



The Federation of Telangana Chambers of Commerce and Industry

ISO 9001:2015

Empowering Industry, Commerce & Trade

Registered under the Companies Act, 1956

REGD OFFICE : Federation House, Federation Marg , 11-6-841, Red Hills, Hyderabad 500004, Telangana. India. Tel : 91-40-23395515 to 22 (8 lines), Fax : 91-40-23395525
e-Mail : info@ftcci.in ; Website : www.ftcci.in

CIN U91110TG1964NPL001030

Suresh Kumar Singhal
President

R.Ravi Kumar
Senior Vice President

K K Maheshwari
Vice President

Brief Statement of Objection on Petition filed by TGGENCO for Truing up the Generation Tariff for the FY 2022-23 and Multi Year Tariff Petition for the period from FY 2024-25 to FY 2028-29 for the existing stations

1. The instant petition has been filed by TGGENCO for the True up of FY 2022-23 and determination of Multiyear Tariff (MYT) for the FY 2024-29. The petition for the True up of FY 2022-23 has been filed under the Telangana State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Generation Tariff) Regulations, 2019 whereas the MYT for FY 2024-29 has been filed under the Telangana State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Multi Year Tariff) Regulation, 2023.

2. Non-adherence to the timelines of filing of the petitions:

Multi-year Tariff for FY 2024-29 – Regulation 6 of the TSERC (Multi Year Tariff) Regulation, 2023 provides for the filing of the MYT petition by 30th November. The relevant extracts of the same are reproduced as under:

“6 Procedure for filing Petition

6.2 The petitions to be filed for each Control Period under this Regulation areas under:

a) Multi Year Tariff petition shall be filed by 30th November of the year preceding the first year of the Control Period by generating entity, comprising:

i. True-up of preceding year for generation business;

ii. True-up of preceding year for integrated mine;

iii. Proposal of Tariff for each year of the Control Period for generation business;

iv. Proposal of Input Price of coal supplied from integrated mine foreach year of the Control Period.”

Based on the above, it is clear that the instant petition (True up for preceding year and Tariff for each year of the Control period) must have been filed by the Generating company (APGENCO) by 30th November, 2023. However, the Petitioner has filed the instant Petition after a prolonged delay of ~10 months (September 2024) which in the opinion of the Objector is not appropriate.

3. Absence of Audited Accounts

It is well understood that the True up for any FY is to be done in reference to the actual expenses gains against each line item of the ARR. Notably, the MYT Regulations 2019 also provides for the submission of Audited Accounts by the Licensed business along with the Petition to be filed before the Hon'ble Commission:

“2.2. "Accounting Statement(s)" means foreach Financial Year, the following statements, namely:

2.2.4. cost records” prescribed by the Central Government under the Companies Act, 2013, as applicable together with notes thereto, and such other supporting statements and information as the Commission may direct:

Provided that separate Accounting Statements shall be prepared and submitted to the Commission for each Licensed Business in accordance with the License conditions, and for each regulated business:

Provided further that, in case separate Accounting Statements are not submitted for each Licensed Business in accordance with the License conditions and for each regulated business for the FY 2018-19 onwards, the petitions filed by the Generating Entity, may be rejected by the Commission after giving the Petitioner a reasonable opportunity of being heard.”

In addition to non-submission of Audited Statement of Accounts for the FY 2022-23, the Licensee has also failed to provide the Auditor’s certification to substantiate the claim of Non tariff Income, Prior period income which are solely dependent on the Audit Accounts. Accordingly, the Licensee must be directed to submit the Annual Audited Statement of Accounts as part of the instant petition.

4. Operations and Maintenance Expenses

Regulation 19 of the MYT Regulations 2019 provides for the O&M Expenditure based on norms as shown under:

“19. Operating & maintenance expenses (O&M)

19.t. The O&M expenses for each year of the Control Period shall be approved based on the formula shown below

$$O\&M_n = (R\&M + EMP_n + A\&G_n) \times 99\%$$

Where,

R&M_n - Repair and Maintenance Costs of the Applicant for then nth year;

EMP_n - Employee Cost of the Applicant for then n th year;

A&G_n - Administrative and General Costs of the Applicant for the n th year;

The above components shall be computed in the manner specified in this clause:

19.2. Employee Cost (EMP_n)

Employee cost shall be computed as per the approved norm escalated by CPI, adjusted by provisions for expenses beyond the control of the Generating Entity and one time expected expenses, such as recovery/adjustment of Terminal Benefits, implications of pay commission, arrears and interim relief, governed by the following formula

.....

.....

19.3. Repairs and Maintenance Expense (R&M)

The expense shall be calculated as **percentage (as per the norm defined)** of Opening Gross Fixed Assets for the Year governed by following formula:

.....
.....

19.4 Administrative & General Expense (A&G)

A&G expense shall be **computed as per the norm escalated by the inflation factor and adjusted by provisions for confirmed initiatives (IT etc. initiatives as proposed by the Generating Entity and validated by the Commission) or other expected one-time expenses, and shall be governed by following formula.**”

The O&M Expenses claimed by the Petitioner is based on actuals as per the Annual Audited Accounts for the FY 2022-23 and is ~146% of the O&M Expenses approved in the MTR Order. The Petitioner submission is therefore in non-compliance of the MYT Regulations 2019 and does not deserve attention.

Notably, the Petitioner has placed excessive reliance on the Impact of Pay revision to account for the deviation in actual O&M expenses. Even otherwise, the claims made by the Petitioner is not in concurrent with the MYT Regulations 2019 which adequately provide for the one-time claims.

5. Return on Equity

The Petitioner has considered the Rate of RoE of 20.713% for thermal stations and run-of river stations and 22.049% for hydel stations with pondage by grossing up the base rate of 15.5% and 16.5% with the applicable Corporate Tax rate of 22% with applicable Surcharge and CESS of 10% and 4% respectively.

It is pointed out that the Tax rate claimed by the Licensee is not in accordance with the MYT Regulations 2019 which provide for the consideration of Tax rate based on actuals. In such regard, the Tax rate must be considered in reference to the Audited Accounts for the FY 2022-23.

6. Additional Pension liabilities

The Licensee has not submitted any reasons for the variations in respect of the contribution towards pension liabilities. Additionally, there is no documentary evidence to substantiate the claim of Additional Pension liabilities. Accordingly, the Hon’ble Commission is humbly submitted to disallow any such expense in the absence of necessitating information on record.

7. Gains sharing on Operational parameters

Regulation 6.9 of the MYT Regulations 2019 provide for a mechanism for pass through of gains or losses on account of controllable factors. The Licensee has not submitted the proposal for Gain sharing in respect of Variation in performance parameters, such as

Availability, AuxiliaryConsumption, Secondary fuel oil consumption, Gross Station HeatRate for the FY 2022-23.

For instance, for KTPS V Genco, the actual SHR is 2307 kCal/ kWh (against normative of 2500 kCal/ kWh), the actual Secondary Fuel Oil Consumption is 0.523 ml/ kWh (against normative of 2 ml/ kWh). The Licensee has failed to pass on the impact of better operational performance to the consumers keeping them devoid of their rightful due.

Date: 11/10/2024

Place: Hyderabad



OBJECTOR

Sr. Director, FTCCI