

**MEGHALAYA STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
SHILLONG**

CASE NO. 9/2022

In the matter of Review of ARR and Tariff Order for FY 2022-23 dated 25.03.2022

AND

Meghalaya Power Distribution Corporation Limited (the Petitioner)

Coram

Shri P.W. Ingty, IAS (Retd), Chairman

Shri Roland Keishing, Member (Law)

ORDER

(Dated: 10 .10 .2022)

1. MePDCL has filed the Petition as per the Regulation 22 for Review of ARR and Tariff Order for FY 2022-23 dated 25.03.2022.
2. Commission had approved ARR and Tariff Order as per section 62 (1) read with 62 (3) and section 64 (3) of Electricity Act 2003 for FY 2022-23 on 25.03.2022.
3. Regulation 22.2 of MYT Regulation 2014 provides that the Commission shall under take the review of ARR & Tariff Order considering the terms & Conditions laid down there in that.
 - a) the review petition is filed within sixty days from the date of the order.
4. Commission considers that the Review petition is filed within 60 days of date of ARR & Tariff Order and admitted the petition for Review of ARR & Tariff Order for FY 2022-23 and registered as Case No. 9 of 2022.
5. Commission issues this Review Order considering the petition with reference to the Regulation 22.2 of MSERC MYT Regulations 2014.

**Sd/-
Shri. Roland Keishing
(Member)**

**Sd/-
Shri.P.W. Ingty, IAS (Retd)
(Chairman)**

1 Introduction

Petitioner's Submission

The present petition is being filed as per clause 22 of MSERC (Multi Year Tariff) Regulations 2014, which is reproduced below:

“22 Review of Tariff Order

All applications for the review of tariff shall be in the form of petition accompanied by the prescribed fee. A petition for review of tariff can be admitted by the Commission under the following conditions:

- a) the review petition is filed within sixty days for the date of the tariff order, and / or
- b) there is an error apparent on the face of the record

On being satisfied that there is a need to review the tariff of any generating company or the licensee, the Commission may on its own initiate process of review of the tariff of any generating company or the licensee. The Commission may also, in its own motion review any tariff order to correct any clerical error or any error apparent of the face of the record”

As such, the MSERC (Multi Year Tariff) Regulations 2014 provides for the petitioner or any other person aggrieved by an order of the Hon'ble Commission to file a review petition based on new facts and information, which was/were not considered during the time of issue of order or on account of apparent errors or mistakes. MePDCL, in this petition is requesting the Hon'ble Commission to review certain costs which were disallowed in view of the latest facts and information submitted in this petition or in view of apparent errors observed.

The present petition is also being filed as per clause 21 of MSERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations 2006, which is reproduced below:

“A person aggrieved by a decision or order of the Commission from which no appeal is preferred, or is not allowed to be preferred, can seek a review of the order if new and important facts which, after the exercise of due diligence, were not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was passed or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of record or for any other sufficient reason, by making an application within 60 days of the date of the order.”

Commission’s Analysis

Commission considers the Review petition for Revision of ARR & Tariff Order for FY 2022-23 is filed as per Regulation 22 of MSERC MYT Regulations 2014 within the prescribed 60 days from the date of order.

Commission considers that the ARR and Tariff Order for FY 2022-23 has been determined based on the petition filed by the licensee MePDCL with reference to the additional information/data filed on 07.01.2022 and 01.02.2022 with respect to power purchase cost for ARR & Tariff order for FY 2022-23.

Commission considers that the power purchase cost approved in the ARR for FY 2022-23 is based on the estimates subject to True up after completion of the FY 2022-23 with reference to the audited performance filed by the licensee as per the Regulations.

2 Review of ARR and Tariff Order for FY 2022-23

2.0 Components of Review

Petitioner's Submission

It is submitted that the specific grounds on which the review is being sought have been identified against each aspect of the Order, on which review is being sought, in subsequent paragraphs.

Commission's Analysis

Commission considers that the Regulation 23.1 of MSERC MYT Regulations 2014 stipulates;

No tariff or part of any tariff may be ordinarily amended, more frequently than once in any financial year, except FPPPA based on FPPPA formulae approved by the Commission from time to time. Provided that the consequential orders, which the Commission may issue to give effect to the subsidy by the State Government shall not be construed as amendment of the tariff notified.

Commission had determined the ARR and Tariff Order for FY 2022-23 based on the projections estimated to be realistic considering the additional information filed by the licensee on 07.01.2022 and 01.02.2022.

The specific grounds on which licensee sought for Review of the Tariff order shall be of not valid for the estimated determination of ARR and Tariff Order for FY 2022-23.

The specific grounds stated to be identified in the Review petition shall be validated on completion of FY 2022-23 with reference to the audited performance.

2.1 Power Purchase Cost

Petitioner's Submission

The Hon'ble Commission in the order has escalated the power purchase cost by 5% with the actual power purchase cost upto December 2021 for FY 2021-22 as the base to arrive at power purchase cost for FY 2022-22. In doing so, the Hon'ble Commission has considered the quantum of energy received as what was approved in the MYT order dated 25 March 2021 but the cost based on the actual of FY 2021-22 (upto December 2021). The Power purchase cost approved by the Hon'ble Commission in

Part A of Table 5.9 : Power Purchase Cost considered for ARR of FY 2022-23 is reproduced below:

Table 1: Approved power purchase Cost (Part A)

(Rs in Cr)

Sl. No	Source	Energy received (MU)	April 2021 to December 2021 (Actual)			January 2022 to March 2022 (Estimated)			Estimate for FY 2021-22	Estimate for FY 2022-23 With 5% Escalation
			Total Variable Cost	Total Fixed Cost	Total Cost	Total Variable Cost	Total Fixed Cost	Total Cost		
Part-A										
1	MePGCL	1293.49							172.01	272.02
	a) Umiam Stage-I HEP	114.61	0.84	1.61	2.45	0.28	0.54	0.82	3.27	26.94
	b) Umiam Stage-II HEP	45.45	0.61	0.89	1.50	0.20	0.30	0.50	2.00	14.96
	c) UmiamStage-III HEP	137.33	2.26	2.67	4.93	0.75	0.89	1.64	6.57	44.89
	d) Umiam Stage-IVHEP	203.90	1.78	2.67	4.45	0.59	0.89	1.48	5.93	44.89
	e) Sonapani	4.94	0.08	0.07	0.15	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.19	1.12
	f) Umtru HEP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	g)Myntdu- Leishka HEP	478.71	37.42	36.77	74.19	12.47	12.26	24.73	98.92	94.26
	h)New Umtru HEP	231.48	13.30	16.74	30.04	4.43	5.58	10.01	40.05	29.92
	i) Lakroh HEP	10.87	0.34	0.55	0.89	0.11	0.18	0.29	1.18	1.12
	j) Ganol HEP	66.20							13.92*	13.92
	m) Auxiliary Consumption									
2	NTPC	589.50							144.57	151.80
	a)Farakka	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	b)Khalgaon I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	c)KhalgaonII	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	d)Talcher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	e)Bongaigoan	589.50	0.39	108.04	108.43	0.13	36.01	36.14	144.57	
3	NHPC	40.28								
	a)Loktak HEP	40.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.94*	2.03
4	NEEPCO	723.70			172.05			57.37	229.42	240.90
	a) KopiliStage-I	82.23	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.09	
	b) KopiliStage-II	8.48	0.06	0.11	0.17	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.23	
	c) KhandongHEP	17.53	2.36	2.63	4.99	0.79	0.88	1.67	6.66	
	d) Rangandai HEP	131.25	13.59	14.64	28.23	4.53	4.88	9.41	37.64	
	e) DoyangHEP	23.65	2.61	5.03	7.64	0.87	1.68	2.55	10.19	
	f) AGBPP	187.65	23.27	29.27	52.54	7.76	9.76	17.52	70.06	
	g) AGTPPC-Cycle	119	17.31	13.96	31.27	5.77	4.65	10.42	41.69	
	h) Pare	42.92	25.43	0.03	25.46	8.48	0.01	8.49	33.95	
	i) Kameng	45.99	21.65	0.03	21.68	7.22	0.01	7.23	28.91	
	Free Power	65.00								
5	OTPC	436.79								
	a) Pallatana	436.79	57.89	44.00	101.89	19.30	14.66	33.96	135.85	142.64
6	Solar Sources	39.42							13.80*	14.49
	Sub Total (A)	3123.18	221.19	279.78	500.97	73.72	93.26	166.98	697.59	823.88

*** Breakup of variable and fixed cost is not available. (Unit rate for Ganol HEP considered at Rs.2.10 Ps per unit on the weighted average cost for MePGCL Energy)**

It can be clearly seen that the above-approved cost for FY 2022-23 is based on the actual cost up to December 2021 of FY 2021-22 but there is no mention of actual energy received during the period.

The escalation purely on cost with FY 2021-22 as the base without considering the actual energy received during the corresponding period is flawed and constitutes an error apparent on the face of the record and is fulfilling the parameters for review of the tariff fixation order, inter-alia on the following grounds:

- (a) The variable cost depends on the energy received.
- (b) The Capacity charge/Fixed Cost depends on the Monthly Plant availability factor. Therefore, when there is no generation, the Monthly plant availability Factor will be Nil and hence Capacity charge will be Nil. Further Capacity Charge will be receivable in full when the Monthly availability factor achieved meets the normative target.
- (c) From the information submitted on actual power purchase cost, it can be seen that there is also energy received. Therefore, this energy received should have also be considered to arrive at the cost for FY 2022-23.

It may be stated that the energy proposed to be received for FY 2022-23 is based on full share allocation. However not all generating stations could meet the full generation from the actual data submitted for FY 2021-22. The followings are the stations which could not meet the full generation:

a) Kopili Stage-I

There was no generation from this station. The amount shown as Fixed charge is only against the RELDC fees and charges paid by NEEPCO against this station to POSOCO and claimed as reimbursement from MePDCL.

b) Kopili Stage-II

This station started generation in mid October 2021. As such the Capacity charge is only against this period. This station does not entail full capacity charge during the month because

- 1) Plant Availability Factor achieved during the month (PAFM) for October'21 was only 14.62713857%, Cumulative Plant Availability Factor achieved upto the month was only 2.118884559%

- 2) Plant Availability Factor achieved during the month (PAFM) for November'21 was only 69.97300945%, Cumulative Plant Availability Factor achieved upto the month was only 10.46160483%
- 3) Though Plant Availability Factor achieved during the month (PAFM) for December'21 was o 81.75525663%, but Cumulative Plant Availability Factor achieved upto the month was only 18.49834376%
- c) Bongaigong

There was no energy received except for a small quantum of 1.64 MU from this station since there was power regulation. The total cost was mainly due to Fixed charge.

- d) Loktak HEP

There was no energy received as the entitlement share allocation is given to Manipur.

It is submitted that for determination of tariff, it is necessary to arrive at the ARR, which is to be based as far as possible on the facts and figures as per actuals. The Commission has erred in not considering the fact that the actual power purchase cost is based on the actual energy received. This non-consideration is an error apparent on the face of the record, which is liable to be reviewed. That without prejudice to the said contention, the non-consideration of a material fact is also a violation of Principles of Natural justice, which renders the order of the Ld. Commission to be subjected to review.

It is further submitted that the Hon'ble Commission fell in manifest error in ignoring the actual energy received, which fact was duly placed on record of the Hon'ble Commission, but not considered.

In view of the above, MePDCL proposes to revise that the estimates of power purchase cost for ARR for FY 2022-23 of some generating stations as follows:

NTPC Bongaigaon

The actual variable cost of Rs 0.39 Cr of Bongaigaon is for 1.65 MU only. Therefore, the actual variable rate is Rs 2.36 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 589.50 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 144.05 Cr

ii Variable Cost would be Rs 139.22 Cr.

iii. Total cost would be Rs 283.17 Cr.

NHPC Loktak

The Hon'ble Commission has considered cost of power for Loktak as Rs. 1.39 ps/kwh based on FY 2015-16 (True up). However, it is to be mentioned here that the actual cost of power approved in FY 2015-16 (True up) was Rs 4.09/kwh. The extract of the true up order dated 25.09.2018 in Case No 1/2018 In the matter of True up Business for the FY 2015-16 1 st Year of 1st MYT Control Period FY 2015- 16 to FY 2017-18. Is enclosed as Annexure-A

Further from the available information, MePDCL received only 1.69 MU from Loktah HEP in the month of October 2015. The variable cost for this quantum was Rs 0.29 Cr. This was due to the revision of share allocation from 12.393%(till September 2015) to 2.303% for October 2021. Thereafter Share allocation from Nov'2021 onwards was Nil.

However as per actual data for FY 2021-22,

1. The actual AFC was Rs 272.6449 Cr

2. The ECR was Rs 1.209 per Kwh.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 40.28 MU

i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 16.89 Cr

ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 4.87 Cr.

iii. Total cost would be Rs 21.76 Cr.

OTPC Pallatana

The actual variable cost of Rs 57.89 Cr is against the actual energy of 310.20 MU. Therefore, the actual variable rate works out as Rs 1.87 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 436.79 MU,

i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 54.66 Cr

ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 81.68 Cr.

iii. Total cost would be Rs 140.34 Cr.

NEEPCO

a) Kopili Stage-I

There was no generation from this station. The amount shown as Fixed charge is only against the RELDC fees and charges paid by NEEPCO against this station to POSOCO and claimed as reimbursement from MePDCL. This is applicable to other stations.

However as per actual data for FY 2021-22,

1. The actual AFC was Rs 120.2764 Cr
2. The ECR was Rs 0.582 per Kwh.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 82.23 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 10.46 Cr
- ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 4.79 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.09 Cr
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 15.34 Cr.

b) Kopili Stage-II

This station started generation only from mid October 2021. However as per actual data for FY 2021-22,

1. The actual AFC was Rs 12.2577 Cr
2. The ECR was Rs 0.815 per Kwh.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 8.48 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 0.84 Cr
- ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 0.69 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.01 Cr
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 1.54 Cr.

c) Khandong HEP

The actual variable cost of Rs 2.36 Cr is against the actual energy of 28.70 MU. Therefore, the actual variable rate works out as Rs 0.824 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 17.53 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be 3.51
- ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 1.44 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.00 Cr
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 4.95 Cr.

d) Ranganadi HEP

The actual variable cost of Rs 13.59 Cr is against the actual energy of 117.77 MU. Therefore, the actual variable rate works out as Rs 1.154 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 131.25 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 19.53
- ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 15.15 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.00 Cr
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 34.68 Cr.

e) Doyang HEP

The actual variable cost of Rs 2.62 Cr is against the actual energy of 9.71 MU. Therefore, the actual variable rate works out as Rs 2.697 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 23.65 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 6.71
- ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 6.38 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.00 Cr
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 13.09 Cr.
- v. With 5% escalation, the Total cost for FY 2022-23 would be Rs 13.74 Cr.

f) AGBPP

The actual variable cost of Rs 23.27 Cr is against the actual energy of 156.53 MU. Therefore, the actual variable rate works out as Rs 1.487 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 187.65 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 39.02 Cr
- ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 27.90 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.00 CR
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 66.92 Cr.

g) AGTPPC-Cycle

The actual variable cost of Rs 17.32 Cr is against the actual energy of 89.16 MU. Therefore, the actual variable rate works out as Rs 1.942 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 119.00 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Rs 18.61 Cr
- ii. Variable Cost would be Rs 23.11 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.00 Cr
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 41.72 Cr.

h) Pare

There is no Capacity Charge for Pare HEP. The amount shown as Fixed cost is only against RELDC fees and charges paid by NEEPCO against this station to POSOCO and claimed as reimbursement from MePDCL.

The actual variable cost of Rs 25.43 Cr is against the actual energy of 50.87 MU. Therefore, the actual variable rate works out as Rs 5.00 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 42.92 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Nil
- ii. Variable Charge would be Rs 21.46 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.04 CR
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 21.50 Cr.

i) Kameng

There is no Capacity Charge for Pare HEP. The amount shown as Fixed cost is only against RELDC fees and charges paid by NEEPCO against this station to POSOCO and claimed as reimbursement from MePDCL.

The actual variable cost of Rs 21.65 Cr is against the actual energy of 54.12 MU. Therefore, the actual variable rate works out as Rs 4.00 per unit.

Therefore, for FY 2021-22 and with quantum of 45.99 MU,

- i. Capacity Charge would be Nil

- ii. Variable Charge would be Rs 18.40 Cr.
- iii. Reimbursement of POSOCO charges Rs. 0.04 CR
- iv. Total cost would be Rs 18.44 Cr.

Based on the above and using the escalation factor of 5%, the Revised power Purchase Cost for Part A is shown below:

Table 2: Revised power purchase Cost (Part A)

(Rs in Cr)				
Sl. No	Source	Energy received (MU)	Revised Estimate for FY2021-22	Revised Estimate for FY 2022-23
Part-A				
1	MePGCL	1293.49	172.01	272.02
	a) Umiam Stage-I HEP	114.61	3.27	26.94
	b) Umiam Stage-II HEP	45.45	2.00	14.96
	c) Umiam Stage-III HEP	137.33	6.57	44.89
	d) Umiam Stage-IV HEP	203.90	5.93	44.89
	e) Sonapani	4.94	0.19	1.12
	f) Umtru HEP	0.00	0.00	0.00
	g) Myntdu- Leishka HEP	478.71	98.92	94.26
	h) New Umtru HEP	231.48	40.05	29.92
	i) Lakroh HEP	10.87	1.18	1.12
	j) Ganol HEP	66.20	13.92	13.92
	m) Auxiliary Consumption			
2	NTPC	589.50	283.17	297.33
	a) Farakka	0.00		
	b) Kahalgaon I	0.00		
	c) Khalgaon II	0.00		
	d) Talcher	0.00		
	e) Bongaigoan	589.50	283.17	
3	NHPC	40.28	21.76	22.85
	a) Loktak HEP	40.28	21.76	
4	NEEPCO	723.70	218.18	229.09
	a) Kopili Stage-I	82.23	15.34	
	b) Kopili Stage-II	8.48	1.54	
	c) Khandong HEP	17.53	4.95	
	d) Rangandai HEP	131.25	34.68	
	e) Doyang HEP	23.65	13.09	
	f) AGBPP	187.65	66.92	
	g) AGTPPC-Cycle	119.00	41.72	
	h) Pare	42.92	21.50	
	i) Kameng	45.99	18.44	
	Free Power	65.00		
5	OTPC	436.79	140.34	147.36
	a) Pallatana	436.79	140.34	
6	Solar Sources	39.42	13.80	14.49
	Sub Total (A)	3123.18	849.26	983.14

Hence based on above, the additional claim of Utility on power purchase cost for review is given below:

Table 3: Additional Power purchase cost (Part A) Claimed in Review

(In Rs Cr)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Amount
1	Power purchase cost allowed by MSERC in the Order (1)	823.88
2	Power purchase cost claimed by MePDCL in the Review (2)	983.14
3	Additional Power purchase cost to be allowed in the review petition (=2-1)	159.26

Commission's Analysis

Commission had considered the power purchase cost based on the actual expenditure incurred during the FY 2021-22 (upto December 2021) as submitted by the licensee in the additional information dated 07.01.2022 and 01.02.2022, and escalating 5% over the estimated power purchase cost for FY 2021-22 for computation of power purchase cost required for FY 2022-23.

The Regulation 85.1 to 85.6 of MSERC MYT Regulations 2014 provides that; *Commission shall assess the source wise power purchase cost for procurement of power considering the firm allocation from the central generating stations and state owned power projects, purchase from IPPs and also bilateral short term procurement from traders.*

Commission had approved power purchase cost for FY 2022-23 considering the projections filed by the Licensee in the petition and also in the additional information submitted on 07.01.2022 and 01.02.2022.

The analysis of source wise power purchase cost notified vide page no.57 to 62 in the ARR and Tariff order for FY 2022-23 is **amply illustrated and requires no review.**

The approved power purchase cost was on the basis of estimates considering the actual expenditure for FY 2021-22 with an escalation of 5% considered for computation of estimates for FY 2022-23.

The specific source wise grounds now claimed by the licensee in the Review petition are not valid for estimates and determination of power purchase cost for Review of ARR and Tariff order for FY 2022-23.

The Regulation 23 mandates, *No tariff or part of any tariff may be ordinarily amended, more frequently than once in any financial year, except FPPPA based on FPPPA formulae approved by the Commission from time to time. Provided that the consequential orders, which the Commission may issue to give effect to the subsidy by the State Government shall not be construed as amendment of the tariff notified.*

Commission shall consider the actual power procurement cost on filing of the audited performance for the FY 2022-23 in the True up exercise.

3 Revised ARR & Net Additional Claim in Review for ARR FY 2022-23

Petitioner's Submission

Based on the above submissions, the revised ARR and additional amount claimed for MePDCL in review is given below:

Table 4: Revised ARR and Additional Amount Claimed in Review

(Rs. in crore)

Particulars	Approved in Present Order	MePDCL Claim in Review	Additional Gap to be Passed
Power Purchase cost	856.32	1015.58	159.26
Transmission Charges (PGCIL)	68.38	68.38	
Transmission Charges (MePTCL)	73.49	73.49	
Employee Expenses	182.86	182.86	
Repair & Maintenance Expenses	6.46	6.46	
Administration & General Expenses	12.63	12.63	
Depreciation	0	0	
Interest and Finance charges	10.14	10.14	
Interest on working capital	23.77	23.77	
Return on Equity	0	0	
Bad & Doubtful Debt	0	0	
Gross Annual Revenue Requirement (ARR)	1234.05	1393.31	159.26
Less: Non-Tariff Income and Other Income	104.71	104.71	
Less: Sale of Surplus Power	395.72	395.72	
Net ARR	733.62	892.88	159.26
Add: True up Gap/(Surplus) for FY 2018-19	-15.88	-15.88	
Add: True up Gap for FY 2019-20	179.43	179.43	
ARR for FY 2022-23	897.17	1056.43	159.26

Based on the above submission, MePDCL requests the Hon'ble Commission to pass an additional amount of Rs 159.26 Cr as claimed in this review petition.

Commission's Analysis

Commission does not consider the Review of power purchase cost claimed in the petition, the approved ARR for FY 2022-23 remains unchanged as notified in the Tariff Order dated 25.03.2022.

Table 5 : Approved Aggregate Revenue Requirement for FY 2022-23 Review

(Rs. Crore)

S.No	Particulars	Filed for Review	Approved
1	Power Purchase cost	1015.58	856.32
2	Transmission Charges (PGCIL)	68.38	68.38
3	Transmission Charges (MePTCL)	73.49	73.49
4	Employee Expenses	182.86	182.86
5	Repair & Maintenance Expenses	6.46	6.46
6	Administration & General Expenses	12.63	12.63
7	Depreciation	0	0.00
8	Interest and Finance charges	10.14	10.14
9	Interest on working capital	23.77	23.77
10	Return on Equity	0	0.00
11	Bad & Doubtful Debt	0	0.00
	Gross Annual Revenue Requirement (ARR)	1393.31	1234.05
12	Less: Non-Tariff Income and Other Income	104.71	104.71
13	Less: Sale of Surplus Power	395.72	395.72
	Net ARR	892.88	733.62
14	Add: True up Gap/(Surplus) for FY 2018-19	-15.88	(15.88)
15	Add: True up Gap for FY 2019-20	179.43	179.43
	ARR for FY 2022-23	1056.43	897.17

Thus the Review petition filed by MePDCL for FY 2022-23 Stands disposed off.

Sd/-
Shri. Roland Keishing
(Member)

Sd/-
Shri.P.W. Ingty, IAS (Retd)
(Chairman)