

TELANGANA POWER GENERATION CORPORATION LIMITED (formerly Telangana State Power Generation Corporation Limited)

(A Govt. of Telangana Undertaking) Vidyut Soudha, Khairatabad, Hyderabad- 500082.

From
The Chief Engineer,
Coal & Commercial,
TGGENCO, Vidyut Soudha,
Khairatabad,
Hyderabad-500082

To
The Commission Secretary,
TGERC,
#Vidyut Niyantran Bhavan,
GTS Colony, Kalyan Nagar,
Hyderabad-500045.

Lr.No: TGGENCO/CE (Coal & Comml)/ SE(C&C)/ D.No: % / /25, dt:36 .08.2025

Sir,

Sub:- TGGENCO- Submission of replies on Objections/ Suggestions raised on True-up for the FY: 2023-24 - Reg.

Ref: Letter from Sri M Thimma Reddy, Dtd: 23.08.2025.

The replies to the Objections/Suggestions raised by Sri M Thimma Reddy, Convener, People's Monitoring Group on Electricity Regulation, Hyderabad on True up for FY: 2023-24 Petition is herewith enclosed.

Encl: As above

Yours faithfully

Chief Engineer (Coal & Commercial) TGGENCO/VS/HYD

> Copy to

Sri M. Thimma Reddy, Convener, People's Monitoring Group on Electricity Regulation, H.No. 3-4-107/1, Plot No. 39, Radha Krishna Nagar, Attapur, Hyderabad-500048.

S.	Objections/Suggestions	TGGENCO Reply
No. 2.1	There are discrepancies between TGGENCO's true up petition and Cost Audit Report for the FY 2023-24. According to the true up petition at the end of the FY 2023-24 Gross Fixed Assets (GFA) of TGGENCO were Rs. 32,002.88 Crore (p.4). But according to Cost Audit Report GFA during the same period was Rs. 53,932.70 GFA of 226.77 crore were added, according to the Cost Audit Report during the same period Rs. 5,759.21 Crore were added to GFA. [TGGENCO could have uploaded better and legible copies of Cost Audit Report and Annual	The Gross Fixed Assets (GFA) Shown in Cost Audit Report consist of Fixed Assets Rs.27,314.13 Crore (Note No.3 of Annual Report), Intangible Assets Rs.39.03 Crore and Capital Work in Progress (CWIP)- Rs.26,579.54 Crore. Further, The additions Shown as Rs.5,759.77 Crore also includes additions of CWIP of Rs.5,491.86 Crore apart from GFA additions. (Note No.3 to 5 of Annual Report may be referred).
2.2	Accounts Report]. According to the Cost Audit Report for FY 2023-24 current liabilities and provisions increased from Rs. 11630.58 Crore in FY 2022-23 to Rs. 17,886.23 Crore in FY 2023-24. As a result, net current assets declined from Rs. 414.30 crore in FY 2022-23 to minus Rs. 3,932,64 Crore in FY 2023-24 (P.A28). This indicates that TGGENCO is facing serious financial situation. Auxiliary consumption has to be limited to the approved	The current Liabilities increased due to increase in trade payables towards Coal and Oil and other O&M payments. Delay in realisation of Trade receivable resulted delay in payment of Coal bills resulted in increase of Current Liabilities. As per clause 3.13.2 of TGERC Regulation 1 of 2019, the True-up
3	percentage. Auxiliary consumption above the approved percentage shall not be allowed.	the state of the s

	43				
4	Particulars	Approved	Claimed	Variation	
	O&M	1,840.94	2,685.83	844.89	The second street and the second seco
	Depreciation	1,230.47	1,264.02	33.55	Tatebalk travial steeps accessed NSLatt to been all a contravious
	Interest	965.49	947.66	-17.83	THE SHOP SHOULD BE SHOULD BE SHOWN OF THE OWNER.
	IOWC	304.47	425.93	121.46	To the same of the last of the same and the same of th
	RoE	1,884.17	2,005.22	121.05	properties trouble assess a may TX IRCS to AR 8 (0755) 28 28 28 (1894)
	Total	6,225.54	7,328.66	1,103.12	resect of the total control outside and the control of the control
1.1	Increase on O&N	// costs accounte	ed for 76.59% o	f the increase in	As far as O&M cost is concerned, the expenses claimed as per the
	fixed charges. Out of total O&M costs employee expenses				audited annual accounts which include provision towards termina
	increased by Rs. 770.85 Crore. TGGENCO attributed the				
	increase in employee expenses to the impact of PRC-2022. But				benefits of employees and artisans. Indian Accounting (Ind AS) 19
	according to its own submission PRC impact for FY 2023-24				specifies that the provision shall be made towards employed
	was Rs. 287.40 Crore (Table 8-9). Increase in employee costs				terminal benefits as per actuarial valuation report. In the approved
	to the extent of	nearly 500 Crore	was not explai	ned. In the case	figures the same was not considered.
	of BTPS emplo	yee expenses i	ncreased by 1	38%. Impact of	and F. (60A Ft PS ECOS Y San anima D 66 SSE S Anima of SS F
	PRC on this plan	nt was only Rs. 4	10.97 Crore.		The second is leading to the second s
4.2	Interest on work	ing capital (IOW	C) increased by	y 39.89% during	
	the FY 2023-24. The reasons for such increase in IOWC need				
	to be scrutinized.				increased due to PRC 2022.

- 5.1 Fixed charges of BTPS increased by Rs. 367.52 Crore. BTPS alone accounted for 33.32% of the increased fixed charges of TGGENCO. Its employee expenses increased by 138% in spite of minimal impact of PRC.
- Unit-IV (Last unit) of BTPS was commissioned on 09.01.2022 (i.e., FY 21-22). Hence, all the four units of the station are operationalized from FY2022-23.
 - In the initial years the expenditure was low as the unit was under the warranty period. Subsequently, Hon'ble TGERC allowed the O&M expenses based on initial years actual expenditure. Hence the allowed O&M expenditure was very less. In True-up of FY 2023-24, actual expenditure as per audited annual accounts was claimed.
 - In the absence of base expenditure of a full year for projections, Hon'ble Commission has provisionally approved O&M expenses of Rs.169.55 Cr. in Mid-Term Review Order. However, actual O&M expense incurred is Rs.439.46 Cr. It is justifiable due to below mentioned reasons:
 - As per clause No.35(1)(1) CERC Regulations 2019, Normative O&M expenses of thermal generation stations of 250MW series is Rs.37.84 Lakhs/ MW were allowed by the commission. If same were considered for BTPS the Normative O&M Expenses would have been Rs.408.672 Crs. The Normative O&M expenses allowed by the CERC is exclusive of Security expenses and water charges, Whereas, BTPS O&M Expenses claimed is of Rs.439.46

Cr. at actuals as per Annual Accounts. Further, O&M expenses approved by the commission for the FY 2023-24, with similar capacity TGGENCO Thermal stations viz., KTPS V & VI (1000 MW) - Rs. 391.40 Cr. and KTPP I & II (1100 MW) -Rs. 358.57 Cr. Thus, the impact of variance in O&M Cost of BTPS is Rs. 269.91 Cr., in the overall variance. BTPS Normative energy charges computed considering the actual BTPS's energy charges increased from Rs. 3.31 per unit to 3.62 values of Coal price, Oil price, GCV and Normative operating per unit, an increase of 9.37%. An important reason for this parameters viz., Auxiliary Consumption, Gross Station Heat Rate higher energy charges was higher Gross Station Heat rate and Secondary Fuel Consumption. Actual energy charges (GSHR); While the Commission approved GSHR for this plant computed considering the actual operating parameters, coal rate, oil was 2273 kcal/kWh actual GSHR of this plant during the rate and GCV for True-up of FY 2023-24. approved heat rate. The higher heat rate indicates inefficient Due to integration of renewable energy, the units of BTPS were operation of the plant. Electricity consumers in the state shall running in low load operations due to back down. Hence the not be burdened due to inefficient operation of this plant. It is auxiliary consumption has been increased and also poor heat rate well known that TGGENCO procured substandard machinery from BHEL for this plant. This plant was facing troubles since its obtained. BHEL is a Maharathna Central PSU and has expertise in synchronization with the grid. We request the Commission not establishment of Thermal Power Stations across the country and allow higher heat rate of this plant. also is the sole manufacturer of BTG in the Govt Sector. As per clause 3.13.2 of TGERC Regulation 1 of 2019, the True-up

	Secretary Research 9 etc. Franchischer Set 1007-307	shall be a comparison of the actual operational and financial
	benefities we	performance vis-à-vis the approved forecast.
5.3	Another reason for higher energy charges of BTPS was the	ECR approved by the commission are provisional. Variation in fuel
	higher coal price paid by BTPS than approved by the	prices shall be adjusted based on the actual price of coal in
	Commission. While the approved coal price for BTPS was Rs.	accordance with the provisions under clause 21.10 & 21.11 of
	3.28 per kg the price claimed by TGGENCO for this plant was	regulations No.1 of 2019.
	Rs. 3.59 per kg the price claimed by TGGENCO for this plant	Ministry of coal allocated 100% domestic coal from SCCL group of
	was Rs. 3.59 per kg. Apart from BTPS and RTS-B all other	mines to TGGENCO thermal Stations. The coal price shall be as
	plants of TGGENCO reported lower coal prices compared to the	per the price notification issued by SCCL.
	ones approved by the Commission. Higher coal prices paid by	
	BTPS needs to be scrutinized.	
6	Fixed charges of Nagarjuna Sagar HES also were 31.66%	Major variation in fixed charges of Nagarjuna Sagar are on account
	higher than approved by the Commission and the same needs	of O&M Expenses of Rs.78.78 Crore out of which Rs. 73.47 Crore is
	to be scrutinized.	on account of Employee Expenses due to PRC-2022 impact and
		other provisions.
7	TGGENCO claimed Rs. 1,093.52 Crore towards true up	
	charges for FY 2023-24 (Part 13). At the same time, it brought	
	down actual claim to Rs. 723.32 Crore after sharing gains and	Commission along with TGERC Regulation 2 of 2023. Accordingly,
	losses (Part 14). But it did not include Form-16 (mentioned in	the consolidated Form-16 is enclosed in Volume-3 of True-up
	para 14) in the true up petition. Without this information it is not	
	possible to assess the actual claim of TGGENCO.	

8	The petition did not mention whether TGGENCO received the	TGGENCO did not collected any Late Payment Surcharges from its
	late payment surcharge (LPS) from TGDISCOMs. If it had	beneficiaries.
	received LPS the same shall be deducted from the true up	The second STER SC Englishes regardle through not be season radion Article
	amount.	THE RESERVE WAR AND ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY

Chief Enginesy
Cost & Commercial
TEGENCO, V.S. Hyderabed-52