
ਦਿੱਲੀ ਬਿਜਲੀ ਰੈਗੂਲੇਟਰੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ

Milap (Urdu) dated 07th April, 2015

دلی الیکٹریسیٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن
 وی بی ایک بھون، سی۔ بلاک، شیوا لک، بالویہ نگر نئی دہلی۔ 110017
 ویب سائٹ: www.derc.gov.in ٹیلی فون: 26673606

اطلاع عام

مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے فیرف سے متعلق پیشینوں پر اعتراض مرد عمل کو وصول کرنے کی آخری تاریخ بڑھا کر 17 اپریل، 2015 کر دی گئی ہے۔

1. ڈسٹریکٹ لائسنس ہولڈروں یعنی بی ایس این ایس راجدھانی پاور لیمنڈ (بی آر پی ایل)، بی ایس ای ایس یمن پاور لیمنڈ (بی وی پی ایل)، ٹاٹا پاور ڈسٹریکٹ لائسنس (ٹی ڈی ڈی ایل) اور نئی دہلی میونسپل کونسل (این ڈی ایم سی) کے ذریعہ مالی سال 2013-14 کے اخراجات کی ٹرو۔ اپ اور مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے کل ریونیو ضرورت اور فیرف کا تعین کرنے اور جزیں لائسنس ہولڈروں یعنی اندر پرستھ پاور جزیں لیمنڈ (آئی پی جی سی ایل) اور پرمتی پاور جزیں کارپوریشن لیمنڈ (پی پی جی ایل) اور ٹرانس مشن لائسنس ہولڈر یعنی دی ٹرانسکو لیمنڈ (ڈی ٹی ایل) کے ذریعہ مالی سال 2012-13 سے 2013-14 کے اخراجات کی ٹرو۔ اپ اور مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے کل ریونیو ضرورت اور فیرف کا تعین کرنے کی پیشین دہی الیکٹریسیٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن کے سامنے پیش کی گئی ہے۔
2. سٹیک ہولڈروں سے اعتراضات زبرد عمل وصول کرنے کی آخری تاریخ بی آر پی ایل، بی وی پی ایل اور پی پی جی ڈی ایل کیلئے 7 اپریل 2015 اور این ڈی ایم سی، آئی پی جی سی ایل، پی پی جی ایل اور ڈی ٹی ایل کیلئے 10 اپریل 2015 طے کی گئی تھی۔
3. کمیشن نے سٹیک ہولڈروں سے موصول درخواستوں پر گزارشوں کی بنیاد پر سٹیک ہولڈروں سے اعتراض مرد عمل وصول کرنے کی آخری تاریخ کو 17 اپریل 2015 کو شام 05.00 بجے تک بڑھانے کا فیصلہ لیا ہے۔
4. لائسنس ہولڈروں کے ذریعہ پیش پیشینوں اور پیشینوں کی اہم خصوصیات کا اختصار، کمیشن کی ویب سائٹ یعنی www.derc.gov.in سے ڈاؤن لوڈ کئے جاسکتے ہیں۔ پیشینوں کی کاپیاں مطالعہ مرد عملنے کیلئے کمیشن کی ویب سائٹ کے دفتر میں بھی دستیاب ہے۔

سکریٹری
 دلی الیکٹریسیٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن

DIP/0025/15-16

Amar Ujala (Hindi) dated 07th April, 2015



दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवमलिका, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली-110017
वेबसाइट: www.derc.gov.in, टेलीफोन: 26673606

सार्वजनिक सूचना

वित्त वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए टैरिफ संबंधी याचिकाओं पर आपत्तियाँ/टिप्पणियों को प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तारीख बढ़ा कर 17 अप्रैल, 2015 कर दी गई है।

1. वितरण लाइसेंसधारकों यथा बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमिटेड (बीवाईपीएल), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन लिमिटेड (टीपीडीडीएल) और नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका परिषद (एनडीएमसी) द्वारा वित्त वर्ष 2013-14 के व्ययों के सत्यापन और वित्त वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता और टैरिफ का निर्धारण करने और जनरेशन लाइसेंसधारक यथा इन्द्रप्रस्थ पावर जनरेशन कंपनी लिमिटेड (आईपीजीसीएल) और प्रगति पावर जनरेशन कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (पीपीजीएल) तथा ट्रांसमिशन लाइसेंसधारक यथा दिल्ली ट्रांस्को लिमिटेड (डीटीएल) द्वारा वित्त वर्ष 2012-13 से 2013-14 के व्ययों के सत्यापन और वित्त वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता और टैरिफ का निर्धारण करने की याचिका दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग के समक्ष प्रस्तुत की गई है।
2. हितधारकों से आपत्तियाँ/टिप्पणियाँ प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तारीख बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल और टीपीडीडीएल के लिए 7 अप्रैल, 2015 और एनडीएमसी, आईपीजीसीएल, पीपीजीएल और डीटीएल के लिए 10 अप्रैल, 2015 निर्धारित की गई थी।
3. आयोग ने हितधारकों से मिले विभिन्न अनुरोधों/प्रतिवेदन करने के आधार पर हितधारकों से आपत्तियाँ/टिप्पणियाँ प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तारीख को 17 अप्रैल, 2015 को शाम 05.00 बजे तक बढ़ाने का निर्णय लिया है।
4. लाइसेंसधारकों द्वारा प्रस्तुत याचिकाओं और याचिकाओं की मुख्य विशेषताओं का कार्यकारी सारांश, आयोग की वेबसाइट अर्थात् www.derc.gov.in से डाउनलोड किए जा सकते हैं। याचिकाओं की प्रतियाँ निरीक्षण/देखने के लिए आयोग के कार्यालय में भी उपलब्ध हैं।

DIP/0025/15-16

सचिव
दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

Times of India dated 18th April, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Viniyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110 017.
Website: www.derc.gov.in, Telefax: 26673608

PUBLIC NOTICE

1. **LAST DATE FOR RECEIPT OF OBJECTIONS/COMMENTS ON TARIFF PETITIONS FOR FY 2015-16 EXTENDED TO 24/04/2015.**
2. **COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS ON PROPOSED AT&C LOSS TARGETS FOR FY 2015-16 ALSO INVITED UPTO 24/04/2015.**

1. Petitions have been filed for True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Distribution Licensees, viz. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL) and New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True Up of expenses for FY 2012-13 to FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Generation Licensees, viz., Indraprastha Power Generation Company Limited (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Limited (PPCL) and Transmission Licensee, viz., Delhi Transco Limited (DTL) before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission.
2. The Commission had extended the applicability of MYT Regulations for FY 2015-16 vide order dated 22.10.2014. Accordingly, AT&C loss targets for FY 2015-16 for the distribution licensees also need to be fixed in the Tariff Order for FY 2015-16. The Commission intends to fix the AT&C loss target for FY 2015-16 by reducing the AT&C loss target by 0.83%, 1.16%, 0.5% and 0.25% from AT&C loss target for FY 2014-15 for BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL and NDMC respectively as per the trajectory approved in MYT Order dated 13.07.2012. The target for FY 2015-16 derived as per the said trajectory is 11.67%, 13.34%, 11.00% and 9.60% for BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL and NDMC respectively.
3. The last date for receipt of objections/comments from Stakeholders on the petitions of BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL, NDMC, IPGCL, PPCL and DTL was 17/04/2015.
4. The Commission has decided to extend the last date for receipt of objections/comments from Stakeholders to 24/04/2015 upto 5:00 PM due to various requests/representations received from the Stakeholders. Objections/comments on the proposed AT&C loss targets may also be filed by 24/04/2015 upto 5:00 PM.
5. The petitions filed by the licensees and Executive Summary on the salient features of Petitions can be downloaded from the website of the Commission i.e. www.derc.gov.in. Hard copies of the petitions can be obtained from the respective Petitioner's Head offices on any working day between 11:00 AM to 4:00 PM upto 24/04/2015.

DIP/0101/2015-16

HIT-18.04.15

Secretary
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Hindustan Times dated 18th April, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Viniyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110 017.
Website: www.derc.gov.in, Telefax: 26673608

PUBLIC NOTICE

1. **LAST DATE FOR RECEIPT OF OBJECTIONS/COMMENTS ON TARIFF PETITIONS FOR FY 2015-16 EXTENDED TO 24/04/2015.**
2. **COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS ON PROPOSED AT&C LOSS TARGETS FOR FY 2015-16 ALSO INVITED UPTO 24/04/2015.**

1. Petitions have been filed for True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Distribution Licensees, viz. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL) and New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True Up of expenses for FY 2012-13 to FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16 filed by the Generation Licensees, viz., Indraprastha Power Generation Company Limited (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Limited (PPCL) and Transmission Licensee, viz., Delhi Transco Limited (DTL) before the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission.
2. The Commission had extended the applicability of MYT Regulations for FY 2015-16 vide order dated 22.10.2014. Accordingly, AT&C loss targets for FY 2015-16 for the distribution licensees also need to be fixed in the Tariff Order for FY 2015-16. The Commission intends to fix the AT&C loss target for FY 2015-16 by reducing the AT&C loss target by 0.83%, 1.16%, 0.5% and 0.25% from AT&C loss target for FY 2014-15 for BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL and NDMC respectively as per the trajectory approved in MYT Order dated 13.07.2012. The target for FY 2015-16 derived as per the said trajectory is 11.67%, 13.34%, 11.00% and 9.60% for BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL and NDMC respectively.
3. The last date for receipt of objections/comments from Stakeholders on the petitions of BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL, NDMC, IPGCL, PPCL and DTL was 17/04/2015.
4. The Commission has decided to extend the last date for receipt of objections/comments from Stakeholders to 24/04/2015 upto 5:00 PM due to various requests/representations received from the Stakeholders. Objections/comments on the proposed AT&C loss targets may also be filed by 24/04/2015 upto 5:00 PM.
5. The petitions filed by the licensees and Executive Summary on the salient features of Petitions can be downloaded from the website of the Commission i.e. www.derc.gov.in. Hard copies of the petitions can be obtained from the respective Petitioner's Head offices on any working day between 11:00 AM to 4:00 PM upto 24/04/2015.

DIP/0101/2015-16

HT-18.04.15

Secretary
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Hindustan (Hindi) dated 18th April, 2015



दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवालिक, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली-110 017
वेबसाइट: www.derc.gov.in, टेलीफोन : 26673608

सार्वजनिक सूचना

1. वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए शुल्क आवेदनों पर आपत्तियां / टिप्पणियां प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तिथि 24/04/2015 तक बढ़ाई गई।
2. वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए प्रस्तावित एटीएण्डसी लॉस टारगेट्स पर टिप्पणियां / सुझाव 24/04/2015 तक भी आमंत्रित।

1. वित्त-वर्ष 2013-14 के व्यय के टू-अप हेतु तथा वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता तथा शुल्क हेतु वितरण लाइसेंसधारियों यानी बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमिटेड (बीवाईपीएल), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन लिमिटेड (टीपीडीडीएल) तथा नई दिल्ली नगर निगम (एनडीएमसी) और वित्त-वर्ष 2012-13 से वित्त-वर्ष 2013-14 तक के व्यय का टू अप तथा वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता एवं शुल्क हेतु उत्पादन लाइसेंसधारियों यानी इन्द्रप्रस्थ पावर जेनरेशन कंपनी लिमिटेड (आईपीजीसीएल) और प्रगती पावर कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (पीपीसीएल) तथा वितरण लाइसेंसधारी यानी दिल्ली ट्रांसको लिमिटेड (डीटीएल) द्वारा दिल्ली विद्युत नियामक आयोग के समक्ष याचिका दायर की गई है।
2. आयोग ने वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए एमवाईटी विनियमनों की अनुप्रयोज्यता को दिनांक 22.10.2014 का आदेशानुसार बढ़ाया था। इस अनुरूप, वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए वितरण लाइसेंसधारियों के एटीएण्डसी लॉस टारगेट्स (नुकसान लक्ष्य) को भी वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के टैरिफ ऑर्डर में निर्धारित करने की आवश्यकता है। आयोग चाहता है कि वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए एटीएण्डसी लॉस टारगेट्स को इस प्रकार निर्धारित किया जाए कि 13.07.2012 के एमवाईटी आदेश में स्वीकृत प्रावधान के अनुसार बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल और एमडीएमसी के लिए वित्त-वर्ष 2014-15 हेतु एटी-सी लॉस टारगेट्स (नुकसान लक्ष्य) इसे क्रमशः 0.83%, 1.16%, 0.5% और 0.25% कम निर्धारित किया जाए। उक्त प्रावधान के अनुसार वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 में बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल और एमडीएमसी के लिए लक्ष्य क्रमशः 11.67%, 13.34%, 11.00% और 9.60% है।
3. बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल, एनडीएमसी, आईपीजीसीएल, पीपीसीएल और डीटीएल की याचिकाओं पर हितधारकों की ओर से आपत्ति / टिप्पणी प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तिथि 17/04/2015 थी।
4. हितधारकों की ओर से कई अनुरोध / प्रतिनिधि भेजे जाने के बाद आयोग ने हितधारकों की ओर से आपत्ति / टिप्पणी प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तिथि को 24/04/2015 के संध्या 5 बजे तक बढ़ा दी गई है। प्रस्तावित एटीएण्डसी लॉस टारगेट्स पर आपत्ति / टिप्पणी 24/04/2015 के संध्या 5 बजे तक दर्ज कराई जा सकती है।
5. लाइसेंस धारियों द्वारा दायर की गई याचिकाएं और याचिकाओं की मुख्य विशेषताओं पर कार्यकारी सारांश (एक्जीक्यूटिव समरी) आयोग की वेबसाइट www.derc.gov.in से डाउनलोड किया जा सकता है। याचिकाओं की लिखित प्रतियां (हार्ड कॉपी) संबंधित याचिकाकर्ता के मुख्यालयों से किसी भी कार्य दिवस में दिन के 11:00 बजे से 4:00 बजे के बीच दिनांक 24/04/2015 तक प्राप्त की जा सकती हैं।

DIP/0101/2015-16
दिल्ली विद्युत नियामक आयोग

The Educator, New Delhi (Punjabi) dated 18th April, 2015

دہلی الیکٹری سٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن

ونیشیاک بھون، سی۔ بلاک، شیوالک، مالویہ نگر، نئی دہلی۔ 110017
فیکس: 26673608 میل: secyderc@nrc.in



عوامی سنوائی کیلئے نوٹس

موضوع: بی ایس ای ایس راجدھانی پاور لمیٹڈ (بی آر پی ایل)، بی ایس ای ایس بینا پاور لمیٹڈ (بی وائی پی ایل)، ٹاٹا پاور دہلی ڈسٹری بیوشن لمیٹڈ (ٹی پی ڈی ڈی ایل)، نئی دہلی میونسپل کونسل (این ڈی ایم سی) کے ذریعے دائر اپیل مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے گراس ریونیوریکوآئزمنٹ (اے آر آر) اور ٹیرف، مالی سال 2014-15 کیلئے سالانہ پرفارمنس ریویو (اے پی آر) اور مالی سال 2013-14 کے خرچوں کی تصدیق اور دہلی ٹرانسکو لمیٹڈ (ڈی ٹی ایل)، اندر پرستھ جزیشن کمپنی لمیٹڈ (آئی پی جی سی ایل) اور پرگتی پاور کارپوریشن (پی پی سی ایل) کے لئے مالی سال 2012-13 اور 2013-14 کیلئے اے آر آر کی تصدیق اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے ٹیرف کے لئے۔

1. دہلی کے ڈسٹری بیوشن لائسنسز یعنی بی آر پی ایل، بی وائی پی ایل، ٹی پی ڈی ڈی ایل، این ڈی ایم سی نے مالی سال 2013-14 کے لئے خرچوں کی تصدیق، مالی سال 2014-15 کی سالانہ پرفارمنس ریویو (اے پی آر) اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے گراس ریونیوریکوآئزمنٹ (اے آر آر) اور ٹیرف کے لئے اپنی اپیل دائر کی ہیں۔

2. ڈی ٹی ایل، آئی پی جی سی ایل، پی پی سی ایل نے مالی سال 2012-13 اور مالی سال 2013-14 کے لئے اے آر آر کی تصدیق اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے گراس ریونیوریکوآئزمنٹ اور ٹیرف کے لئے اپنی اپیل دائر کی ہیں۔

3. اسٹیک ہولڈرز سے اعتراضات رائے حاصل کرنے کی آخری تاریخ 27-05-2015 کی جسے 06-06-2015 تک بڑھا دیا گیا تھا۔

4. کمیشن اوپر درج ٹیرف اپیلوں پر سبھی اسٹیک ہولڈروں/صرافین زمروں کے لئے، ان کے سمیت جو پہلے ہی اپنی رائے اعتراض دے چکے ہیں ذیل میں دیئے گئے پروگرام کے مطابق سیری فورٹ آڈیو ریم-11، گیٹ نمبر-5، اگست کرائی مارگ، نئی دہلی۔ 110049 میں عوامی سنوائی منعقد کریگا۔

تاریخ	وقت	یوٹی لیٹرز
04-08-2015	صبح 10:30 بجے سے دوپہر 1:00 بجے تک	بی آر پی ایل، بی وائی پی ایل، ٹی پی ڈی ڈی ایل، این ڈی ایم سی
05-08-2015	صبح 10:30 بجے سے دوپہر 1:00 بجے تک	ڈی ٹی ایل، آئی پی جی سی ایل، پی پی سی ایل

5. اسٹیک ہولڈرز کو ڈسٹری بیوشن کمپنیوں یعنی بی آر پی ایل، بی وائی پی ایل، ٹی پی ڈی ڈی ایل، این ڈی ایم سی کے ذریعے کئے گئے دعووں کو سمجھنے کے لئے گراس ریونیوریکوآئزمنٹ (اے آر آر) اور ٹیرف مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے اپیل کنندگان کے دعووں کے اسسٹ کے تذکرہ کرتے ہوئے ہرڈسکام کے لئے ایک مفصل اختصاری شیٹ تیار کی گئی ہے اور ڈی ای آر سی ویب سائٹ www.derc.gov.in پر اپ لوڈ کی گئی ہے۔ اسے عوامی سنوائی میں کوئی بھٹاؤ اور رائے دینے کے لئے استعمال میں لایا جاسکتا ہے۔ اس اختصاری شیٹوں پر کسی بھی وضاحت کے لئے اسٹیک ہولڈرز کمیشن کے دفتر میں درج ذیل افسران سے 3 اگست، 2015 تک ہر کام کے دن سہ پہر 3:00 بجے سے شام 5:00 بجے کے درمیان رابطہ کر سکتے ہیں۔

(i) شری پرشانت کمار، جوائنٹ ڈائریکٹر (ٹیرف - فائننس) فون: 26680433

(ii) شری امت شرما، جوائنٹ ڈائریکٹر (ٹیرف - انجینئرنگ) فون: 26673601

(iii) شری تجے کمار شرما، جوائنٹ ڈائریکٹر (بی ایس اینڈ ای) فون: 26680734

6. مذکورہ اختصاری آخری ہے اور ٹیرف آرڈر کو قطعی شکل دینے کے لئے اسٹیک ہولڈرز کے نظریات کو جاننے کے لئے جانکاری میں اضافے کے مقصد کے لئے ہیں۔

7. سبھی اسٹیک ہولڈرز/صرافین کی سنوائی پہلے آؤ پہلے پاؤ بنیاد پر ہوگی۔ برائے مہربانی اپنے ساتھ اپنا فوٹوشاپ کارڈ لے کر آئیں۔

سیکرٹری
دہلی الیکٹری سٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن

DIP/0784/15-16

Daily Milap (Urdu) dated 18th April, 2015

دلی الیکٹری سٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن
 وینی یامک بھون، سی۔ بلاک، شیوالک، مالویہ نگر، نئی دہلی۔ 110017
 ویب سائٹ: www.derc.gov.in، ٹیلی فیکس: 26673608

اطلاع عام

1. مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے ٹیرف پینشنوں پر اعتراضات / رد عمل وصول کرنے کی آخری تاریخ کو 24/04/2015 تک بڑھا دیا گیا ہے۔

2. مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے مجوزہ ایف ڈی اینڈ سی لاس ٹارگیٹوں پر اعتراضات / مشورے بھی 24/04/2015 تک طلب کئے جاتے ہیں۔

1. ڈسٹریبیوٹن لائسنسز یعنی ای ایس ایس راجدھانی پاور لمیٹڈ (بی آر پی ایل)، بی ایس ای ایس یو پاور لمیٹڈ (بی یو پی ایل)، ٹاٹا پاور دلی ڈسٹریبیوٹن لمیٹڈ (ٹی پی ڈی ایل) اور نئی دہلی میٹروپولیٹن کونسل (این ڈی ایم سی) کے ذریعہ مالی سال 2013-14 کے اخراجات کے ٹرو-آپ اور مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے ایگریگٹ ریونیوریکوآرمنٹ اور ٹیرف کیلئے اور جزییشن لائسنسز، یعنی اندر پرستھ پاور جزییشن کمپنی لمیٹڈ (آئی پی جی سی ایل)، اور پرستی پاور کارپوریشن لمیٹڈ (پی پی سی ایل) اور ٹرانس میشن لائسنسز، یعنی دلی ٹرانسکو لمیٹڈ (ڈی ٹی ایل) کے ذریعہ مالی سال 2012-13 سے مالی سال 2013-14 تک کے اخراجات کے ٹرو-آپ اور مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے ایگریگٹ ریونیوریکوآرمنٹ اور ٹیرف کے تعین کیلئے دلی الیکٹری سٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن کے روپریٹیشنز داخل کی گئی ہیں۔

2. کمیشن نے مورخہ 22-10-2014 کے وائڈ آرڈر کے ذریعہ مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے ایف ڈی اینڈ سی لاس ٹارگیٹوں کو بھی مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے ٹیرف آرڈر میں طے کئے جانے کی ضرورت لائسنسز کیلئے مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے ایف ڈی اینڈ سی لاس ٹارگیٹوں کو بھی مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے ٹیرف آرڈر میں طے کئے جانے کی ضرورت ہے۔ کمیشن مورخہ 13-07-2012 کے ایف ڈی اینڈ سی لاس ٹارگیٹوں کو بھی مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے ٹیرف آرڈر میں طے کئے جانے کی ضرورت ہے۔

3. کمیشن نے مالی سال 2014-15 کیلئے ایف ڈی اینڈ سی لاس ٹارگیٹ سے بالترتیب 0.83%، 1.16%، 0.5% اور 0.25% تک ایف ڈی اینڈ سی لاس ٹارگیٹ گھٹا کر مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے ایف ڈی اینڈ سی لاس ٹارگیٹ کو طے کرنے ارادہ رکھتا ہے۔ مذکورہ ٹرمینکٹری کے مطابق مالی سال 2015-16 کیلئے اخذ کیا گیا ٹارگیٹ بی آر پی ایل، بی یو پی ایل، بی ٹی پی ڈی ایل، اور این ڈی ایم سی کیلئے بالترتیب 11.67%، 13.34%، 11.00% اور 9.60% ہے۔

4. بی آر پی ایل، بی یو پی ایل، بی ٹی پی ڈی ایل، این ڈی ایم سی، آئی پی جی سی ایل، پی پی سی ایل اور ڈی ٹی ایل کی پیشینوں پر سٹیک ہولڈروں سے اعتراضات رد عمل وصول کرنے کی آخری تاریخ 17/04/2015 تھی۔

5. کمیشن نے سٹیک ہولڈروں سے موصول مختلف درخواستوں پر نمائندگیوں کی وجہ سے سٹیک ہولڈروں سے اعتراضات رد عمل وصول کرنے کی آخری تاریخ کو 24/04/2015 کو شام 5.00 بجے تک بڑھانے کا فیصلہ کیا ہے۔

6. لائسنسہڈوں کے ذریعہ داخل کی گئی پیشینوں اور پینشنوں کی اہم خصوصیات پر ایگریگٹ سٹریکچر کو کمیشن کی ویب سائٹ یعنی www.derc.gov.in سے ڈاؤن لوڈ کیا جاسکتا ہے۔ پیشینوں کی ہارڈ کاپیاں متعلقہ پینشن دہندگان کے ہیڈ آفسوں سے کسی بھی کاروباری دن مورخہ 24/04/2015 تک صبح 11.00 بجے سے شام 4.00 بجے کے درمیان حاصل کی جاسکتی ہیں۔

سیکرٹری
 دلی الیکٹری سٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن

Daily Milap 18.04.15 DIP/0101/2015-16

Amar Ujala (Hindi) dated 18th April, 2015

दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग
 विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवालिफ, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली-110 017
 वेबसाइट: www.derc.gov.in, टेलीफोन : 26673608

सार्वजनिक सूचना

- वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए शुल्क आवेदनों पर अपत्तियां / टिप्पणियां प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तिथि 24/04/2015 तक बढ़ाई गई।
- वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए प्रस्तावित एटीएण्डसी लॉस टारगेट्स पर टिप्पणियां / सुझाव 24/04/2015 तक भी आमंत्रित।

- वित्त-वर्ष 2013-14 के व्यय के दू-अप हेतु तथा वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता तथा शुल्क हेतु वितरण लाइसेंसधारियों यानी बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमिटेड (बीवाईपीएल), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन लिमिटेड (टीपीडीडीएल) तथा नई दिल्ली नगर निगम (एनडीएमसी) और वित्त-वर्ष 2012-13 से वित्त-वर्ष 2013-14 तक के व्यय का दू-अप तथा वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए कुल राजस्व आवश्यकता एवं शुल्क हेतु उत्पादन लाइसेंसधारियों यानी इन्द्रप्रस्थ पावर जनरेशन कंपनी लिमिटेड (आईपीजीसीएल) और प्रगती पावर कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (पीपीसीएल) तथा वितरण लाइसेंसधारी यानी दिल्ली ट्रांसको लिमिटेड (डीटीएल) द्वारा दिल्ली विद्युत नियामक आयोग के समक्ष याचिका दायर की गई है।
- आयोग ने वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए एमवाईटी विनियमनों की अनुप्रयोज्यता को दिनांक 22.10.2014 का आदेशानुसार बढ़ाया था। इस अनुरूप, वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए वितरण लाइसेंसधारियों के एटीएण्डसी लॉस टारगेट्स (नुकसान लक्ष्य) को भी वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के टैरिफ ऑर्डर में निर्धारित करने की आवश्यकता है। आयोग चाहता है कि वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए एटीएण्डसी लॉस टारगेट्स को इस प्रकार निर्धारित किया जाए कि 13.07.2012 के एमवाईटी आदेश में स्वीकृत प्रावधान के अनुसार बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल और एमडीएमसी के लिए वित्त-वर्ष 2014-15 हेतु एटी-सी लॉस टारगेट्स (नुकसान लक्ष्य) इस क्रमशः 0.83%, 1.16%, 0.5% और 0.25% कम निर्धारित किया जाए। उक्त प्रावधान के अनुसार वित्त-वर्ष 2015-16 में बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल और एमडीएमसी के लिए लक्ष्य क्रमशः 11.67%, 13.34%, 11.00% और 9.60% है।
- बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल, एनडीएमसी, आईपीजीसीएल, पीपीसीएल और डीटीएल की याचिकाओं पर हितधारकों की ओर से आपत्ति / टिप्पणी प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तिथि 17/04/2015 थी।
- हितधारकों की ओर से कई अनुरोध / प्रतिनिधि भेजे जाने के बाद आयोग ने हितधारकों की ओर से आपत्ति / टिप्पणी प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तिथि को 24/04/2015 के संध्या 5 बजे तक बढ़ा दी गई है। प्रस्तावित एटीएण्डसी लॉस टारगेट्स पर आपत्ति / टिप्पणी 24/04/2015 के संध्या 5 बजे तक दर्ज कराई जा सकती है।
- लाइसेंस धारियों द्वारा दायर की गई याचिकाएं और याचिकाओं की मुख्य विशेषताओं पर कार्यकारी सारांश (एक्जीक्यूटिव समरी) आयोग की वेबसाइट www.derc.gov.in से डाउनलोड किया जा सकता है। याचिकाओं की लिखित प्रतियां (हार्ड कॉपी) संबंधित याचिकाकर्ता के मुख्यालयों से किसी भी कार्य दिवस में दिन के 11:00 बजे से 4:00 बजे के बीच दिनांक 24/04/2015 तक प्राप्त की जा सकती हैं।

सचिव
 DIP/0101/2015-16
 Amar Ujala 18.04.15, दिल्ली विद्युत नियामक आयोग

The Hindu (English) dated 23rd July, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Viniyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110 017
Fax: 26673608 Email: secyderc@nic.in

NOTICE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Subject: Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 & True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 filed by BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL), New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True-up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 and Tariff for FY 2015-16 for Delhi Transco Ltd. (DTL), Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd. (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Ltd. (PPCL)

1. The Distribution Licensees of Delhi viz. BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL, NDMC have filed their petitions for True up of expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16.
2. DTL, IPGCL, PPCL have filed their petitions for True-up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16.
3. The last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 27.05.2015, which was extended to 06.06.2015.
4. The Commission shall conduct Public Hearing on the above mentioned Tariff Petitions for all stakeholders/consumer categories including those, who have already given their comments/objections, **at Siri Fort Auditorium-II, Gate No. 5, August Kranti Marg, New Delhi – 110049, as per schedule given below:**

Date	Time	Utilities
04.08.2015	10.30 AM to 1.00 P M 02.30 PM to 5.30 PM	BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL, NDMC
05.08.2015	10.30 AM to 1.00 PM	DTL, IPGCL, PPCL

5. In order to enable stakeholders to appreciate the claims made by the Distribution Utilities i.e. BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL and NDMC in respect of Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, a detailed summary sheet for each DISCOM indicating the tentative evaluation of the claims of the Petitioners have been prepared and uploaded on DERC website www.derc.gov.in. These may be used for making any suggestions and comments in the Public Hearing. For any clarifications on these summary sheets, the stakeholders may approach the following officers in the Commission between 3.00 PM to 5.00 PM on all working days upto 3rd August, 2015.
 - i) Shri Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) Phone : 26680433
 - ii) Shri Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) Phone: 26673601
 - iii) Shri Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Joint Director (PS&E) Phone: 26680734
6. The aforesaid summary is tentative and is meant only for the purpose of dissemination of information for eliciting the views of the stakeholders for finalizing the tariff orders.
7. All the stakeholders/consumers will be heard on first come first serve basis. Please bring your photo I-card with you.

Secretary
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

DIP/0784/15-16

The Pioneer (English) dated 23rd July, 2015



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Viniyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110 017
Fax: 26673608 Email: secyderc@nic.in

NOTICE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Subject: Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 & True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 filed by BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL), New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True-up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 and Tariff for FY 2015-16 for Delhi Transco Ltd. (DTL), Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd. (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Ltd. (PPCL)

1. The Distribution Licensees of Delhi viz. BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL, NDMC have filed their petitions for True up of expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16.
2. DTL, IPGCL, PPCL have filed their petitions for True-up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16.
3. The last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 27.05.2015, which was extended to 06.06.2015.
4. The Commission shall conduct Public Hearing on the above mentioned Tariff Petitions for all stakeholders/consumer categories including those, who have already given their comments/objections, **at Siri Fort Auditorium-II, Gate No. 5, August Kranti Marg, New Delhi – 110049, as per schedule given below:**

Date	Time	Utilities
04.08.2015	10.30 AM to 1.00 P M 02.30 PM to 5.30 PM	BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL, NDMC
05.08.2015	10.30 AM to 1.00 PM	DTL, IPGCL, PPCL

5. In order to enable stakeholders to appreciate the claims made by the Distribution Utilities i.e. BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL and NDMC in respect of Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, a detailed summary sheet for each DISCOM indicating the tentative evaluation of the claims of the Petitioners have been prepared and uploaded on DERC website www.derc.gov.in. These may be used for making any suggestions and comments in the Public Hearing. For any clarifications on these summary sheets, the stakeholders may approach the following officers in the Commission between 3.00 PM to 5.00 PM on all working days upto 3rd August, 2015.
 - i) Shri Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) Phone : 26680433
 - ii) Shri Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) Phone: 26673601
 - iii) Shri Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Joint Director (PS&E) Phone: 26680734
6. The aforesaid summary is tentative and is meant only for the purpose of dissemination of information for eliciting the views of the stakeholders for finalizing the tariff orders.
7. All the stakeholders/consumers will be heard on first come first serve basis. Please bring your photo I-card with you.

Secretary
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

DIP/0784/15-16

Hindustan Times (English) dated 23rd July, 2015**DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Viniyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110 017
Fax: 26673608 Email: secyderc@nic.in

NOTICE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Subject: Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 & True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 filed by BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL), New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True-up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 and Tariff for FY 2015-16 for Delhi Transco Ltd. (DTL), Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd. (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Ltd. (PPCL)

1. The Distribution Licensees of Delhi viz. BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL, NDMC have filed their petitions for True up of expenses for FY 2013-14, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff for FY 2015-16.
2. DTL, IPGCL, PPCL have filed their petitions for True-up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 and Aggregate Revenue Requirement and Tariff for FY 2015-16.
3. The last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 27.05.2015, which was extended to 06.06.2015.
4. The Commission shall conduct Public Hearing on the above mentioned Tariff Petitions for all stakeholders/consumer categories including those, who have already given their comments/objections, **at Siri Fort Auditorium-II, Gate No. 5, August Kranti Marg, New Delhi – 110049, as per schedule given below:**

Date	Time	Utilities
04.08.2015	10.30 AM to 1.00 P M 02.30 PM to 5.30 PM	BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL, NDMC
05.08.2015	10.30 AM to 1.00 PM	DTL, IPGCL, PPCL

5. In order to enable stakeholders to appreciate the claims made by the Distribution Utilities i.e. BRPL, BYPL, TPDDL and NDMC in respect of Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, a detailed summary sheet for each DISCOM indicating the tentative evaluation of the claims of the Petitioners have been prepared and uploaded on DERC website www.derc.gov.in. These may be used for making any suggestions and comments in the Public Hearing. For any clarifications on these summary sheets, the stakeholders may approach the following officers in the Commission between 3.00 PM to 5.00 PM on all working days upto 3rd August, 2015.

- i) Shri Prashant Kumar, Joint Director (Tariff-Finance) Phone : 26680433
- ii) Shri Amit Sharma, Joint Director (Tariff-Engg.) Phone: 26673601
- iii) Shri Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Joint Director (PS&E) Phone: 26680734

6. The aforesaid summary is tentative and is meant only for the purpose of dissemination of information for eliciting the views of the stakeholders for finalizing the tariff orders.
7. All the stakeholders/consumers will be heard on first come first serve basis. Please bring your photo I-card with you.

Secretary
Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

DIP/0784/15-16

Navbharath Times (Hindi) dated 23rd July, 2015



दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवालिक, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली -110 017
फैक्स: 26673608 मेल: secyderc@nic.in

N.D. 23.7.2015

सार्वजनिक सुनवाई हेतु सूचना

विषय: बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमि. (बीवाईपीएम), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन लिमि. (टीपीडीडीएल), नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका परिषद (एनडीएमसी) के द्वारा दायर याचिका वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिये सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) और टैरिफ, वित्तीय वर्ष 2014-15 के लिये वार्षिक कार्यनिष्पादन समीक्षा (एपीआर) और वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के खर्चों का सत्यापन तथा दिल्ली ट्रांसको लिमि. (डीटीएल), इंद्रप्रस्थ पावर जनरेशन कं. लिमि. (आईपीजीसीएल) और प्रगति पावर कार्पोरेशन लिमि. (पीपीसीएल) के लिये वित्तीय वर्ष 2012-13 तथा 2013-14 के लिये एआरआर का सत्यापन और वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के टैरिफ के लिए।

1. दिल्ली के वितरण लाइसेंसीज अर्थात बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल, एनडीएमसी ने वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के लिये खर्चों के सत्यापन, वित्तीय वर्ष 2014-15 की वार्षिक कार्यनिष्पादन समीक्षा (एपीआर) और वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिये सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) तथा टैरिफ के लिये अपनी याचिकाएं दायर की हैं।
2. डीटीएल, आईपीजीसीएल, पीपीसीएल ने वित्तीय वर्ष 2012-13 और वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के लिये एआरआर का सत्यापन और वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिये सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता तथा टैरिफ के लिये अपनी याचिकाएं दायर की हैं।
3. स्टैकहोल्डर्स से आपत्तियां/टिप्पणियां प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तिथि 27.05.2015 थी जिसे 06.06.2015 तक बढ़ा दिया गया था।
4. आयोग ऊपर वर्णित टैरिफ याचिकाओं पर सभी स्टैकहोल्डर्स/उपभोक्ता श्रेणियों के लिये, उनके सहित जो पहले ही अपनी टिप्पणियां/आपत्तियां दे चुके हैं, नीचे दिये गये कार्यक्रम अनुसार सिरी फोर्ट ऑडिटोरियम-II, गेट नं. 5, अगस्त क्रांति मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110049 में सार्वजनिक सुनवाई आयोजित करेगा:

तिथि	समय	यूटिलिटीज
04.08.2015	प्रातः 10:30 बजे से अपरान्ह 1:00 बजे तक अपरान्ह 02.30 बजे से सायं 5:30 बजे तक	बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल, एनडीएमसी
05.08.2015	प्रातः 10:30 बजे से अपरान्ह 1:00 बजे तक	डीटीएल, आईपीजीसीएल, पीपीसीएल

5. स्टैकहोल्डर्स को वितरण कंपनियों अर्थात बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल और एनडीएमसी द्वारा किये गये दावों को समझने में सहायता के लिये सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) और टैरिफ वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिये याचिकाकर्ताओं के दावों के मूल्यांकन का उल्लेख करते हुए प्रत्येक डिस्कॉम के लिये एक विस्तृत सारांश शीट तैयार की गई है और डीईआरसी वेबसाइट www.derc.gov.in पर अपलोड की गई है। इसे सार्वजनिक सुनवाई में कोई सुझाव और टिप्पणी करने के लिये प्रयोग में लाया जा सकता है। इन सारांश शीटों पर किसी भी स्पष्टीकरण के लिये स्टैकहोल्डर्स आयोग के कार्यालय में निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों से 3 अगस्त, 2015 तक सभी कार्य दिवसों में अपरान्ह 3:00 बजे से अपरान्ह 5:00 बजे के बीच संपर्क कर सकते हैं।
 - i) श्री प्रशांत कुमार, संयुक्त निदेशक (टैरिफ-फाइनेंस) फोन: 26680433
 - ii) श्री अमित शर्मा, संयुक्त निदेशक (टैरिफ-इंजी.) फोन: 26673601
 - iii) श्री संजय कुमार शर्मा, संयुक्त निदेशक (पीएसएंडई) फोन: 26680734
6. उपरोक्त सारांश अनंतिम है और टैरिफ आदेश को अंतिम रूप देने के लिये स्टैकहोल्डर्स के दृष्टिकोणों को जानने के लिये सूचना के विस्तार के उद्देश्य के लिये है।
7. सभी स्टैकहोल्डर्स/उपभोक्ताओं की सुनवाई पहले आओ पहले पाओ आधार पर होगी। कृपया अपने साथ अपना फोटो पहचान पत्र लेकर आयें।

सचिव
दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

DIP/0784/15-16

Dainik Jagaran (Hindi) dated 23rd July, 2015



दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवालिक, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली -110 017
फैक्स: 26673608 मेल: secyderc@nic.in

सार्वजनिक सुनवाई हेतु सूचना

विषय: बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमि. (बीवाईपीएम), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन लिमि. (टीपीडीडीएल), नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका परिषद (एनडीएमसी) के द्वारा दायर याचिका वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिये सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) और टैरिफ, वित्तीय वर्ष 2014-15 के लिये वार्षिक कार्यनिष्पादन समीक्षा (एपीआर) और वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के खर्चों का सत्यापन तथा दिल्ली ट्रान्सको लिमि. (डीटीएल), इंदरप्रस्थ पावर जनरेशन कं. लिमि. (आईपीजीसीएल) और प्रगति पावर कार्पोरेशन लिमि. (पीपीसीएल) के लिये वित्तीय वर्ष 2012-13 तथा 2013-14 के लिये एआरआर का सत्यापन और वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के टैरिफ के लिए।

1. दिल्ली के वितरण लाइसेंसीज अर्थात बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल, एनडीएमसी ने वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के लिये खर्चों के सत्यापन, वित्तीय वर्ष 2014-15 की वार्षिक कार्यनिष्पादन समीक्षा (एपीआर) और वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिये सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) तथा टैरिफ के लिये अपनी याचिकाएं दायर की हैं।
2. डीटीएल, आईपीजीसीएल, पीपीसीएल ने वित्तीय वर्ष 2012-13 और वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के लिये एआरआर का सत्यापन और वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिये सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता तथा टैरिफ के लिये अपनी याचिकाएं दायर की हैं।
3. स्टैकहोल्डर्स से आपत्तियां/टिप्पणियां प्राप्त करने की अंतिम तिथि 27.05.2015 थी, जिसे 06.06.2015 तक बढ़ा दिया गया था।
4. आयोग ऊपर वर्णित टैरिफ याचिकाओं पर सभी स्टैकहोल्डर्स/उपभोक्ता श्रेणियों के लिये, उनके सहित जो पहले ही अपनी टिप्पणियां/आपत्तियां दे चुके हैं, नीचे दिये गये कार्यक्रम अनुसार सिरि फोर्ट ऑडिटोरियम-II, गेट नं. 5, अगस्त क्रांति मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110049 में सार्वजनिक सुनवाई आयोजित करेगा:

तिथि	समय	यूटिलिटीज
04.08.2015	प्रातः 10:30 बजे से अपरान्ह 1:00 बजे तक अपरान्ह 02.30 बजे से सायं 5:30 बजे तक	बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल, एनडीएमसी
05.08.2015	प्रातः 10:30 बजे से अपरान्ह 1:00 बजे तक	डीटीएल, आईपीजीसीएल, पीपीसीएल

5. स्टैकहोल्डर्स को वितरण कंपनियों अर्थात बीआरपीएल, बीवाईपीएल, टीपीडीडीएल और एनडीएमसी द्वारा किये गये दावों को समझने में सहायता के लिये सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) और टैरिफ वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिये याचिकाकर्ताओं के दावों के मूल्यांकन का उल्लेख करते हुए प्रत्येक डिस्कॉम के लिये एक विस्तृत सारांश शीट तैयार की गई है और डीईआरसी वेबसाइट www.derc.gov.in पर अपलोड की गई है। इसे सार्वजनिक सुनवाई में कोई सुझाव और टिप्पणी करने के लिये प्रयोग में लाया जा सकता है। इन सारांश शीटों पर किसी भी स्पष्टीकरण के लिये स्टैकहोल्डर्स आयोग के कार्यालय में निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों से 3 अगस्त, 2015 तक सभी कार्य दिवसों में अपरान्ह 3:00 बजे से अपरान्ह 5:00 बजे के बीच संपर्क कर सकते हैं।
 - i) श्री प्रशांत कुमार, संयुक्त निदेशक (टैरिफ-फाइनेंस) फोन: 26680433
 - ii) श्री अमित शर्मा, संयुक्त निदेशक (टैरिफ-इंजी.) फोन: 26673601
 - iii) श्री संजय कुमार शर्मा, संयुक्त निदेशक (पीएसएंडई) फोन: 26680734
6. उपरोक्त सारांश अनंतिम है और टैरिफ आदेश को अंतिम रूप देने के लिये स्टैकहोल्डर्स के दृष्टिकोणों को जानने के लिये सूचना के विस्तार के उद्देश्य के लिये है।
7. सभी स्टैकहोल्डर्स/उपभोक्ताओं की सुनवाई पहले आओ पहले पाओ आधार पर होगी। कृपया अपने साथ फोटो पहचान पत्र लेकर आएं।

सचिव
दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

Quami Patrika (Punjabi) dated 23rd July, 2015

ਦਿੱਲੀ ਵਿਧੁਤ ਵਿਨਿਆਮਕ ਆਯੋਗ

ਵਿਨਿਆਮਕ ਭਵਨ, ਸੀ-ਬਲਾਕ, ਸਿਵਾਲਿਕ, ਮਾਲਵੀਆ ਨਗਰ, ਨਵੀਂ ਦਿੱਲੀ -110 017

ਫੋਨ: 26673608 ਮੇਲ: secyderc@nic.in

ਜਨਤਕ ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਲਈ ਸੂਚਨਾ

ਵਿਸ਼ਾ: ਬੀਐਸਏਐਸ ਰਾਜਧਾਨੀ ਪਾਵਰ ਲਿਮਟਿਡ (ਬੀਆਰਪੀਐਲ), ਬੀਐਸਏਐਸ ਯਮੁਨਾ ਪਾਵਰ ਲਿਮਿਟਿਡ (ਬੀਵਾਈਪੀਐਮ), ਟਾਟਾ ਪਾਵਰ ਦਿੱਲੀ ਡਿਸਟ੍ਰੀਬਿਊਸ਼ਨ ਲਿਮਿਟਿਡ (ਟੀਪੀਡੀਡੀਐਲ), ਨਵੀਂ ਦਿੱਲੀ ਨਗਰ ਪਾਲਿਕਾ ਪਰਿਸ਼ਦ (ਐਨਡੀਐਮਸੀ) ਦੇ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਦਾਇਰ ਅਰਜ਼ੀ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਵਰ੍ਹੇ 2015-16 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਕਲ ਰਾਜਸਵ ਆਵਸਕਤਾ (ਏਆਰਆਰ) ਅਤੇ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਵਰ੍ਹੇ 2014-15 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਾਲਾਨਾ ਕੰਮ ਨਿਸ਼ਪਾਦਨ ਸਮੀਖਿਆ (ਏਪੀਆਰ) ਅਤੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਵਰ੍ਹੇ 2013-14 ਦੇ ਖਰਚਿਆਂ ਦਾ ਸਤਿਆਪਨ ਅਤੇ ਦਿੱਲੀ ਟ੍ਰਾਂਸਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਲਿਮਿਟਿਡ (ਡੀਟੀਐਲ), ਵਿਦਰਪ੍ਰਸਥ ਪਾਵਰ ਜਨਰੇਸ਼ਨ ਕੰ. (ਆਈਪੀਜੀਐਲ) ਅਤੇ ਪ੍ਰਗਤੀ ਪਾਵਰ ਕਾਰਪੋਰੇਸ਼ਨ ਲਿਮਿਟਿਡ (ਪੀਪੀਸੀਐਲ) ਦੇ ਲਈ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਵਰ੍ਹੇ 2012-13 ਅਤੇ 2013-14 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਏਆਰਆਰ ਅਤੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਵਰ੍ਹੇ 2015-16 ਦੇ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਦੇ ਲਈ।

1. ਦਿੱਲੀ ਦੇ ਵਿਭਿੰਨ ਲਾਈਸੈਂਸਿੰਗ ਯਾਨੀ ਬੀਆਰਪੀਐਲ, ਬੀਵਾਈਪੀਐਮ, ਟੀਪੀਡੀਡੀਐਲ, ਐਨਡੀਐਮਸੀ ਨੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2013-14 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਖਰਚਿਆਂ ਦਾ ਸਤਿਆਪਨ, ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2014-15 ਦੀ ਸਾਲਾਨਾ ਕੰਮ ਨਿਸ਼ਪਾਦਨ ਸਮੀਖਿਆ (ਏਪੀਆਰ) ਅਤੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2015-16 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਕਲ ਰਾਜਸਵ ਆਵਸਕਤਾ (ਏਆਰਆਰ) ਅਤੇ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਆਪਣੀਆਂ ਅਰਜ਼ੀਆਂ ਦਾਇਰ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਹਨ।
2. ਡੀਟੀਐਲ, ਆਈਪੀਜੀਐਲ, ਪੀਪੀਸੀਐਲ ਨੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2012-13 ਅਤੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2013-14 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਏਆਰਆਰ ਦਾ ਸਤਿਆਪਨ ਅਤੇ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2015-16 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਕਲ ਰਾਜਸਵ ਆਵਸਕਤਾ ਅਤੇ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਆਪਣੀਆਂ ਅਰਜ਼ੀਆਂ ਦਾਇਰ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਹਨ।
3. ਸਟੇਕਹੋਲਡਰਜ਼ 'ਚ ਵਿਤਰਾਜ਼/ਟਿੱਪਣੀਆਂ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਐਂਤਿਮ ਮਿਤੀ 27.05.2015 ਸੀ ਜਿਸਨੂੰ 06.06.2015 ਤਕ ਵੱਧਾ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ।
4. ਆਯੋਗ ਉੱਪਰ ਵਰਣਿਤ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਅਰਜ਼ੀਆਂ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਸਟੇਕਹੋਲਡਰਜ਼/ਉਪਰਗਤਾ ਸ਼੍ਰੇਣੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਲਈ, ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਸਹਿਤ ਜੋ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਹੀ ਆਪਣੀਆਂ ਟਿੱਪਣੀਆਂ/ਵਿਤਰਾਜ਼ ਦੇ ਚੁੱਕੇ ਹਨ, ਚੋਣਾਂ ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਗਏ ਪ੍ਰੋਗਰਾਮ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਫੋਰਟ ਆਡੀਟੋਰੀਅਮ-II, ਗੇਟ ਨੰ. 5, ਅਗਸਤ ਭ੍ਰਾਂਡੀ ਮਾਰਗ, ਨਵੀਂ ਦਿੱਲੀ-110049 'ਚ ਜਨਤਕ ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਆਯੋਜਿਤ ਕਰੇਗਾ।

ਮਿਤੀ	ਸਮਾਂ	ਯੂਟੀਲਿਟੀਜ਼
04.08.2015	ਸਵੇਰੇ 10:30 ਵਜੇ ਤੋਂ ਦੁਪਹਿਰ 1:00 ਵਜੇ ਤਕ ਦੁਪਹਿਰ 02:30 ਵਜੇ ਤੋਂ ਸ਼ਾਮ 5:30 ਵਜੇ ਤਕ	ਬੀਆਰਪੀਐਲ, ਬੀਵਾਈਪੀਐਲ, ਟੀਪੀਡੀਡੀਐਲ, ਐਨਡੀਐਮਸੀ
05.08.2015	ਸਵੇਰੇ 10:30 ਵਜੇ ਤੋਂ ਦੁਪਹਿਰ 1:00 ਵਜੇ ਤਕ	ਡੀਟੀਐਲ, ਆਈਪੀਜੀਐਲ, ਪੀਪੀਸੀਐਲ

5. ਸਟੇਕਹੋਲਡਰਜ਼ ਨੂੰ ਵੇਡ ਕੰਪਨੀਆਂ ਯਾਨੀ ਬੀਆਰਪੀਐਲ, ਬੀਵਾਈਪੀਐਲ, ਟੀਪੀਡੀਡੀਐਲ ਅਤੇ ਐਨਡੀਐਮਸੀ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਦਾਅਵਿਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਮਝਣ 'ਚ ਮਦਦ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਕਲ ਰਾਜਸਵ ਆਵਸਕਤਾ (ਏਆਰਆਰ) ਅਤੇ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਵਿੱਤੀ ਸਾਲ 2015-16 ਦੇ ਲਈ ਅਰਜ਼ੀਕਰਤਾਵਾਂ ਦੇ ਦਾਅਵਿਆਂ ਦੇ ਮੁਲਾਂਕਣ ਦਾ ਉੱਲੇਖ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਹਰੇਕ ਹਿਸ਼ਕਾਮ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਇਕ ਵਿਸ਼ਵਾਸਯੋਗ ਸਾਰਾਂਸ਼ ਸੀਟ ਤਿਆਰ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਡੀਟੀਐਲਸੀ ਵੈਬਸਾਈਟ www.derc.gov.in 'ਤੇ ਅਪਲੋਡ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ। ਇਸਨੂੰ ਜਨਤਕ ਸੁਣਵਾਈ 'ਚ ਕਈ ਸੁਝਾਅ ਅਤੇ ਟਿੱਪਣੀ ਕਰਨ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਇਸਤਮਾਲ 'ਚ ਲਿਆਂਦਾ ਜਾ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਸਾਰਾਂਸ਼ ਸੀਟਾਂ 'ਤੇ ਕਿਸੀ ਵੀ ਸਪਸ਼ਟੀਕਰਨ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਟੇਕਹੋਲਡਰਜ਼ ਆਯੋਗ ਦੇ ਦਫਤਰ 'ਚ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਤੋਂ 3 ਅਗਸਤ, 2015 ਤਕ ਸਾਰੇ ਕੰਮ ਵਾਲੇ ਦਿਨਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਦੁਪਹਿਰ 3:00 ਵਜੇ ਤੋਂ ਦੁਪਹਿਰ ਬਾਅਦ 5:00 ਵਜੇ ਦੇ ਦਰਮਿਆਨ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹਨ।
 - i) ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਾਂਤ ਕੁਮਾਰ, ਸੰਯੁਕਤ ਨਿਦੇਸ਼ਕ (ਟੈਰਿਫ-ਵਾਈਨਿੰਗ) ਫੋਨ: 26680433
 - ii) ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਅਮਿਤ ਸ਼ਰਮਾ, ਸੰਯੁਕਤ ਨਿਦੇਸ਼ਕ (ਟੈਰਿਫ-ਵਿਜੀ) ਫੋਨ: 26673601
 - iii) ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਸੰਜੇ ਕੁਮਾਰ ਸ਼ਰਮਾ, ਸੰਯੁਕਤ ਨਿਦੇਸ਼ਕ (ਪੀਐਸਐੱਫਟੀ) ਫੋਨ: 26680734
6. ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਸਾਰਾਂਸ਼ ਐਂਤਿਮ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਟੈਰਿਫ ਆਦੇਸ਼ ਨੂੰ ਐਂਤਿਮ ਰੂਪ ਦੇਣ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਟੇਕਹੋਲਡਰਜ਼ ਦੇ ਵਿਸ਼ਟੀਕਰਣਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਜਾਣਨ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦੇ ਵਿਸ਼ਵਾਸ ਦੇ ਮਕਸਦ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਹੈ।
7. ਸਾਰੇ ਸਟੇਕਹੋਲਡਰਜ਼/ਉਪਰਗਤਾਵਾਂ ਦੀ ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਆਉਂਦੀ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਪਾਏ ਆਧਾਰ 'ਤੇ ਹੋਵੇਗੀ। ਕ੍ਰਿਪਾ ਆਪਣੇ ਨਾਲ ਆਪਣਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਪਤਾ ਪਤਰ ਲੈ ਕੇ ਆਵੇ।

ਸਕੱਤਰ

DIP/0784/15-16

ਦਿੱਲੀ ਵਿਧੁਤ ਵਿਨਿਆਮਕ ਆਯੋਗ

Pratap (Urdu) dated 23rd July, 2015

دہلی الیکٹری سٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن

ونیاک ہون، سی۔ بلاک، شیوالک، مالویہ نگر، نئی دہلی۔ 110017

فیکس: 26673608 میل: secyderc@nrc.in



عوامی سنوائی کیلئے نوٹس

موضوع: بی ایس ای ایس راجدھانی پاور لمیٹڈ (بی آر پی ایل)، بی ایس ای ایس یو پاور لمیٹڈ (بی وائی پی ایل)، ٹاٹا پاور دہلی ڈسٹری بیوشن لمیٹڈ (ٹی پی ڈی ڈی ایل)، نئی دہلی میونسپل کونسل (این ڈی ایم سی) کے ذریعہ دائر اپیل مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے گراس ریونیوریکو ائزمنٹ (اے آر آر) اور ٹیرف، مالی سال 2014-15 کیلئے سالانہ پرفارمنس ریویو (اے پی آر) اور مالی سال 2013-14 کے خرچوں کی تصدیق اور دہلی ٹرانسکو لمیٹڈ (ڈی ٹی ایل)، اندر پرستھ جزیشن کمپنی لمیٹڈ (آئی پی جی سی ایل) اور پرجی پاور کارپوریشن (پی پی سی ایل) کے لئے مالی سال 2012-13 اور 2013-14 کیلئے اے آر آر کی تصدیق اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے ٹیرف کے لئے۔

1. دہلی کے ڈسٹری بیوشن لائسنس یافتہ بی آر پی ایل، بی وائی پی ایل، ٹی پی ڈی ڈی ایل، این ڈی ایم سی نے مالی سال 2013-14 کے لئے خرچوں کی تصدیق، مالی سال 2014-15 کی سالانہ پرفارمنس ریویو (اے پی آر) اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے گراس ریونیوریکو ائزمنٹ (اے آر آر) اور ٹیرف کے لئے اپنی اپیل دائر کی ہیں۔

2. ڈی ٹی ایل، آئی پی جی سی ایل، پی پی سی ایل نے مالی سال 2012-13 اور مالی سال 2013-14 کے لئے اے آر آر کی تصدیق اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے گراس ریونیوریکو ائزمنٹ اور ٹیرف کے لئے اپنی اپیل دائر کی ہیں۔

3. اسٹیک ہولڈرس سے اعتراضات برائے حاصل کرنے کی آخری تاریخ 27-05-2015 کی جسے 06-06-2015 تک بڑھا دیا گیا تھا۔

4. کمیشن اوپر درج ٹیرف اپیلوں پر سبھی اسٹیک ہولڈروں/حصہ دارین زمروں کے لئے، ان کے سمیت جو پہلے ہی اپنی رائے راعتراض دے چکے ہیں ذیل میں دیئے گئے پروگرام کے مطابق سیری فورٹ آڈیو ریم۔ 11، گیٹ نمبر۔ 5، اگست کراچی مارگ، نئی دہلی۔ 110049 میں عوامی سنوائی منعقد کریگا۔

تاریخ	وقت	یوٹی لیٹرز
04-08-2015	صبح 10:30 بجے سے دوپہر 1:00 بجے تک	بی آر پی ایل، بی وائی پی ایل، ٹی پی ڈی ڈی ایل
	دوپہر 02:30 بجے سے 5:30 بجے تک	ایل، این ڈی ایم سی
05-08-2015	صبح 10:30 بجے سے دوپہر 1:00 بجے تک	ڈی ٹی ایل، آئی پی جی سی ایل، پی پی سی ایل

5. اسٹیک ہولڈرس کو ڈسٹری بیوشن کمپنیوں یعنی بی آر پی ایل، بی وائی پی ایل، ٹی پی ڈی ڈی ایل، این ڈی ایم سی کے ذریعہ کئے گئے دعووں کو سمجھنے کے لئے گراس ریونیوریکو ائزمنٹ (اے آر آر) اور ٹیرف مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے اپیل کنندگان کے دعووں کے اسسٹمنٹ کا تذکرہ کرتے ہوئے ہرڈسکام کے لئے ایک مفصل اختصاری شیٹ تیار کی گئی ہے اور ڈی ای آر سی ویب سائٹ www.derc.gov.in پر اپ لوڈ کی گئی ہے۔ اسے عوامی سنوائی میں کوئی بھٹا اور رائے دینے کے لئے استعمال میں لایا جاسکتا ہے۔ اس اختصاری شیٹوں پر کسی بھی وضاحت کے لئے اسٹیک ہولڈرس کمیشن کے دفتر میں درج ذیل افسران سے 3 اگست، 2015 تک ہر کام کے دن سہ پہر 3:00 بجے سے شام 5:00 بجے کے درمیان رابطہ کر سکتے ہیں۔

(i) شری پرشانت کمار، جوائنٹ ڈائریکٹر (ٹیرف - فائننس) فون: 26680433

(ii) شری امت شرما، جوائنٹ ڈائریکٹر (ٹیرف - انجینئرنگ) فون: 26673601

(iii) شری تجے کمار شرما، جوائنٹ ڈائریکٹر (بی ایس اینڈ ای) فون: 26680734

6. مذکورہ اختصاری آخری ہے اور ٹیرف آرڈر کو قطعی شکل دینے کے لئے اسٹیک ہولڈرس کے نظریات کو جاننے کے لئے جانکاری میں اضافے کے مقصد کے لئے ہیں۔

7. سبھی اسٹیک ہولڈرس/حصہ دارین کی سنوائی پہلے آڈیو پہلے پابند پر ہوگی۔ برائے مہربانی اپنے ساتھ اپنا فونو شناختی کارڈ لے کر آئیں۔

سیکرٹری

دہلی الیکٹری سٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن

DIP/0784/15-16

The Hindu dated 01st August, 2015

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Vinyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Mayapuri Nagar, New Delhi-110017
Fax No.: 011-26673608, E-mail: secy@derc.nic.in

CORRIGENDUM

Reference DERC advertisement dated 23.07.2015 regarding Notice on Public Hearing for Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 & True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 filed by BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL), New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 and Tariff for FY 2015-16 for Delhi Transco Ltd. (DTL), Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd. (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Ltd. (PPCL).

In this connection, the para 3 of the above advertisement may be read as:
"Last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 17.04.2015 which was extended to 24.04.2015."

Instead of:
"Last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 27.05.2015 which was extended to 06.06.2015."

The rest of the content of the advertisement published on 23.07.2015 remain same. Corrigendum is also available in DERC website www.derc.gov.in

Secretary

D/P/0827/15-16 Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

The Pioneer dated 1st August, 2015

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Vinyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Mayapuri Nagar, New Delhi-110017
Fax No.: 011-26673608, E-mail: secy@derc.nic.in

CORRIGENDUM

Reference DERC advertisement dated 23.07.2015 regarding Notice on Public Hearing for Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 & True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 filed by BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL), New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 and Tariff for FY 2015-16 for Delhi Transco Ltd. (DTL), Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd. (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Ltd. (PPCL).

In this connection, the para 3 of the above advertisement may be read as:
"Last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 17.04.2015 which was extended to 24.04.2015."

Instead of:
"Last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 27.05.2015 which was extended to 06.06.2015."

The rest of the content of the advertisement published on 23.07.2015 remain same. Corrigendum is also available in DERC website www.derc.gov.in

Secretary

D/P/0827/15-16 Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

The Hindustan Times dated 01st August, 2015

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Vinyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110017
Fax No. 011-26673608, E-mail: secyderc@nic.in

CORRIGENDUM

Reference DERC advertisement dated 23.07.2015 regarding Notice on Public Hearing for Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) & Tariff for FY 2015-16, Annual Performance Review (APR) of FY 2014-15 & True up of expenses for FY 2013-14 filed by BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (BRPL), BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL), Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (TPDDL), New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and True up of ARR for FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 and Tariff for FY 2015-16 for Delhi Transco Ltd. (DTL), Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd. (IPGCL) and Pragati Power Corporation Ltd. (PPCL).

In this connection, the para 3 of the above advertisement may be read as:
"Last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 17.04.2015 which was extended to 24.04.2015."

Instead of:
"Last date for receipt of objections/comments from stakeholders was 27.05.2015 which was extended to 06.06.2015."

The rest of the content of the advertisement published on 23.07.2015 remain same. Corrigendum is also available in DERC website www.derc.gov.in

Secretary

DIP/0827/15-16 Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Dainik Jagaran dated 01st August, 2015

दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग
विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवालीक, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली - 110017
फैक्स सं.: 011-26673608, ई-मेल: secyderc@nic.in

शुद्धिपत्र

बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमिटेड (बीवायपीएल), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन लिमिटेड (टीपीडीडीएल), नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका (एनडीएमसी) के द्वारा दायर याचिका वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) और टैरिफ, वित्तीय वर्ष 2014-15 के लिए वार्षिक कार्य निष्पादन समीक्षा (एपीआर) और वित्तीय वर्ष 2013-14 के खर्चों का सत्यापन तथा दिल्ली ट्रांसको लिमिटेड (डीटीएल), इंदरप्रस्थ पावर जनरेशन कम्पनी लिमिटेड (आईपीजीसीएल) और प्रगति पावर कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (पीपीसीएल) के लिए वित्तीय वर्ष 2012-13 तथा 2013-14 के लिए एआरआर का सत्यापन और वित्तीय वर्ष 2015-16 के टैरिफ के हेतु सार्वजनिक सुनवाई पर संबंधित सूचना पर डीईआरसी के विज्ञापन तिथि 23.07.2015 के संदर्भ में।

इस संबंध में, उपरोक्त विज्ञापन के पैरा 3 को इस प्रकार पढ़ा जाये।
"स्टेकहोल्डर्स से आपत्तियों / टिप्पणियों की प्राप्ति की अंतिम तिथि 17.04.2015 थी जिसे 24.04.2015 तक बढ़ाया गया था।
बजाय इसके
"स्टेकहोल्डर्स से आपत्तियों / टिप्पणियों की प्राप्ति की अंतिम तिथि 27.05.2015 थी जिसे 06.06.2015 तक बढ़ाया गया था।
23.07.2015 को प्रकाशित विज्ञापन के शेष विषय वस्तु यथावत रहेंगे।
शुद्धिपत्र डीईआरसी की वेबसाइट www.derc.gov.in पर भी उपलब्ध है।

सचिव

DIP/0827/15-16 दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

Nav Bharat Times dated 01st August, 2015

दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग
 विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवालय, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली - 110017
 फ़ैक्स सं.: 011-26673608, ई-मेल: secyderc@nic.in

शुद्धिपत्र

बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमिटेड (बीवायपीएल), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन लिमिटेड (टीपीडीडीएल), नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका (एनडीएमसी) के द्वारा दायर याचिका वितीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लिए सकल राजस्व आवश्यकता (एआरआर) और टैरिफ, वितीय वर्ष 2014-15 के लिए वार्षिक कार्य निष्पादन समीक्षा (एपीआर) और वितीय वर्ष 2013-14 के खर्चों का सत्यापन तथा दिल्ली ट्रांसको लिमिटेड (डीटीएल), इंदरप्रस्थ पावर जनरेशन कम्पनी लिमिटेड (आईपीजीसीएल) और प्रगति पावर कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (पीपीसीएल) के लिए वितीय वर्ष 2012-13 तथा 2013-14 के लिए एआरआर का सत्यापन और वितीय वर्ष 2015-16 के टैरिफ के हेतु सार्वजनिक सुनवाई पर संबंधित सूचना पर डीईआरसी के विज्ञापन तिथि 23.07.2015 के संदर्भ में।

इस संबंध में, उपरोक्त विज्ञापन के पैरा 3 को इस प्रकार पढ़ा जाये।
 "स्टेकहोल्डर्स से आपत्तियों/टिप्पणियों की प्राप्ति की अंतिम तिथि 17.04.2015 थी जिसे 24.04.2015 तक बढ़ाया गया था।
 बजाय इसके :
 "स्टेकहोल्डर्स से आपत्तियों/टिप्पणियों की प्राप्ति की अंतिम तिथि 27.05.2015 थी जिसे 06.06.2015 तक बढ़ाया गया था।
 23.07.2015 को प्रकाशित विज्ञापन के शेष विषय वस्तु यथावत रहेंगे।
 शुद्धिपत्र डीईआरसी की वेबसाइट www.derc.gov.in पर भी उपलब्ध हैं। सचिव
 DIP/0827/15-16 दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

Quami Patrika dated 01st August, 2015

दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग
 विनियामक भवन, सी-ब्लॉक, शिवालय, मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली-110017
 फ़ैक्स नं.: 011-26673608, ई-मेल: secyderc@nic.in

सूची पत्र

बीएसईएस राजधानी पावर लिमिटेड (बीआरपीएल), बीएसईएस यमुना पावर लिमिटेड (बीवायपीएल), टाटा पावर दिल्ली डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन लिमिटेड (टीपीडीडीएल), नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका (एनडीएमसी) के द्वारा दायर याचिका वितीय वर्ष 2015-16 के लਈ सकल राजस्व लेख (एआरआर) अउ टैरिफ, वितीय साल 2014-15 के लਈ सालाना कार्य निष्पादन समीक्षा (एपीआर) अउ वितीय साल 2013-14 के खर्चों का सत्यापन उष दिल्ली ट्रांसको लिमिटेड (डीटीएल), इंदरप्रस्थ पावर जनरेशन कम्पनी लिमिटेड (आईपीजीसीएल) अउ प्रगति पावर कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (पीपीसीएल) के लਈ वितीय साल 2012-13 अउ 2013-14 के लਈ एआरआर का सत्यापन अउ वितीय साल 2015-16 के टैरिफ के लਈ जनरल सूचना 'उ' संविधित सूचना 'उ' डीईआरसी के विज्ञापन तिथि 23.07.2015 के संघर्ष 'उ'।

इस संघर्ष 'उ', उपरोक्त विज्ञापन के पैरा 3 नुं इस तरुं पढ़िआ जाये।
 "स्टेकहोल्डर्स से आपत्तियों/टिप्पणियों की प्राप्ति की अंतिम तिथि 17.04.2015 थी जिसे 24.04.2015 तक बढ़ाया गया था।
 बजाय इसके :
 "स्टेकहोल्डर्स से आपत्तियों/टिप्पणियों की प्राप्ति की अंतिम तिथि 27.05.2015 थी जिसे 06.06.2015 तक बढ़ाया गया था।
 23.07.2015 नुं प्रकाशित विज्ञापन के शेष विषय वस्तु यथावत रहेंगे।
 सूची पत्र डीईआरसी की वेबसाइट www.derc.gov.in 'उ' वी उपलब्ध है। सचिव
 DIP/0827/15-16 दिल्ली विद्युत विनियामक आयोग

Quami Patrika dated 01st August, 2015

دہلی الیکٹریسیٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن
 ویٹاک، بیرون، سہرا بلاک، شوالک، ملانہ، نئی دہلی-110017
 فیکس نمبر: 011-26673608 ای میل: secy@derc.nic.in

تصدیق نامہ

بی ایس ای ایس راجدھانی پاور لمیٹڈ (بی آر پی ایل)، بی ایس ای ایس ریٹا پاور لمیٹڈ (بی ڈا پی ایل)، ڈی ڈی پاور دہلی ڈسٹری بیوٹن لمیٹڈ (ڈی ڈی ڈی ایل)، نئی دہلی میونسپل کونسل (این ڈی ایم سی) کے ذریعے دائر عرض مالی سال 2015-16 کے لئے ایکری گیٹ ریوینیو ریکوارسٹ (اے آر آر) اور ٹیرف، مالی سال 2014-15 کے لئے سالانہ کارکردگی کا جائزہ (اے پی آر) اور مالی سال 2013-14 کے خرچوں کی تصدیق اور دہلی ٹرانسکو لمیٹڈ (ڈی ٹی ایل) اندر پرستھ پاور جزیشن کمپنی لمیٹڈ (آئی پی جی سی ایل) اور پرمیتی پاور کارپوریشن لمیٹڈ (پی پی سی ایل) کے لئے مالی سال 2012-13 اور 2013-14 کے لئے اے آر آر کی تصدیق اور مالی سال 2015-16 کے ٹیرف کے لئے عوامی سنوائی پر متعلقہ نوٹس پریڈی ای آر سی کے اشتہار مورہ 2015-07-23 کے سلسلے میں۔

اس سلسلے میں، مذکورہ اشتہار کے پیرا 3 کو حسب ذیل پڑھا جائے۔

”اسٹیک ہولڈروں سے اعتراضات درائے کی وصولی کی آخری تاریخ 17-04-2015 تھی جسے 24-04-2015 تک پڑھایا گیا تھا۔

بجائے اس کے:

”اسٹیک ہولڈروں سے اعتراضات درائے کی وصولی کی آخری تاریخ 27-05-2015 تھی جسے 06-06-2015 تک پڑھایا گیا تھا۔

2015-07-23 کو شائع اشتہار کا دیگر مسودہ حسب سابق رہے گا۔

جج نامہ ڈی آر سی کی ویب سائٹ www.derc.gov.in پر بھی دستیاب ہے۔

سکریٹری
 دہلی الیکٹریسیٹی ریگولیٹری کمیشن

DIP/0827/15-16

LIST OF RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM STAKEHOLDERS ON THE TRUE UP OF EXPENSES UP TO FY 2013-14, REVIEW AND PROVISIONAL TRUE UP FOR FY 2014-15 AND ANNUAL REVENUE REQUIREMENT (ARR) FOR FY 2015-16.

S. No.	R. No.	Name	Address	Category	Company/ Licensee	Date of Receipt	No. of Pages
1.	1	Sh. Vinod Kumar	East Sagar Pur, New Delhi 110 046 kvinod1971@gmail.com	Domestic	BRPL	11.03.2015	02
2.	2	Sh. Shish Pal	kpsamity2311@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	01
3.	3	Ms. Yashoda Singh	kpsamity2311@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	01
4.	4	Sh. P.C. Gupta	radhikagraphics8@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	02
5.	5	Sh. Rudranand Thakur	Indian Institute of Public Administration C-103, IIPA CGHS Ltd. Dwarka, Sector 6, Plot No. 26 Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	17.03.2015	01
6.	6	Sh. Ashok Bhasin	North Delhi Resident's Welfare Federation 1618, Main Chandraval Road, Delhi 110 007 icespy1000@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	17.03.2015	02
	6A	Sh. Ashok Bhasin	North Delhi Resident's Welfare Federation 1618, Main Chandraval Road, Delhi 110 007 anandphotostat2013@gmail.com				
7.	7	Sh. S.K. Goel	153 Sandesh Vihar Pitampura, Delhi 110 034 sk.goel@yahoo.co.in	Domestic	DISCOMs	15.03.2015	05
8.	8	Sh. B.S. Sachdev President	Akhil Bhartiya Grahak Panchyat 45, North Avenue New Delhi 110 001 grahakevraja@rediffmail.com grahakevraja@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	19.03.2015	02
9.	9	Sh. Ashok Gupta President	Udyog Nagar Factory Owners Association unfoa_office	Domestic	BRPL	19.03.2015	01

10.	10	Sh. Ajay Kumar	J-12/35, Rajouri Garden, New Delhi 110 027 anitachhabra@gmail.com	Domestic	BRPL	20.03.2015	02
11.	11	Dr. N.K. Garg Chairman	Maharaja Agrasen Technical Education Society Keshav Kunj, 10/4 East Punjabi Bagh, Delhi 110 026 mait@mait.ac.in	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	23.03.2015	02
12.	12	Sh. Suresh Kamara	H.No. 2286, Hudson Lane, G.T.B. Nagar, Kingsway Camp Delhi 110 009 Suresh.kamra55@gmail.com	Domestic	TPDDL	23.03.2015	04
13.	13	Sh. Deepak Rana	Deepakyash82@gmail.com	Domestic	TPDDL	23.03.2015	01
14.	14	General Manager	Mother Dairy Fruit & Vegetable Pvt. Ltd. Mother Dairy Patparganj, Delhi 110 092 contact@motherdairy.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	23.03.2015	01
15.	15	Sh. Vijender Singh Verma	B-56, Sunder Apartment Sector 14, Rohini Delhi 110 085	Domestic	TPDDL	24.03.2015	04
16.	16	Sh. Mahendra Gupta	DU-131, Pitampura, Delhi 110 034 mgupta10mg@yahoo.com	Domestic	TPDDL	24.03.2015	04
17.	17	Sh. Kuldeep Kumar Jain	C-9, Ahinsa Vihar, Sector-9, Rohini, Delhi 110 085 k_kjain27@yahoo.co.in	Domestic	TPDDL	26.03.2015	02
18.	18	Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma	Flat No. D32, Delhi Citizen Society Sector-13, Rohini Delhi 110 085	Domestic	TPDDL	26.03.2015	03
19.	19	Sh. Surender Babar Secretary	DVB Employees Terminal Benefit Fund 2002 (Pension Trust) Rajghat Power House Complex, New Delhi – 110 002.	Government	DISCOMs	27.03.2015	17
20.	20	Sh. Rajinder Lal Kapoor	kappor_rajinder@yahoo.in	Domestic	DISCOMs	27.03.2015	01
21.	21	Sh. Mahesh Chandra Gurani	170/C-9, Sector -7 , Rohini, Delhi 110 085 mc.gurani@gmail.com	Domestic	TPDDL	31.03.2015	04

22.	22	Sh. Ram Phal Mangal Gen. Secretary	Keval Park Agarwal Sabha A-244/1, Shivaji Marg, Keval Park, Azadpur, Delhi 110 033	NGO	TPDDL	01.04.2015	03
23.	23	Sh. Nanak Chand Mallah President	DVB Pensioners Association (Regd.) Rajghat Power House, New Delhi 110 002	Domestic	DISCOMs	01.04.2015	02
24.	24	Sh. L.D. Takhtani	E-350. Ramesh Nagar, New Delhi 110 015	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	07
25.	25	Sh. Shiv Kumar	H. NO. 20A, Shahpur Jat New Delhi 110049	Domestic	DISCOMs0	06.04.2015	08
26.	26	Sh. Avtar Singh Chandhok	BQ-160, 2 nd Floor, Shalimar Bagh, New Delhi 110 088	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	09
27.	27	Sh. Naved Yar Khan	House No. 5182 Ballimaran, Chandni Chowk New Delhi 110 006	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	08
28.	28	Sh. C.L. Raw	2002 Tirthankar Nagar, New Delhi 110 081	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	08
29.	29	Sh. S.L. Diwan	E-25, Masjid Moth Greater Kailash-III New Delhi 110 048	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	09
30.	30	Sh. M.L. Sharma	D-224, Ashok Vihar, New Delhi 110 052	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	09
31.	31	Sh. D.D. Gupta	4/32 A, East Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi 110 026	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	07
32.	32	Ms. P.S. Sharda	109, M.M. House, 59, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110 055	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	07
33.	33	Sh. Sarbajit Roy National Convener	B-59, Defence Colony New Delhi 110 024	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	01
	33A	Sh. Sarbajit Roy National Convener	B-59, Defence Colony New Delhi 110 024 raosl@hotmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	29.04.2015	01
34.	34	Sh. Rohit Sharma Advocate	Supreme Court of India C-99, East of Kailash New Delhi 110 065 rohshar@gmail.com	Domestic	TPDDL	06.04.2015	01
35.	35	Sh. Inderjeet Singh	singhinderjeet469@yahoo.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	01
36.	36	Sh. Kartik Singh	Coolkkartick957@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	01
37.	37	Sh. Ashok Deshpande	dateforall@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	01
38.	38	Sh. Ishwar Dutt Kashyap	ishwarduttk@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	01

39.	39	Sh. Yogesh Kumar	Yogesh1922.yk@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	01
40.	40	Sh. Mohan Singh	Mohansigh1581966@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	01
41.	41	Sh. M.L. Khan	Extn. J3/49, Krishan Kunj, Laxmi Nagar, New Delhi 110 092	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	07
42.	42	Sh. Kharati Lal Juneja	Quarter No. 20, Hakikat Nagar, Delhi 110 009	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	03
43.	43.	Sh. Anil Kumar Bajpai	AC-61, Gandhi Nagar, Vidhan Sabha	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
44.	44	Sh. Adarsh Shastri	Dwarka	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
45.	45	Ms. Bhavna Gaur	Palam, AC-37	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
46.	46	Sh. Rituraj Govind MLA	H.No. 6, Surat Vihar, Mubarakpur Dabas Kirari	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
47.	47	Sh. Akhilesh Pati Tripathi MLA	Model Town, AC-18, N-25/A-277 Lal Bagh Azadpur, Delhi 110 033	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
48.	48	Sh. Fatesingh	A/C-68, Gokal Pur	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
49.	49	Sh. Amanat Ullah Khan MLA	AC-54, Okhla	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	02
50.	50	Sh. Rajeshi Rishi	E-3/5 & 6, Chankakya Place-I Pankha Road, Janakpur, New Delhi 110 059	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
51.	51	Sh. Pawan Kumar Sharma MLA	A-13, Street No. 36, Adarsh Nagar Mahendra Park	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
52.	52	Sh. S.K. Bagga MLA	12/46, Geeta Colony Delhi 110 031	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
53.	53	Sh. Dhananjay Kumar Mishra Energy Controller	10, Tower-B, 9 th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon-122 002	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	26
54.	54	Sh. Tej. B, Khattar Vice President	The Mother Dairy Employee CGHS Ltd. Plot No. 6, Sector, 5 Dwarka, New Delhi 110 075 Mother.decghs@airtelmai.in	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	19
55.	55	Sh. Jagdish Kumar	D-2/44, Janakpuri, New Delhi 110 058 jagdishpowerip@yahoo.co.in	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.03.2015	01

56.	56	Sh. Jarnail Singh MLA	Tilak Nagar	Domestic	DISCOMs	08.04.2015	01
57.	57	Sh. S.S. Dalal MLA	Mundka	Domestic	DISCOMs	08.04.2015	01
58.	58	Sh. Avtar Singh Kalra	Vidhan Sabha Kalkaji	Domestic	DISCOMs	08.04.2015	01
59.	59	Sh. Naresh Yadav MLA	Mehrauli	Domestic	DISCOMs	07.04.2015	01
60.	60	Sh. Gulab Singh MLA	Matiyalal	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.04.2015	01
61.	61	Sh. Rajiv Kakria Co Chairman	E-230, Greater Kailash-1, New Delhi 110 048	RWA	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	03
	61A	Sh. Rajiv Kakria	E-230, Greater Kailash-1, New Delhi 110 048	RWA	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	04
	61B	Sh. Rajiv Kakria	E-230, Greater Kailash-1, New Delhi 110 048 rkakria2@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
62.	62	Sh. Nitin Tyagi MLA	Laxmi Nagar, AC-58	Domestic	DISCOMs	10.04.2015	01
63.	63	Ranbir Singh Flying Officer (Retd.)	H. No. 3111 Jis Sarai New Delhi 110 016	Domestic	DISCOMs	10.04.2015	01
64.	64	Sh. Vivek Bagga	78, South Anarkali, Street No. 4 Near Chander Nagar, Delhi 110 051 vivekbagga@airtelmail.in	Domestic	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	01
65.	65	Sh. Krishan Gopal Sharma	H. No. 51, Mandir Wali Gali Azadpur (Village) Delhi 110 033 kgsharma19@rediffmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	01
66.	66	Sh. Vikash Bhagchandka President	M2K Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. E13/29, 1st Floor, Harsha Bhawan, Connought Circus, New Delhi 110 001	Industrial/ Commercial	TPDDL	13.04.2015	37

67.	67	Sh. B.B. Tiwari		RWA	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	02
	67A	Sh. B.B. Tiwari	sarwasharpan@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
	67B	Sh. B.B. Tiwari	sarwasharpan@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	21
	67C	Sh. B.B. Tiwari	sarwasharpan@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	28.04.2015	10
	67D		sarwasharpan@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	05.05.2015	03
	67E	Sh. B.B. Tiwari	sarwasharpan@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	05.05.2015	02
		Sh. B.B. Tiwari					
68.	68	Sh. Naveen Goel	ngoel@panchanan.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	02
69.	69	Sh. S.P. Shaha	RZ-8N/1, Gali No. 3 Indra park, Palam Cly. S. W. Delhi, Delhi 110 045 kkarshu@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	01
70.	70	Sh. Jaswinder Singh	4jassi.king@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	01
71.	71	Sh. R.P. Jindal	Rohini East RWA rohiniestrwa@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	01

72.	72	Sh. Anil Sood Hony President CHETNA	A417-418, Somdutt Chamber-1 5 Bhikajicam Place, New Delhi anilsood@spchetna.com	RWA	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	03
	72A	Sh. Anil Sood Hony President CHETNA	A417-418, Somdutt Chamber-1 5 Bhikajicam Place, New Delhi anilsood@spchetna.com	RWA	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	14
	72B	Sh. Anil Sood Hony President CHETNA	A417-418, Somdutt Chamber-1 5 Bhikajicam Place, New Delhi anilsood@spchetna.com	RWA	DISCOMs	23.04.2015	09
73.	73	Sh. Rajesh Agrawal Gen. Secretary	Shahdara Resident Welfare Association (Regd.) 356, Farsh Bazar, Shahdara, Delhi 110 032 shahdarawa@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	01
74.	74	Sh. Vipin Jain Director	M/s Negolice India Ltd. E-34, 2 nd Floor, Connaught Circus, New Delhi 110 001 rohit@rschambers.com	Domestic	TPDDL	06.04.2015	161
75.	75	Sh. Ujjwal	ujjwal.jain@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.04.2015	01
76.	76	Sh. S. Krishnan, IAAS (Retired) Advisor	Consumer Online Foundation F-9, 2 nd Floor, Kailash Colony New Delhi 110 048 krishnan.sivaraman.ks@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.04.2015	10

77.	77	Sh. Vivek Agarwal General Manager/ Electrical	Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Metro Bhawan, Fire Brigade lane, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi 110 001	Government	BRPL	16.04.2015	45
	77A	Sh. Vivek Agarwal General Manager/ Electrical	Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Metro Bhawan, Fire Brigade lane, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi 110 001	Government	BYPL	16.04.2015	45
	77B	Sh. Vivek Agarwal General Manager/ Electrical	Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Metro Bhawan, Fire Brigade lane, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi 110 001	Government	TPDDL	16.04.2015	44
	77C	Sh. Vivek Agarwal General Manager/ Electrical	Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Metro Bhawan, Fire Brigade lane, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi 110 001	Government	NDMC	16.04.2015	34
78.	78	Sh. Rajender Munjal	rajindramunjal@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.04.2015	01
79.	79	Sh. Nikhil Chauhan	nikhil.chauhancse@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	01
80.	80	Sh. Jaidev Bhattacharya	vigilantcitizen@outlook.com	Domestic	DISCOMs		
81.	81	Sh. Sanjay Gupta	C-4/15, Model Town-3 Delhi 110 009	Domestic	BYPL	17.04.2015	14
	81A	Sh. Sanjay Gupta	C-4/15, Model Town-3 Delhi 110 009	Domestic	BRPL	29.04.2015	22
82.	82	Sh. B.S. Vohra President	rwabhagidari@yahoo.in	RWA	DISCOMs		02
83.	83	Sh. Arun Kumar Datta	222, Pocket E Mayur Vihar-II Delhi 110 091	Domestic	BYPL	17.04.2015	43

84.	84	Ms. Kiran Saini General Manager (C&RA)	Delhi Transco Ltd. Shakti Sadan, Kotla Road New Delhi 110 002 gm.comm@dtl.gov.in	Government	BRPL BYPL TPDDL NDMC	17.04.2015	07
85.	85	Sh. Shanu Ahluwalia	ahluwalia.shanu@hotmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	08
86.	86	Sh. Faiyaz Muhammed Pasha CEO	Arslan Scientific, Physical and Industrial Research D-601, 605, Pocket -11 DDA, Jasola Vihar New Delhi 110 025 faiyazmuhammedpasha@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	02
87.	87	Sh. B.P. Agarwal Advocate	A-106, Prashant Vihar, Delhi 110 085	Industrial/ Commercial	TPDDL	17.04.2015	07
	87A	Sh. B.P. Agarwal Advocate		Industrial/ Commercial	TPDDL	17.04.2015	07
	87B	Sh. B.P. Agarwal Advocate		Industrial/ Commercial	BYPL	17.04.2015	07
	87C	Sh. B.P. Agarwal Advocate		Industrial/ Commercial	BRPL	17.04.2015	06
	87C	Sh. B.P. Agarwal Advocate		Industrial/ Commercial	TPDDL	29.04.2015	04
88.	88	Sh. S. Babbar	DVB Employees Terminal Benefits Fund 2002 (Pension Trust) Rajghat Power House, New Delhi 110 002	Government	DISCOMs	16.04.2015	04
89.	89	Sh. Chander Pal	A-101, Sharma Market, Pul Pehlad Pur, (M.B. Road) New Delhi 110 044 Chanderpaul_India@hotmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	13.04.2015	02
90.	90	Sh. Kuldeep Kumar General Secretary	Delhi State Electricity Workers Union GENCO, TRANSCO DISCOM I,II, III L-2, Main Road, Brahmipuri, Delhi 10053	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.04.2015	15

91.	91	Sh. Rajan Gupta Former Member,	Delhi Electricity Consultative Council, 355 Udyan, Narela, Delhi 110 040	Domestic	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	21
92.	92	Sh. V.K. Malhotra General Secretary	DVB Engineers Association D-3, Vikas Puri, New Delhi 110 018	Domestic	TPDDL	16.04.2015	25
93.	93	Sh. Saurabh Gandhi Gen. Secretary	United Residents of Delhi C-6/7, Rana Pratap Bagh Delhi 110 007 urdrwas@gmail.com	RWA	BYPL	17.04.2015	43
	93A	Sh. Saurabh Gandhi Gen. Secretary	United Residents of Delhi C-6/7, Rana Pratap Bagh Delhi 110 007 urdrwas@gmail.com	RWA	BRPL	17.04.2015	03
94.	94	Sh. G.S. Shuklas Sr. Citizen and Social Advisor	DDA- F1/72 Sultan Puri Delhi 110 086	Domestic	DISCOMs	15.04.2015	01
95.	95	Sh. Madan Lal Bhasin President	Delhi Electricity Consumer Society Patron, RWA D Block, Ashok Vihar, D-163 Ashok Vihar, Phase-I Delhi 110 052 mmlal1942@Yahoo.co.in	RWA	DISCOMs	15.04.2015	04
	95A	Sh. Madan Lal Bhasin President	Delhi Electricity Consumer Society Patron, RWA D Block, Ashok Vihar, D-163 Ashok Vihar, Phase-I Delhi 110 052	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	02
	95B	Sh. Madan Lal Bhasin President	Delhi Electricity Consumer Society Patron, RWA D Block, Ashok Vihar, D-163 Ashok Vihar, Phase-I Delhi 110 052 mmlal1942@Yahoo.co.in	RWA	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	10
96.	96	Sh. Meena Chand Joint Secretary	Green Valley Cooperative group Housing Society Ltd. Plot No. 18, Sector-22, Dwarka, New Delhi 10077 greenvalleyvalleydwarka@yahoo.co.in	Domestic	DISCOMs	12.04.2015	01

97.	97	Sh. Deepak Goyal Secretary	Bawana Food Processors Association (Regd.) H-7, Sector-3, DSIDC, Bawana, New Delhi 110 039	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	15.04.2015	02
	97A	Sh. Deepak Goyal Secretary	Delhi Dal Mills (Millers) Association (Regd.) 4122, Naya Basar, Delhi 110 006	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	15.04.2015	02
98.	98	Sh. H.H. Bhardwaj Secy. General	207 United Plaza, DDA Community Centre Karkardooma Delhi 110 092 federationorg@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	15.04.2015	
99.	99	Sh. Raj Kumar Sharma	Rajsharma_del@yahoo.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	-	01
100.	100	Ms. Geeta Devi	Ambedkar Jan Kalyan Smiti E-10/444 Pratap Nagar, Saboli Delhi 110 093	Domestic	DISCOMs	-	04
101.	101	Sh. S.K. Maheshwari General Secretary	Patparganj F.I. E. Entrepreneurs Association Opp. Plot No. 157, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092 pfeappg@yahoo.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	04
102.	102	Sh. K.C. Jain	Plot No. A-1, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
103.	103	Sh. S.N. Mittal	Plot No. 363, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
104.	104	Sh. Sunil Kapoor	Plot No. 345, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
105.	105	Sh. Satender Jain	Plot No. 374, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03

106.	106	Sh. I.S. Bedi	Plot No. 115, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
107.	107	Sh. K.C. Jain	Plot No. 451, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
108.	108	Sh. Sanjay Rastogi	Plot No. 169, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
109.	109	Sh. S.K. Tyagi	Plot No. 220, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
110.	110	Sh. Vikram Singh Rawat	Plot No. 324, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
111.	111	Sh. Ashutosh Kapoor	Plot No. 379, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
112.	112	Sh. Madhur Goel	Plot No. 233, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
113.	113	Sh. Sagar Anand	Plot No. 266, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
114.	114	Sh. Sarvjit Singh	Plot No. 295, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
115.	115	Sh. N. K. Mehra	Plot No. C-28, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
116.	116	Sh. Rajeev Chawla	Plot No. 199, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
117.	117	Sh. Jitendra Kumar	Plot No. 200, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
118.	118	Sh. Dinesh Kumar	Plot No. 398, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
119.	119	Sh. K.R. Misra	Plot No. 65, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03

120.	120	Sh. Ravinder Kachru	Plot No. 291, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
121.	121	Sh. Virender Kumar	Plot No. 130, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
122.	122	Sh. Sunil Puri	Plot No. 18, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
123.	123	Sh. Tara Chand	Plot No. B-21, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
124.	124	Sh. Sanjay Gaur	Plot No. 150, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
125.	125	Sh. O.P. Sharma	Plot No. 198, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
126.	126	Sh. Anurag Garg	Plot No. 216, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
127.	127	Sh. Vivek Bagga	Plot No. B-14, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
128.	128	Sh. Rajeev Kapoor	Plot No. 189, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
129.	129	Sh. Deepak Gaba	Plot No. 125, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
130.	130	Sh. Pawan Kumar yagi	Plot No. 535, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
131.	131	Sh. Sanjeev Anand	Plot No. 261, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	03
132.	132	Ms. Usha Batra	Flat No. 6027, C-6/7 Vasant Kunj, New Delhi 110 070	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2014	01
133.	133	Sh. Ompal Singh Former President	Resident Welfare Association B-219, Chhattarpur Extn. New Delhi 110 074	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	02

134.	134	Sh. Naresh Tehran	Maharana Bagh, Cooperative Housing Building, New Delhi 110 054	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
135.	135	Sh. Triloki Singh Vice President	Nav Nirman Welfare Association Meetha Pur Part-2 Sai Nagar, New Delhi 110 044	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
136.	136	Sh. Hari Ram Bhardwaj President	DVB Pensioners Association Rajghat Power House, New Delhi 110 002	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	13
137.	137	Sh. H.M. Sharma	E-8(SF), Lajpat Nagar,-2 New Delhi 110 024	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	12
	137A	Sh. H.M. Sharma	E-8(SF), Lajpat Nagar,-2 New Delhi 110 024 hemantahemanta@rediffmail.co	Domestic	BRPL	21.04.2015	11
138.	138	Sh. Dushyant Kumar Vice President	Nagar Market Harsh Vihar Hari Nagar, Part III, Welfare Society C-408, Harsh Vihar, Hari Nagar, Extp-III, Badarpur New Delhi 110 044	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
139.	139	Sh Ajay Kumar	170B, Govind Puri, Kalkaji Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
140.	140	Sh. B.D. Sharma	Mundka Division	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
141.	141	Sh. A.K. Upadhyay Vice President	C-9, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	14
142.	142	Ms. Mamta Arya	M-95, Near Pratap Market Munirka, Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
143.	143	Sh. Amar Lal	206, Ist Floor, Jeevan Nagar, Ashram, New Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
144.	144	Sh. Rajan Kumar	Sarita Vihar, New Delhi 110 076	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
145.	145	Ms. Garima Bishawas	F-244A, Raj Nagar, Part – 2 Palam, New Delhi 110 003	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
146.	146	Sh. Rajiv Agarwal	E-290, Ramesh Nagar, Delhi 110 015	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
147.	147	Sh. Rajeev Sharma	172 B, Govindpuri Kalkaji Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
148.	148	Sh. Deshraj Yadav	Sector-4 R.K. Puram, Delhi	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
149.	149	Sh. B.S. Goel	Mundka	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01

150.	150	Ms. Savita Swami	H.No. 150, C/15, Ward No. 02 Mehrauli, New Delhi 110 030	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
151.	151	Sh. JK Kheterpal	D-2/39, Hari Nagar, New Delhi 110 058	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
152.	152	Sh. B. L Ratnakar	Lawerance Road, Keshave Puri, Delhi 110 035	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
153.	153	Fit Lt. (Retd.) ID Sharma General Secretary	Arjun Nagar, House Owners Welfare Association (Regd.) 150, Arjun Nagar, New Delhi 110 029	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
154.	154	Sh. Sandeep	C-18, Amar Colony	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
155.	155	Sh. Akhilesh	18, Pragati Appartment Paschim Vihar, New Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
156.	156	Sh. Kapil Dev	Plot No. DIC & D2A, Adhyapak Nagar, Near Narayan Dharam Kanta Nangloi, New Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
157.	157	Sh. Mukesh Kumar	P No-47-old-103-A Naresh Park Nangloi New Delhi 110041	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	02
158.	158	Sh. Kaushal Kishore	H.No. 64, Kirlokari, Hari Nagar, Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
159.	159	Sh. P.C. Maurya	Manch Publications	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
160.	160	Sh. R.K. Atoliya Chief Electrical Distribution Engineer	Northern Railway Baroda House, New Delhi 110 001	Government	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	21
161.	161	Dr. Pradeep Saini	Drps7777@gmail.com	Industrial/Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
162.	162	Sh. Chote Lal Yadav	Purvanchal Vikas Samiti(Regd.) H.No. 13, Gali No. 5/2 Shakti Vihar, A-Block Meethapur Chowk, Badarpur, New Delhi 110 014	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
163.	163	Dr. Navin Dang	drnavindang@gmail.com	Industrial/Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
164.	164	Dr. Vijay Kinra	C-29, C.C. Colony Delhi 110 007 tannyson.vk@gmail.com	Industrial/Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
165.	165	Dr. Rajiv Aggarwal	smedisoft@gmail.com	Industrial/Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
166.	166	Sh. Shrikant Kaushik	shrikantkaushik@yahoo.com	Industrial/Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01

167.	167	Dr. Rohit Rajput	rohitrajputd299.rr@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
168.	168	Dr. R.M. Chhabra	rmchhabra58@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
169.	169	Dr. Ashish Rohatgi	ashishrohatgi65@yahoo.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
170.	170	Dr. Samir Grover	samirgrover1@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
171.	171	Dr. Varun Tyagi	drvaruntyagi@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
172.	172	Ms. Manish Kukreja	manisha.bhatia@outlook.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
173.	173	Mrs. Neeta Gupta	A-17, Antriksh Apartments, Opp. Rohini District Courts, Sector, 14-Extn, Rohini, Delhi 110 085 Neegagupta.vg111@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
174.	174	Sh. H.R. Sarin President	Mangla Apartments, G-Block, Kalkaji, New Delhi	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
175.	175	Dr. Puneet Kumar	Kumar Child Clinic, Dwarka kumarchildclinic@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	24.04.2015	01
176.	176	Dr. B.L. Jain	Delhi Heart Hospital Advanced Critical Care Center 176, Jagriti Enclave Delhi Delhi_heart@yahoo.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMS	24.04.2015	01
177.	177	Sh. Anil Goswami	GH-1/360, Paschim Vihar, New Delhi 110 063	Domestic	BRPL	21.04.2015	01
178.	178	Sh Yog Raj Goswami	GH-1 Resident Welfare Association GH-1/231, Archana Apartments, Paschim Vihar, New Delhi 110 063	RWA	BRPL	21.04.2015	01
179.	179	Ms. Jyotsna Tiwari	Dr. Jyotsna Tiwari Type IV/19, NCERT Campus Sri Aurobindo Marg New Delhi 110 016	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
180.	180	Sh. Manoj Nootiyal	Shri Ganga Vihar Residents Welfare Association Regd. Village Dindar Pur, Najafgarh, New Delhi 110 043	Domestic	BRPL	21.04.2015	01
181.	181	Sh. S.R. Abrol	L-2, 91B, DDA, LIG Flats Kalkaji, New Delhi 110 019	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01

182.	182	Sh. I.K. Ramani Gen. Secretary	Residents Welfare Association 1, Mini Market, E-Block, East of Kailash, New Delhi 110 065 Rwaeok6@gmail.com	RWA	BRPL	21.04.2015	01
183.	183	Ms. Geeta Mahor	Aman Vihar Resident Welfare Association C-568, Aman Vihar, Kiradi, Suleman Nagar, Delhi 110 086	RWA	TPDDL	23.04.2015	01
184.	184	Sh. Jeet Singh	R2-5/262, J Block West Sagar Pur, New Delhi 110 046	Domestic	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
	184A	Sh. Jeet Singh	R2-5/262, J Block West Sagar Pur, New Delhi 110 046	Domestic	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
	184B	Sh. Jeet Singh	R2-5/262, J Block West Sagar Pur, New Delhi 110 046	Domestic	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01F
185.	185	Sh. Jeet Suneja	RZ – 5/262, J-Block West Sagar Pur, New Delhi 110 046	Domestic	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
186.	186	Sh. Vipin Gupta	A-17, Antriksh Apartments, Opp. Rohini District Courts, Sector 14, Extn. Rohini, Delhi 110 085	Domestic	DISCOMs	23.04.2015	04
187.	187	Sh. Rajesh Dhotre	Rajesh12dhotre@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	23.04.2015	01
188.	188	Sh. Jagdish Bhartiya Member	Tagore Garden Resident Welfare Association ID, 143/1, Tagore Garden, New Delhi 110 027	RWA	DISCOMs	23.04.2015	02
189.	189	Sh. C.M. Bhagat (MD) Chairman, DMA NH & MEF	DMA Nursing Home & Medical Establishment Forum DMA House, Medical Association Road dmanhf@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	23.04.2015	02
190.	190	Sh. Davinder Kumar Mehendiratta President kalkaji vyapar Mandal	BSES Rajdhani Power Limited BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place, New Delhi 110 019	Domestic	BRPL	22.04.2015	01

191.	191	Dr. Dudani	drdudani@yahoo.co.in	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
192.	192	Sh. Pratik Banerjee	Vk3336@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
193.	193	Dr. Pardeep Gupta	Plot No. 4, Sukhbir Nagar, Karala, Delhi 110 081 Pradeepgupta111@yahoo.in	Domestic	TPDDL	21.04.2015	02
194.	194	Sh. Raghuvansh Arora Vice President	Apex Chamber of Commerce & Industry of NCT of Delhi A-8, Naraina Industrial Area, Phase II, New Delhi 110 028 delhichamber@airtelmail.in	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	23.04.2015	05
195.	195	Sh. Ashu Gupta Office In-charge	Green Energy Association Sargam, 143, Taqdir Terrace, Near Shirodkar High School prafulla@malpani.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	09
196.	196	Sh. R.S. Wadhwa	New Friends Resident Welfare Association New Friends Colony Opp. A297, Delhi	RWA	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
197.	197	Sh. J.N. Rawal President	Resident Welfare Association Pocket-'G' Sarita Vihar Delhi	RWA	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
198.	198	Sh. N.S. Dagar President	Resident Welfare Association RWA Gopal Nagar, B-Block, Najafgarh New Delhi	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
199.	199	Sh. Sanjay Puri Chairman	AAM Aadmi Party A1A/51-A, Janak Puri, New Delhi 110 058	Political Party	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	13
200.	200	Sh. Sman Panwar					
201.	201	Sh. Satyavir Singh	Resident Welfare Association, Druga Vihar-II (Sainik Colony) Dinpur Najafgarh, New Delhi 110 043	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
202.	202	Sh. K.K. Singh President	Shakti Vihar, A-Block, Rehayasi Welfare Association Office No. 15, Street No. 5/2 A-Block, Shakti Vihar Badarpur, New Delhi 110 044	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01

203.	203	Sh. Hari Singh	K-272 Shahi Bhagat Singh Marg Mundka Delhi 110 041	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
204.	204	Sh. S.K. Narula General Secretary	AC Block Welfare Association AC-27, Tagore Garden New Delhi 110 027	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
205.	205	Sh. M.S. Ahluwalia	C-20 (G. Floor) Somani Nagar,	Domestic	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
206.	206	Sh. Sodaan Singh	Nand Nagri Sangharsh Simiti B-3/8, Nand Nagri, Delhi 110 093	RWA	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	02
207.	207	Dr. Shalabh Sharma	drshalabh68@yahoo.co.in	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	23.04.2015	01
208.	208	Dr. Ranjit Gulati	gulati_rs@yahoo.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
209.	209	Dr. Majoj Goel	dr.manojgoel@yahoo.in	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
210.	210	Dr. Nitin Agarwal	dr.nitinagarwal@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
211.	211	Sh. J.L. Johar	cmdelhi@nic.in	Domestic	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
212.	212	Dr. Jagdeep Chugh	jagdeepchugh@yahoo.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
213.	213	Sh. Chetan Sharma Chairman	chetnasharma1512@gmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
214.	214	Sh. Suresh Tiwari	tiwarisuresh41@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	22.04.2015	01
215.	215	Sh. Kishore Rajurkar	kishorej_58@yahoo.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
216.	216	Sh. Dinesh Kumar Gupta	Dineshk.Gupta@bsmail.in	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
217.	217	Sh. Gaurav Nand	Indian Energy Regulatory Services T-44, Karampura, New Delhi 110 015	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	17.04.2015	02
218.	218	Sh. Dharminder Kumar	Federation of Vikas Nagar	RWA	DISCOMs	27.04.2015	03
219.	219	Dr. Sunil Dargar	drsunildargar@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	27.04.2015	01
220.	220	Sh. Sudhir Gupta	E-5, Amar Colony Lajpat Nagar IV New Delhi 110 024	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
221.	221	Sh. R.S. Dixit President	Sourabh Vihar Resident Welfare Association (Regd.) N-349/13 Sourabh Vihar, Hari Nagar Extn. Jait PUR Badar Pur New Delhi 110 044	-	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01

222.	222	Sh. Sanjay Jain	10, Brothers Apartments 16, I.P. Extn. Patparganj Delhi 110 092 Jainsanjay59@yahoo.co.in	-	BYPL	21.04.2015	21
223.	223	Sh. S.K. Puri	AE Block AE/59, Tagore Garden New Delhi 110 027	-	DISCOMs	23.04.2015	01
224.	224	Sh. Jagjit Singh	Isapur Gram Vikas Simiti Gaun Isapur New Delhi 110 073	RWA	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
225.2	225	Prof. Pandav Nayak President,	Indian Institute of Public Administration CGHS Plot No. 26, Sector-6, Dwarka, New Delhi 110 075	Domestic	TPDDL	21.04.2015	02
226.	226	Sh. Gaurav Nand Coordinator	Associaition of Power Traders Ground Floor, Central Board of Irrigation & Power Malcha Mar, Chankyapuri, New Delhi 110 021	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	27.04.2015	03
227.	227	Ms Meghna Aggarwal Executive Director	National Medical Forum 24, Ansari Road, Daryaganj New Delhi 110 002 meghna1304@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	28.04.2015	01
228.	228	Dr. Prem Aggarwal Managing Director	Sanjeevan Hospitals 24, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi 110 002 sanjeevanhospitals@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	24.04.2015	14
229.	229	Sh. Paramjeet Singh President	Vikas Puri Welfare Society	RWA	DISCOMs	27.04.2015	03
230.	230	Sh. Rajesh Garg	Engineers Association Okhla Y-35, Okhla Industrial Area, Phase-II, New Delhi	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	27.04.2015	02
231.	231	Sh. S.C. Dua President	Kailash Hills Market Assocaition 21 Kailash Hills Market, New Delhi 110 065	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
232.	232	Sh. Rakesh Kumar	RWA Sector-1 R.K. PUram Delhi	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
233.	233	Sh. Ved Prakash Arya	895 A 1, W No. 8, Mehrauli New Delhi 110 030	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
234.	234	Sh. S.K. Sharma	C-34, ODS Lajpat Nagar New Delhi 110 024	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01

235.	235	Ms. Anita	H. No. 41, G/F, Killa No. 44 Adhopak Nagar, Behind Narayan Dhoom Kanta Delhi 110 041	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
236.	236	Sh. Rajesh Kumar	C-19, Amar Colony Delhi 110 024	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
237.	237	Sh. Raj Kumar	C-27, Amar Colony Delhi 110 024	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
238.	238	Sh. Raj Kumar	C-17, Amar Colony Delhi 110 024	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
239.	239	Sh. Jawal Singh	C-28 Amar Colony Delhi 110 024	Domestic	DISCOMs	21.04.2015	01
240.	240	Sh. Rajeev Chowdhary	BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place, New Delhi 110 019		DISCOMs	27.04.2015	15
241.2	241	Sh. Aditya Pyasi	Aditya.Pyasi@relianceada.com		DISCOMs	28.04.2015	15
242.	242	Dr. Yashpaul Jindal	C-49, Ground Floor Yojna Vihar Delhi 110 092	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	28.04.2015	01
243.	243	Dr. Uppal	drsuppal@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	28.04.2015	01
244.	244	Dr. J.C. Pathak Ex President	drjcpatak@yahoo.co.in	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	27.04.2015	01
245.	245	Dr. V.S. Gogia	dr.vsgogia@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	27.04.2015	01
246.	246	Sh. P.K. Jalali Treasurer	Satisar Cooperative Group Housing Society Ltd. Plot No. – 6, Sector -7 Dwarka New Delhi 110 075 pradeepjalali@hotmail.com	Domestic	BRPL	27.04.2015	01
247.	247	Sh. Girish Jain	Gcjain1948@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	28.04.2015	01
248.	248	Sh. Balvinder Singh Thapar	Delhi State Resident Welfare Council (Regd.)	Domestic	DISCOMs	27.04.2015	03
249.	249	Sh. Rajiv Kumar Bhagat	Shop #06, DDA Market "QD", Block, Pitampur Delhi 110 034	Industrial/ Commercial	TPDDL	27.04.2015	03
250.	250	Sh. Ashwani Kumar	Vijay Nagar Welfare Association A-23/A First Floor, Single Storey, Vijay Nagar, Delhi	Domestic	BYPL	29.04.2015	21
251.	251	Ms. Rama Chhabra	anitachhabra@gmail.com	Domestic	BRPL	29.04.2015	02
	251A	Ms. Rama Chhabra	anitachhabra@gmail.com	Domestic	BRPL	29.04.2015	03

252.	252	Sh. Sanjay Gupta	sanjayrssons@gmail.com	Domestic	BRPL	29.04.2015	03
253.	253	Sh. Davinder Kumar Gupta	J-302, Green Valley CGHS Sector 22, Dwarka, New Delhi 110 077 guptadk25@gmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	28.04.2015	01
254.	254	Sh. Buhpinder Singh Coordinator Sh. Rajiv Kumar Coordinatory	Confederation Relocated Industries Bawana E-57, Sector-2, DSIIDC, Bawana Industrial Complex, Bawana, Delhi 110 039 cribawana@gmail.com	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	29.04.2015	12
255.	255	Sh. Atul Mehra	Resident Welfare Association Block FFA & FB FB 24, Tagore Garden, New Delhi 110 027	RWA	DISCOMs	29.04.2015	01
256.	256	Sh. Harmit Singh Director	Heat Exchange (P) Ltd. 349, FIE Patparganj Delhi 110 092 Khurram.khan@wurthdelhi.co.in	Industrial/ Commercial	DISCOMs	29.04.2015	01
257.	257 257A	Sh. Padam Chand Jain Sh. Padam Chand Jain	19, Navyug Appartments Sector 9, Rohini 19, Navyug Appartments Sector 9, Rohini engpadam66@hotmail.com	RWA	DISCOMs	29.04.2015	02
258.	258	Sh. Jyotish Kumar Sinha	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. NDPL House Hundson Lines Kingsway Camp Delhi 110 009	TPDDL	DTL	28.04.2015	07
259.	259	Sh. Bharat Kumar Gohel	Uuwa2009@yahoo.com	RWA	DISCOMs	24.04.2015	03
260.	260 260A	Sh. Atul Kumar Goyal Sh. Atul Kumar Goyal	atulcumargoyal9@gmail.com atulcumargoyal9@gmail.com	RWA RWA	BYPL BRPL	25.04.2015 25.04.2015	14 10

261.	261	Sh. A.S. Chauhan	D.V.B. Pensioners Association Rajghat Power House New Delhi 110 002	Domestic	DISCOMs	16.04.2015	85
262.	262	Sh. Manoj Jain	MCT-290, Gautam Puri Delhi 110 053	RWA	DISCOMs	05.05.2015	01
263.	263	Ms. Ganga Saini	Bhagwal Park Resident's Welfare Association 91, Gali No. 3, Bhagwan Park Jharoda Marja, Burari Delhi 110 084	RWA	DISCOMs	05.05.2015	09
264.	264	Sh. Amit Kumar Ojha	58C, B-4 Salhapur Khera Bijwasan, New Delhi 110 061	RWA	BYPL	27.04.2015	14
	264A	Sh. Amit Kumar Ojha	58C, B-4 Salhapur Khera Bijwasan, New Delhi 110 061 mailamitojha@gmail.com	RWA	BRPL		
265.	265	Sh. S.K. Bhatia	sk_bhatia45@yahoo.com 3/102 Subhash Nagar, New Delhi 110 027	Domestic	DISCOMs	06.05.2015	01
	265A	Sh. S.K. Bhatia	Sk_bhatia45@yahoo.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	12.05.2015	01
266.	266	Sh. Anil Sharma	Anilsharma49@rediffmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	24.06.2015 16.06.2015	01
267.	267	Sh. S.R. Sangar General Secretary	Federation of Indraprastha Extn.-II, Housing Societies, 71, Kiran Vihar, New Delhi-92	Domestic	DISCOMs	20.05.2015	
268.	268	Suresh Abrol	surgeonxeros@yahoo.co.in	Commercial	DISCOMs	12.05.2015	01
269.	269	Sh. Manju Vishnu Lal	manjuvishnulal@hotmail.com	Domestic	DISCOMs	12.05.2015	04

Stakeholders who have attended the Hearing for the petition filed by DISCOMs for Approval of FY 2013-14, Review for FY 2014-15 and ARR for FY 2015-16

S.No.	Name	Address
1.	Mr. Ashok Bhasin	RWA, North Delhi
2.	Mr. R.S. Jarout	DMRC
3.	Mr. Ved Prakash	RWA, Mehrauli
4.	Ms. Savita Swami	RWA
5.	Mr. Pawan	DMRC
6.	Mr. Vivek Aggarwal	DMRC
7.	Mr. Sharad Sharma	DMRC
8.	Mr. Sarbajit Roy	B-59, Defence Colony
9.	Mr. M.S. Ahluwalia	C-20, FG, Soami Nagar
10.	Mr. Subodh Pandey	DMRC
11.	Mr. Kapil Dev	3/23, Damruddin Nagar, Nangloi, N.Delhi
12.	Mr. Jagmohan	DMRC
13.	Mr. Om Pal Singh	E186, E-Block, Cattarpur, Ext. Delhi
14.	Mr. Sukhdev Raj Abrol	New Delhi, Bar Association, Patiala House Courts N.Delhi 110 001
15.	Mr. Mahender Singh	RWA, Ranjit Nagar
16.	Mr. Kuldeep Kumar	DSEW Union, Delhi Workers Union
17.	Mr. K.L. Katyal	G-3, Block-G, Rattan Park Basai Darapur, Delhi
18.	Mr. Harswroop Bakshi	H-18/74, Sec.-7, Rohini, Delhi 110 085
19.	Mr. S.K. Bhatia	3/102, Subhash Nagar, N.Delhi
20.	Ms. Firdous Jahan	
21.	Ms. Renu	
22.	Ms. Ravinder Kaur	School of open learning
23.	Mr. Satyavan Singh	P-1, Sultan Puri, Delhi-86
24.	Mr. Dharmendra	G-43, Jailerwala Bagh, Delhi
25.	Mr. Tej Khatar	Mother Dairy GCHS
26.	Mr. Sanjay Gaur	Patpargang, FIE Association, 149,150 FIE IA Delhi-92
27.	Mr. B.B. Tiwari	A-2/149, Safdarjung Enclave
28.	Mr. Himanshu Arora	11/141, Malviya Nagar
29.	Mr. Girish Deveshwar	Indus Tower Gurgaon
30.	Mr. H.M. Sharma	Lajpat Nagar
31.	Mr. ANish Garg	Delhi Government
32.	Mr. Bhupender Chawla	RWA Bhaipur Parmanand
33.	Mr. Ramesh Berwa	RWA, Manak Pura, Karol Bagh
34.	Mr. Vijay Jain	Industrial and Commercial
35.	Mr. Dharminder Kumar	CU-143, Pitampura, Delhi 110 034
36.	Mr. Tilak Mitra	Industrial/Commercial
37.	Mr. Praveen Dhamija	RWA, Parmanand Colony
38.	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Billa	174, Bhai Permanand Colony
39.	Mr. Meghraj Goyal	Industrial and Commercial
40.	Mr. Bharat Bhatia	Industrial and Commercial
41.	Mr. R.L. Kamboj	RWA, Rohini
42.	Mr. Jitender Aggarwal	Industrial and Commercial
43.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Industrial and Commercial
44.	Mr. Rohit Banjamin	Ramesh Tyagi Colony Burari
45.	Mr. Sidharth	NDPL House
46.	Mr. Rashid Anwar	554/14, Zakir Nagar, Delhi 25
47.	Mr. B.S. Gujral	Janakpuri, RWA

48.	Mr. Yankush	Industrial and Commercial
49.	Ft. Lt. I.D. Sharma Gen. Secretary	150, Arjun Nagar, Delhi
50.	Mr. Samant Bhushan	BQ Block, Shalimar Bagh
51.	Mr. Ajay Chhabra	B-117, Sarvodaya Enclave
52.	Mr. Rishi Prakash	79, Gali No. 15, Sanjay Nagar, Delhi 110 033
53.	Mr. Chandra Bhan Jain	A-60, Gali No. 21, Mahendra Park, Adarsh Nagar
54.	Mr. Avtar Singh Chandhok	B-Q1/160, Shalimar Bagh
55.	Mr. Varun Mathur	A-904/Exotica, Indrapuram
56.	Mr. Rajeev Kakria	E-230, Greater Kailash-1, New Delhi 110 048
57.	Mr. R.C. Sharma	B-4/43, Phase-II, Ashok Vihar
58.	Ms. Sheetal Jain	T-15, Budh Vihar
59.	Ms. Anil Sood	1056, C-1, Vasant Kunj
60.	Mr. A.K. Datta	222, Pocket E, Mayur Vihar-II, Delhi 110 091
61.	Mr. Sunil Shekhawat	Industrial and Commercial
62.	Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh	342/1, Sector-6, Rohini
63.	Mr. Subhash	RWA
64.	Mr. Sanjay Puri	Delhi Vidhan Sabha, AIA/34 A, Janakpuri
65.	Mr. Yogesh Shani	C-6/B, Block RWA
66.	Mr. Narendra Kumar Singal	347 B/28, Onkar Ngr, B-Trinagar, Delhi-35
67.	Mr. Roshan Lal Garg	PVC Compound & Footwear Mgr. Association, 2682/199, (First Floor) Mangol Puri
68.	Mr. Gaurav Arora	C-48, Mintro Road Complex, New Delhi 02
69.	Mr. Gaurav Nand	Indian Energy Regulatory Services, T-44, Karampura, New Delhi 110 015
70.	Mr. Satveer Singh	RZ-284, Durga Vihar, Najafgarh Delhi-43
71.	Mr. Akbar Basha	C-49, Ganga Vihar Deenpur, Najafgarh
72.	Mr. Abhijeet Kumar	Consultant
73.	Mr. Vaibhav Saini	Indian Energy Regulatory Services, T-44, Karampura, New Delhi 110 015
74.	Mr. Rajnesh	M-172/Pashchim Vihar,
75.	MR. Suresh Joshi	B-798, MIG DDA Flats East Loni Road Delhi-93
76.	Mr. Saurabh Gandhi	C-6/7, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi 110 007
77.	Mr. Vijay Kr. Malhotra	68, RPS Flats, Shekih Sarai, PH-I, N.D-17
78.	Mr. Anmol	Indus Tower
79.	Mr. Samson Josef Fedrick	CR-247, Lalita Park, Central Road, Laxmi Nagar
80.	Mr. P.K. Malhotra	DVB Engineers Association
81.	Mr. Yograj Goswami	RWA, Punjabi Bagh
82.	Mr. Deepak Shankar	42/First Floor Gagan Vihar
83.	Dr. M.K. Agarwal	RWA, Balbir Nagar
84.	Mr. Rajan Gupta	Former, DECC Member
85.	Mr. B.S. Vohra	East Delhi RWA
86.	Mr. Jitender Tyagi	President URD
87.	Mr. S.K. Maheshwari	Patparganj, FIA
88.	Mr. Surender Arora	Industrial / Commercial
89.	Mr. Amit Kumar	Industrial / Commercial
90.	Mr. Purushottam	Patparganj Association, RWA
91.	Mr. K.R. Misra	65, Patpargaj, Industrial Estate
92.	Mr. Sanjay Jain	C-574, Gali No. 25, Bhajan Pura
93.	Mr. Anshuman Roy	3610 Khala phase-3
94.	Mr. Om Prakash Sharma	Patparganj Industrial Area, D-115, Block D, Surajmal Vihar
95.	Mr. Damodar Kashyap	
96.	Mr. Sunil Kumar	All Delhi, RWA
97.	Mr. Naresh Bhati	RWA, Aruna Ngr, Civil Lines

98.	Mr. Prashant Kamal	A-96, Madhuban, Vikas Marg, Delhi -92
99.	Mr. Balbir Singh	15/3, Indra Vikas Colony, Kukherjee Nagar,
100.	Mr. Jagjeet Singh	RWA, Hudson Line GTB Nagar
101.	Mr. Shivander Yadav	RWA Kotla Village Mayur Vihar, Phase I
102.	Mr. Mahender Pal Singh	1188, Shora Kothi, Subzi Mandi, Delhi
103.	Mr. Harish Kumar	D-528, Block-D, Ranjeet Vihar, Nalothi Ext. Nangloi
104.	Mr. Sushil Kumar	RWA Nangloi
105.	Ms. Ravinder Singh Bisht	J-60, S-5 Dilshad Colony
106.	Mr. P. Gopalan	A-501, Thiruvzha Apartment, Plot No. 37, Sec. 10, Dwarka (RWA)
107.	Mr. Harmeet Singh Sarna	RWA, Basti Punjabi Subji Mandi, Delhi 110 007
108.	Mr. Shajan Pailo Paul	Thiruvizha Apartment Dwarka
109.	Mr. Arvind Mehta	RWA Double Store New Rajender Nagar
110.	Mr. Prem Nagpal	P-21, West Patel Nagar, N.D. 18
111.	Mr. Sanjeev Bhatnagar	RWA, Prasad Nagar, Karol Bagh, Delhi 110 005
112.	Mr. M.S. Dhaka	G.B.S.S.S Krishna Nagar, Delhi
113.	Mr. C.P. Singh	RWA, Jyoti Sadan Welfare Association West Jyoti Nagar, Delhi-94
114.	Mr. Kanwar Pratap Singh	D-408, Gali No. 9, D-Block, Bhajanpura
115.	Mr. Jagdish Kumar	RWA, D-2 Block Janak Puri
116.	Mr. Rampat	139, Village Auchandi Bawana, Delhi
117.	Mr. Anwasha	Edelman Gurgaun
118.	Mr. Rajender Kr. Munjal	B-832, Panchvati SOC F-Block, Vikas Puri, N. Delhi-18
119.	Mr. Mukesh Yadav	RWA Naresh park, Nagaloi
120.	Mr. S.L. Gosain	RWA, Raja Park
121.	Mr. Praveen Kumar	H-22, Shakarpur, Delhi 110 034
122.	Mr. Rohit Sharma	Negolice India Ltd. E-34, 2nd Floor, Connaught Circus, New Delhi 110001
123.	Mr. Amarjeet Singh	
124.	Mr. Rajesh	RWA, Vasant Kunj
125.	Mr. Thaneshwer Dutt	
126.	Mr. Satvir Singh	RWA, Narela
127.	Mr. Rajesh Rishi	MLA, Janakpuri
128.	Mr. Jarnail Singh	MLA, Rajouri Garden
129.	Mr. Satish Yadav	Janakpuri
130.	Mr. Rajeev Rishi	Janakpuri
131.	Mr. Alka Lamba,	MLA, Chandni Chowk
132.	Mr. Sukhbir Singh,	MLA
133.	Mr. Sandeep	Mundka
134.	Dr. Devender	Mundka
135.	Mr. Virender Singh	Mundka
136.	Mr. Amit Dalal	Mundka
137.	Mr. Gulab Singh	MLA, Matiyala
138.	Mr. Devender Singh	Matiyala
139.	Ms. Bhawana Gaur,	MLA , Palam Colony
140.	Mr. Onkar	(With Bhawna Gaur)
141.	Mr. Mamta Kundu	Dwarka
142.	Ms. Pooja Badola	Patparganj
143.	Ms. Anju Singh	Chattarpur
144.	Mr. Ajay Rai	G-70/4
145.	Mr. Naresh Yadav	MLA, D-7, 7399, Vasant Kunj, Mehrauli
146.	Mr. Shivraj	Vasant Kunj
147.	Mr. Jagdeep Singh	MLA, Hari Nagar
148.	Mr. Karnal Singh	Rajouri Garden

149.	Mr. Nitin Tyagi	MLA, Laxmi Nagar
150.	Mr. S.K. Bagga	MLA, Krishna Nagar
151.	Mr. Avtar Singh	MLA, Kalkaji
152.	Mr. Ajesh Yadav	MLA, Badali
153.	Mr. Lokesh	Laxmi Nagar
154.	Mr. Vikas Bagga	Krishna Nagar
155.	Mr. Kapil Arora	Krishna Nagar
156.	Mr. Inder Gupta	Rohini Sec. 7
157.	Mr. P.K. Bhardwaj	Sector 63, Noida
158.	Mr. Faiyaz Muhammed Pasha	2/Block-D, Okhla, Delhi
159.	Mr. Shiv Charan Goel	MLA, Parliament Secretary (Fin.)
160.	Mr. Mahender SinghYadav	MLA , Vikaspuri,
161.	Mr. S.S. Yadav	Vikas Puri
162.	Mr. Rajenda Pal Gautam	MLA, Seemapuri
163.	Mr. Suresh Saxena	
164.	Mr. Pawan Sharma	MLA Adarsh Nagar,
165.	Mr. Kamlesh Chandev	H.No. 102, Part-1, Rohini, Sec-21, ND-86
166.	Mr. Anand Prakash Sharma	Mangesur, Delhi 39
167.	Mr. Ritu Raj	MLA, Kirari
168.	Mr. Deepak	N-93, Kirari
169.	Mr. Choudhary Fateh Singh	MLA Gokulpur
170.	Mr. R. Swaroop	Vasant Kunj
171.	Mr. M.P. Singh	
172.	Mr. Vaibhav Sharma	
173.	Mr. Akhilesh Tripathi	MLA, Model Town
174.	Mr. Jitender Kumar	F-14/34, Model Town
175.	Mr. Yash Upadhaya	Model Town
176.	Mr. Amit Arora	F-8, Model Town
177.	Mr. Vikas	Model Town
178.	Ms. Geeta Mahaur	RWA Kirari
179.	Ms. Radha Bhardwaj	RWA, Rohini
180.	Mr. Dashrath Kumar	RWA, Rohini
181.	Mr. Ravinder Singh	Mehrauli
182.	Mr. Yusuf Khan	Mehrauli
183.	Mr. Navdeep Singh	Kalkaji
184.	Mr. Raja Singh	Mehrauli
185.	Mr. Mashesh Chand Sharma	Mehrauli
186.	Mr. Mustkeen Khan	Mehrauli
187.	Mr. B.P. Agarwal	North, MC Delhi, Bar Association
188.	Mr. Brij Mohan Verma	D-14/104, Sec-3, Rohini, Delhi 110 085
189.	Mr. Ajit Kumar	D-14/107, Sec-3 Rohini, Delhi 110 085
190.	Mr. S.C. Dhupar	E-19, 20/10, Sec-3, Rohini
191.	Mr. Tarminder Singh	B-2C/4A, Janakpuri
192.	Mr. Gurmeet	150, Punjabi Bagh, ND-26
193.	Ms. Gargi	HD-87, Sec-135, Noida
194.	Ms. Geeta Bhardwaj	BD 87, Sec-135, Noida
195.	Mr. Gautam Sharma	K-290, Kangara Niketan, Vikas Puri
196.	Mr. Anil Chadha	K-288, Kangra Niketan, Vikas Puri
197.	Mr. Rajesh Gautam	E-57/B-217, Sunder Ngr. North East
198.	Mr. Chiranjilal	Bawana
199.	Mr. Shabhit	WZ-27, Golden Park Rampura
200.	Mr. Shahid Khan	3770, Shah Jungi, Ajmeri Gate
201.	Mr. Naeem Bharti	RWA, Nai Subha, Chandni Chowk
202.	Mr. Surender Babbar,	GM (Fin.) DTL

Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Viniyamak Bhawan, C-Block, Shivalik,
Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110017

Fax.: 011-41080417, e-mail: secyderc@nic.in

Website: www.derc.gov.in