GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tariff Order

Truing up for FY 2016-17

and Determination of Tariff for FY 2018-19

For

Torrent Power Limited - Distribution Ahmedabad

Case No. 1696 of 2018

31st March, 2018

6th Floor, GIFT ONE, Road 5C, GIFT CITY
Gandhinagar-382335 (Gujarat), INDIA
Phone: +91-79-23602000 Fax: +91-79-23602054/55
E-mail: gerc@gercin.org : Website www.gercin.org

सत्यमेव जयते

GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION (GERC)

GANDHINAGAR

Truing up for FY 2016-17

and Determination of Tariff for FY 2018-19

For

Torrent Power Limited - Distribution Ahmedabad

Case No. 1696 of 2018

31st March, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

A&G	Administration and General Expenses
ARR	Aggregate Revenue Requirement
CAPEX	Capital Expenditure
CERC	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
3rd Control Period	FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21
DGVCL	Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited
DISCOM	Distribution Company
EA	Electricity Act, 2003
EHV	Extra High Voltage
FPPPA	Fuel and Power Purchase Price Adjustment
FY	Financial Year
GEB	Gujarat Electricity Board
GERC	Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission
GETCO	Gujarat Energy Transmission Corporation Limited
GFA	Gross Fixed Assets
GoG	Government of Gujarat
GSECL	Gujarat State Electricity Corporation Limited
GUVNL	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited
HT	High Tension
JGY	Jyoti Gram Yojna
kV	Kilo Volt
kVA	Kilo Volt Ampere
kVAh	Kilo Volt Ampere Hour
kWh	Kilo Watt Hour
LT	Low Tension Power
MGVCL	Madhya Gujarat Vij Company Limited
MUs	Million Units (Million kWh)
MW	Mega Watt
MYT	Multi-Year Tariff
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
p.a.	Per Annum
PF	Power Factor
PGCIL	Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
PGVCL	Paschim Gujarat Vij Company Limited
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
R&M	Repairs and Maintenance
RLDC	Regional Load Despatch Centre
SBI	State Bank of India
SLDC	State Load Despatch Centre
UGVCL	Uttar Gujarat Vij Company Limited
WRLDC	Western Regional Load Despatch Centre

Before the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission at Gandhinagar

Case No. 1696 of 2018

Date of Order: 31/03/2018

CORAM

Shri Anand Kumar, Chairman

Shri K. M. Shringarpure, Member

Shri P.J. Thakkar, Member

ORDER

1 Background and Brief History

1.1 Background

Torrent Power Limited (hereinafter referred to as TPL or the Petitioner) has filed the present petition on 30th December, 2017 under Section 62 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read in conjunction with the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Multi-Year Tariff) Regulation, 2016 for True up for FY 2016-17 and for determination of tariff for its distribution business at Ahmedabad for FY 2018-19.

Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission notified the GERC (Multi-Year Tariff) Regulations, 2016 on 29th March, 2016 which shall be applicable for determination of tariff in all cases covered under the Regulations from 1st April, 2016 onwards. Regulations 17.2 (b) of the GERC (Multi-Year Tariff) Regulations, 2016 provides for submission of detailed application comprising of truing up for FY 2016-17 to be carried out under Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Multi-Year Tariff) Regulations, 2016, revenue from the sale of power at existing tariffs and charges for the ensuing year (FY 2018-19) and revenue gap or revenue surplus for the third year of the Control Period calculated based on Aggregate Revenue Requirement approved in the MYT Order and truing up for the previous year and determination of tariff for FY 2018-19.

After technical validation of the petition, it was registered on 3rd January, 2018 and as provided under Regulation 29.1 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, the Commission has proceeded with this tariff order.

1.2 Torrent Power Limited (TPL)

Torrent Power Limited (TPL), a company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956, is carrying on the business of Generation and Distribution of electricity in the cities of Ahmadabad, Gandhinagar, Surat and Dahej. The present petition has been filed by TPL-Distribution (Ahmedabad) for its distribution business in Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar.

TPL had assumed the business, consequent upon the amalgamation of Torrent Power Ahmadabad Limited (TPAL), Torrent Power Surat Limited (TPSL) and Torrent Power Generation Limited (TPGL) with Torrent Power Limited. Besides, TPL is also engaged in other businesses, which do not come under the regulatory purview of the Commission.

1.3 Commission's Orders for tariff of FY 2016-17

The Commission in its order dated 2nd December, 2015, in the Suo Motu Petition No. 1534 of 2015 decided that the approved ARR of FY 2015-16 of the licensees / generating companies concerned be considered as provisional ARR of the licensees / generating companies for FY 2016-17.

The Commission also decided that the licensees / generating companies shall file the ARR for FY 2016-17 based on the MYT Regulations for FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21 and the true-up for the same shall also be governed as per the new MYT Regulations. It is also decided that the licensees / generating companies shall file the petition for determination of ARR and tariff for FY 2016-17 and true-up for FY 2014-

15 within 3 weeks from the date of issuance of this order for Commission's consideration and decision.

Accordingly, the Petitioner filed its petition for Truing-up of FY 2014-15 and determination of tariff for FY 2016-17 on 23rd December, 2015. The petition was registered on 28th December, 2015. The Commission decided to approve the provisional ARR vide order dated 31st March, 2016, and the tariff for FY 2016-17 was determined accordingly.

1.4 Commission's order for Approval of final ARR for FY 2016-17 and Approval of Multi-Year ARR for FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21

The Petitioner filed its petition for Truing up for 2015-16, Approval of Final ARR for 2016-17, Approval of Multi-Year ARR for FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21 and Determination of tariff for 2017-18 on 30th November, 2016. The petition was registered on 3rd December, 2016 (under Case No. 1627 of 2016). The Commission vide order dated 9th June, 2017 approved the Truing up for 2015-16, Final ARR for 2016-17, Multi-Year ARR for FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21 and determined the tariff for FY 2017-18.

1.5 Background of the present petition

The Commission has notified the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 for the control period of FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21. Regulation 16.2 (iii) of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 provides for the truing up of previous year's expenses and revenue based on audited accounts vis-à-vis the approved forecast and categorization of variation in performance as those caused by factors within the control of the applicant (controllable factors) and those caused by factors beyond the control of the applicant (uncontrollable factors).

Regulation 16.2 (vi) of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 provides for annual determination of tariff for the Generating Company, Transmission Licensee, SLDC, Distribution Wire Business and Retail Supply Business, for each financial year, within the Control Period, based on the approved forecast and results of the truing up exercise.

1.6 Registration of the Current Petition and the Public Hearing Process

The Petitioner submitted the current Petition for Truing up of FY 2016-17 and determination of tariff for FY 2018-19 on 30th December, 2017. After technical validation of the petition, it was registered on 3rd January, 2018 (Case No 1696 of 2018) and as provided under Regulation 29.1 of GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, the Commission has proceeded with this tariff order.

In accordance with Section 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003, TPL was directed to publish its application in newspaper to ensure public participation.

The Public Notice, inviting objections /suggestions from the stakeholders on the Truing up and tariff determination petition filed by it, was published in the following newspapers:

Sl. No.	Name of Newspaper	Language	Date of Publication
1	The Times of India	English	10/01/2018
2	Sandesh	Gujarati	10/01/2018
3	Gujarat Samachar	Gujarati	10/01/2018
4	Divya Bhaskar	Gujarati	10/01/2018

The Petitioner also placed the public notice and the petition on its website (www.torrentpower.com), for inviting objections and suggestions. The interested parties / stakeholders were asked to file their objections / suggestions on the petition on or before 9th February, 2018.

The Commission also placed the petition and additional details received from the Petitioner on its website (www.gercin.org) for information and study for all the stakeholders.

The Commission received objections / suggestions from consumers / consumer organizations as shown in Table below. The Commission examined the objections / suggestions received from the stakeholders and fixed the date for public hearing for the petition on 15th February, 2018 at the Commission's Office at Gandhinagar and subsequently a communication was sent to the objectors to take part in the public hearing process for presenting their views in person before the Commission.

The Commission received request from some of the stakeholders to postpone the date of public hearing and considering the request, the Commission fixed second date of public hearing for the petition on 26th February, 2018. Both the public hearings were conducted in the Commission's Office at Gandhinagar as scheduled on the above dates.

The status of stakeholders who submitted their written suggestion / objections, those who remained present in public hearing, those who could not attend the public hearings and those who made oral submissions is given in the Table below:

Sr. No.	Name of Stakeholders	Written Submission	Oral Submission	Present on 15.02.2018	Present on 26.02.2018
1.	Shri V.K. Shah	Yes	No	No	No
2.	Akhil Gujarat Grahak Sewa Kendra	Yes	No	No	No
3.	Surat Citizen's Council Trust	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
4.	Laghu Udyog Bharati - Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
5.	Madhav Infra Projects Ltd.	Yes	No	No	No
6.	Shri K.K. Bajaj	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
7.	Shri Amarsinh Chavda	Yes	No	No	No
8.	Shree Gujarat Vijli Contractor Mandal	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
9.	Gujarat Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
10.	Utility Users' Welfare Association (UUWA)	No	Yes	Yes	No
11.	Shri R.G. Tillan	No	Yes	Yes	No
12.	Shri Vishnubhai B. Desai	Yes	No	No	No

A short note on the main issues raised by the objectors in the submissions in respect to the petition, along with the response of GETCO and the Commission's views on the response, are given in Chapter 3.

1.7 Contents of this Order

The order is divided into **Nine** Chapters as detailed under: -

1. The **first chapter** provides a brief background regarding the Petitioner, the petition on hand and details of the public hearing process and approach adopted in this Order.
2. The **second chapter** outlines the summary of TPL's Petition.
3. The **third chapter** deals with the objections raised by various stakeholders, TPL's response and Commission's views thereon.
4. The **fourth chapter** focuses on the details of truing up for FY 2016-17.

5. The **fifth chapter** deals with the determination of tariff for FY 2018-19
6. The **sixth chapter** deals with compliance of directives and issue of fresh directives.
7. The **seventh chapter** deals with FPPPA charges
8. The **eighth chapter** outlines the wheeling charges and cross subsidy surcharge
9. The **ninth chapter** deals with tariff philosophy and tariff proposals

1.8 Approach of this Order

The GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, provide for “Truing up” of the previous year and determination of tariff for the ensuing year. The Commission has approved ARR for five years of the control period of FY 2016-17 to FY 2021-22 in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017.

The Commission in its order dated 2nd December, 2015, in the Suo Motu Petition No. 1534/2015 decided that the approved ARR of FY 2015-16 of the licensees / generating companies concerned be considered as provisional ARR of the licensees / generating companies for FY 2016-17.

The Commission on 9th June, 2017 passed order for truing up of FY 2015-16, determination of final ARR for FY 2016-17, determination of ARR for the third Control Period i.e. FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21 and determination of tariff for the FY 2017-18.

TPL has approached the Commission with the present Petition for “Truing up” of the FY 2016-17 and determination of Tariff for the FY 2018-19.

The Commission has undertaken “Truing up” for FY 2016-17, based on the submissions of the Petitioner. The Commission has undertaken the computation of gains and losses for FY 2016-17, based on the audited annual accounts and final ARR for FY 2016-17 approved vide Order dated 9th June, 2017.

While truing up for FY 2016-17 the Commission has been primarily guided by the following principles:

- Controllable parameters have been considered at the level approved as per the MYT Order, unless the Commission considers that there are valid reasons for revision of the same.

- Uncontrollable parameters have been revised, based on the actual performance observed.
- The Truing up for the FY 2016-17 has been considered, based on the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016.

The Commission has also considered the difference between provisional and final approved ARR for FY 2016-17, since the tariff for FY 2016-17 was determined by the Commission and recovered by TPL based on provisional ARR.

Determination of Tariff for FY 2018-19 have been considered as per the GERC (Multi-Year Tariff) Regulations, 2016.

2 A Summary of TPL's Petition

2.1 Actuals for FY 2016-17 submitted by TPL-D (A)

Torrent Power Limited (TPL) submitted the current Petition, seeking approval of True-up for ARR of FY 2016-17and determination of tariff for FY 2018-19.

2.2 Actuals for FY 2016-17 Submitted by TPL

The details of expenses under various heads of ARR are given in the Table below:

Table 2.1: Actual Claimed by TPL for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17 (MYT Order)	FY 2016-17 (Claimed)
Power Purchase	3,537.58	3,499.96
O&M Expenses	274.56	297.74
Depreciation	135.30	143.47
Interest and Finance Charges	83.87	102.45
Interest on Security Deposits	43.37	41.16
Interest on Working Capital	-	-
Return on Equity	184.86	190.13
Bad Debts Written off	4.92	3.04
Contingency Reserve	0.60	0.60
Income Tax	97.80	72.75
Less: Non-Tariff Income	91.51	83.75
Annual Revenue Requirement	**4,271.34**	**4,267.54**

2.3 Sharing of gains and losses for FY 2016-17

The sharing of gains and losses as projected by TPL is depicted below.

Table 2.2: Summary of sharing of gains and losses

(Rs Crore)

Particular	FY 2016-17 (MYT Order)	FY 2016-17 (Claimed)	Over / (Under) recovery	Controllable Gain / (Loss)	Uncontrollable Gain / (Loss)
Power Purchase	3537.58	3,499.96	37.62	33.69	3.93
O&M Expenses	274.56	297.74	(23.18)	(23.18)	-
Depreciation	135.3	143.47	(8.17)	-	(8.17)
Interest and Finance Charges	83.87	102.45	(18.57)	-	(18.57)
Interest on Security Deposits	43.37	41.16	2.21		2.21

Particular	FY 2016-17 (MYT Order)	FY 2016-17 (Claimed)	Over / (Under) recovery	Controllable Gain / (Loss)	Uncontrollable Gain / (Loss)
Interest on Working Capital	-	-	-		-
Return on Equity	184.86	190.13	(5.27)	-	(5.27)
Bad Debts Written off	4.92	3.04	1.88	1.88	-
Contingency Reserve	0.6	0.6	-	-	-
Income Tax	97.8	72.75	25.05	-	25.05
Less: Non-Tariff Income	91.51	83.75	7.76	-	7.76
ARR	**4271.34**	**4,267.54**	**3.79**	**12.39**	**(8.59)**

2.4 Summary of ARR, Revenue at Existing Tariff and Proposed Revenue Gap

Table below summarises the revised ARR for FY 2016-17 after true up.

Table 2.3: True-up ARR claimed by TPL for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particular		Claimed
ARR as per MYT	(a)	4,271.34
Gains/(Losses) due to Uncontrollable Factors	(b)	(8.59)
Gains/(Losses) due to Controllable Factors	(c)	12.39
Pass through as tariff	d= -(1/3rd of c+ b)	(4.46)
Trued -up ARR	e=a+d	4,275.80

Table below summarises the Gap/Surplus for Ahmedabad supply area for FY 2016-17.

Table 2.4: Revenue Gap/ (Surplus) for Ahmedabad Supply Area for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particular	FY 2016-17 (Claimed)
Trued up ARR	4,275.80
Revenue	4,440.44
Less: Revenue towards recovery of earlier years Approved Gap/(Surplus)	651.32
Balance Revenue	3,789.12
Gap/(Surplus)	**486.68**

2.5 ARR, Revenue at existing Tariff, Revenue Gap and Tariff proposal for FY 2018-19

Table 2.5: Revenue Gap of Ahmedabad Supply Area for FY 2018-19

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Rs Crore
ARR for FY 2018-19	4,780.66
Revenue from sale of power including FPPPA revenue @ Rs.1.23 per unit	5,074.81
Revenue from OA charges	117.23
Surplus Revenue	**(411.37)**

TPL has claimed the cumulative revenue gap/(surplus) for FY 2018-19 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 2.6: Cumulative Revenue (Gap)/Surplus for determination of Tariff of Ahmedabad Supply Area for FY 2018-19

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Amount
Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2016-17	486.68
Carrying Cost for FY 2016-17	136.78
DSM	1.90
Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2018-19	(411.37)
Carrying cost for FY 2013-14 and FY 2015-16 Gap	176.83
Cumulative Gap/ (Surplus) to be recovered through tariff	390.83

2.6 TPL's request to the Commission

a) Admit the petition for truing up of FY 2016-17 and determination of tariff for FY 2018-19.
b) Approve the trued up Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2016-17.
c) Approve the sharing of gains/ losses as proposed for FY 2016-17.
d) Approve the cumulative Gap/ (Surplus).
e) Approve the wheeling ARR and corresponding charges for wheeling of electricity with effect from 1st April, 2018.
f) Approve the recovery through retail tariff and/or Regulatory Charge.
g) Allow recovery of the costs as per the Judgments of the Hon'ble Tribunal in the Appeals filed by the Petitioner.

h) Allow additions/ alterations/ changes/ modifications to the petition at a future date.
i) Permit to file all necessary pleading and documents in the proceeding and documents from time to time for effective consideration of the proceeding.
j) Allow any other relief, order or direction which the Commission deems fit to be issued.
k) Condone any inadvertent omissions/ errors/ rounding off difference/ shortcomings.

3 Brief outline of Objections raised, Response from TPL-D (A) and the Commission's View

3.1 Stakeholder's suggestions / objections, Petitioner's response and the Commission's view

In response to the public notice inviting objections / suggestions from the stakeholders on the Petition filed by TPL-D (A) for Truing up of ARR for FY 2016-17 and determination of Tariff for FY 2018-19 under the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, a number of Consumers / organizations filed their objections / suggestions in writing. Some of these objectors participated in the public hearing also. The objections / suggestions by the consumers / consumers' organizations, the response from the Petitioner and the views of the Commission are given below:

1. **Subsidy for Residential Consumers**

   The Objector has requested the Commission to advise the Government to reintroduce the scheme of subsidy of 20% for consumption below 100 units for residential consumers as same was prevailing in the past.

   Response of TPL

   The scheme of subsidy is within the purview of the Government of Gujarat under Section 65 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

   Commission's View

   It is the prerogative of the State Government to grant subsidy in electricity tariff to any category of the consumers.

2. **Taxes and Duty applicable to Power Sector**

   The Objector has suggested that the Commission should represent before the State & Central Government to rationalize the Duty and Taxes applicable to the Power Sector and to bring the Electricity under the Goods and Service Tax regime. The Objector has further requested the Commission to request the Government to exempt the Power Sector from the Excise, Custom and GST as the same would further reduce the retail tariff of the end consumers.

Response of TPL

The Duty and Taxes applicable to Power Sector are within the preview of the Government.

Commission's View

Stakeholders are required to represent before the State Government regarding exemption from Tax and Electricity Duty and to the Central Government for bringing the electricity under the purview of GST.

3. **Recovery of past gaps and carrying cost**

The Objector has referred to the past under recoveries and associated carrying cost and has suggested not to accumulate such under recoveries as same attracts the carrying cost as per the Judgments of the Hon'ble Tribunal. The Objector has also requested the Commission to verify the carrying cost sought by the Petitioner and see that it is computed correctly by applying correct interest rate only on the approved gaps.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it has requested the Commission to approve the accumulated gap including the carrying cost to ensure speedy recovery as any further delay would result in incurring carrying cost which would burden the consumers. The proposed gap has been arrived at in accordance with the provisions of the Regulatory Framework based on the judgments and orders of the Hon'ble Tribunal and the Commission. Regarding the calculation of carrying cost, the Petitioner has submitted that it has calculated the carrying cost as per the methodology approved by the Commission by applying correct interest rate only on the past approved gap.

Commission's View

While determining retail tariff for the consumers, Commission considers projected gap as well as consumers' interest and tries to avoid tariff shocks. Regulation 21.6 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations 2016 provides for allowing the carrying cost at the weighted average State Bank Base Rate/ 1 year MCLR/ any replacement thereof.

4. **Consumer Awareness for Safety**

The Objector has requested the Commission to organise Consumer Awareness Programmes to safeguard the consumers from electrical accidents.

Response of TPL

-

Commission's View

As such Distribution Licensees are organising such type of awareness programmes and Commission monitors the activity of the licensees with regard to electrical safety through interaction with the members of State Advisory Committee.

5. **Additional slab in tariff of residential consumer**

The objector has submitted that it has been demanding additional slab of above 400 units for residential consumers of Gujarat due to prevailing high standard of living in major cities of Gujarat. Due to basic necessities of electricity a middle class consumer has an average consumption of 200/300 units per month. But high society consumers staying in posh bungalows with five air conditioners and other gadgets also pay the same tariff, which is highly unjustified. Mumbai and Delhi have slabs above 1000 units/month for residential consumers as Tariff Policy also mandates that tariff should be based on the paying capacity of the consumers.

The Objector has suggested following changes in tariff slabs of residential category:

Slab No.	Present Slabs – Ahmedabad		Present Slabs – Surat		Proposed Slabs	
	Units / Month	Rs./ Unit	Units / Month	Rs./ Unit	Units / Month	Rs./ Unit
1	0-50	3.20	0-50	3.20	0-50	3.20
2	51-200	3.90	51-100	3.65	51-200	3.90
3	201 - Above	4.90	101-200	4.25	201-400	4.70*
4	-	-	201-250	4.35	401 - Above	5.30*
5	-	-	251 - Above	5.05	-	-

* Imaginary figures

The Objector has stated that it has given an example for third and fourth slabs but the Commission can decide these rates with no financial loss to distribution companies. The loss incurred due to drop in tariff for Slab-3 should be recovered by new slab with increased tariff. The tariff for first and second slabs should remain same and consumers with monthly consumption above 400 units should be compelled to pay higher tariff.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it has proposed the tariff structure based on certain widely recognized best practices in accordance with the legal framework. Some of the key factors considered by the Petitioner for tariff design are consumers' capacity to pay, adhering to the band of cross subsidy prescribed by Tariff Policy, incentivizing energy conservation through telescopic tariff and promotion of efficient use of electricity. However, the Commission may take appropriate view this regard since the Petitioner, as distribution licensee is revenue neutral.

Commission's View

Rationalisation of Tariff Structure calls for reduction in number of categories and slabs. At present three energy slabs are prescribed for the residential consumers of Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar area. Commission would like to continue existing slabs till Commission takes decision for other licensees in the State in this regard. Commission will decide on the slabs proposed by the Objector at appropriate time after conducting detailed study of the impact of such slabs on the consumers as well as utilities.

6. Merger of Meter Rent in Fixed/Demand Charges

The Objector has submitted that it has been demanding merger of Meter Rent into Fixed/Demand Charges since last couple of years as Meter rent continues in spite of recovery of entire meter cost. The meter rent has been abolished in many States to avoid confusion to consumers. Therefore, the Commission is requested to abolish meter rent and merge this amount in Fixed/Demand Charges with effect from 01.04.2018. Same will also help in avoiding any controversy or applicability of additional taxes. The Commission is requested to abolish meter rent and add this cost in Fixed /Demand charges per month without any financial loss to utilities and without any additional burden on consumers of Gujarat.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it recovers the meter rent in line with the provisions of the GERC (Licensee's Power to Recover Expenditure incurred in providing supply and other Miscellaneous Charges} Regulations, 2005. The Commission may take a view to merge the meter rent with fixed/demand charges to address the issue of applicability of multiple taxes on different component of electricity bill like energy charge, fixed charge, meter rent etc.

Commission's View

In view of the representation from the stakeholders and submission of the licensee, Commission decided to abolish meter rent for the electricity consumers with effect from 1st April 2018.

7. Consumer Advocacy Cell

The Objector has recommended that consumer advocacy cell should be formed in GERC, as detailed in model regulations framed by the Forum of Regulators, for giving guidance and legal aid to consumers.

The electricity supply companies with array of senior lawyers, that too at stakeholders' expense, are getting the favourable decisions in the absence of effective participations by consumers in the GERC hearing procedures. Most of consumer organizations are voluntary in nature, represented by their members and not having financial resources like electricity companies. While Supply companies are engaging senior lawyers at hefty fees, the normal stakeholder's voice is suffocated at hearing.

Response of TPL

-

Commission's View

As such at present, Staff of the Commission processing consumer complaints and providing guidance to individual consumer /Consumer Associations.

However, considering representation from the various stakeholders, Commission will explore the option of constituting 'Consumer Advocacy Cell'.

8. Admission of incomplete Tariff Petition by GERC

The Objector has submitted that Regulation25.1 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 specifies that the proceedings to be held by the Commission for determination of tariff shall be in accordance with the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 as amended from time to time. The Commission has not conducted the proceedings for admitting the tariff petitions as per the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 and without verifying the petition whether it is complete or not, without directing TPL to comply with the discrepancy, without passing any admission order violated its own regulations which is bad in law.

Before the petitions are registered as stipulated in Regulation 28.2 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, because the petition falls within the definition of petition under Regulation 2.1 (h) of the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004, under Regulation 34 of the said Regulations, the Secretary has to ensure beforehand whether the petition is conforming the provisions and requirements of the Acts and Regulations made by the Commission under them. And in the event of any petition not conforming to the provisions and requirements of the Act, then, he is required to refuse to get it registered.

Because of failure of statutory duty on the part the Secretary in non-compliance of requirements as stipulated in Regulations 34 of the Conduct of Business Regulations in as much as he has ignored the fact that the petitioner's prayers are in violation of provisions of Section 64(3) read with Section 64(1) of the Act read with Regulations 16.2(vi), 19.8(a), 31, 94.1 and 102.2 of the MYT Regulations, 2016 read with Clause 5.3(h).4, 8.2.2 and 8.4 of the Tariff Policy. Year to year, Ahmedabad / Gandhinagar consumers who were entitled to huge relief in tariffs, have already suffered loss in the financial year 2016-17 and 2017-18 and are likely to suffer loss in FY 2018-19.

It is submitted that TPL has submitted incomplete petitions and till all the details and information on which Commission rely upon to pass a tariff order is made available to the consumers and its organization, it is not just and fair to invite objections and suggestions in the subject matter.

Response of TPL

The Objections have been filed completely disregarding the nature of the proceedings which is essentially a Regulatory proceeding. The hearing of suggestions and objections is not akin to an adjudicatory process. There is no lis between a Distribution Licensee and its consumers when the suggestions and objections of the Consumers are heard for tariff determination under Section 64 (3). These are not contentious proceedings.

The Petitioner has further stated that the objections filed by SCCT ignore the fact that the Commission comprises of the Chairman and the Members. The Secretary of the Commission does not constitute the Commission. The Secretary therefore does not deal with the merits of the Petitions. The role of the Secretary has been misconstrued by the Objector. The Secretary is bound to rely on the provisions of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, in undertaking the filing of the Tariff Petition. Regulation 28 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 brings out the regulatory nature of the filing. These specialized Regulations will prevail over the general Regulations namely the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004.

The GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 ensure that the Commission which undertakes various other functions like adjudication, regulatory functions other than Tariff, advisory functions and which is a quasi-judicial Authority functions under its own procedural framework. These general Regulations are applicable for the proceedings in Tariff which mean they apply to the hearings, meetings, discussions, deliberations, inquiries, investigations and consultations. Regulation 28 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 being a special provision will prevail over any filing and registration procedure contemplated under the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004.

The Petitioner has submitted that the present proceedings are a part of Tariff Proceedings. The GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 have been framed under Section 181 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Section 12 of the

Gujarat Industry (Reorganisation and Regulation) Act, 2003. The State enactment (GIR&R Act, 2003) deals with the proceedings before the Commission.

The other Regulations namely, GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 are framed under inter alia Section 181, 61, 62 and provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 and Section 32 of the GIR&R Act, 2003. Section 32 of the state enactment specifically deals with tariff.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the Regulations contemplated in Section 64 (1) of the Act are the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016. The MYT Regulations are special Regulations and it is pertinent to note that Sub-section (zh) of Section 181 devolves power on the Commissions to frame Regulations in respect of issuance of tariff orders. The Special Regulations would therefore prevail over general Regulations.

The Petitioner has submitted that Regulation 34 of the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 confers authority on the Secretary to deal with issues which are in the nature of Objections in filing (i.e.) the mode, manner and method of filing pleadings and not with the adjudication of pleadings. A perusal of Regulations 34 to 38 reveals that the said provisions relate to presentation of the Petitions. As an illustration it is pointed out that if a Petition is not accompanied by the Affidavit in Support, the Petition may be kept in objection. If the objections are not removed as directed by the Secretary, then under Regulation 34; the Petition stands dismissed. These objections invariably relate to the presentation and lodging of the Petition. The scrutiny contemplated, when the Petitions are presented, is in the nature of defects in the Petition which are required to be corrected by the Petitioner. There are two different stages even under the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004. It is only upon the objections being attended to that subsequent steps follow.

The Petitioner has denied the allegations relating to the purported surplus as claimed by the Objector. But more importantly the Objector has made these submissions in support of the alleged inaction by the Secretary in exercising jurisdiction under Regulation 34 of the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations,

2004. It is submitted that the essence of the allegations made by the Objector do not fall within the scope and ambit of the Objections which relate to the filing of the pleadings and presentation of the Petition. The action of the Secretary at the time of lodging of the Petition cannot encompass issues relating to Tariff, if any, on merits.

Admission of a proceeding is a stage in the procedural aspect concerning litigation. Stricto Sensu the admission of a proceeding is between the Petitioner and the adjudicating Authority.

It is in this light, that power has been conferred on the Commission to admit a Petition for hearing, without requiring the attendance of the party. This is specifically pointed out as the Objector is relying on the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004, to the exclusion of the special Regulations namely the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016.

The Objector has raised various procedural objections relating to the Petition filed under the Electricity Act, 2003 without appreciating the role of a Electricity Regulatory Commission in Tariff determination under the Act. The statute contemplates formulation of policies under Section 3. It is pertinent to note that the National Tariff Policy enjoins the Electricity Regulatory Commissions to even undertake a Suo-Motu Tariff Determination exercise upon a Utility failing to approach them. This basic essence of the proceedings under the subject Tariff Determination Provisions have been lost sight of by the Objector.
The Objections therefore on the issue of admission of the tariff petition besides being hyper technical, are not inconsonance with the spirit of Section 64 (3).

Commission's View

As provided in the GERC (MYT) Regulations 2016, Secretary of the Commission is authorised for registration of tariff application and intimating the Petitioner for publication of notice in this regard. Further, as provided in Tariff Policy, Commission has to initiate tariff determination exercise in the absence of filing by the licensee or incomplete filing.

9. **Special Audit by ICAI**

The Objector has requested the Commission to pass necessary orders for special audit by the Institute of Chartered Accounts of India (ICAI) to determine the actual income especially non-tariff income as per the MYT Regulations.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that this objection cannot be part of present proceedings. The Petitioner prepares and maintains the accounts in accordance with the Accounting Standards issued by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India. Further, the Accounting Statement is prepared in line with the Companies Act and duly verified by the Statutory Auditor of the Company. All the requisite information for the present proceedings is already provided in accordance with the GERC MYT Regulations.

Commission's View

Commission carries out detailed analysis and prudence check during tariff determination exercise.

10. **Issuance of Circulars**

The Objector has requested the Commission to direct the licensees not to issue any circular (which involves financial burden or financial benefit to any consumer) without getting the approval of Commission. Approval granted by the Commission or the power to issue the circular quoting the provisions of Act, Rules and Regulations should be disclosed in the circular. If any circular is issued which does not involve financial implications, DISCOM should give certificate on that circular confirming that no financial part is involved in this circular thus no permission is required from the Commission for this particular circular.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it issues circulars/notices in accordance with the statutory and legal requirements of the Companies Act, GERC Regulations and/or under the applicable legal framework. Further, it mentions the references of provisions of Act, Law and Regulations in its Notices as per the requirements of Authorities. Circulars are also issued in respect of internal working / departmental instructions, within the organization and which may or may not have any nexus with Tariff. The Objector should not seek micromanagement of the TPL by the Commission.

Commission's View

Normally, activities of licensees having financial impact on its consumers are governed through various Regulations notified by the Consumers. Stakeholders may bring specific instances in this regard to the notice of the Commission.

11. Disclosure of Total Income

The Objector has requested the Commission to direct the licensee to disclose the total income including the Tariff and Non-Tariff income, which they collect from the consumers as per Supply code, Schedule of Charges, General Condition of tariff, Schedule of Tariff, Electricity Supply, and all other income collected under Section 126, slow meter charges, Late payment surcharge with interest, fees and fines, and all other charges collected from consumers, advertisement income, and all other income with details of income received from every head.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it prepares and maintains the accounts in accordance with the Accounting Standards issued by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India. Further, the Accounting Statement is prepared in line with the Companies Act and duly verified by the Statutory Auditor of the Company. The Petitioner has stated that it has disclosed the details of income from sale of power and Non-Tariff income in its Audited Accounts, at Note 28 & 29.

Commission's View

During prudence check of the submission from licensee, whenever required Commission asks licensee to provide additional details and clarification. This time Commission has placed all the additional information received from licensee in tariff determination exercise on Commissions' website and made it available to all the stakeholders.

12. Disclosure of FPPA Charges

The Objector has requested the Commission to direct the licensee to disclose income earned from Fuel Surcharge charged from consumers separately for each category which is over and above the tariff income earned by them calculating as per Tariff rates. It is observed that income collected from consumers under head FPPA charges has not been shown in revenue income and one cannot find out whether supply company charged FPPA charges correctly or in excess.

The variation in power purchase cost (gain/loss) is immediately recovered by DISCOM, but in ARR it is shown as controllable/uncontrollable. The Gap is carried forward to be recovered from the following year consumers who have not consumed the electricity for that period. The increase in power purchase cost, when it is collected by DISCOMs for that year consumers, it should not be a part of controllable and uncontrollable variations in ARR gap calculations. There is no reconciliation of FPPA charges recovered and increase in power purchase cost account is done.

The Objector has requested the Commission to remove the benchmark FPPA charges of Rs. 1.23 / unit and same is to be merged with Tariff charges. This will bring transparency in the system.

Response of TPL

The income from sale of power as shown in Annual Accounts includes the income from FPPPA charges. Further, a detailed breakup of income from sale of power is provided at Form 10 of the Petition including income from FPPPA charges.

Commission's View

Recovery from consumers under FPPPA charges is covered in the revenue from sale of energy by licensee and same is considered while working out gap/surplus. Further due to ceiling of 10 paise per unit increase in regular FPPPA charges and difference in quarterly electricity consumption, normally there is mismatch in FPPPA charges and its recovery.

13. Electricity Duty account ledger in TPL books

The Objector has submitted that, on behalf of the Government of Gujarat, the Petitioner is collecting Electricity Duty from consumers and deposit the same with

Government. Though it is revenue neutral, account of Electricity Duty collected and deposited should be part of AFR. The Commission should direct TPL to provide Electricity Duty account ledger in TPL books.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it prepares and maintains the accounts as per the Accounting Standards specified by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act. The Petitioner collects the Electricity duty from the consumers on behalf of the Govt. of Gujarat in accordance with the Bombay Electricity Duty Act, 1958 and deposits the same with the GOG. The suggestion is outside the purview of the present proceedings.

Commission's View

Electricity Duty is the subject matter of the State Government and the Collector of Electricity Duty is the authority to examine the books of accounts of the Petitioner for their purpose.

14. Temporary Connection

The Objector has submitted that the tariff of Temporary Connection is too high as compared to a tariff of permanent supply consumers. The income from Temporary Connection is not shown in Tariff income. Non disclosing of these figures will affect the consumer tariff.

Every new connection is given permanent connection after completing the construction of Factory shed and office building by getting Temporary Connection only. This practice by licensee is hampering the growth of new industries in Gujarat State as it raises the cost of construction too high. The Commission is requested to classify separate Tariff Schedule for new construction activities, allowing consumers to carry out construction activity. Otherwise construction activity for all consumers should be allowed at the prevailing rate of tariff for that category after completion. This will save consumers from paying huge amounts as fine recovered by electricity supply companies or being saved from undue extortion by supply company officials, under disguise of unauthorized use of electricity under Section 126 of Electricity Act.

Response of TPL

Detailed category wise breakup of income from sale of power is provided at Form 10 of the petition. The same includes the income from sale of power from consumers of temporary category.

In case of TPL, the construction activity is allowed at NRGP tariff applicable for permanent category. Thus, the issue raised is not relevant for consideration of the Petition.

Commission's View

Request for electricity supply for more than 2 years qualifies for permanent/ regular electricity connection and it is not treated as 'Temporary' in accordance with the present Regulations.

15. Introduction of LTMD Tariff above 1 KW in all categories

The Objector has submitted that majority of small industrial enterprise and small commercial business falls under NRGP category of consumers having connected load up to 15 KW. These consumers are periodically harassed by Torrent inspectors by booking the case under Section 126 of Electricity Act for any additional load found in the industry/business place. The consumer is honest and has not done any theft of electricity yet he is required to pay hefty sum as per the provisions of the Act or being victim of undue extortion by supply company officials. The Objector has stated that this is major source of corruption prevailing in the system.

The Objector has requested the Commission:

- Either to create new demand based RGP/GLP/NRGP tariff for consumers having connected load from 1 KW to 15 KW (LTMD 1)
  OR
- Demand based Tariff should be applicable to all small consumers having load from 1 KW and above in all categories including Residential /Commercial/ Industrial and GLP category.

The Objector has requested the Commission to consider the request for option of LTMD tariff for all categories above 6 KW load. This will save small consumers from harassment due to misuse of Section 126 of Electricity Act.

i. Residential Demand based Tariff LTRDT:

For residential three phase consumers having connected load 6 KW and above having demand charges 50% of LTMD, Unit charges and reactive energy charges same as LTMD tariff.

ii. LT GLP demand based LTGLPDT:

Tariff with demand charges 50% of LTMD, Unit charges and reactive energy charges same as LTMD tariff.

iii. LTMD tariff for Construction work:

There should be a separate LTMD Tariff for construction activity from 6 KW and above or construction should be allowed in all category tariffs for the ongoing project (Means RGP/GLP/NRGP/HTP, etc.).

iv. Option to NRGP Consumers to switch over to LTMD Category without any restrictions from 6 KW load and above

Response of TPL

The accusations regarding corruption are denied. The demand based categorization for 15 KW and above load, is being done for valid and verified reasons. The tariff based on contracted demand are used as indicative price signals to reflect the costs for creating the capacity and is helpful to the consumers in regulating its usage despite higher connected load. Small consumers may find it difficult to adopt tariff based on contract demand in Non-RGP category.

With reference to the suggestions of the Objector to reduce the Demand Charges to 50%, the Petitioner has submitted that the Objector has not given any justification / rationale for proposed changes in tariff structure and rates except the alleged harassment to the consumers. The Petitioner has requested the Commission to ensure that the tariff structure is not distorted and results into the new level of cross subsidization. Further, provision like Section 126 of the Act, is a distinct provision in the Act enacted by the Parliament and cannot be used to contend support for tariff categorization.

Commission's View

Based on representation from the stakeholders, Commission decides to provide option of Demand based tariff to small consumers as provided to the electricity consumers of State Owned Distribution Licensees.

16. Revenue Billed and Revenue Collected

The Objector has requested the Commission to direct Discoms to submit figures of revenue billed and revenue collected during FY 2016-17.

Response of TPL

All the required information in accordance with the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 is provided in the petition. The Petitioner considers the amount billed as its revenue on accrual basis and the same is offered in ARR. Any under-recovery on account of lower collection efficiency, will reflect in receivables. The bad debts written off is specified as controllable parameter, as per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016. Thus, any inefficiency results into the loss to the Petitioner.

Commission's View

Commission considers revenue billed as revenue in tariff determination exercise. Further actual bad debts written off is considered after prudence check during truing up exercise.

17. Discrepancy in Power Purchase Cost as per Petition & Annual Accounts

The Objector has compared the power purchase cost claimed in the petition with the power purchase cost shown in the Audited Accounts and power purchase cost as per FPPPA and questioned the difference in figures.

Response of TPL

The power purchase cost claimed in the Petition includes cost of Rs. 54.48 Crs towards the purchase of RECs as well as the difference of Rs. 38.23 Crores on account of trued-up ARR of TPL-G (APP) claimed in the Petition No. 1695/2018. Thus, the cost considered in FPPPA does not include these two figures. Similarly, the difference in cost of power purchase shown in the Audited Accounts and claimed in the petition is Rs. 38.23 Crs on account of trued up ARR of TPL-G (APP).

Commission's View

Detailed analysis of approved power purchase expenses is covered in chapter 4 of this Order.

18. Certificate of Income Tax paid not provided

The Objector has submitted that there is claim of Rs. 43.56 Crs for Income Tax. As per MYT Regulation 41 the Commission allows the actual Income Tax paid for the period, duly certified by Audited accounts. The Objector has submitted that the Income tax claimed by the Petitioner is not supported by certificate of Income Tax paid.

Response of TPL

The supporting documents of income tax paid and the claim of the Petitioner has to be considered and allowed in accordance with the provisions of the MYT Regulations.

Commission's View

Detailed analysis of approved expenses under Income Tax is covered in chapter 4 of this Order.

19. Retained earnings is transferred to H.O.

The Objector has suggested to deduct the amount of retained earnings transferred to HO from the ARR.

Response of TPL

The ARR is arrived at in accordance with the provisions of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 and the Financial Statements are prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013.

Commission's View

According to the present Regulations, the licensee is free to use its retained earnings/ return on equity.

20. Petitioner is in Revenue Surplus

The Objector has raised the issue of purported revenue surplus to which the consumers are entitled as and by way of refund. The Objector has requested the Commission to not allow additional regulatory charges as requested by the Petitioner.

Response of TPL

The Objector while filing the objections in the present proceedings cannot seek to reopen the past tariff orders which have attained finality, including those orders which have been subsequently subjected to clarification/ rectification petitions, Appeals and subsequent proceedings held under the Electricity Act, 2003.

Secondly, the Objector has also tried to compare various figures to arrive at fictitious surplus for Ahmedabad and Surat Supply Areas by considering irrelevant and non-descript information and has tried to mislead the Commission. The sources from which the figure has been derived by the Objector are not only erroneous but completely disregard the estimations contemplated in the tariff determination process.

Thirdly, the Objector has further submitted that the gaps approved by the Commission have already been factored into tariff vide previous tariff orders. The Petitioner has filed the present Petition under Section 62 and 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with GERC (Multi Year Tariff) Regulations,2016 for Truing up of FY 2016-17 and Determination of tariff for FY 2018-19 for its Distribution businesses of Ahmedabad and Surat Supply Areas.

Any outstanding gap that has already been considered by the Commission has not been considered again while filing the present tariff petition. Hence, the submission made by the Objector is erroneous and the same is denied. The Commission in the tariff order dated 08.06.2017 approved tariff for FY 2016-17 to recover cumulative gap which included amongst others the then previous years' approved gap as well. Hence, at the time of truing up, the revenue recovered in the FY 2016-17 is required to be compared with the components against which it was approved for. Further, those components of gap have also been revised due to various applicable orders by the Hon'ble Tribunal as well as the Commission.

The overall result is thus working out to be a Revenue Gap recoverable by the Petitioner. The same has been proposed to be recovered by way of regulatory charge.

Commission's View

Surplus or Gap in recovery of Aggregate Revenue Requirement is required to be determined on the basis of projections for the ensuing year and the result of truing up exercise for the previous year. The detailed analysis in this regard is covered in the related chapters of this Order.

21. Delayed filing of Tariff Petition

The Objector has submitted that it had requested the Commission to grant extension to enable him to study the tariff petitions filed by TPL. However, the Commission has not granted the request in spite of the facts that TPL as per Regulation-28.8 of MYT Regulation, 2016, ought to have filed the petitions on or before 30th November. The word used in the Regulation is "SHALL" which leaves no space for relaxation on part of the Commission. However, Commission seems to have granted the relaxation and extension to TPL on what ground is neither mentioned by TPL in its petitions nor mentioned in the public notice for inviting suggestions and objections on delayed petitions.

The Objector has submitted that TPL is not vigilant and alert for its recovery and is lethargic in submission of tariff petitions on or before 30th November. Further, the Commission is anxious and eager to pass the tariff order on 31st March, 2018 by depriving the Consumers of their right of participation in the tariff determination process, which is against the principle of Natural Justice.

The Objector has submitted that the Petitioner should be penalized for delay in filing the petition.

Further it is submitted that if the reasons for delay in submission of petition is election and formation of State Government as to which political party comes into power, it has nothing to do with such political events to the tariff proceedings because GERC is an independent, Statutory body bound to act independently, impartially, in the interest of justice, within four corners of the provision of the Act, and without any influence of any Government.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it had sought the extension of time considering prevalent scenario in the State at that point of time and in turn, the Commission had granted time period till 31.12.2017 to file the Petition and the petition was filed on 30.12.2017. The Commission is entitled under the Statutory Regulations to abridge or extend time.

Commission's View

The Tariff Policy notified by the Ministry of Power provides that Commission should initiate tariff determination on a suo motu basis in case the licensee does not initiate filing in time. It is also provided that it is desirable that requisite tariff changes come into effect from the date of the commencement of each financial year.

Accordingly, in accordance with the MYT Regulations 2016, the Commission accepted delayed filing by the licensee and 30 days' time period was provided to the stakeholders to file their suggestions /objections from the date of publication of advertisement in daily newspapers. Subsequently, on request from some of the stakeholders, further time period (beyond 30 days) was also provided to them for filing suggestions and objections.

22. Redetermination of ARR of FY 2016-17 and truing up of FY 2016-17 as per provisionally approved ARR and GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2011

The Objector has submitted that there is no provision in either E.A. 2003 or MYT or other Regulations to determine the ARR for the same financial year (FY 2016-17) because the sharing of gain/loss of controllable and uncontrollable factors of tariff is the comparison of approved value with the actual received in the truing up. The question is which ARR is to be considered valid which is approved in the tariff petitions No. 1551/1552/1553 of 2015 which is based on the MYT Regulations, 2011 or approved in the tariff petitions No. 1626/1627/1628 of 2016 which is based on the MYT Regulations, 2016. Both the tariff orders for approval of ARR of FY 2016-17 are valid and legal.

ARR is approved in Petitions No. 1551, 1552 and 1553 of 2015 vide order dated 31.03.2016 is based on the MYT Regulations, 2011 and TPL has recovered the charges on the strength of the said order, how the truing up of the same ARR can be carried out under MYT Regulations, 2016 and with the ARR approved in the Petitions No.1626, 1627 and 1628 of 2016 Order dated 09.06.2017. The ARR for FY 2016-17 under the MYT Order is after completion of FY 2016-17 and no tariff increase or decrease was decided in the said order dated 09.06.2017. The Objector submitted that the truing up of FY 2016-17 should be compared with ARR determined vide Orders dated 31.03.2016 and not at all with ARR approved in Orders dated 09.06.2017.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has stated that the Petition for truing-up of FY 2014-15 and determination of tariff for FY 2016-17 was duly filed with the Commission as was directed in the order in Suo Motu Petition No. 1534/2015. Further, as stated in the said order the Petitioner had also filed ARR for the third control period of FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21 as per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016. In turn, the Commission issued the order approving final ARR for FY 2016-17. The MYT Regulations, 2016 provide for truing up of FY 2016-17 as per the MYT Regulations, 2016. Thus, there is no irregularity or infirmity in the proceedings and the issue raised by the Objector does not survive. The Petitioner submitted that the Objector had also participated in both the tariff proceedings. The Objector is now seeking to obliquely assail the order passed in Suo Motu proceedings viz. Petition No. 1534 of 2015 and the subsequent orders and the MYT Regulations notified by the Commission.

Commission's View

Tariff Policy provides that it is desirable that requisite tariff changes come into effect from the date of the commencement of each financial year. Accordingly, the Commission adopted ARR approved for FY 2015-16 as provisional ARR for determination of tariff for the FY 2016-17. In order to carry out truing up exercise for FY 2016-17, it is required to approve final ARR for FY 2016-17 with targeted/benchmarked controllable parameters. Accordingly, approval of ARR for FY 2016-17 was considered by the Commission in MYT Order. The deviation between the provisional ARR and final ARR is to be considered as uncontrollable.

23. Maintaining separate accounting statements as per MYT Regulations

The Objector has submitted that the Regulation 17.3 of the MYT Regulations specifies that TPL has to maintain separate entity wise, business wise and segment wise books of accounts. It should be audited and such audited accounting statement as mandated in the MYT Regulations should be submitted as part of tariff petitions. However, TPL has not complied with this mandatory requirement of the MYT regulations and has breached the mandatory requirement. Violating the Regulations is bad in law and petitions are required not to be admitted till the compliance is made by TPL in this regard.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it prepares and maintains the accounts as per the Accounting Standards specified by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act. The Petitioner has furnished the separate Financial Statements, duly certified by the Statutory Auditors' of the Company for the FY 2016-17 in accordance with the statutory provisions.

Commission's View

Commission accepted the separate Accounting Statements duly certified by the statutory auditors of the petitioner. Further, the Commission also engage third party experts for analysis of submission and carry out detailed prudence check during truing up of ARR exercise. Over and above, Commission also appointed Chartered Accounting firm empanelled by CAG for exhaustive third party audit of accounts submitted/ prepared by the petitioner.

24. Non submission of various information and supporting documents

The Objector has submitted that the Petitioner has not submitted various information and supporting documents.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that it has furnished all the information as specified in the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016.The current proceedings are to be conducted as per the scope and ambit of Part VII of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Commission's View

After receiving the application for the determination of tariff from the licensee, the Commission carries out detailed analysis of the submission and if required, calls for additional information and clarification/supporting documents from the petitioner. As suggested earlier by some of the stakeholders, the Commission has placed the additional information received from the petitioner on GERC website and accordingly, same is made available to all the stakeholders.

25. Allocation of SUGEN power purchase cost as per allocation percentage defined in the PPA

The objector has submitted that the sale of energy, number of consumers, nature of consumption, category of consumers in Ahmedabad and Surat supply area is quite different. Also separate tariff of electricity is being determined for Ahmedabad and Surat supply area. The power procurement sources approved and quantum of share of SUGEN power for Ahmedabad is 25% and 50% is of Surat area of 1147.5 MW installed capacity which is 286 MW for Ahmedabad and 573 MW for Surat. SUGEN power is costly power. The allocation of power purchase cost of Ahmedabad and Surat is not justified because it should be scheduled only as per the approved PPA for Ahmedabad and Surat. The Ahmedabad consumers should not bear the brunt of excess power purchase cost of Sugen when its share is only 25%. TPL has not submitted a certificate from SLDC for verification of power scheduled for Ahmedabad and for Surat from Sugen. The Commission is requested to call for the details to prevent Ahmedabad consumers from subsidizing Surat consumers for SUGEN power procurement cost.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that the apprehension of the Objector is misplaced. The Commission approves the total power purchase cost for Ahmedabad/ Gandhinagar and Surat Supply Areas collectively. The aforesaid power purchase cost is then allocated between both the areas based on their actual energy requirement for the year. Thus, the question of one area subsidising another does not arise. The collective power purchase helps to reduce the overall cost including reduction of risk due to diversification of sources. It does not result in any extra recovery to TPL-D.

Commission's View

For the MYT control period 2011-16, in order to get benefit of diversity and to optimise total cost of power purchase, Commission has considered combined power procurement for Ahmedabad and Surat licensee area and the same practice is continued for the current MYT period 2016-21.

26. Non-approval of Final PPA for SUGEN

The Objector has submitted that the Power Purchase Agreement has been approved conditionally by the Commission vide Order dated 23.12.20015 in Petitions No.813 and 814of 2004. These PPAs were given provisional approval subject to submission of Fuel Supply Agreement and subject to adoption of tariff by the Commission to be determined by Central Electricity Regulatory Commission under Section79 (1) (b) read with Section 62 (1)(a) of E.A.2003 SUGEN being Inter-State generating power plant. As stated at page No.28 and 29 concluding para of the Order dated 23.12.2005, the Commission has not accorded the final approval of the PPAs in question.

Hence, the Recovery of fixed cost under legal force of approval of these PPAs vide Order dated 23.12.2005 is totally null and void. The approval for power procurement from SUGEN power plant itself is contrary to the Commission's own order and the power procurement cost of SUGEN is required not to be permitted for truing up. The fixed cost recovered for SUGEN is required to be refunded with bank interest.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that that the Commission has approved the PPAs vide order dated 23.12.2005 in Petition No. 813 & 814 of 2004. While granting approval, the Commission had observed that the tariff of SUGEN, being an Inter-State Generating Station, was to be determined by the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC). Upon approval by the CERC, same was to be adopted by the Commission. Meanwhile, the Commission issued the Regulatory Framework for the first MYT Control Period (FY 2008-09 to FY 2010-11). In turn, TPL furnished all the details of SUGEN tariff as part of its MYT Petition and sought comments/ suggestions from all the Stakeholders. Based on the same, the Commission granted approval in its MYT Tariff order and allowed the recovery of cost of power purchase of SUGEN from the consumers upon commissioning of SUGEN. Thus, the contention of purchase of power from SUGEN without approval is baseless and incorrect.

Commission's View

Commission consistently considered the arrangement of supply of power from SUGEN to TPL distribution business since commissioning of SUGEN plant. In past, the Commission had on representation from some of the stakeholders, advised TPL to explore the possibilities of increasing the allocated capacity from SUGEN to its distribution business to take benefits of lower cost of generation.

27. Sharing of Gains/ (Losses) arising out of variations in price of fuel and power purchase

The Objector has submitted that the Regulation 10.2 of the MYT Regulations, 2007 and Regulation 24.3 of the MYT Regulations, 2011 does not permit TPL to share any gain or loss arising out of variations in the price of fuel and power purchase, which shall be dealt with as specified by the Commission from time to time. Therefore, all the tariff orders in which truing up is carried out to arrive at either revenue gap/surplus and are passed under the above MYT Regulations, 2007 and 2011 from FY 2008-09to FY 2016-17, and in which the sharing of gain/loss is considered is totally invalid, unjust and against the GERC's own MYT Regulations, 2007 and 2011. The truing up of FY 2016-17 as proposed in the current petitions is required to be carried out under the MYT Regulations, 2011.

It is a fact that the variation in price of fuel and power purchase is immediately recovered by TPL under the FPPPA determined by the Commission in view of the direction of Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity in Order OP1 of2011 dated 11.11.2011 that variation in the price of fuel and power purchase should be recovered immediately from the embedded contemporary consumers of the licensee so that future consumers who are added can be protected from paying past dues on account of the variation of price for fuel and power purchase. Here in this case, it is carried forward and those consumers who have not consumed that energy are forced to pay the unwarranted past charges. The motive of introduction, adoption and implementation of the Multi Year Tariff system is the sole base of this solution.

It has come to know after careful perusal of the tariff orders of various Government Utilities as well as private, in the truing up, the revenue gap/surplus on account of variation in price of fuel and power purchase is also allowed as pass through resulting into very heavy revenue gap which is not fair and valid in view of the facts that the same difference is allowed to be recovered under the FPPPA formula approved by the Commission. Even Regulation 10.2 and Regulation 24.3 of the MYT Regulations, 2007 and 2011 respectively do not permit the Commission to allow the recovery of variation in price of fuel and power purchase. This tantamounts to double recovery of FPPPA amount which is illegal and not valid.

The objector has requested the Commission that before determining the ARR for FY 2018-19 and before approval of truing up of accounts of FY 2016-17, the revenue gap arrived in the truing of accounts of earlier years in which the variation in price of fuel and power purchase is carried forward is required to be reviewed by Suo Motu proceedings to arrive at the correct revenue gap/surplus as specified in the MYT Regulations, 2007 and 2011.

Response of TPL

The Petitioner has submitted that the ARR and revenue gap has been arrived at as per the provisions of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016. The sharing of Gains/(Losses) due to variation in Power purchase cost, O&M expenses etc. are calculated in accordance with the provisions of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016. Regarding issue of suo motu, the Petitioner submitted that the Tariff orders pertaining to past control periods have attained finality. hence, the issue is no longer resintegra.

The Petitioner submitted that the present tariff proceedings have been adopted in accordance with the Statutory Regulations. All the filings, details and information have been already undertaken in accordance with the Regulations.

Commission's View

Regulation 23.3 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations provide that- Nothing contained in Regulations related to mechanism for pass through of gains or losses on account of uncontrollable factors shall apply in respect of any gain or loss arising out of variations in the price of fuel and power purchase, which shall be dealt with **as specified by the Commission from time to time**.

The Commission has consistently considered the gain or loss arising out of variation in the fuel and price of power purchase and its recovery during truing up exercise only and treated the same as uncontrollable.

28. APPC Tariff for procurement of surplus power of renewable sources

The Objector has referred to the Average Power Purchase Cost (APPC) as defined in the GERC (Net Metering Rooftop Solar PV Grid Interactive System) Regulations, 2016 and submitted that for the purposes mentioned in the Gujarat Solar Policy, the Petitioner and all other State Distribution Licensees (i.e. DGVCL, MGVCL, PGVCL and UGVCL) consider the said APPC rate at its own whims and fancies, over which small consumers do not have any power to object or refer any document for the purpose of claiming actual APPC rate. For the said purposes, the Petitioner considers the rate considered by State Distribution Licensees as its APPC rate (around Rs. 3.22/kWh) as against the actual APPC of Rs. 4.52/kWh computed as per the definition in the GERC (Net Metering Rooftop Solar PV Grid Interactive System) Regulations, 2016.

The Objector has submitted that, using its dominant position, TPL develops its own interpretation for deciding APPC rate and does not respond to the queries in this regard by small solar power players. This leads to the loss of revenue to the small solar rooftop owners who do not individually have the capability to file a Petition for considering and deciding the APPC rate.

The Objector has also requested the Commission to determine the APPC rate as well as to order the Petitioner to reimburse the consumers retrospectively.

Response of TPL

The issue of determination of APPC rate for the distribution licensees of the State is already sub-judice vide Petition No. 1557 of 2016. The interpretation sought to be espoused by the Objector is denied as selective computations cannot be resorted to, The Petitioner would rely on the said proceedings and the pleadings there-in. The present proceeding is under Section 86 (1)(a) and other applicable provisions and not under Section 86 (1) (f). It is denied that TPL has acted in a dominant position or has not responded to queries as alleged.

Commission's View

As the determination and applicability of APPC tariff rates for procurement of surplus power from renewable sources is covered under various Orders related to determination of tariff rates for renewable sources of energy, the stakeholder are requested to approach Commission separately in this regard.

29. Issuing bills monthly instead of bi-monthly

Electricity Bills should be issued on monthly basis instead of bi-monthly. Due to bi-monthly billing, total units consumed increases which increases the bill amount and increases the financial burden on the Consumes.

Response of TPL

-

Commission's View

Although the slabs for energy rates are prescribed in the Tariff Order for monthly consumption, in case of bi-monthly billing, appropriate adjustment is made and bill for such type of consumers is calculated by extending slab benefits appropriately. Stakeholders are requested to bring specific instances of loss to consumer due to bi-monthly billing. In view of the cost related to meter reading, billing and cash collection, Commission is of the view that the bi-monthly billing system for small consumers is cost-effective.

4 Truing up for FY 2016-17

4.1 Introduction

This Chapter deals with the truing up of FY 2016-17.

The Commission has studied and analysed each component of the ARR for FY 2016-17 in the following paragraphs.

4.2 Energy Sales to the Consumers

Petitioner's submission:

TPL has submitted category-wise actual energy sales for Ahmedabad area for FY 2016-17 along with the sales approved by the Commission in the MYT Order dated 09th June 2017, as given in the Table below.

Table 4.1: Energy sales for FY 2016-17 for Ahmedabad area

(MU)

Category	MYT Order	Actual
RGP	2608.00	2517.12
NRGP	926.44	914.72
LTMD	1702.90	1647.71
HT	1584.38	1529.39
HT Pumping	129.70	127.21
Others	89.48	80.58
DoE units	0.00	12.11
Total	**7040.90**	**6828.84**

The actual sales is 6828.84 MUs for Ahmedabad area for FY 2016-17 as against 7040.90 MUs approved in the MYT Order.

While the actual sales in FY 2016-17 showed an overall growth of 2.45% over FY 2015-16, the sales were lower than that approved in MYT Order. The major reasons for deviation are enumerated hereunder:

a) The actuals sales for RGP category showed a normal growth of 3.42% over FY 2015-16. However, the sales were lower than the MYT approved sales due to relatively lesser ambient temperature and awareness in residential consumers.

b) The actual sales for Non RGP and LTMD categories showed a normal growth of 2.05% and 0.89% over FY 2015-16 respectively. However, the sales in these categories were lower than the MYT approved sales due to demonetization and slowdown in industrial segment.

c) In HT category, the consumption is mainly attributed to industries and commercial establishments and water works and pumping stations run by Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation. During FY 2016-17, the sales in HTMD category were lower than approved mainly due to demonetization and slowdown in industrial segment. Further, HT consumers also availed 421.53 MUs through open access.

d) The actual sales for the Others category were lower than approved mainly due to lower consumption in street light and agriculture.

Commission's Analysis

The Commission, in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017, had considered estimated sales of 7040.90 MUs for Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar license area for FY 2016-17. The actual sales in Ahmedabad & Gandhinagar area was 6828.84 MUs, lower by 212.06 MUs than the sales approved by the Commission in the MYT Order. The sales as submitted by TPL is verified, compared and confirmed with the sale of energy furnished in the monthly return under Form A specified in Rule 6 (1) (A) filed by TPL with the Chief Electrical Inspector and Collector of Electricity Duty. The report shows information regarding energy supplied, consumed, consumption charges and electricity duty recovered and paid to Government month wise during FY 2016-17. The sales have also been verified and confirmed from the financial statement submitted by TPL along with the Petition.

The Commission approves the energy sales as mentioned in Table 4.1 for Ahmedabad area totalling to 6828.84 MUs for truing up for FY 2016-17.

4.3 Distribution Loss

Petitioner's submission

TPL has submitted that the distribution loss for Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar distribution license area was 7.50% as per MYT Order dated 9th June 2017 whereas the actual distribution loss is 6.81% as given in the Table below. TPL submitted that it has been making consistent efforts to contain the distribution losses. Consequently, it has outperformed the distribution losses approved by the Commission and submitted that deviation from the approved value is to be considered controllable as shown in the Table below:

Table 4.2: Petitioner's submission of Distribution loss for 2016-17

Particulars	Approved MYT	Actual
Distribution Loss	7.50%	6.81%

Commission's Analysis

The distribution loss reduction took place in the distribution license area due to upgrading/uprating of the distribution network, augmentation of the old assets, replacement of meters, bifurcation of load where overloading happened etc. A substantial capital expenditure of Rs. 743.44 Crores as well as capitalisation of assets of Rs. 641.98 Crores has been made by TPL during FY 2016-17 which resulted in reduction of transformation losses as well as line losses and ultimately overall distribution losses. The Commission accepts TPL's submission and approves the actual distribution loss of 6.81% for the FY 2016-17. The Commission also accepts the TPL's submission to treat the deviation in the distribution loss as controllable factor and share the gain accordingly.

4.3.1 Energy Requirement

Petitioner's submission

The Petitioner has submitted the actual energy requirement for Ahmedabad & Gandhinagar Supply area based on the (i) actual energy sales, (ii) transmission loss and (iii) distribution loss for FY 2016-17 as given in the Table below:

Table 4.3: Energy Requirement for FY 2016-17 for Ahmedabad area

Particulars	MYT Order	Actual
Energy Sales (MUs)	7040.90	6828.84
Distribution Loss (%)	7.50%	6.81%
Distribution Loss (MUs)	570.85	499.28
Energy input at distribution level	7611.37	7328.12
Transmission Loss(MUs)	53.66	86.18
Energy Requirement(MUs)	**7665.03**	**7414.30**

The Petitioner submitted that the total energy requirement was met through various sources as discussed in the subsequent section.

Commission's Analysis

The actual energy requirement submitted by the Petitioner for FY 2016-17 along with energy requirement as per MYT Order dated 9th June 2017 has been examined and verified by the Commission.

The actual energy sales is lower than that approved in the MYT Order dated 09th June 2017.The distribution losses approved in the MYT order dated 9th June 20217 was 7.50% and the actual distribution losses as reported by TPL is 6.81%, which has resulted into lower requirement of energy as compared to estimated due to better efficiency in the loss reduction by TPL. The actual energy requirement, being the sum of energy sales and transmission and distribution losses, works out to 7414.30 MUs for FY 2016-17.

The Commission accordingly approves the energy requirement at 7414.30 MUs for truing up of FY 2016-17 as given in the above Table 4.3.

4.3.2 Energy Availability

TPL-D has submitted that it sourced the power collectively for Ahmedabad and Surat license areas from its own plant at Sabarmati TPL-G (APP), TPL (SUGEN) Plant, Renewable Energy and other sources such as bilateral and power exchange.

TPL has also submitted that during FY 2016-17, lower forced outages at TPL-G (APP) have resulted in higher availability of Sabarmati plant. In reference to SUGEN, the quantum of procurement of power is almost in line with the approval. However, with respect to Renewables, there is a variation due to supply constraints.

TPL has also procured power from bilateral sources in line with the Commission's approval. Balance requirement has been fulfilled through procurement of top up power from power exchange.

The details of energy availability (net) from different sources from whom TPL-D procured the energy during FY 2016-17 is stated in the Table below:

Table 4.4: Energy Availability (Net) for FY 2016-17 for Ahmedabad & Surat

(MUs)

Sl. No.	Energy Sources	MYT Order	Actual
1	TPL-G (APP)	2470.20	2520.31

Sl. No.	Energy Sources	MYT Order	Actual
2	TPL-G (SUGEN)	4754.49	4749.53
3	Bilateral and others	1180.51	1229.85
4	Power Exchange	1671.25	1642.97
5	Renewable Energy	1119.60	558.43
6	UI		89.87
	Total	**11196.05**	**10790.97**

Commission's Analysis

It is seen from the above Table that TPL has procured power from TPL-G (APP), SUGEN power plant, through Bilateral, Power Exchange and Renewable. TPL-G (APP), SUGEN, Power Exchange and Renewable energy are approved sources of power by the Commission as per the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017.

The Commission noted that TPL has procured the renewable energy from generators under preferential tariff besides procurement of RECs for compliance of RPO. The Commission has also noted that TPL has filed a separate Petition for compliance of RPO which is pending for adjudication before the Commission. Therefore, as far as compliance of RPO is concerned, the Commission will decide it in separate proceedings.

The Commission has considered the aforesaid aspects and accordingly determined the availability of energy during FY 2016-17 as shown in the Table below:

Table 4.5: Approved Energy Availability (Net) for FY 2016-17 for Ahmedabad &Surat

(MU)

Sl. No.	Energy Sources	MYT Order	Approved in Truing Up FY 2016-17
1.	TPL-G (APP)	2470.20	2520.31
2.	TPL-G (SUGEN)	4754.49	4749.53
3.	Bilateral	1180.51	1229.85
4.	Power Exchange	1671.25	1642.97
5.	Renewable	1119.60	558.43
6.	Add: Sale of Surplus power/UI	-	89.87
	Total	**11196.05**	**10790.97**

The Commission approves the source wise power procured as summarized in Table 4.5 above for truing up for FY 2016-17

4.4 Power Purchase

TPL has submitted the actual power purchase cost for FY 2016-17against the power purchase cost approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017 as shown in the Table below:

Table 4.6: Power Purchase cost projected by TPL for Ahmedabad and Surat area for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Energy Sources	MYT Order	Actual
TPL-G (APP)	1113.67	1135.56
TPL-G (SUGEN)	2616.98	2623.16
Bilateral	371.86	394.92
Power Exchange	521.43	493.74
Renewable	543.29	375.28
REC	0.00	54.48
*GETCO LTOA Charges	0.00	16.80
Total	**5167.23**	**5093.94**

* As per Form 2 of the Petition

TPL-Distribution submitted that the quantum of power purchase depends on energy sales and distribution loss and the mix of power purchase depends on availability and cost of different sources at a point of time.

The variation in the power purchase cost from the MYT Order is on account of variation in sales and distribution losses, variation in actual cost with respect to the base rate along with purchase of power from short term sources to meet the shortfall during the year.

TPL has also submitted that the variation in power purchase cost is an uncontrollable component except on account variation in distribution losses. Hence, the same needs to be allowed in ARR as per Regulations.

TPL submitted that the power purchase for its Ahmedabad & Surat license areas has been carried out on collective basis and the total power purchase cost has been apportioned between Ahmadabad & Surat on the basis of usage of power. Accordingly, the allocated power purchase cost for Ahmedabad Supply area is Rs. 3499.96 Crore for FY 2016-17.

Commission's Analysis

The Commission had approved the quantum of power purchase at 11,196.05 MUs for FY 2016-17 in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017 against which TPL has purchased 10,790.97 Mus. The energy requirement is evaluated based on the sale of energy and losses in the transmission and distribution system of Ahmadabad/Gandhinagar and Surat license area. The energy requirements for TPL-Ahmedabad license area works out to 68.71% of total energy requirement and accordingly the total power procurement cost for the TPL-Ahmedabad/Gandhinagar license area has been evaluated based on 68.71% of total power requirement for TPL- Ahmedabad/Gandhinagar area.

The Commission observed from Table 4.6 above that the total power purchase cost was short by Rs. 73.29 Crores against the cost approved in the MYT Order. The main reason for decrease in power purchase cost is due to lower sales, lower energy requirement due to reduction in distribution losses and consequently lower purchase of power against what is approved by the Commission.

The Commission has duly verified the annual accounts of TPL-D, Ahmedabad and Surat and the FPPPA approved in 4 (four) quarters of FY 2016-17.

TPL carries out the power purchase for Ahmadabad/Gandhinagar and Surat license area on collective basis and the total power purchase cost is apportioned between these two license areas based on usage of power. The Commission has approved the generation cost of TPL's Ahmadabad Generation Plant at Rs 1128.79 Crore in the true up of FY 2016-17. The Commission approved the power purchase cost as given in the Table below.

Table 4.7: Power Purchase cost approved for Ahmedabad & Surat area for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Energy Sources	MYT Order	Approved in Truing Up
TPL-G(APP)	1113.67	1128.79
TPL-(SUGEN)	2616.98	2623.16
Bilateral	371.86	394.92
Power Exchange	521.43	493.74
Renewable Energy	543.29	375.28
REC	0.00	54.48
GETCO LTOA Charges	0.00	16.80
Total	**5167.23**	**5087.18**

Considering the approved power purchase cost of Rs 5087.18 Crore for the approved total energy procurement of 10790.97 MUs, the per unit power purchase cost works out to Rs 4.71/kWh. Since the Commission has approved the energy requirement of Ahmedabad license area at 7414.30 MUs, the power purchase cost for Ahmedabad license area is computed at Rs 3495.31 Crore.

The Commission accordingly approves the power purchase cost of Rs 3495.31 Crore for Ahmedabad/Gandhinagar license area in the True Up for FY 2016-17.

4.4.1 Gain due to reduction in energy requirement on account of reduction in distribution loss

Petitioner's Submission

TPL has computed the gain due to reduction in distribution loss for Ahmedabad area at Rs. 33.69 Crore, as given in the Petition, on account of reduction in distribution losses. TPL furnished the details of computation of distribution loss gains for Ahmedabad area in their Petition as given in the Table below:

Table 4.8: Gain due to reduction in energy requirement for FY 2016-17 claimed by TPL

Particulars	Unit	Legend	Actuals
Actual energy purchased at distribution level	MU	a	7328.12
Energy Sales	MU	b	6828.84
Wheeling of energy	MU	c	484
Total energy wheeled	MU	d=b+c	7312.84
Distribution loss (approved in MYT)	%	e	7.50%
Energy required at distribution level at approved loss	MU	f=d/(1-e)	7905.77
Difference	MU	g=(f)-((a)+(c))	93.65
Units recovered as loss	MU	h	22.28
Reduction in energy requirement	MU	i=g-h	71.37
Average PPC	Rs/kWh	j	4.72
Savings	**Rs Cr**	**k=i * j**	**33.69**

Thus, TPL computed the gains due to reduction in distribution loss at Rs. 33.69 Crore.

Commission Analysis

The Commission has approved distribution loss at 7.50% in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017 whereas TPL has claimed the actual distribution loss at 6.81% for FY

2016-17. The Commission has worked out gain on account of reduction in distribution loss as shown in the Table below:

Table 4.9: Approved gain due to reduction in energy requirement for FY 2016-17

Particulars	Unit	Legend	Approved in Truing Up
Actual energy purchased at distribution level	MU	a	7328.12
Energy Sales	MU	b	6828.84
Wheeling of energy	MU	c	484
Total energy wheeled	MU	d=b+c	7312.84
Distribution loss (approved in MYT)	%	e	7.50%
Energy required at distribution level at approved loss	MU	f=d/(1-e)	7905.77
Difference	MU	g=(f)-((a)+ (c))	93.65
Units recovered as loss	MU	h	22.28
Reduction in energy requirement	MU	i=g-h	71.37
Average PPC	Rs/kWh	j	4.71
Savings	**Rs Cr**	**k=i * j**	**33.65**

The Commission, accordingly, approves the gain on account of reduction in distribution loss at Rs. 33.65 Crores during FY 2016-17 for truing up.

4.5 Fixed Charges

4.5.1 Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Expenses

TPL has claimed Rs. 297.74 Crore as O&M expenses as against the total O&M expenses of Rs. 274.56 Crore approved for FY 2016-17 in the MYT Order as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.10: O&M expenses claimed by TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17	
	MYT Order	Actual
Total O&M Expenses	**274.56**	**297.74**

Petitioner's submission

TPL has submitted that the actual O&M expenses of Ahmedabad/Gandhinagar supply area have exceeded the approved value mainly due to increase in R&M expenses.

It is further submitted that the as per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 the variation in O&M expenses is to be considered as controllable except the change in law and wage revision. Therefore, based on the Regulations, the Petitioner has considered the entire variation in O&M expenses in FY 2016-17 as controllable in the present petition for sharing of gains/losses in line with the Regulations.

Commission's Analysis

It is observed that as per Annual Accounts the O&M Expenses are Rs.308.21 Crore; whereas TPL has claimed O&M Expenses of Rs. 297.74 Crore.

(a) Employee Expenses: Employee expenses as per annual accounts are Rs. 113.42 Crore. TPL has added the commission to non-executive directors of Rs. 0.40 Crore (From A&G expenses head) and expenses towards re-measurement of defined benefit plans of Rs. 4.04 Crore. Accordingly, the Petitioner has claimed employee expenses of Rs. 117.86 Crore.

(b) A&G: A&G Expenses as per annual accounts is Rs. 99.82 Crore. The Petitioner has claimed the A&G Expenses after reduction on account of commission to non-executive directors (Rs.0.40 Crore), donations (Rs. 9.22 Crore), Bad debts written off (Rs.3.04 Crore), DSM Expenses (Rs. 1.90 Crore), lease land depreciation (Rs. 0.32 Crore) and insurance claim receipt (Rs. 0.02 Crore) totalling to Rs. 14.90 Crore. Accordingly, TPL has claimed A&G expenses of Rs. 84.92 Crore. It is observed that insurance claim receipt of Rs. 0.02 Crore is part of Non-Tariff income, and hence, the same has been added to non-tariff income by removing it from the aforesaid claim of A&G expenses. Accordingly, the Commission approved the A&G Expenses of Rs. 84.94 Crore.

(c) R&M: The Petitioner has claimed R&M expenses of Rs. 94.97 Crore as per annual accounts.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the O&M expenses of Rs. 297.77 Crore, for truing up for FY 2016-17.

Further as per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 the variation in O&M expenses is to be considered as controllable except the change in law and wage revision.

Accordingly, as per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 Gain/(Losses) on account of O&M expenses in truing up of FY 2016-17 is approved by the Commission as given in the Table below:

Table 4.11: O&M Expenses approved by Commission for FY 2016-17

(Rs Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17 (MYT Order)	FY 2016-17 (Approved)	Over(+) / Under(-) recovery	Gain / (loss)due to Controllable factor
O&M Expenses	274.56	297.77	(23.21)	(23.21)

4.5.2 Capital expenditure, Capitalization and Sources of Funding

TPL has furnished actual capital expenditure of Rs. 743.44 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17 against Rs. 947.89 Crore approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017 as per the details given in the Table below:

Table 4.12: Capital expenditure claimed by TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs Crore)

Particulars	MYT Order	Actual
EHV	411.01	350.32
HT Network	258.84	206.91
LT Network	177.43	138.52
Metering	27.15	22.56
Other Department	52.48	19.41
IT & related expenditure	16.98	4.07
PSC	4.00	0.00
Misc.	0.00	1.65
Total	**947.89**	**743.44**

Petitioner's submission

TPL has submitted that the capital expenditure incurred for Ahmedabad Supply Area in FY 2016-17 is Rs. 743.44 Crore which is lower than the approved value. TPL has given reasons for the major variances in the actual expenditure against the approved expenditure as detailed below:

(a) EHV – The Commission had approved the capital expenditure of Rs. 411.01 Crores for EHV. In this regard, the Petitioner has incurred the expenditure of Rs. 350.32 Crores. Thus there is a shortfall in expenditure of Rs. 60.69 Crores. The major variation is on account of expenditure incurred towards:

- Bulk Supply Points: During FY 2016-17, the major expenditure incurred under this head is towards the work of upgradation of existing 220 kV Nicol-2 substation which was initiated in MYT 2nd control period.

- EHV line: Under this head, the major deviation in expenditure is towards 400 kV LILO of Dehgam Pirana line at Nicol-2, wherein lower expenditure was incurred due to keeping on hold the line erection work owing to finalisation of draft TP and need for modification in tower design. Similarly, lower expenditure was incurred towards upgradation of evacuation capacity at Nicol-2 due to requirement of payment of betterment charges by AMC/AUDA.

  The work of balance upgradation of the network between Jamalpur and Dudheshwar is underway and accordingly cost was incurred during FY 2016-17. Similarly cost was also incurred towards upgradation of 66kV line between Vinzol and Amraiwadi & between Odhav and Amraiwadi.

  Further, expenditure was incurred towards work of upgradation of 66kV EHV line of Vasna with connectivity to Thaltej.

- EHV Projects: Major expenditure under the head of EHV projects has been incurred towards 132 kV GIS substation at Naranpura initiated during MYT 2nd Control Period.

- In addition, expenditure has been incurred towards installation of additional 40 MVA 132/11 kV Transformer to enhance reliability and to cater to the load demand. However, the proposed expenditure for FY 2016-17 to establish 132 kV EHV substation at Lambha could not be incurred due to issue in land procurement.

- 33 kV Substation: During FY 2016-17, majority of the expenditure has been incurred towards 33 kV substations at CG Road-2, Motera, Devraj Industrial Estate, New Ranip, CTM, GHB, and Transstadia. Further, expenditure of Rs. 6.69 Crore has been incurred towards the energisation of 33kV customers. Expenditure was also incurred towards installation of additional 33/11 kV transformers at Rakhial, Isanpur and GIDC to cater to the load growth and for relieving the existing transformers.

- Renovation and Replacement: Expenditure has also been incurred towards phasing out of obsolete assets such as switchgears and capacitor banks during FY 2016-17.

- Safety: During FY 2016-17, expenditure has been incurred towards providing additional cross-arms, emulsification system, net to cover EHV switchyard and for revamping of earthing system.

- Supporting Infrastructure: Under this head, expenditure has been incurred for procurement of relays, panels, testing equipment and battery.
- Automation: Expenditure has also been incurred towards EHV substation automation and islanding scheme

(b) HT – The Commission had approved the capital expenditure of Rs. 258.84 Crores for HT network. In this regard, the Petitioner has incurred the expenditure of Rs. 206.91 Crores. The major variation is because of:

Normal load growth: Expenditure has been incurred mainly towards transformer installation necessitated by higher inflow of bunch applications and replacement of transformers due to overloading. Cost has also been incurred for HT customer application processing and various network modification schemes.

- Reliability, Renovation and Modernisation: Lower capital expenditure has been incurred under this head mainly due to variation in road opening charges and cable length for different types of schemes pertaining to feeder bifurcation and old and obsolete network upgradation.
- Safety: Major capital expenditure has been incurred under the head of safety towards execution of projects for overhead to underground conversion and switchgear replacement.
- Supporting Infrastructure: Expenditure has been incurred towards testing and measuring equipment.

c) LT – The Commission had approved the capital expenditure of Rs. 177.43 Crore for LT network. The actual expenditure incurred is Rs. 138.52 Crore. The major variation is on account of:

- Normal load growth: Expenditure is incurred mainly towards release of new connection/extension/reduction and load balancing. Lower expenditure has been incurred towards overloaded distributors due to scattered schemes and substation interlinking schemes.
- Reliability, Renovation and Modernisation: Higher expenditure has been incurred mainly towards LT network shifting necessitated due to road widening by local authorities for infrastructure development projects such as BRTS, AMC road widening, flyover, Metro etc. Expenditure has also been incurred towards revamping of LT network of Distribution Transformers.

- Safety: Lower capital expenditure has been incurred under the head of safety mainly towards replacement of LC

d) Metering – The Commission had approved capital expenditure pertaining to Metering of Rs. 27.15 Crore. The actual expenditure incurred was lower as compared to the approved due to lower number of applications received, variation in the quantum of three phase & single phase applications, and utilization of recycled meters due to implementation of single meter single premises concept.

e) Other Dept. – The Commission had approved capital expenditure pertaining to Other Dept. of Rs. 52.48 Crore. The actual expenditure incurred was Rs. 19.41 Crore towards:

- Upgradation of existing customer care centres including establishing new customer care centre at City Centre Naroda.
- Procurement of server, workstations, and supporting infrastructure as per requirement of GIS project.
- Procurement of testing equipment.
- Procurement of Laser distance meter, Gas detector, and First aid kit.
- Establishing central stores at Pirana.

f) PSC – The Commission had approved capital expenditure pertaining to PSC of Rs. 4 Crore. In this regard, the Petitioner submits that the implementation of PSC has been deferred to next year.

g) Miscellaneous – The Petitioner has incurred need based capital expenditure of Rs. 1.65 Crore towards office building work at Amraiwadi and miscellaneous works.

h) IT & related expenditure – Majority capex under the head of IT has been deferred due to ongoing evaluation of SAP's new database platform – HANA and CCTV & surveillance projects.

Commission's Analysis

The Commission observed that the Petitioner has claimed CAPEX of Rs. 743.44 Crores in FY 2016-17, against approved CAPEX of Rs. 947.89 Crores in MYT Order. With reference to the Commission's query regarding explanation for the deviation in CAPEX from the approved figures, TPL has submitted the details.

From the said details, the Commission noted that the Petitioner has carried out major expenditure for EHV network amounting to Rs 350.32 Crore, in which the cost for

Bulk Supply Points towards the upgradation of existing 220 kv Nicol-2 substation was carried out. Further, EHV lines is one of the major components with a CAPEX of Rs. 126.14 Crore. The major deviation in EHV line is towards 400 kV LILO of Dehgam Pirana line at Nicol-2, wherein lower expenditure was incurred as compared to the approved amount in MYT due to keeping on hold the line erection work owing to finalisation of draft TP and a need for modification in tower design. Cost was also incurred for the work of balance upgradation of network between Jamalpur and Dudheshwar. Also upgradation of 66 kV line between Vinzol and Amraiwadi, between Odhav and Amraiwadi, upgradation of 66 kV EHV line of Vasna with connectivity to Thaltej was carried out during the FY 2016-17. Major expenditure was also incurred under the head of EHV projects towards 132 kV GIS substation at Naranpura initiated during the MYT 2nd Control Period. In addition to above expenditure was also incurred towards installation of additional 40 MVA 132/11 kV transformers to cater to the load demand. Further in the 33 kV substation category major expenditure was incurred towards 33 kV substations at CG Road-2, Motera, Devraj Industrial Estate, New Ranip, CTM, GHB, and Transstadia. Capital Expenditure relating to HT network has been incurred mainly towards transformer installations due to higher inflow of applications and replacement of transformers due to overloading whereas in the LT network CAPEX is incurred mainly towards release of new connection / extension / reduction and load balancing, LT network shifting necessitated due to infrastructure development projects such as BRTS, AMC road widening, flyover, Metro etc.

The Commission has verified from the annual accounts that the Petitioner has incurred capital expenditure of Rs. 743.44 Crore during FY 2016-17.

The Commission, therefore, approves the capital expenditure of Rs 743.44 Crore for FY 2016-17.

Capitalization

Petitioner's Submission

TPL has claimed a sum of Rs. 641.98 Crore towards capitalization, against the actual capital expenditure of Rs. 743.44 Crore

Commission's Analysis

The addition to assets during FY 2016-17 is Rs 641.98 Crore, as verified from the annual accounts of TPL-Ahmedabad. The Commission observed that the Petitioner has capitalized higher amount as against Rs. 371.19 Crore approved by the

Commission in the MYT Order for FY 2016-17. The Petitioner has given break up of asset wise capitalization which is depicted in the Table below:

Table 4.13: Break up of capitalised assets for FY 2016-17

(Rs Crore)

Asset Classification	Actual Capitalization
EHV	
Bulk Supply Points	5.47
EHV Lines	126.14
EHV SS Projects	43.53
33 kV SS Projects	49.17
Renovation and Replacement	0.08
Safety	3.80
Support Infrastructure	8.14
Automation	6.68
Total EHV	**244.05**
HT	
New Substations	44.85
New HT Consumers	18.80
Transformer Replacement	23.57
11kV Normal Load Growth	37.98
Reliability, Renovation & Modernization	21.91
Safety	75.41
Supporting Infrastructure	0.23
Total HT	**223.74**
LT	
Normal Load Growth	95.73
Reliability, Renovation & Replacement	19.02
Safety	19.60
Supporting Infrastructure	0.34
Total LT	**134.69**
Meters	
Normal Load Growth	8.39
Reliability, Renovation, And Replacement	13.68
Supporting Infrastructure	0.41
Total Meters	**22.48**
Special Projects	
CS	12.05
Stores	0.63
GIS	-

Asset Classification	Actual Capitalization
QA/QC	
Safety	
IT	1.70
Others	2.63
PSC	
RPRC	
Grand Total	**641.98**

The Commission has noted the submissions of TPL in the earlier paragraphs regarding the capital expenditure as well as capitalisation of assets. In the present case, the Commission notes that TPL has upgraded and uprated some of the existing sub-stations and lines as well as switchgears. Moreover, they have also established and augmented various sub-stations at 33 KV level in different parts of the city near the load centre. The aforesaid action led to reduction in the transmission and distribution losses.

Based on the above observations, and verification from the annual accounts, the Commission approves the net capitalization of Rs 641.98 Crore for FY 2016-17.

Funding of CAPEX

TPL has submitted the capitalisation and funding of CAPEX, as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.14: Projected capitalization and sources of funding for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17	
	Legend	**As Claimed**
Opening GFA	a	4014.97
Addition to GFA	b	641.98
Deletion from GFA	c	24.42
Closing GFA	d= a+b-c	4632.54
Less: SLC Additions	e	66.09
Balance Capitalization	f=b-c-e	551.47
Normative Debt @ 70%	g=f*70%	386.03
Normative Equity @ 30%	h=f*30%	165.44

The Commission approves the capitalization and funding as shown in the above Table in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

4.5.3 Depreciation

TPL has claimed a sum of Rs.143.47 Crore towards actual depreciation in the truing up for FY 2016-17 against Rs. 135.30 Crore approved in the MYT Order for FY 2016-17 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.15: Depreciation claimed by TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17	
	MYT Order	Actual
Depreciation	135.30	143.47

Petitioner's submission

TPL has submitted that the depreciation rates, as per CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2004, are applied on the Opening GFA of FY 2009-10 and for addition of assets from 1st April, 2009 onwards, the depreciation has been computed at the rates specified in the GERC Regulations. TPL has claimed depreciation as an uncontrollable item.

Commission's Analysis

The details of opening balance of GFA, as on 1st April, 2016, addition to and deduction from the Gross Block, during FY 2016-17, and the depreciation on the assets, asset classification-wise, are given in the Petition. The Commission has verified the same from the annual accounts for FY 2016-17. It is observed that depreciation as per annual accounts is Rs. 176.51 Crore. The Petitioner has added lease land depreciation of Rs. 0.32 Crore and reduced the depreciation on assets funded through service line contribution of Rs. 33.36 Crore and accordingly claimed the depreciation of Rs. 143.47 Crore.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the depreciation of Rs. 143.47 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

The deviation of Rs. 8.17 Crore is considered as a loss and the same to be considered as uncontrollable item as the depreciation is dependent on Capex and capitalization.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the gains / losses on account of depreciation in the truing up for FY 2016-17 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.16: Depreciation and gain / loss due to depreciation approved in the truing up for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	As per MYT Order FY 2016-17	Approved in truing up for FY 2016-17	Deviation +(-)	Gain / (loss) due to uncontrollable factor
Depreciation	135.30	143.47	(8.17)	(8.17)

4.5.4 Interest and Finance Charges

TPL has claimed a sum of Rs. 102.45 Crore towards actual interest expenses in the truing up for FY 2016-17 as detailed in the Table below against Rs. 83.87 Crore approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017.

Table 4.17: Interest claimed in the truing up for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Amount
Addition to GFA	641.98
Less : Deletions from GFA	24.42
Less: SLC Additions	66.09
Capitalisation for Debts	551.47
Normative Debt @ 70%	386.03
Opening Balance of Loans	709.26
Loan addition during the year	386.03
Repayments	143.47
Closing Balance of Loans	951.82
Average Loan	830.54
Interest Expense @ 11.40%	94.69
Other Borrowing Cost	7.75
Total Interest & Finance Charges	102.45

Petitioner's Submission

The Petitioner submitted that the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 provide for the calculation of interest expenses on normative basis considering the amount of depreciation as the amount of repayment.

The Petitioner has calculated the interest expenses by applying Weighted Average Rate of interest of the actual loan portfolio of the Petitioner during the year on the loan component while repayment has been considered equal to the depreciation of the assets for the year.

Commission's Analysis

The existing loan outstanding as on 31st March, 2016 has been verified with the tariff order dated 9th June, 2017 and found to be correct. The additional loan of Rs. 386.03 Crore is in accordance with the requirements of capitalization and source of funding as approved in Table 4.14 above. GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 provide for computation of interest on loan on normative basis on the opening balance of loan brought forward from the previous year's closing balance, capitalization and funding approved during the year. The opening balance of loan for FY 2016-17 has been brought forward from the closing balance of the actual loan outstanding as on 31.03.2016. As per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, repayment of the loan is considered equal to the depreciation allowed.

As per first proviso of Regulation 38.5 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, at the time of truing up, the weighted average rate of interest calculated on the basis of the actual loan portfolio during the year applicable to the Distribution Company shall be considered as the rate of interest. As per aforesaid Regulations, the Commission has worked out the interest rate of 11.21% based on information such as lender wise portfolio with periodical variation in interest rate, principle repayment and tenure during FY 2016-17 as received from the Petitioner vide e-mail dated 20th March 2018.

The other borrowing cost, as per annual accounts, is Rs. 7.75 Crore for FY 2016-17. The Commission has recomputed the interest on loan for FY 2016-17, as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.18: Interest approved by Commission during truing up of FY 2016-17

(Rs Crore)

Particulars	True Up FY 16-17
Opening Balance of Loan	709.26
Addition of Loan due to capitalisation during the year	386.03
Repayment of loan during the year	143.47
Closing Balance of Loans	951.82
Average Balance of Loans	830.54
Weighted average Rate of Interest on actual Loans (%)	11.21%
Interest Expenses	93.10
Finance Charges	7.75
Total Interest & Finance Charges	**100.85**

The Commission, accordingly, approves the interest and finance charges at Rs. 100.85 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

With regard to the computation of Gains/ (Losses), Regulation 22.2 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations,2016 considers variation in capitalization on account of time and/or cost overruns / efficiencies in the implementation of capital expenditure project, not attributable to an approved change in scope of such project, change in statutory levies or force majeure events, as a controllable factor. As per Regulation 24 of the GERC (MYT) Regulation, 2016, if the gain is on account of lesser capital expenditure and capitalization, it cannot be attributed to the efficiency of the utility to allow 2/3rd of gain to the utility. Similarly, if the loss is on account of more capital expenditure and capitalization due to bonafide reasons beyond the control of utility due to Force Majeure event like Act of God, non-receipt of statutory approval etc., the utility cannot be penalized by allowing only 1/3rd of the loss in the ARR. Accordingly, the Commission decides to consider variation in capitalization as uncontrollable. Hence, the components of ARR related to capitalization, like interest and finance charges, depreciation and return on equity are considered as uncontrollable.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the Gains/(Losses) on account of interest and finance charges in the truing up for FY 2016-17, as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.19: Gains / losses approved in the truing up for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	As per MYT Order for FY 2016-17	Approved in truing up for FY 2016-17	Deviation +/(-)	Gain /(loss) due to uncontrollable factor
Interest and Finance charges	83.87	100.85	(16.98)	(16.98)

4.5.5 Interest on Security Deposit

TPL has claimed a sum of Rs. 41.16 Crore towards interest on security deposit in the truing up for FY 2016-17 against Rs. 43.37 Crore approved in the MYT Order. The Commission in the MYT Order had approved the interest on security deposit for the Petitioner considering 7.75% interest rate on the average estimated balance of security deposit for FY 2016-17.

TPL submitted that the actual interest expense on security deposit considering the rate of interest of 7.75% paid to consumers based on Bank Rate is submitted in the Table below.

TPL submitted that the variation in interest on security deposit compared to the approved expenses is to be treated as uncontrollable.

Table 4.20: Interest on security deposit claimed for TPL-D (A) for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	MYT Order	Actual
Interest Rate	**7.75%**	**7.75%**
Interest on Security Deposits	43.37	41.16

Commission's Analysis

The Commission has verified the actual interest on security deposit and found the same to be as per the annual accounts submitted with the petition.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the interest on security deposit at Rs. 41.16 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

The deviation of Rs. 2.21 Crore is considered a gain on account of uncontrollable factor as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.21: Approved gain / loss due to interest paid on security deposit in the truing up for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Approved in the MYT Order for FY 2016-17	Approved in the truing up for FY 2016-17	Deviation +(-)	Gain/(loss)due to uncontrollable factor
Interest on Security Deposits	43.37	41.16	2.21	2.21

4.5.6 Interest on Working Capital

The working capital requirement is arrived at as per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016. As the working capital requirement works out to be negative as shown in the Table below, the Petitioner has not claimed any interest on working capital.

Table 4.22: Interest on working capital claimed by TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	MYT Order	Actuals
O&M Expense for 1 month	22.88	24.81
1 % of GFA for maintenance spares	40.15	40.15
Receivables for 1 months	378.08	370.27
Less: Security Deposit	559.56	567.74
Normative Working Capital	-	-
Interest Rate(%)	11.80%	11.31%
Interest on Working Capital	-	-

Commission's Analysis

The Commission has examined the interest on working capital claimed by TPL for FY 2016-17.

While computing the working capital, the Commission has reduced the working capital requirement by considering the average security deposit of Rs. 567.74 Crore for FY 2016-17 as per annual accounts. The working capital requirement works out to be negative as shown in the Table below.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the interest on working capital at Rs Nil Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

Table 4.23: Interest on working capital approved for TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs Crore)

Particulars	MYT Order	Approved
O&M Expense for 1 month	22.88	24.81
1 % of GFA for maintenance spares	40.15	40.15
Receivables for 1 months	378.08	370.27
Less: Security Deposit	559.56	567.74
Normative Working Capital	(118.45)	(132.51)
Interest Rate(%)	11.80%	-
Interest on Working Capital	-	-

4.5.7 Return on Equity

TPL has claimed a sum of Rs. 190.13 Crore towards return on equity @ 14% in the truing up for FY 2016-17 against Rs. 184.86 Crore approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.24: Return on equity claimed by TPL-Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17	
	MYT Order	Actual
Opening Equity	1275.34	1275.34
Equity addition during the year	90.20	165.44
Closing Equity	1365.54	1440.78
Average of Opening and Closing Equity	1320.44	1358.06
Rate of Return on Equity	14%	14%
Return on Equity	184.86	190.13

Petitioner's submission

TPL has submitted that the closing balance of equity has been arrived at considering additional equity equivalent to 30% of the capitalization during the year. The return on equity has been computed by applying the rate of 14% on the average of the opening and closing balance of equity for FY 2016-17.

Commission's Analysis

The opening equity for FY 2016-17 is same as the closing equity for FY 2015-16 approved in the true up order for FY 2015-16. The addition of equity of Rs. 165.44 Crore is due to net capitalization during the FY 2016-17 as approved in para 4.5.2 of this order.

The Commission has observed that there is an addition to GFA of Rs 641.98 Crore and deletion from GFA of Rs 24.42 Crore during FY 2016-17 as per Table 4.14. Thus, net capitalization during the year is Rs 617.56 Crore and considering the Service Line Contribution received during the year of Rs 66.09 Crore, the balance capitalization works out to Rs 551.47 Crore. The GERC (MYT) Regulations,2016 provide for funding of such balance capitalization through a mix of debt and equity in the ratio of 70:30. Accordingly, the equity addition for the year works out to Rs 165.44 Crore and considering the rate of return of 14% as per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 on average equity, the return on equity works out to Rs 190.13 Crore as given in Table 4.24 above.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the return on equity at Rs. 190.13 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

The return on equity depends on the amount of capitalization during the year and the debt equity ratio considered during the Financial Year and these parameters are uncontrollable in nature. The variance in the amount of return on equity is therefore treated as an uncontrollable item.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the gains /(loss) on account of return on equity in the truing up for FY 2016-17 as detailed below.

Table 4.25: Return on Equity and gain / loss approved in the truing up for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	As per MYT Order for FY 2016-17	Approved in truing up for FY 2016-17	Deviation +/(-)	Gain / (loss) due to uncontrollable factor
Return on Equity	184.86	190.13	(5.27)	(5.27)

4.5.8 Income Tax

TPL has claimed a sum of Rs. 72.75 Crore towards Income Tax in the truing up for FY 2016-17 against Rs. 97.80approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.26: Income Tax claimed by TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17	
	MYT Order	Actual
Income Tax	97.80	72.75

Petitioner's submission

While passing the MYT Order, the Commission approved Rs. 97.80 Crore as income tax as per true up of FY 2015-16.

For FY 2016-17, the Petitioner has claimed the Income Tax based on the actual tax paid in proportion to the PBT of TPL-D(A). Hence, the total amount claimed under the head of income-tax is Rs. 72.75 Crore.

Commission's Analysis

The Commission had asked TPL to furnish the details of segregation of income tax paid by TPL in respect of TPL Ahmedabad along with copies of challans of income tax paid. In its reply, TPL submitted that being a single corporate entity, income tax is paid for the company as a whole. TPL has also submitted that it has computed the income tax, by applying the prevailing MAT rate on the PBT, as per the annual accounts and submitted the copies of challans of income tax paid.

The Commission verified the PBT figures from the annual accounts for FY 2016-17. The Petitioner has shown a PBT of Rs. 327.04 Crore net of Remeasurement of Defined Benefit Plans. The PBT as per standalone financial statement of TPL net of Remeasurement of Defined Benefit Plans is Rs. 574.21 Crore and the total current tax paid is Rs 128.30 Crore. It is observed that during FY 2016-17, the Petitioner has paid the MAT.

The Commission computed the income tax of 118.89 Crore by applying the MAT rate of 21.3416% on the PBT of TPL (G), TPL (A), TPL (S) and TPL (Dahej) (PBT of Rs. 557.06 @ 21.3416%).

It is further observed that apart from MAT of Rs. 128.30 Crore, the standalone financial statement of the Petitioner also indicates a tax credit of Rs. 6.35 Crore. The aforesaid MAT of Rs. 118.89 Crore computed on the PBT of TPL (G), TPL (A), TPL (S), TPL (Dahej) has been further adjusted by the tax credit of Rs.6.16 Crore (proportionate amount). Accordingly, the Commission computed the MAT to be allowed to TPL (G), TPL (A), TPL (S), TPL (Dahej) at Rs.112.73 Crore (Rs.118.89 Crore Minus Rs.6.16 Crore) with the condition that the MAT amount computed above does not exceed the actual tax paid for the Company as a whole of Rs. 121.95 Crore net of tax credit (Rs.128.30 Crore Minus Rs. 6.35 Crore).

The share of income tax for TPL(A) in the total tax of TPL (G), TPL (A), TPL (S), TPL (Dahej) of Rs.112.73 Crore (net of tax credit) as computed above works out to Rs.66.18 Crore considering PBT net of Remeasurement of Defined Benefit Plans and tax credit.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the income tax at Rs. 66.18 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

The Commission has treated the income tax as an uncontrollable expense and, accordingly, approves the gains / losses on account of income tax in the truing up for FY 2016-17, as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.27: Income tax and gain / loss due to income tax approved in the truing up for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	As per MYT Order for FY 2016-17	Approved in truing up for FY 2016-17	Deviation +(-)	Gain/(loss)due to uncontrollable factor
Income Tax	97.80	66.18	31.62	31.62

4.5.9 Bad Debts Written Off

TPL has claimed Rs. 3.04 Crore towards bad debts written off in the truing up for FY 2016-17 against Rs.4.92 Crore approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.28: Bad Debts claimed by TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17	
	MYT Order	Actual
Bad Debts Written off	4.92	3.04

Petitioner's submission

TPL has requested to consider the actual bad debts written off as controllable item.

Commission's Analysis

The Commission has verified the bad debts written off from the annual accounts submitted by TPL for FY 2016-17.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the bad debts written off at Rs. 3.04 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

The deviation in bad debts is Rs. 1.88 Crore due to controllable factor.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the gain / loss on account bad debts in the truing up for FY 2016-17 as detailed below:

Table 4.29: Bad debts and gain / loss approved in the truing up for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	As per MYT Order for FY 2016-17	Approved in truing up for FY 2016-17	Deviation +(-)	Gain/(loss) due to controllable factor
Bad Debts Written off	4.92	3.04	1.88	1.88

4.5.10 Contingency Reserve

Petitioner's submission

TPL has proposed the contingency reserve at Rs. 0.60 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17 which is the same as approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June,2017 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.30: Contingency Reserve claimed by TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17	
	MYT Order	Actual
Contingency Reserve	0.60	0.60

Commission's Analysis

The proposed contingency reserve is consistent with the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016.

Table 4.31: Contingency Reserve and gain/loss approved in the truing up for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	As per MYT Order for FY 2016-17	Approved in truing up for FY 2016-17	Deviation +/(-)	Gain / (loss) due to uncontrollable factor
Contingency Reserve	0.60	0.60	-	-

The Commission, accordingly, approves the contingency reserve at Rs. 0.60 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

There is no deviation in the contingency reserve.

4.5.11 Non-Tariff Income

TPL has claimed a sum of Rs. 83.75 Crore as the non-tariff income in the truing up for FY 2016-17 against Rs. 91.51 Crore approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017 as detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.32: Non-Tariff Income claimed for TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	FY 2016-17	
	MYT Order	Actual
Non-Tariff Income	91.51	83.75

Petitioner's submission

The Petitioner has submitted that the actual non-tariff income for FY 2016-17 is Rs. 83.75 Crore and has claimed it as an uncontrollable item.

Commission's Analysis

The non-tariff income is specified in Regulation 89 and 97 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, which includes various items such as income from sale of scrap, income from statutory investment, interest on advances to supplier/contractor, etc. The Commission noted that the non-tariff income claimed by the Petitioner for FY 2016-17 is Rs. 83.75 Crores.

It is observed that the non-tariff income as per annual accounts is Rs.118.73 Crore. The Petitioner has reduced the provision for doubtful debts no longer required (Rs. 1.59 Crore) insurance claim receipt (Rs. 0.02 Crore) and Deferred income (Rs. 33.37 Crore) from the aforesaid non-tariff income to arrive at claimed figure of Rs. 83.75 Crore. As discussed in O&M section of this Chapter, the insurance claim receipt of Rs. 0.02 Crore has been considered as non-tariff income and hence, the same been added to non-tariff income claim of the Petitioner.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the non-tariff income at Rs. 83.77 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the gains /(losses) on account of non-tariff income in the truing up for FY 2016-17 as detailed below.

Table 4.33: Non-Tariff Income and gains / (losses) approved in the truing up for FY 2016.17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	As per MYT Order for FY 2016-17-	Approved in truing up for FY 2016-17	Deviation +/(-)	Gain/ (loss) due to uncontrollable factor
Non-Tariff Income	91.51	83.77	7.74	7.74

4.5.12 Revenue from Sale of Power

Petitioner's submission

TPL has submitted a sum of Rs. 4440.44 Crore as the revenue from sale of power in the truing up for FY 2016-17 as detailed in the Table below.

Table 4.34: Revenue with existing tariff claimed by TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particulars	Actual
Revenue from Sale of Power at existing tariff	4440.44

Commission's Analysis

As per annual accounts submitted by TPL, the revenue from sale of power for FY 2016-17 is Rs 4443.22 Crore, whereas the Petitioner has claimed the revenue from sale of power after reduction of discount for prompt payment of Rs. 2.78 Crore. Accordingly, the Petitioner has claimed the Revenue from sale of power of Rs. 4440.44 Crore.

It is observed that prompt payment discount is a relief given to the consumers for early and advance payment of bills by them. Proviso to Regulation 94.4 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 provides that such discount/rebate has to be borne by the licensee and the impact of such rebate cannot be allowed to be passed through to the consumers, in any form. Any reduction of such discount from revenue would lead to recovery of such discount from the consumers, which is against the said provision of the Regulation and hence, cannot be allowed.

The Commission, accordingly, approves the revenue from sale of power at Rs. 4443.22 Crore in the truing up for FY 2016-17.

4.5.13 Gain / Loss under truing up for FY 2016-17

The Commission has reviewed the performance of TPL-D Ahmedabad Supply Area under Regulation 22 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016, for FY 2016-17. The Commission has computed the gain / loss for FY 2016-17 based on the truing up for each of the components discussed in the above paragraphs.

The Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) approved in the MYT, and the actuals claimed in truing up, approved for truing up, Gains/(Losses) computed in accordance with the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 are as given in the Table below:

Table 4.35: ARR approved in respect of TPL- Ahmedabad in the truing up or FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particular	FY 2016-17 (MYT Order)	FY 2016-17 (Claimed)	Approved for FY 2016-17	Over (+) / Under (-) recovery	Controllable Gain / (Loss)	Uncontrollable Gain / (Loss)
Power Purchase	3537.58	3499.96	3495.31	42.27	33.65	8.62
O&M Expenses	274.56	297.74	297.77	(23.21)	(23.21)	0.00
Depreciation	135.30	143.47	143.47	(8.17)	0.00	(8.17)
Interest and Finance Charges	83.87	102.45	100.85	(16.98)	0.00	(16.98)
Interest on Security Deposits	43.37	41.16	41.16	2.21	0.00	2.21
Interest on Working Capital	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
RoE	184.86	190.13	190.13	(5.27)		(5.27)
Bad debts Written off	4.92	3.04	3.04	1.88	1.88	
Contingency Reserve	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.00		0.00
Income Tax	97.80	72.75	66.18	31.62		31.62
Less: Non-Tariff Income	91.51	83.75	83.77	7.74		7.74
ARR	**4271.34**	**4267.54**	**4254.74**	**16.61**	**12.32**	**4.29**

4.5.14 Sharing of Gains / Losses for FY 2016-17

The Commission has analysed the gains / losses on account of controllable and uncontrollable factors.

The relevant Regulations are extracted below:

"Regulation 23. Mechanism for pass-through of gains or losses on account of uncontrollable factors

23.1 The approved aggregate gain or loss to the Generating Company or Transmission Licensee or SLDC or Distribution Licensee on account of uncontrollable factors shall be passed through as an adjustment in the tariff of the Generating Company or Transmission Licensee or SLDC or Distribution Licensee over such period as may be specified in the Order of the Commission passed under these Regulations.

23.2 The Generating Company or Transmission Licensee or SLDC or Distribution Licensee shall submit such details of the variation between expenses incurred and revenue earned and the figures approved by the Commission, in the prescribed format to the Commission, along with the detailed computations and supporting documents as may be required for verification by the Commission.

23.3 Nothing contained in this Regulation 23shall apply in respect of any gain or loss arising out of variations in the price of fuel and power purchase, which shall be dealt with as specified by the Commission from time to time.

Regulation 24. Mechanism for sharing of gains or losses on account of controllable factors

24.1 The approved aggregate gain to the Generating Company or Transmission Licensee or SLDC or Distribution Licensee on account of controllable factors shall be dealt with in the following manner:

(a) One-third of the amount of such gain shall be passed on as a rebate in tariffs over such period as may be stipulated in the Order of the Commission under Regulation 21.6;

(b) The balance amount, which will amount to two-thirds of such gain, may be utilised at the discretion of the Generating Company or Transmission Licensee or SLDC or Distribution Licensee.

24.2 The approved aggregate loss to the Generating Company or Transmission Licensee or SLDC or Distribution Licensee on account of controllable factors shall be dealt with in the following manner:

(a) One-third of the amount of such loss may be passed on as an additional charge in tariffs over such period as may be stipulated in the Order of the Commission under Regulation 21.6; and

(b) The balance amount of loss, which will amount to two-thirds of such loss, shall be absorbed by the Generating Company or Transmission Licensee or SLDC or Distribution Licensee."

The trued up ARR for FY 2016-17 as claimed by TPL-D Ahmedabad and as approved by the Commission is summarized in the Table below:

Table 4.36: Approved Trued up ARR incl. Gains/(Losses) for TPL-D Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particular		Claimed	Approved
ARR as per MYT	(a)	4,271.34	4271.34
Gains/(Losses) due to Uncontrollable Factors	(b)	(8.59)	4.29
Gains/(Losses) due to Controllable Factors	(c)	12.39	12.32
Pass through as tariff	d= -(1/3rd of c+ b)	(4.46)	8.40
Trued-up ARR	**e=a+d**	**4,275.80**	**4,262.94**

The Petitioner has submitted to consider an amount of Rs. 651.32 Core being Revenue towards recovery of earlier years' approved Gap/(Surplus). With reference to the Commission's query for reconciliation of Rs 651.32 Crore, TPL has furnished the break up of aforesaid Rs. 651.32 Crore which includes carrying cost of Rs. 140.62 Crore from FY 2007-08 to 2012-13 and FY 2014-15 and Rs. 510.70 Crore towards gap of FY 2014-15.

With regard to carrying cost claim of Rs. 140.62 Crore, the Commission has dealt with this issue separately under sin Chapter 5. Thus, the same has not been considered here.

The Commission has considered revenue gap of FY 2014-15 of Rs. 510.70 Crore and Revenue of Rs. 4443.22 Crore for computation of net revenue gap for FY 2016-17.

The revenue gap claimed and approved for Ahmedabad supply area for FY 2016-17 are detailed in the Table below:

Table 4.37: Approved Revenue Gap for TPL- Ahmedabad for FY 2016-17

(Rs. Crore)

Particular	FY 2016-17 (Claimed)	Approved for FY 2016-17
Trued up ARR	4,275.80	4,262.94
Revenue	4440.44	4443.22
Less: Revenue towards recovery of earlier years Approved Gap/(Surplus)	651.32	510.70
Balance Revenue	3,789.12	3,932.52
Gap/(Surplus)	**486.68**	**330.42**

Accordingly, the Commission now considers the trued-up revenue gap of Rs. 330.42 Crore for FY 2016-17 for determination of tariff for FY 2018-19.

5 Determination of Tariff for FY 2018-19

This Chapter deals with the determination of revenue gap/surplus, as well as consumer tariff for the FY 2018-19.

The Commission has considered the ARR approved in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017 for FY 2018-19 and the adjustment on account of True-up for FY 2016-17, while determining the revenue gap/surplus for FY 2018-19.

5.1 Approved ARR for FY 2018-19

Based on above approach, the Table below summarises the Annual Revenue Requirement, as approved by the Commission for FY 2018-19 in the MYT Order dated 09.06.2017

Table 5.1: Approved ARR for Ahmedabad Supply Area FY 2018-19

(Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	ARR for FY 2018-19
1	Power Purchase Expense	3,947.68
2	Employee Expenses	128.81
3	Administrative & General Expenses	85.41
4	Repair & Maintenance Expenses	92.65
5	Depreciation	172.81
6	Interest on Long term Loan	83.06
7	Interest on Security Deposits	53.58
8	Interest on Working Capital	0.00
9	Bad Debts Written off	4.92
10	Income Tax	97.80
11	Contingency Reserve	0.60
12	Return on Equity	211.07
13	Non-Tariff Income	97.72
14	**Aggregate Revenue Requirement**	**4,780.67**

5.2 Projected Revenue from existing Tariff for FY 2018-19

Petitioner's Submission

The revenue for FY 2018-19, arrived at considering the projected sales and existing tariff, is Rs 5192.04 Crores which includes revenue of Rs. 117.23 Crore from the

Open Access consumers who may utilize the network of the Petitioner, TPL. The ARR for Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar Supply Area for FY 2018-19 is Rs. 4780.66 Crores. Accordingly, the Petitioner has arrived at the Surplus of Rs. 411.37 Crores.

Table 5.2: Projected Revenue Gap/(Surplus) of Ahmedabad Supply Area for FY 2018-19

Particulars	Rs. Crore
ARR for FY 2018-19	4780.67
Revenue from sale of power including FPPPA revenue @ Rs.1.23 per unit	5,074.81
Revenue from OA charges	117.23
Surplus Revenue	**(411.37)**

As per the GERC (Demand Side Management) Regulations, 2012, the Petitioner had formulated and submitted to the Commission a DSM Plan for the license areas of Ahmedabad, Gandhinagar and Surat. The Commission has approved Rs. 4.45 Crores for Ahmedabad/Gandhinagar supply area. The Petitioner has incurred the expense of Rs. 1.90 Crores during FY 2016-17.

The Petitioner has calculated carrying cost for the Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2016-17 which works out to Rs. 136.78 Crores for Ahmedabad/Gandhinagar supply area. Also, the Petitioner has considered the pending carrying cost for FY 2013-14 and FY 2015-16 which results in a further claim of Rs. 176.83 Crores for Ahmedabad / Gandhinagar supply area. The Petitioner, therefore, requested the Commission to consider the aforementioned outstanding amount in addition to the Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2016-17 for the purpose of determination of tariff for FY 2018-19. The total gap is thus arrived at Rs. 390.83 Crores as shown in the Table below:

Table 5.3: Projected cumulative revenue gap/ (surplus) for determination of tariff for TPL-D (Ahmedabad)

Particulars	Amount (Rs. Crore)
Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2016-17	486.68
Carrying Cost for FY 2016-17	136.78
DSM	1.90
Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2018-19	(411.37)
Carrying Cost for FY 2013-14 and FY 2015-16 Gap	176.83
Cumulative Gap/ (Surplus) to be recovered through tariff	390.83

Commission's Analysis

The Commission has gone through the merits of the Petition and determined the various components of the tariff in the previous paras of this order and accordingly the Commission has independently worked out the ARR as well as revenue for TPL-D (Ahmedabad) for FY 2018-19. The Commission has also considered the revenue receivable from the Open Access consumers as Cross Subsidy Surcharge, Transmission Charges, wheeling charges, losses to the Petitioner and the same has been factored in the total revenue receivable by the Petitioner. This has resulted in surplus revenue of Rs 411.37 Crore for FY 2018-19 as shown in the Table below.

Table 5.4: Approved Revenue Gap/ (Surplus) of Ahmedabad Supply Area for 2018-19

Particulars	Rs Crore
ARR for FY 2018-19	4,780.67
Revenue from sale of power at existing tariff rates including FPPPA revenue @1.23 per unit	5,074.81
Revenue from Open Access Charges	117.23
Gap/ (Surplus)	**(411.37)**

Treatment of Carrying Cost

TPL-D (A) in the present petition, has claimed carrying cost of Rs. 140.62 Crores as against truing up for FY 2014-15, Rs. 176.83 Crore against FY 2015-16 and Rs.136.78 Crores against the truing up of FY 2016-17 and proposed to recover such gap from the consumers through a regulatory charge @ 25 paise per unit with effect from 1st April, 2018.

In the true up orders for 2014-15 & 2015-16, the Commission had kept carrying cost of Rs. 140.62 Crores and Rs. 176.83 Crores in abeyance.

However, the above orders of the Commission have been challenged by the licensee before the Hon'ble APTEL and the same is pending. As the matter is sub judice, the Commission is of the opinion to deal with the carrying cost for previous years after disposal of the matter by the Hon'ble APTEL.

In the current tariff proceedings on truing up for FY 2016-17, the Commission examined the carrying cost of Rs. 136.78 Crore as claimed by TPL vis-à-vis provisions of the current MYT Regulations. Regulation 21.6 (c) of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 provides that:

"Carrying cost to be allowed on the amount of Revenue Gap or Revenue Surplus for the period from the date on which such gap/surplus has become due, i.e., from the end of the year for which true-up has been done, till the end of the year in which it is addressed, calculated <u>on simple interest basis at the weighted average State Bank Base Rate (SBBR) / 1 year State Bank of India (SBI) Marginal Cost of Funds Bused Lending Rate (MCLR)</u> / any replacement thereof by SBI for the time being in effect applicable for 1 year period, as may be applicable for the relevant year, i.e. the year for which Revenue Gap or Revenue Surplus is determined:

Provided that carrying cost on the amount of revenue gap shall be allowed up to the above limit subject to prudence check and submission of documentary evidence for having incurred the carrying cost in the years prior to the year in which the revenue gap is addressed:"

TPL-D (A) in its submission on the carrying cost has submitted that carrying cost should be allowed on financial principle for time value of money and to be worked out based on simple mathematical formula for the period of delay in addressing the gap. TPL has claimed compounding of interest for working out the carrying cost in its proposal. In this context, it is to be noted that Hon'ble APTEL in its order in Appeal No. 250 of 2015 decided that:

"We tend to agree with the State Commission's view that there is no concept of compound interest in dealing with various provisions related to interest calculations in the Tariff Regulations, 2011. Thus the principle applied by the State Commission in absence of specific provisions of interest rate of carrying cost is equitable and just and there is no need of interference by us on the same."

During the current proceedings, TPL-D (A) has presented its statement of accounts for FY 2016-17 wherein loan from Head Office to TPL-D (A) during the year, is shown for its requirement of funding. Accordingly, in view of above Regulation and considering the time value of money, the Commission allows Rs 46.43 Crore as carrying cost for FY 2016-17 at a simple interest rate of 8.81% for 2 years i.e. FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19, to be claimed in the ARR of FY 2018-19.

Accordingly, the summary of revenue gap/ (surplus) for determination of tariff FY 2018-19 as approved by the Commission is given in the Table below.

Table 5.5:Summary of total gap/(surplus)

Particulars	Rs Crore
Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2016-17	330.42
Carrying Cost	46.43
DSM	1.9
Gap/ (Surplus) of FY 2018-19	(411.37)
Cumulative Gap/ (Surplus) to be recovered through tariff	**(32.61)**

6 Compliance of Directives

6.1 Earlier Directives

a) Recovery of "Regulatory Charge"

Petitioner was directed to submit a statement of actual recovery of "Regulatory Charge" along with units sold on bi-monthly basis to the Commission duly certified by the Statutory Auditors and shall also host these details on their website.

Compliance

Petitioner has submitted the certificate of Regulatory Charge to the Commission and has also placed the same on its website.

Commission's comment:

The Commission has noted the submission.

b) Interest Cost Reduction

Petitioner was directed to negotiate with the lenders for reduction in the rate of interest on the borrowings failing which they should replace high cost debt with low cost debt so that the net benefit of interest cost reduction is available to the consumers.

TPL-D shall furnish Quarterly Progress Report about the action taken and results thereof.

Compliance

Petitioner submitted that it has successfully pursued the Banks/FIs for reduction of interest rate and accordingly, the interest rates have been revised leading to substantial saving to consumers.

Commission's comments:

The Commission has noted the submission.

6.2 Directives issued in the MYT Order dated 9th June, 2017

Directive 1: Approval from Commission for capex of projects and Providing details of capitalization of assets in the respective years of 3rd MYT Control Period.

TPL was directed to take in principle approval for any CAPEX more than Rs. 5 Crores by furnishing information to Commission prior to undertaking any work/projects that needs a capital investment of Rs. 10 crore or more. TPL shall furnish details about such projects in the form of 'Detailed Project Report' which shall include the information regarding project cost, source of fund, cost benefit analysis, timelines, technical significance, supplier/vendor selection mechanism etc. Further, the procurement of materials, selection of EPC contractors etc. shall be carried out by following competitive biddings. TPL is directed to provide the details consisting of technical, commercial, financial aspects (including funding) justifying the capitalization of assets. Further the cost benefit analysis shall be submitted with consideration of technical and financial benefits available from such capitalization of assets to the consumer as well as retail tariff.

Compliance

The Petitioner submitted that it had furnished various details pertaining to capex and capitalization in its MYT petition and related proceedings. In turn, the Commission has approved the capex as part of the MYT order. The Petitioner was required to continuously incur Capex to provide reliable & quality power supply and to cater to the increase in demand of its existing & new consumers. Accordingly, in case the Petitioner incurred any additional EHV capex in excess of Rs. 10 Crore over and above the Schemes already included in the MYT Petition, it shall approach the Commission for its approval.

Commission's comments:

The Commission has noted the submission and directed TPL(A) to submit Half Yearly progress report for the projects for which Capex approved in the MYT Order 9th June, 2017.

Directive 2: Power Procurement

The Commission had decided the source of power procurement and its quantum, price etc. The Petitioner was directed to adhere to the aforesaid quantum of power procurement from the approved source as far as possible. If the Petitioner is able to reduce the power procurement cost as approved in this order from specific source, in that case, the Petitioner may procure the same.

Compliance

The Petitioner submitted the power purchase arrangements made by TPL. In case of any bilateral power purchase arrangement, the Petitioner shall take approval of the Commission.

Commission's comments:

The Commission has noted the submission.

Directive 3: Procurement of renewable energy through competitive bidding

The Commission had observed that TPL Distribution Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar has signed PPAs for Wind and solar generation procurement without calling expression of interest from the generators. The tariff of wind energy generators as well as solar energy discovered under the competitive bidding carried out in the country has been lower than the preferential generic tariff determined by the Commission. Therefore, TPL was directed to ensure that the procurement of renewable energy specifically wind and solar is carried out in transparent manner by following competitive bidding.

Compliance

Petitioner submitted that it has noted the directive of the Commission and shall approach the Commission appropriately.

Commission's comments:

The Commission has noted the submission.

Directive 4: Additional Surcharge

The Commission noted that there are some of the consumers who are availing the open access in the license area of TPL-Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar. They are paying the Cross Subsidy Surcharge as determined by the Commission and also paying transmission and wheeling charges as the case may be. The Commission has also noted that Section 42(4) of the Electricity Act, 2003 provides that whenever any consumer avails the open access it is liable to pay an additional surcharge on the charges of the wheeling as may be specified by the Commission. Regulation 25 of the GERC (Terms and Conditions of Intra-State Open Access) Regulations, 2011 also provides that the open access consumers are liable to pay the additional surcharge. The additional surcharge is an amount payable by the open access customer against the stranded cost required to be borne by the open access customers. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the additional surcharge for the open access customer, otherwise the cost of stranded capacity of the licensee is borne by the other consumers. TPL Ahmedabad has not filed any Petition for determination of the additional surcharge. Therefore, TPL – Ahmedabad was directed to file a Petition with complete details within 3 months from the passing of this order for determination of additional surcharge in the license area of TPL.

Compliance

The issue of stranded capacity due to consumers seeking open access is not presently relevant. Therefore, the Petitioner has not filed any petition for determination of additional surcharge. However, the Petitioner will keep reviewing the situation and file a petition for determination of additional surcharge as and when stranded capacity on account of open access arises.

Commission's comments:

The Commission has noted the submission.

Directive 5: Renegotiation of PPA for stranded generating stations due to non-availability of fuel or costly fuel

Some of the stakeholders represented that there is an adverse impact on the tariff rates of the consumers because of fixed cost liability of some generating stations which are not working either due to non-availability of fuel or costly fuel. In view of the above, the Distribution Licensee was directed to explore the possibilities of reduction in fixed cost elements e.g. normative O&M charges, Return on Equity, normative interest on working capital etc. by renegotiating existing PPAs of such stranded generating stations. The Distribution Licensee was also directed to submit action taken report in this regard by 30th September, 2017.

Compliance

The Petitioner submitted that it has long term power purchase arrangements with SUGEN and AMGEN in addition to various Renewable Power Purchase arrangements. For AMGEN, necessary FSA with M/s SECL exists whereas for SUGEN, requisite gas from international markets has been tied up due to shortfall of domestic gas. Hence, as of now there is no stranded generating station and therefore, question of renegotiation of any PPA does not arise.

Commission's comments:

The Commission has noted the submission.

Directive 6: Review of existing fuel purchase agreement

TPL-D should impress upon SUGEN as well as AMGEN to seek better terms in their existing fuel purchase agreements and try to reduce the cost as far as possible.

Compliance

The Petitioner submitted that AMGEN has necessary FSA with M/s SECL whereas SUGEN has tied up requisite gas from international markets to the extent of shortfall in domestic gas. It may kindly be noted that the cost of gas being supplied by IOCL to SUGEN under long term contract is in accordance with the Master Contract between Petronet LNG Ltd and Rasgas, Qatar. This Master Contract was renegotiated in 2016 on a government-to-government basis between GoI and Government of Qatar. Similarly, AMGEN has been continuously pursuing M/s SECL for supply of quality coal and compensation in case of grade slippages. Accordingly, the Petitioner submits that all efforts are being made to reduce the fuel costs.

Commission's comments:

The Commission has noted the submission.

6.3 Fresh Directives

Directive 1:

It is required to match the electricity demand curve with the availability of electricity supply and in order to optimise the overall cost of electricity supply to consumers and to move towards recovery of cost of supply according to time of use of electricity supply, Commission would like to introduce Demand Response measures. Accordingly, the Distribution Licensee is directed to initiate study for implementing 'Demand Response' measures and submit its Action Plan accordingly.

7 Fuel and Power Purchase Price Adjustment

7.1 Fuel Price and Power Purchase Price Adjustment

The Commission in Case No. 1309/2013 and 1313/2013 vide its order dated 29.10.2013 has revised the formula for Fuel Price and Power Purchase Cost Adjustment (FPPPA) as mentioned below:

7.2 Formula

FPPPA = [(PPCA-PPCB)]/ [100-Loss in %]

Where,

PPCA	is the average power purchase cost per unit of delivered energy (including transmission cost), computed based on the operational parameters approved by the Commission or principles laid down in the power purchase agreements in Rs./kWh for all the generation sources as approved by the Commission while determining ARR and who have supplied power in the given quarter and transmission charges as approved by the Commission for transmission network calculated as total power purchase cost billed in Rs. Million divided by the total quantum of power purchase in Million Units made during the quarter.
PPCB	is the approved average base power purchase cost per unit of delivered energy (including transmission cost) for all the generating stations considered by the Commission for supplying power to the company in Rs./kWh and transmission charges as approved by the Commission calculated as the total power purchase cost approved by the Commission in Rs. Million divided by the total quantum of power purchase in Million Units considered by the Commission.
Loss in %	is the weighted average of the approved level of Transmission and Distribution losses (%) for the four DISCOMs / GUVNL and TPL applicable for a particular quarter or actual weighted average in Transmission and Distribution losses (%) for four DISCOMs / GUVNL and TPL of the previous year for which true-up have been done by the Commission, whichever is lower.

7.2.1 Base Price of Power Purchase (PPCB)

The Commission has approved the total energy requirement and the total Power Purchase Cost for all TPL-D including fixed cost, variable cost etc. from the various sources for FY 2018-19 in this Order as given in the Table below:

Total Energy Requirement (MUs)	Total Energy Requirement (MUs)	Approved Power Purchase Cost (Rs. Crore)	Power Purchase Cost per unit (Rs./kWh)
FY 2018-19	12,099.68	5643.63	4.66

As mentioned above the base Power Purchase cost for TPL-D is Rs. 4.66 per kWh and the base FPPPA charge is Rs. 1.23/kWh.

TPL may claim difference between actual power purchase cost and base power purchase cost approved in the table above as per the approved FPPPA formula mentioned in para 7.2 above.

Information regarding FPPPA recovery and the FPPPA calculations shall be kept on website of TPL.

For any increase in FPPPA, worked out on the basis of above formula, beyond ten (10) paise per kWh in a quarter, prior approval of the Commission shall be necessary and only on approval of such additional increase by the Commission, the FPPPA can be billed to consumers.

FPPPA calculations shall be submitted to the Commission within one month from end of the relevant quarter.

8 Wheeling Charges and Cross Subsidy Surcharge

8.1 Wheeling charge

Regulation 87 of the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 stipulates that the ARR be segregated as per the allocation matrix for segregation of expenses between Distribution Wires Business and Retail Supply Business for determination of wheeling charges. The allocation of expenditure to wheeling and retail supply business is based on the consideration that the distribution infrastructure up to the service line is part of the wheeling business and the distribution infrastructure from service line to consumer premises is a part of the retail supply business.

The allocation matrix as specified by the Commission for the segregation of expenses between Wires and Supply business is shown in the Table below:

Table 8.1: Allocation matrix for segregation to Wheeling and Retail Supply for FY 2018-19 as per GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016

Sl. No.	Particulars	Wire business (%)	Retail Supply business (%)
1	Power Purchase Expenses	0	100
2	Employee Expenses	60	40
3	Administration and General Expenses	50	50
4	Repairs and Maintenance Expenses	90	10
5	Depreciation	90	10
6	Interest on Long term Loan Capital	90	10
7	Interest on Working Capital and Security Deposits	10	90
8	Bad Debts Written off	0	100
9	Income Tax	90	10
10	Contribution to Contingency Reserve	100	0
11	Return on Equity	90	10
12	Non-Tariff Income	10	90

Based on the above allocation matrix TPL has segregated the ARR of Ahmedabad Supply Area for Wires and Supply business as under:

Table 8.2: Allocation matrix for segregation to Wheeling and Retail Supply submitted by TPL-D Ahmedabad supply area for FY 2018-19

(Rs. Crore)

ARR Components	Wire Business	Retail Business
Power Purchase Expenses	0.00	3947.68
Employee Expenses	77.29	51.52
Administrative & General Expenses	42.71	42.71
Repair & Maintenance Expenses	83.39	9.27
Depreciation	155.53	17.28
Interest on Long term Loan	74.75	8.31
Interest on Security Deposits	5.36	48.22
Interest on Working Capital	0.00	0.00
Bad Debts Written off	0.00	4.92
Income Tax	88.02	9.78
Contingency Reserve	0.60	0.00
Return on Equity	189.96	21.11
Non-Tariff Income	9.77	87.95
Aggregate Revenue Requirement	**707.83**	**4,072.84**

Thus, TPL has segregated the total ARR for Ahmedabad Supply Area into ARR for Wheeling and Retail Supply business as under:

(i) ARR of Wheeling Business – Rs. 707.83 Crore

(ii) ARR of Retail Supply Business – Rs. 4072.84 Crore

TPL has computed the wheeling tariff based on the allocation of ARR of distribution business, in accordance with the GERC (Multi Year Tariff) Regulations, 2016.

Distribution wires are identified as carrier of electricity from generating station or transmission network to consumer point. The consumption at a particular voltage level requires network at that voltage level and also at all higher voltage levels. Thus consumption at the lower voltages should contribute to the cost of the higher voltage levels also. However, the consumers connected to the higher voltages would not be utilizing the services of the lower voltage level and hence would not be required to contribute to the recovery of cost of lower voltage level.

Determination of Wheeling Charges

Due to difficulties in segregating costs at HT and LT level, the ARR for wheeling business, TPL-D has proposed to apportion the cost between the HT and LT voltage level in proportion to the ratio of their closing GFA of FY 2016-17. The HT voltage level ARR is further proposed to be segregated between HT and LT voltage levels.

TPL submitted that:

- The GFA (excluding assets related to retail supply i.e. SLC and Meters) for Ahmedabad & Gandhinagar Supply Areas as on 31st March, 2017 is Rs. 3610.95 Crores. In case of Ahmedabad & Gandhinagar Supply Area, the GFA identified for HT & LT business are Rs. 2707.07 Crores & Rs. 903.87 Crores, respectively. The ratio of HT assets to LT assets is 75:25, which is considered for the apportionment of ARR for the wheeling business into HT and LT businesses.
- Further as the HT level assets cater to the requirement of customers at both HT and LT levels, the ARR for HT is again apportioned between HT and LT voltage based on their ratio of contribution to the peak
- The system peak demand for Ahmedabad and Gandhinagar Supply Area for the year FY 2016-17 was 1720.40 MW. In case of Ahmedabad & Gandhinagar Supply Area, the contract demand for all the HT consumers is about 665.74 MW. Assuming that 85% of the contract demand of HT consumers contributes to the system peak demand, the total demand of LT contributing to the system peak is computed as 1154.52 MW.
- To determine the wheeling charges for the HT & LT voltage levels, the ARR of the respective voltage level is divided by the sales handled at the respective voltage level. Accordingly, the wheeling charge determined in terms of Rs/ kWh/ Month has been tabulated below:

Table 8.3 :Wheeling charges in case of Ahmedabad Supply Area for FY 2018-19

Particulars	Value
First Level Segregation of ARR (in Rs. Crores)	
HT Voltage	530.65
LT Voltage	177.18
Total	**707.83**
Second Level Segregation of ARR (in Rs. Crores)	
HT Voltage	174.54
LT Voltage	533.28
Total	**707.83**
Wheeling Charge (in Rs/ kWh)	
HT Voltage	0.72
LT Voltage	0.90

- The Petitioner further stated that an open access consumer will also have to bear the following wheeling losses in addition to the wheeling charges:

Table 8.4 : Proposed wheeling charges in kind of Ahmedabad Supply Area for FY 2018-19

Category	Value
HT Category	4.00%

Commission's Analysis

The Commission, in order to compute the wheeling charges and cross subsidy surcharges, has considered the allocation matrix between the wheeling and retail supply business as per the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016.

Based on the ARR approved by the Commission, the allocation thereof as per the matrix provided in the GERC(MYT) Regulation,2016 for wires business and retail supply business is computed as shown below:

Table 8.5: Approved segregation of expenses by the Commission for FY 2018-19

(Rs. Crore)

ARR Components	Wire Business	Retail Business
Power Purchase Expenses	0.00	3947.68
Employee Expenses	77.29	51.52
Administrative & General Expenses	42.71	42.71
Repairs & Maintenance Expenses	83.39	9.27
Depreciation	155.53	17.28
Interest on Long term Loan	74.75	8.31
Interest on Security Deposits	5.36	48.22
Interest on Working Capital	0.00	0.00
Bad Debts Written off	0.00	4.92
Income Tax	88.02	9.78
Contingency Reserve	0.60	0.00
Return on Equity	189.96	21.11
Non-Tariff Income	9.77	87.95
Aggregate Revenue Requirement	**707.83**	**4,072.84**

Table 8.6: Wheeling charges in case of Ahmedabad Supply Area for FY 2018-19

Particulars	Value
First Level apportionment of ARR (in Rs. Crores)	530.65
HT Voltage	177.18
LT Voltage	**707.83**

Particulars	Value
Total	
Second Level apportionment of ARR (in Rs. Crores)	
HT Voltage	174.54
LT Voltage	533.29
Total	**707.83**
Wheeling Charge (in Rs/ kWh)	
HT Voltage	0.72
LT Voltage	0.90

The Commission has accordingly approved the wheeling charges for HT and LT voltages as shown in the Table above.

The Commission has also agreed with the Petitioner and approves the following losses for Open Access consumer in addition to the wheeling charges:

Table 8.7 : Approved wheeling charges in kind of Ahmedabad Supply Area for FY 2018-19

Category	Value
HT Category	4.00%
LT Category	7.50%

8.2 Cross Subsidy Surcharge

Petitioner's Submission

Determination of Cross-Subsidy Surcharge

TPL-D has proposed the cross subsidy for HTMD-1 and HTMD-2 category consumer as 149 Paisa/kWh and 150 Paisa/kWh.

Commission's Analysis

Hon'ble APTEL in its judgement on the issue of formula for calculation of Cross-subsidy has endorsed the use of the formula depicted in the Tariff Policy. The Central Government has issued Tariff Policy, 2016 wherein the formula for Cross Subsidy Surcharge is given as under;

$$S = T – [C / (1 - L/100) + D + R]$$

Where,

S is the surcharge

T is the tariff payable by the relevant category of consumers, including reflecting the Renewable Purchase Obligation

C is the per unit weighted average cost of power purchase by the Licensee, including meeting the Renewable Purchase Obligation

D is the aggregate of transmission, distribution and wheeling charge applicable to the relevant voltage level

L is the aggregate of transmission, distribution and commercial losses, expressed as a percentage applicable to the relevant voltage level

R is the per unit cost of carrying regulatory assets.

The Cross Subsidy Surcharge based on the above formula is worked out as shown in the Table below:

Table 8.8: Cross subsidy surcharge for FY 2018-19

Sl. No.	Particulars	HTMD
1	T - Tariff for HT Category (Rs./kWh)	7.19
2	C - Wt. Avg. Power Purchase Cost (Rs./kWh)	4.66
3	D - Wheeling Charge (Rs./kWh)	0.72
4	L - Aggregate T&D Loss (%)	4.00%
5	R - per unit cost of carrying Regulatory Assets (Rs./kWh)	0.00
6	S = Cross subsidy surcharge (Rs./kWh)	1.62

S = 7.19 – [4.66/ (1-4/100) + 0.72 + 0.00]

= 1.62 Rs./kWh

Thus, Cross Subsidy Surcharge as per Tariff Policy, 2016 works out to Rs. 1.62 /kWh for HTMD. Tariff Policy, 2016 provides that the surcharge shall not exceed 20% of the tariff applicable to the category of the consumers seeking open access. Hence, the aforesaid surcharge is restricted to 20% of Tariff applicable to category.

Accordingly, Cross Subsidy Surcharge for HTMD Category = Rs.1.44/kWh for FY 2018-19.

9 Tariff Philosophy and Tariff Proposals

9.1 Introduction

The Commission is guided by the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, the National Electricity Policy, the Tariff Policy, the Regulations on Terms and Conditions of Tariff issued by the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC) and GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2016 notified by the Commission.

Section 61 of the Act lays down the broad principles and guidelines for determination of retail supply tariff. The basic principle is to ensure that the tariff should progressively reflect the cost of supply of electricity and reduce the cross subsidy amongst categories within a period to be specified by the Commission.

9.2 Proposal of TPL for increase in Retail Tariffs for Ahmedabad for FY 2018-19

Tariff Philosophy

The Petitioner submits that the Commission has approved the existing tariff structure based on widely recognized best practices in accordance with the legal framework as detailed hereunder:

A. Consumers' capacity to pay
B. Adhering to the band of cross subsidy prescribed by Tariff Policy
C. Incentivising energy conservation through telescopic tariff
D. Demand Side Management by shifting of consumption from peak hours to off-peak hours
E. Promotion of efficient use of electricity

Determination of Retail Tariff

The Petitioner submitted that cumulative gap is arising on account of past years' under-recovery. Therefore, instead of seeking Tariff increase, the Petitioner proposes to recover this cumulative gap of Rs. 390.83 Crore by way of Regulatory Charge at the rate of Rs. 0.25 per unit w.e.f. 1st April, 2018. The Petitioner submitted that this Regulatory Charge will be applicable for FY 2018-19 and for part of FY 2019-20 till such time that the said cumulative gap of Rs. 390.83 Crore is fully recovered and would be discontinued upon completion of recovery of cumulative gap.

9.3 Commission's Analysis

The Commission noted that the Petitioner has not proposed any changes in the Tariff Structure or Tariff Rates except for Regulatory Charge @ Rs.0.25 per unit to address earlier Years' gap. However, as stated earlier, the Commission has decided to address the issue of carrying cost on disposal of the matter by Hon'ble APTEL and has accordingly, arrived at revenue surplus for FY 2018-19 which does not necessitate levy of Regulatory Charge as proposed by the Petitioner and the same shall be accommodated in ensuing year as per Regulations.

However, some of the stakeholders have also suggested modification in retail tariff schedule. The details of proposal and suggestions considered by the Commission is given here below:

1. Meter Rent

The State owned Distribution Licensees have proposed merging of meter charges with the fixed charges/ demand charges. Some of the stakeholders have repeatedly suggested to abolish meter rent from the electricity bill.

At present Meter Rent is being collected by the Distribution Licensee in accordance with the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Licensee's Power to Recover Expenditure incurred in providing supply and other Miscellaneous Charges) Regulations, 2005.

In view of the proposal of the State Owned Discoms, representations of the stakeholders and in exercise of the powers conferred under the aforesaid Regulations, the Commission decides to abolish Meter Charges of the consumers of TPL effective from 1st April 2018.

2. Clarity for shifting tariff category for exclusive night time tariff

In order to reduce ambiguity and to provide more clarity in switching of tariff category from regular tariff to exclusive night time tariff and period of notice, the Commission decides to reword existing condition as follows:

‘The option can be exercised to shift from regular tariff category to exclusive night time tariff or from exclusive night time tariff category to regular tariff four times in a calendar year by giving not less than 15 days’ advance notice in writing before commencement of billing period.’

3. Extending benefit of Optional Demand Based Tariff to small consumers

At present, all the Non-RGP installations above 15 kW are covered under demand based tariff category. Some of the stakeholders represented that option for demand based tariff may also be extended to small consumers in line with the option available to small consumers in State Owned Discoms. The Commission agrees with the suggestion and accordingly, description of applicability of ‘Rate: LTMD-2’ is modified to allow small Non-RGP consumer to avail benefit of demand based tariff, if so opts.

4. Tariff for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging facilities

The Commission is also aware about initiative taken by the Government to encourage use of electric vehicles. One of the challenges in this regard is identified as lack of EV charging infrastructure. The Commission would like to clarify that the consumers getting electricity supply under regular tariff categories may use electricity supply for EV charging under same consumer category.

Further, in order to promote creation of new EV charging facilities, the Commission decides to introduce special tariff category for exclusive EV Charging infrastructure with Fixed Charges of Rs. 25 per month per installation and Energy Charges of Rs. 4.10 per kWh for LT consumers and Fixed Charges of Rs. 25 per kW per month and Energy Charges of Rs. 4.00 per kWh for HT consumers. Such consumers also required to pay the FPPPA charges as applicable from time to time.

In view of the above referred modifications, it is estimated that the revenue of TPL-D (A) will be affected, which will be duly considered by the Commission in the truing up exercise.

COMMISSION'S ORDER

The Commission approves the Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for TPL-D (Ahmedabad) for FY 2018-19, as shown in the Table below:

Approved ARR for TPL-D (Ahmedabad) for FY 2018-19

(Rs. Crore)

Sl. No.	Particulars	FY 2018-19
1	Power Purchase Expense	3,947.68
2	O & M Expenses	306.87
3	Depreciation	172.81
4	Interest & Finance Charges	83.06
5	Interest on Security Deposits	53.58
6	Interest on Working Capital	0.00
7	Bad Debts Written Off	4.92
8	Income Tax	97.80
9	Contingency Reserve	0.60
10	Return on Equity	211.07
11	Non-Tariff Income	97.72
12	**Aggregate Revenue Requirement**	**4,780.67**

The retail supply tariffs for Ahmedabad distribution area for FY 2018-19 determined by the Commission are annexed to this order.

This order shall come into force with effect from 1st April, 2018. The revised rates shall be applicable for the electricity consumption from 1st April, 2018 onwards.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
P. J. THAKKAR	**K. M. SHRINGARPURE**	**ANAND KUMAR**
Member	Member	Chairman

Place: Gandhinagar
Date:31/03/2018

ANNEXURE: TARIFF SCHEDULE

TARIFF SCHEDULE FOR AHMEDABAD - GANDHINAGAR LICENSE AREA OF TORRENT POWER LIMITED- AHMEDABAD

TARIFF FOR SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY AT LOW TENSION, HIGH TENSION AND EXTRA HIGH TENSION

Effective from 1st April, 2018

GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. This tariff schedule is applicable to all the consumers of TPL in Ahmedabad-Gandhinagar area
2. All these tariffs for power supply are applicable to only one point of supply.
3. Except in cases where the supply is used for purposes for which a lower tariff is provided in the tariff schedule, the power supplied to any consumer shall be utilized only for the purpose for which supply is taken and as provided for in the tariff.
4. The charges specified in the tariff are on monthly basis, TPL shall adjust the rates according to billing period applicable to consumer.
5. The various provisions of the GERC (Licensee's power to recover expenditure incurred in providing supply and other miscellaneous charges) Regulations, except Meter Charges, will continue to apply.
6. Conversion of Ratings of electrical appliances and equipments from kilowatt to B.H.P. or vice versa will be done, when necessary, at the rate of 0.746 kilowatt equal to 1 B.H.P.
7. The billing of fixed charges based on contracted load or maximum demand shall be done in multiples of 0.5 (one half) Horse Power or kilo watt (HP or kW) as the case may be. The fraction of less than 0.5 shall be rounded to next 0.5. The billing of energy charges will be done on complete one kilo-watt-hour (kWh).
8. The Connected Load for the purpose of billing will be taken as the maximum load connected during the billing period.
9. Contract Demand shall mean the maximum kW for the supply of which TPL undertakes to provide facilities to the consumer from time to time.

10. Maximum Demand in a month means the highest value of average kW as the case may be, delivered at the point of supply of the consumer during any consecutive 15/30 minutes in the said month.

11. Payment of penal charges for usage in excess of contract demand/load for any billing period does not entitle the consumer to draw in excess of contract demand/load as a matter of right.

12. The fixed charges, minimum charges, demand charges and the slabs of consumption of energy for energy charges mentioned shall not be subject to any adjustment on account of existence of any broken period within billing period arising from consumer supply being connected or disconnected any time within the duration of billing period for any reason.

13. Prompt payment discount on the total bill excluding all types of levies, duties or taxes levied by the Government or any other competent authorities but including fixed charges, energy charges and minimum charge may be allowed at the 1% rate for all tariff categories provided that the payment is made within 7 days of presentation of bill and that no previous amount is outstanding as on the date of the bill.

14. The energy bills shall be paid by the consumer within 14 days from the date of billing, failing which the consumer shall be liable to pay the delayed payment charges @15% p.a. for the number of days from the due date to the date of payment of bill.

15. Fuel Price and Power Purchase Adjustment (FPPPA) charges shall be applicable in accordance with the formula approved by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission from time to time.

16. Statutory Levies: These tariffs are exclusive of Electricity Duty, Tax on Sales of Electricity, Taxes and other Charges levied/may be levied or such other taxes as may be levied by the Government or other Competent Authorities on bulk/retail supplies from time to time.

17. The payment of power factor penalty does not exempt the consumer from taking steps to improve the power factor to the levels specified in the Regulations notified under the Electricity Act, 2003 and TPL shall be entitled to take any other action deemed necessary and authorized under the Act.

PART- I

SUPPLY DELIVERED AT LOW OR MEDIUM VOLTAGE

(230 VOLTS- SINGLE PHASE, 400 VOLTS- THREE PHASE, 50 HERTZ)

1. RATE: RGP

This tariff is applicable to supply of electricity for:

i. residential purpose, and

ii. Installations having connected load up to and including 15 kW for common services like elevators, water pumping systems, passage lighting in residential premises and pumping stations run by local authorities.

1.1. FIXED CHARGE

For Other than BPL consumers

(a)	Single Phase Supply	Rs. 25 per month per installation
(b)	Three Phase Supply	Rs. 65 per month per installation

For BPL household consumers*

(a)	Fixed Charges	Rs. 5 per month per installation

1.2. ENERGY CHARGE

For Other than BPL consumers

(a)	First 50 units consumed per month	320 Paise per Unit
(b)	For the next 150 units consumed per month	390 Paise per Unit
(c)	Remaining units consumed per month	490 Paise per Unit

For BPL household consumers*

(a)	First 30 units consumed per month	150 Paise per Unit
(b)	For remaining units consumed per month	Rate as per RGP

** The consumer who wants to avail the benefit of the above tariff has to produce a copy of the Card issued by the authority concerned at the zonal* *office of the Distribution Licensee. The concessional tariff is only for 30 units per month.*

2. RATE: GLP

Applicable for supply of electricity to 'other than residential' premises used for charitable purposes like: public hospitals, dispensaries, educational and research institutions and hostels attached to such institutions, youth hostels run by Government, religious premises exclusively used for worship or community prayers, electric crematorium etc. Such premises should be in the use of 'Public Trust" as defined under section 2(13) of the Bombay Public Trust Act, 1950.

2.1. FIXED CHARGE

(a)	Single Phase Supply	Rs. 30 per month per installation
(b)	Three Phase Supply	Rs. 70 per month per installation

2.2. ENERGY CHARGE

(a)	First 200 units consumed per month	410 Paise per Unit
(b)	Remaining units consumed per month	480 Paise per Unit

3. RATE: NON-RGP

Applicable for supply of electricity to premises which are not covered in any other LT tariff categories, up to and including 15 kW of connected load.

3.1. FIXED CHARGE

(a)	For installations having Connected Load up to and including 5 kW	Rs. 70 per kW per month
(b)	For installations having Connected Load more than 5 kW and up to 15 kW	Rs. 90 per kW per month

3.2. ENERGY CHARGE

A flat rate of	450 Paise per Unit

4. RATE: LTP (AG)

Applicable to motive power installations for agricultural purposes

4.1. ENERGY CHARGE

A flat rate of	330 Paise per Unit

4.2. MINIMUM CHARGE

Minimum Charge per BHP of Connected Load	Rs. 10 per BHP per Month

Note:

1. The agricultural consumers shall be permitted to utilize one bulb or CFL up to 40 watts in the Pump House. Any further extension or addition of load will amount to unauthorized extension.
2. No machinery other than pump for irrigation will be permitted under this tariff.

5. Rate: LTMD-1

Applicable for supply of electricity to installations above 15 kW of connected load used for common services like elevators, water pumping systems and passage lighting for residential purpose and pumping stations run by local authorities.

5.1. FIXED CHARGE

1. For Billing Demand up to and including Contract Demand

(a)	First 50 kW of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 150 per kW
(b)	Next 30 kW of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 185 per kW
(c)	Rest of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 245 per kW

2. For Billing Demand in excess of the Contract Demand

Fixed Charge per kW of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 350 Per kW

Note: The Billing Demand will be taken as under:

i. The Maximum Demand recorded during the month OR

ii. 85% of the Contract Demand OR

iii. 6 KW

Whichever is the highest.

5.2. ENERGY CHARGE

(a)	For Billing Demand up to and including 50 KW	455 Paise per unit
(b)	For Billing Demand above 50 KW	470 Paise per unit

5.3. POWER FACTOR ADJUSTMENT CHARGE

A. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period exceeds 90%

For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor from 90% to 95%	Rebate of 0.15 Paise per Unit
For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor above 95%	Rebate of 0.27 Paise per Unit

B. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period is below 90%

For each 1% decrease in the Power Factor below 90%	Penalty of 3.00 Paise per Unit

6. <u>RATE: LTMD-2</u>

Applicable for supply of electricity to premises which are not covered in any other LT tariff categories, having above 15 kW of connected load.

This tariff shall also be applicable to consumer covered in category- 'Rate: Non-RGP' so opts to be charged in place of 'Rate: Non-RGP' tariff.

6.1. FIXED CHARGE

A. For Billing Demand up to and including Contract Demand

(a)	First 50 kW of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 175 per kW
(b)	Next 30 kW of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 230 per kW
(c)	Rest of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 300 per kW

B. For Billing Demand in excess of the Contract Demand

Fixed Charge per kW of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 425 Per kW

Note: The Billing Demand will be taken as under:

i. The Maximum Demand recorded during the month OR

ii. 85% of the Contract Demand OR

iii. 6 KW

Whichever is the highest.

6.2. ENERGY CHARGE

(a)	For Billing Demand up to and including 50 KW	470 Paise per unit
(b)	For Billing Demand above 50 KW	490 Paise per unit

6.3. POWER FACTOR ADJUSTMENT CHARGE

A. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period exceeds 90%

For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor from 90% to 95%	Rebate of 0.15 Paise per Unit
For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor above 95%	Rebate of 0.27 Paise per Unit

B. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period is below 90%

For each 1% decrease in the Power Factor below 90%	Penalty of 3.00 Paise per Unit

7. RATE: SL

Applicable to lighting systems for illumination of public roads.

7.1. ENERGY CHARGE

A flat rate of	420 Paise per Unit

7.2. OPTIONAL kVAh CHARGE

For all the kVAh units consumed during the month	325 Paise per Unit

8. RATE: TMP

Applicable to installations for temporary requirement of electricity supply.

8.1. FIXED CHARGE

Fixed Charge per Installation	Rs. 25 per kW per Day

8.2. ENERGY CHARGE

A flat rate of	500 Paise per Unit

9. RATE: LT - Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Stations

This tariff is applicable to consumers who use electricity **EXCLUSIVELY** for electric vehicle charging installations.

Other consumers can use their regular electricity supply for charging electric vehicle under same regular category i.e. RGP, NRGP, LTMD etc.

9.1. FIXED CHARGE

Rs. 25 per month per installation

PLUS

9.2. ENERGY CHARGE

Energy Charge	410 Paise per Unit

PART- II
SUPPLY DELIVERED AT HIGH VOLTAGE
(11000 VOLTS- THREE PHASE, 50 HERTZ)

10. RATE: HTMD-1

Applicable for supply of energy to High Tension consumers contracting for maximum demand of 100 kW and above for purposes other than pumping stations run by local authorities.

10.1. FIXED CHARGE

A. For Billing Demand up to and including Contract Demand

Fixed Charge per kW of Billing Demand per Month for Billing demand up to 1000 KW	Rs. 260 per kW
Fixed Charge per kW of Billing Demand per Month for Billing demand 1000 KW and above	Rs. 335 per KW

B. For Billing Demand in excess of the Contract Demand

Fixed Charge per kW of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 385 per kW

Note: The Billing Demand will be taken as under:

i. The Maximum Demand recorded during the month OR
ii. 85% of the Contract Demand OR
iii. 100 KW

Whichever is the highest.

10.2. ENERGY CHARGE

(a)	First 400 units consumed per kW of Billing Demand per Month	445 Paise per unit
(b)	Remaining Units consumed per Month	435 Paise per unit

10.3. TIME OF USE (TOU) CHARGE

For the Consumption during specified hours as mentioned here below: (i) For April to October period- 1200 Hrs. to 1700 Hrs. & 1830 Hrs. to 2130 Hrs. (ii) For November to March period- 0800 Hrs. to 1200 Hrs. & 1800 Hrs. to

2200 Hrs.	
(a) For Billing Demand up to 300 kW	80 Paise per Unit
(b) For Billing Demand Above 300 kW	100 Paise per Unit

10.4. NIGHT TIME CONCESSION

The energy consumed during night hours between 22.00 hours and 06.00 hours next day recorded by the tariff meter having built in feature of time segments shall be eligible for rebate at the rate of 30 Paise per KWH.

10.5. POWER FACTOR ADJUSTMENT CHARGE

A. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period exceeds 90%

For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor from 90% to 95%	Rebate of 0.15 Paise per Unit
For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor above 95%	Rebate of 0.27 Paise per Unit

B. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period is below 90%

For each 1% decrease in the Power Factor below 90%	Penalty of 3.00 Paise per Unit

11. <u>RATE: HTMD-2</u>

Applicable for supply of energy to Water and Sewage Pumping Stations run by local authorities and contracting for maximum demand of 100 kW and above.

11.1. FIXED CHARGE

A. For Billing Demand up to and including Contract Demand

Fixed Charge per kW of Billing Demand per Month	Rs. 225 per kW

B. For Billing Demand in excess of the Contract Demand

Fixed Charge per kW of Billing Demand per month	Rs. 285 Per kW

Note: The Billing Demand will be taken as under:

i. The Maximum Demand recorded during the month OR
ii. 85% of the Contract Demand OR
iii. 100 KW

Whichever is the highest.

11.2. ENERGY CHARGE

A flat rate of	400 Paise per unit

11.3. TIME OF USE (TOU) CHARGE

For the Consumption during specified hours as mentioned here below- (i) For April to October period- 1200 Hrs. to 1700 Hrs. & 1830 Hrs. to 2130 Hrs. (ii) For November to March period- 0800 Hrs. to 1200 Hrs. & 1800 Hrs. to 2200 Hrs.	60 Paise per unit

11.4. NIGHT TIME CONCESSION

The energy consumed during night hours between 22.00 hours and 06.00 hours next day recorded by the tariff meter having built in feature of time segments shall be eligible for rebate at the rate of 30 Paise per KWH.

11.5. POWER FACTOR ADJUSTMENT CHARGE

A. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period exceeds 90%

For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor from 90% to 95%	Rebate of 0.15 Paise per Unit
For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor above 95%	Rebate of 0.27 Paise per Unit

B. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period is below 90%

For each 1% decrease in the Power Factor below 90%	Penalty of 3.00 Paise per Unit

12. RATE: HTMD-3

This tariff shall be applicable to a consumer taking supply of electricity at high voltage, contracting for not less than 100 kW for temporary period. A consumer not taking supply on regular basis under a proper agreement shall be deemed to be taking supply for temporary period.

12.1. FIXED CHARGE

For billing demand up to contract demand	Rs. 25/- per kW per day
For billing demand in excess of contract demand	Rs. 30/- per kW per day

Note: The Billing Demand will be taken as under:

i. The Maximum Demand recorded during the month OR

ii. 85% of the Contract Demand OR

iii. 100 KW

Whichever is the highest.

12.2. ENERGY CHARGE

For all units consumed during the month	695 Paise/Unit

12.3. TIME OF USE (TOU) CHARGE

For the Consumption during specified hours as mentioned here below- (i) For April to October period- 1200 Hrs. to 1700 Hrs. & 1830 Hrs. to 2130 Hrs. (ii) For November to March period- 0800 Hrs. to 1200 Hrs. & 1800 Hrs. to 2200 Hrs.	60 Paise per unit

12.4. POWER FACTOR ADJUSTMENT CHARGE

A. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period exceeds 90%

For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor from 90% to 95%	Rebate of 0.15 Paise per Unit
For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor above 95%	Rebate of 0.27 Paise per Unit

B. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period is below 90%

For each 1% decrease in the Power Factor below 90%	Penalty of 3.00 Paise per Unit

13. RATE: NTCT (NIGHT TIME CONCESSIONAL TARIFF)

This is night time concessional tariff for consumers for regular power supply who opt to use electricity EXCLUSIVELY during night hours between 22.00 hours and 06.00 hours next day.

13.1. FIXED CHARGE

Fixed Charges	30% of the Demand Charges under relevant Tariff Category

13.2. ENERGY CHARGE

A flat rate of	340 Paise per unit

13.3. POWER FACTOR ADJUSTMENT CHARGE

A. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period exceeds 90%

For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor from 90% to 95%	Rebate of 0.15 Paise per Unit
For each 1% improvement in the Power Factor above 95%	Rebate of 0.27 Paise per Unit

B. Where the average Power Factor during the Billing period is below 90%

For each 1% decrease in the Power Factor below 90%	Penalty of 3.00 Paise per Unit

NOTE:

1. *15% of the contracted demand can be availed beyond the night hours prescribed as per para 13.0 above.*
2. *10% of total units consumed during the billing period can be availed beyond the night hours prescribed as per para 13.0 above.*
3. *In case the consumer failed to observe condition no. 1 above during any of the billing month, then demand charge during the relevant billing month shall be billed as per HTMD category demand charge rates given in para*

10.1 of this schedule.

4. *In case the consumer failed to observe condition no. 2 above during any of the billing month, then entire energy consumption during the relevant billing month shall be billed as per HTMD category energy charge rates given in para 10.2 of this schedule.*
5. *In case the consumer failed to observe above condition no. 1 and 2 both during any of the billing month, then demand charge and entire energy consumption during the relevant billing month shall be billed as per HTMD category demand charge and energy charge rates given in para 10.1 and 10.2 respectively, of this schedule.*
6. *This tariff shall be applicable if the consumer so opts to be charged in place of HTMD tariff by using electricity exclusively during night hours as above.*
7. *The option can be exercised to shift from regular HTMD tariff category to Rate: NTCT or from Rate: NTCT to regular HTMD tariff four times in a calendar year by giving not less than 15 days' advance notice in writing before commencement of billing period.*

14. RATE: HT - Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Stations

This tariff is applicable to consumers who use electricity **EXCLUSIVELY** for electric vehicle charging installations.

Other consumers can use their regular electricity supply for charging electric vehicle under same regular category i.e. HTMD-1, HTMD-2, HTMD-3 & NTCT.

14.1 DEMAND CHARGE

For billing demand up to contract demand	Rs. 25 per kW per month
For billing demand in excess of contract demand	Rs. 50 per kW per month

PLUS

14.1. ENERGY CHARGE

Energy Charge	400 Paise per Unit