

# ORDER OF THE

# WEST BENGAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN CASE NO. TP (R) - 52 / 24 - 25

IN REGARD TO THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY ADHUNIK POWER AND NATURAL RESOURCES LIMITED (APNRL) FOR REVIEW OF TARIFF ORDER FOR THE YEAR 2022 – 23 DATED 06.06.2024 PASSED BY THE COMMISSION IN CASE NO. TP – 100 / 22 – 23 UNDER SECTION 94 (1) (F) OF THE ELECTRICITY ACT, 2003 READ WITH ORDER 47 RULE 1 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1908 AND REGULATION 3 OF THE WEST BENGAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION (CONDUCT OF BUSINESS) REGULATIONS, 2013

PRESENT:

SRI MALLELA VENKATESWARA RAO, CHAIRPERSON

DATE: 28.10.2024





#### Facts in brief:

- Adhunik Power and Natural Resources Limited (APNRL) has submitted a review petition vide letter dated 16.07.2024 under section 94 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and regulation 3 of the West Bengal Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2013 seeking review of the order dated 06.06.2024 in Case No. TP 100 / 22 23 passed by the West Bengal Electricity Regulatory Commission (Commission) in regard to the Tariff Order for the year 2022 23.
- 2.0 In their review petition, APNRL has submitted that there are certain errors apparent on the face of the record in the impugned order of the Commission and accordingly they are filing the review petition with a prayer to admit the petition and review the Tariff order to the extent indicated in the petition. APNRL in their petition inter-alia has put forward the following issues for review:
  - A. Erroneous consideration of equity capital on which the return on equity has been allowed;
  - B. Erroneous consideration of O&M expenses and prayer to allow the expenses on actual basis:
  - C. Erroneous computation of requirement of Working Capital;
  - D. Grant liberty to submit detailed justification in respect of additional capitalization made in FY 2014 – 15 and FY 2015 – 16 during the APR application for FY 2022 – 23;
  - E. Erroneous consideration of heat value of coal
  - F. Erroneous consideration of price of coal and prayer to allow the fuel cost on actual basis;
  - G. Clarification in regard to the tariff admitted by the Commission is exclusive of any trading margin;





H. Consideration of saleable energy similar to that of Hydro Generating Station

#### Observations of the Commission:

- 3.0 Now, the Commission proceeds to find whether any case for review has been made out by the Review Petitioner in terms of section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC, according to which a person aggrieved by order of a Court can file review on the following grounds, if no appeal against the said order has been filed:
  - (a) Discovery of new and important matter of evidence which after the exercise of due diligence was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him when the decree was passed or order made.
  - (b) On account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of record; and
  - (c) For any other sufficient reason.
- 4.0 In view of the above, the review sought by APNRL on the items mentioned in paragraph 2.0 above are discussed below:
  - A. Erroneous consideration of equity capital on which the return on equity has been allowed:

#### Submission of APNRL:

In the review petition, APNRL stated that the Commission while computing the Return on Equity has erroneously considered the opening equity as shown in the Balance Sheet of the review petitioner for FY 2022 – 23. APNRL submitted that the equity at the start of FY 2014 – 15 was Rs. 859 Crore which further increased to Rs. 905 Crore during FY 2014 – 15. Hence, the Commission ought to have considered Rs. 905 Crore as on 31.03.2015 and thereon year-on-year equity addition to fund additional capitalization. APNRL further submitted that the initial equity employed by the stakeholders remains the actual investment made and the reduction of equity share does not alter the original amount of capital investment. Thus, the equity shown in the balance sheet of FY 2022 – 23 does not reflect the actual equity employed by the





company but the adjusted equity considering the share capital reduction made in FY 2021 – 22.

#### Observation of the Commission:

The Commission observes that in terms of the WBERC Tariff Regulations, 2011, the tariff is determined on cost plus basis. The WBERC Tariff Regulations recognizes equity at actuals if such actual equity is less than 30%, equity over and above 30% is treated as normative debt. The Commission notes that APNRL has sought Return on Equity on an equity base of Rs. 905 Crores (as on 31.03.2015) deployed at COD originally linked to the capital cost. Whereas, the actual equity as per book of accounts for 2022 – 23 is Rs. 179.90 Crores as on 31.03.2022. The Commission is of the considered opinion that in the event of liquidation, the liability for equity servicing is limited to the base of Rs. 179.90 Crore though this is an outcome of capital restructuring.

The Commission notes that, there is no error apparent on the face of order rather APNRL has prayed to review the decision taken by the Commission in the impugned order. Thus, this does not come under the scope of review under section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act 2003 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC.

# B. Erroneous consideration of O&M expenses and prayer to allow the expenses on actual basis:

#### Submission of APNRL:

APNRL submitted that while determining the O&M expenses for its generating station, the Commission has relied on paragraph 7 of Schedule 9D of the WBERC Tariff Regulations, 2011 and approved O&M expense for FY 2022 – 23 subject to the ceiling as determined by the Commission for Sagardighi Thermal Power Station Stage I for the aforesaid year. APNRL stated that the Commission in the Tariff Order of WBPDCL for 2022 – 23 had approved the norms of O&M expenses for Sagardighi as Rs. 10.01 Lakhs per MW which in turn would have been Rs. 60.06 Crore. However, the Commission had approved Rs. 55.96 Crore as per the proposal of WBPDCL on the basis of actuals. Thus, the Commission in the impugned order has





erroneously considered the base of O&M expenses as Rs. 55.96 Crore in place of Rs. 60.06 Crore, while determining the admissible O&M for APRNL.

APNRL further stated that instead of considering any benchmark O&M expenses based on a plant of WBPDCL, the Commission ought to have allowed the O&M expenses on past actual basis of the APRNL plant.

### Observation of the Commission:

In terms of the Tariff Regulations, the O&M expenses of a generating station is considered as controllable element and are subject to the Annual Norms of O&M expenses in terms of Rs. Lakh/ MW specified in the Schedule of the Tariff Regulations. This being the first tariff order of the APRNL, the Commission has determined the normative O&M expenses in terms of paragraph 7 of Schedule 9D of the Tariff Regulations. According to paragraph 7 of Schedule 9D, the O&M norms for relevant years determined by the Commission for Sagardighi Thermal Power Station Stage I (SgTPP-I) shall be considered as ceiling for determining O&M norms for new power plants.

The Commission in the impugned order has determined the admissible O&M expenses for APRNL 2 x 270 MW plant as Rs. 5037 lakh for the year 2022-23 based on the amount admitted for SgTPP-I (2 x300 MW) of Rs. 5596.40 lakh with due adjustment on account of MW capacity.

The Commission observed that APNRL in its review petition has rightly pointed out that the O&M expenses for SgTPP-I for 2022-23 was admitted based on lesser claim of WBPDCL for Rs. 5596.40 Lakhs than the admissible normative amount of Rs. 6006 Lakh. Thus, the O&M expenses of Rs. 5596.40 Lakh should not be construed as base figure for determining the admissible expense for APRNL.

In view of the above, the Commission decided to recompute the admissible O&M expenses for APRNL based on the normative O&M expense of SgTPP-1 amounting to Rs. 6006 lakh.





Particulars	Rs. Lakh
Normative O&M Sagardighi Thermal Power Station (2x300 MW) – Stage 1. @ Rs. 10.01 Lakh per MW	6006.00
Prorated O&M expense admissible for (2x270 MW) plant	5405.40
O&M Cost allowed in the Tariff Order dated 06.06.2024	5037.00
Additional O&M expenses allowed	368.40

Thus, the Commission admits Rs. 5405 Lakh as O&M expensed for 2022 – 23 and allows Rs. 368.40 Lakh as additional recoverable amount as part of ARR.

The impact of interest on working capital for the additional amount of Rs. 368.40 lakh comes to Rs. 3.91 lakh, The Computation shown in Annexure-B.

## C. Erroneous computation of requirement of Working Capital:

#### Submission of APNRL:

APNRL stated that the Commission in its order dated 06.06.2024 has computed the working capital requirement on normative basis @ 10% on summation of annual fixed charge, fuel cost reduced by the amount of depreciation, deferred revenue expenditure, return on equity and other non-cash expenditure, if any. APNRL submitted that the basis of computation of working capital requirement @ 10% shall be applicable in those cases where the recovery through Monthly Fuel Cost Adjustment (MFCA) is in place, otherwise it should be computed @18%. APNRL further submitted that the Commission in the order dated 29.07.2022 had approved the interim tariff of Rs.4.40/kWh, however the breakup of the tariff in terms of fixed charges and energy charges was not provided in the order. Hence, in absence of base energy charge for 2022 - 23, APNRL was unable to compute the MFCA during the said year due to which there was no any recovery through MFCA in that particular year. APNRL prayed to review the computation of working capital requirement in view of the above submission and amend its calculation considering the normative base rate of 18%, subsequently adjust the interest on working capital accordingly.





#### Observation of the Commission:

The Commission observes that, in terms of regulation 5.6.5.1 of the Tariff Regulations, interest on working capital is applicable on 10% of normative base, where Monthly Fuel Cost Adjustment (MFCA) or Monthly Variable Cost adjustment (MVCA) exists, otherwise interest will be computed on 18% of normative base. In case of APRNL it is observed that, due to composite interim tariff, they were unable to recover the MFCA prior to issuance of this tariff order. However, in the tariff order in question, the Commission has determined the energy charge and capacity charge separately and thus, there remains no difficulty in recovery of MFCA from the date of issuance of this Tariff order.

As tariff order is implemented on prospective basis and the MFCA is applicable post implementation of tariff order, the Commission does not find it prudent to revise the formula for computation of the interest on working capital in the order. However, during truing up, the working capital interest will be computed at 18% base value till the period APRNL was unable to recover MFCA due to earlier composite interim tariff.

D. Grant liberty to submit detailed justification in respect of additional capitalization made in FY 2014 – 15 and FY 2015 – 16 during the APR application for FY 2022 – 23:

APNRL submitted that the additional capitalization of Rs. 5222.00 Lakh (after adjustment of decapitalization of Rs. 201.00 Lakh) and Rs. 1450 Lakh incurred in FY 2014 – 15 and 2015 – 16 was made for separate assets and was not included in the amount of Rs. 9233 Lakh and the negative discharge of liabilities of Rs. 277 Lakh. Hence, APNRL requested the Commission to grant the liberty to APNRL to submit the detailed justification and breakup of additional capitalization made in the FY 2014-15 and FY 2015 – 16, with APR application for FY 2022-23.

#### Observation of the Commission:

APNRL has represented regarding consideration of additional capitalization of Rs 5222 lakhs in 2014 – 15 and Rs 1450 lakhs in 2015 – 16. The Commission in the tariff order has derived cash capital cost from the base capital cost on accrual basis with





discharge of liabilities during the year. Accordingly, the Commission has considered a sum of Rs. 9233 lakhs towards discharge of liabilities as per the details furnished in the petition. APRNL did not submit any documents in support of their claim of additional capitalization of Rs. 5222 lakh and Rs. 1450 lakhs respectively on 2014-15 and 2015-16 over and above Rs. 9233 lakhs considered by the Commission towards discharge of liabilities. However, APRNL in its review petition has sought liberty to submit documents related to additional capitalization in its APR petition.

The Commission observes that prudence check in APR stage is always considered based on submitted documents and accordingly APNRL has the liberty to submit their justifications and documents. The Commission shall consider the same during APR based on applicable provisions of the law.

#### E. Erroneous consideration of heat value of coal:

APNRL stated that the GCV used for computing energy charges must be based on the weighted average GCV of coal As Received Basis ('at the power project site'), measured in kCal/kg for coal-based stations, with a deduction of 120 kCal/kg for staking loss to account for variations during storage at the generating station. APNRL also mentioned that they cannot be penalized for loss in the Gross Calorific Value, during transportation of coal, upto the project site, unless it is shown that APNRL itself contributed to any act of commission/omission, leading to such losses. They also submitted that the measurement of GCV of coal, on the basis, other than, at the power project site, after the coal has been received, and being unloaded, is contrary to the Regulations, and is liable to be reviewed and modified. APNRL stated that the treatment of GCV as considered by the Commission would result in the reduction of actual cost of coal incurred by the generator and thus would be contrary to the regulatory principles.

#### Observation of the Commission:

During tariff determination of a generating station, the Commission projects the energy charge for the ensuring years based on the fuel mix of previous year, subject to any proposed deviation for the ensuing years. The price is based on the latest declared price of coal company along with escalation rates for subsequent years.





During Tariff determination the Commission finds it logical to consider the price as per CIL rate and the heat value based on average GCV of respective grade of coal as notified by Coal India Limited to arrive at a reasonable projection. The detailed reasoning has been narrated in the APR order.

Any variation due to coal mix, price of coal and as received GCV of coal in the real time shall be considered while computing the MFCA and during Annual Fuel Cost Adjustment following the provisions of the Tariff Regulations and prudent analysis by the Commission.

Thus, the Commission does not find any merit in the submission of the petitioner regarding review of the APR order as there is error apparent in the face of the order.

# F. Erroneous consideration of price of coal and prayer to allow the fuel cost on actual basis:

APNRL submitted that as there was no long-term Fuel Supply Agreement (FSA), they were relying on coal from CIL-sponsored spot auctions and other open market sources. Therefore, such price of coal is bound to be higher than the notified price of coal by Coal India Limited. The Commission in the impugned order has limited the price of coal to that of the notified price of coal of CIL. APNRL submitted that it will not be appropriate for limiting the price of coal with reference to the notified price of coal since subjecting the price of procured coal being limited to the reference to the linkage coal, will not result in the payment of the landed fuel cost of primary fuel, as provided in regulation 5.8.2 of the WBERC Tariff Regulations. APNRL submitted that by non-consideration of the actual cost and basing the fuel cost solely on the notified price does not accurately reflect the actual expenditure incurred by them.

#### Observation of the Commission:

The broad principles adopted by the Commission in determining energy charge has already been elaborated in the previous issue. The Commission in the impugned





order has clearly mentioned that determining the fuel cost based on uncertain price and quality for entire coal quantum should not be a prudent practice. Particularly, when tariff order is implemented on prospective basis and APRNL has already secured coal under SHAKTI scheme.

Any variation on account of coal mix or price of coal on real time basis from the amount considered in the Tariff order shall be recovered through the monthly fuel surcharge formula specified in the Tariff Regulation. Final reconciliation of the amount is to be carried out during the annual Fuel and Power Purchase Cost Adjustment (FPPCA).

The Commission notes that, APNRL has prayed to review the decision taken by the Commission in the impugned order. Thus, this does not come under the scope of review under section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act 2003 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC.

# G. Clarification in regard to the tariff admitted by the Commission is exclusive of any trading margin:

APNRL submitted that that the trading margin payable to the trader is always in addition to over and above the tariff applicable to the generator, when the tariff is determined by the Commission under Section 62 of the Electricity Act, 2003. In the order dated 06.06.2024, the Commission has not included any part of the trading margin, in the tariff determined. In view of the above, APNRL prayed before the Commission to clarify that the tariff determined by the Commission for the Review Petitioner does not include any part of the trading margin and the same is required to be paid by WBEDCL to PTC, over and above, the tariff determined for the Review Petitioner.

#### Observation of the Commission:

The Commission has determined generation tariff of APNRL under Section 62 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the tariff so determined is exclusive of any trading margin. Trading margin, if any, is to be recovered in terms of the power purchase agreement approved by the Commission.





## H. Consideration of saleable energy similar to that of Hydro Generating Station:

APNRL submitted that a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Government of Jharkhand was signed in October 2005 to develop a coal-based thermal power plant. The MoU and its extension grant State of Jharkhand, the right to purchase up to 25% of the power generated, with 12% at variable cost only. A subsequent Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) signed on September 28, 2012, stipulated that 63.882 MW (13% of Net Capacity) would be supplied at total tariff, and 58.968 MW (12%) at variable cost. Thus, APNRL emphasized that the capacity charge for WBSEDCL should be based on the available capacity of 432.43 MW after accounting for these arrangements for the State of Jharkhand. APNRL submitted that the Commission has incorrectly considered the saleable capacity of 491.4 MW instead of 432.43 MW. APNRL stated that the PPA with WBSEDCL having been signed, after the legally binding commitment being in existence for supply of free power to the home state (Jharkhand), the parties had proceeded on the basis. that the fixed charges based on the revenue requirements, shall be proportionate to the contracted capacity, excluding the free power capacity. It would be unfair and adjust for the saleable capacity to be considered differently. APNRL requested the Commission to consider the instant case similar to the Hydro generating station to derive the saleable capacity.

#### Observation of the Commission:

The Commission determined the tariff of APRNL under section 62 of the Electricity Act 2003, to the extent APRNL supplying power to WBSEDCL. In terms of PPA entered between WBSEDCL and APRNL, APRNL has agreed to sale 100 MW power to WBSEDCL on sent out basis. Accordingly, the Commission in terms of the PPA has allowed fixed charge to be recovered from WBSEDCL to the extent applicable for 100 MW considering the total sent-out capacity of 491.40 MW.

The Commission also noted that, the contention of APRNL that both parties have agreed to proportionate the total fixed cost proportionate to the contracted capacity, excluding the free power capacity. Whereas WBSEDCL in its suggestions/objections/comments to the tariff petition has opposed the same and prayed to





prorate the contracted capacity of 100 MW with the total installed capacity of 540 MW.

In view of the above, the Commission has reasonably relied on the terms of PPA entered between the parties to identify the admissible capacity charge and thus there is no error on the face of the order. Thus, this does not come under the scope of review under section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act 2003 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC.

5.0 Thus, the review sought for on the issue raised in point 'A', 'E', 'F' and 'H' of paragraph '4.0' above is prayer to review ratio of prudence adopted by the Commission and has no substance for review and the Commission keeping in mind that it is estopped from encroaching upon the jurisdiction of the appellate Court does not propose to entertain the above prayers for review. Further, the issue raised in point 'C' and 'D' will be dealt during APR based on prudence and the issue raise in point 'G' has been clarified. The Commission observed that only the issue raised in point 'B' has some merit and accordingly the same has been reviewed and decided as affirmative.

#### Order:

6.0 In view of the above observations, the Commission re-determines the Net Fixed Cost of APNRL for the year 2022 – 23, after carrying out the adjustments on account of O&M expenses as below:

RECOMPUTED FIXED COST					
SI. No.	Particulars	Total in Rs Lakh			
1	Net Fixed Charge (Sl. No. 20 of Table 29 of the Tariff order dated 06.06.2024)	38885.45			
2	Adjustment on account of O&M expenses as given in paragraph 4.0 'B' above	368.40			
3	Adjustment on interest on Working Capital	3.91			
3	Redetermined Net Fixed Charge	39257.76			





- 7.0 In view of the redetermined net fixed charges of Rs. 39253.85 Lakh, capacity charge for 100 MW share of WBSEDCL at normative PAF of 85% for the year 2022-23 comes to Rs 7988.96 lakh (= Rs.39257.76 lakh x 100 MW / 491.40 MW).
- 8.0 A copy of the order shall be posted in the website of the Commission.
- 9.0 APNRL shall download the copy of the order from the website of the Commission and act on it. Certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties on completion of formalities laid down in the West Bengal Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2013, as amended and on submission of necessary fees.

Sd/-(MALLELA VENKATESWARA RAO) CHAIRPERSON

Dated: 28.10.2024

Sd/-SECRETARY





#### Annexure-A

# Annual Revenue requirement for 2022-23

SI No	Particulars	ARR admitted in Tariff Order	Revised ARR admitted	
		In R	In Rs, lakh	
1	Fuel Cost	75933.73	75933.73	
2	Operation and Maintenance Cost	5037	5405.40	
3	Employee Cost	4752.36	4752.36	
4	Water Charges	2263	2263.00	
5	Coal & Ash handling Expenses	2549	2549.00	
6	Rent, Tax Levies etc.	230	230.00	
7	Insurance	308	308.00	
8	Filing Charges	10	10.00	
9	Depreciation	11484	11484.00	
10	Interest on loan	8962.32	8962.32	
11	Advanced against depreciation	0	0	
12	Return on equity	2757.61	2757.61	
13	Interest on working capital	1056.06	1059.97	
14	CSR	0	0	
15	Bad debt	0	0	
16	Reserve for unforeseen exigencies	0	0	
17	Financing Charges	0	0	
18	Gross ARR (Sum 1 to 17)	115343.08	115715.39	
19	Less: Interest Credit	90.9	90.90	
20	Less: Other Income	433	433.00	
21	Net ARR (21 = 18 - 19 - 20)	114819.18	115191.49	





### Annexure -B

## INTERST ON WORKING CAPITAL

SI No	Particulars	IWC allowed in tariff order	Revised computation of IWC
Table 1		In Rs. lakh	
1	Fuel Cost & Annual Fixed Charge	114819.18	115191.49
2	Less: Depreciation	11484	11484
3	Less: Deferred revenue expenditure	0	
4	Less: ROE	2757.61	2757.61
5	Less: Bad and doubtful debt	0	
6	Less: Reserve for unforeseen exigencies	0	
7	Allowable gross sales for working capital	100577.57	100949.88
8	Allowable working capital 10% of (8)	10057.76	10094.99
9	Short term prime lending rate SBI (As on 1st April 2022)	10.50%	10.50%
10	Interest on Working Capital	1056.06	1059.97
11	Additional interest on working capital admitted		3.91