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ORDER

1. Petitioner, Rajasthan Vidyut Utpadan Nigam Limited (RVUN) has filed this Petition on 01.02.2019 under Regulation 17(2) (iv) of RERC (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 for in principle approval of additional capitalization at Kota Super Thermal Power Station (Unit 1 to 7).
2. The brief summary of capitalization proposal is as under:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Description of Proposal</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (Rs. in cr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Replacement of BHEL makes Pro Control P-13 SG-TG system of KSTPS Unit-5 (210 MW).</td>
<td>12.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Renovation of static excitation and AVR system of 210 MW Unit-3&amp;4, KSTPS, Kota by digital AVR system.</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Replacement of 95 Nos. existing CTMM motor protection relays of HT and LT motor Stage-II (KSTPS Unit-3&amp;4).</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Supply and ETC of variable frequency drive of ID fan motor (4 Nos.) of Unit-6&amp;7.</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Replacement of existing Fuji Make 2x75 KVA UPS system installed in Unit-5 of KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Strengthening and repair of RCC &amp; steel structure of crusher house, RCC structure of DM plant, RCC structure of acid alkali tank, RCC structure of SDG tank and RCC structure of plow feeder at KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Strengthening and repair of RCC framed structure of IDCT Cooling Tower of Unit-6 at KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Renovation /Retrofitting of rotary discharge machine No. 1&amp;2 at KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Conversion of Relay logic control system of CHP into PLC based system.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Purchase of 3 Nos. New bull dozers (BEML Make-Model BD-155).</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Purchase, Erection and commissioning of 14 Nos. Belt weigher at KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Supply, Design, installation, Testing and commissioning of online energy accounting and management system of KSTPS.</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total IDC</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Petitioner has submitted the commissioning and commercial operation dates of KSTPS Unit 1 to 7 as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Date of Commissioning</th>
<th>Date of COD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Unit#1</td>
<td>17.01.1983</td>
<td>01.04.1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Unit#2</td>
<td>13.07.1983</td>
<td>01.04.1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Unit#3</td>
<td>25.09.1988</td>
<td>11.03.1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Unit#4</td>
<td>01.05.1989</td>
<td>16.01.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Unit#5</td>
<td>26.03.1994</td>
<td>18.07.1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Unit#6</td>
<td>30.07.2003</td>
<td>01.08.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Unit#7</td>
<td>30.05.2009</td>
<td>31.12.2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Notices were issued to Respondents to file reply on the petition on 06.02.2019. Respondent Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd. has submitted its reply on 04.04.2019.

5. Public notice with salient features of the petition inviting comments/suggestions/objections from desirous persons, was published in the following newspapers on the dates mentioned against each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of News Paper</th>
<th>Date of publishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>Rajasthan Patrika</td>
<td>08.03.2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>Rastradoot</td>
<td>08.03.2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>Times of India</td>
<td>18.03.2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The petition was also placed on the websites of the Commission and the Petitioner. The last date of receiving comments/suggestions/objections was kept 08.04.2019.

7. Commission received comments/suggestions from the following:

   (1) Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd.
   (2) Sh. Rachel Pearlin
   (3) Bask Research Foundation
   (4) Sh. G.L. Sharma

8. The objections/comments/suggestions received from stakeholders were forwarded to Petitioner to file reply. Accordingly, RVUN submitted its reply on the comments received from stakeholder on 10.05.2019.

10. We have considered the proposals for additional capitalization on the touchstone of the provisions of Regulation 17 “Additional capitalization” of RERC (Terms & Conditions for determination of Tariff) Regulations, 2019 applicable for current control period. We have also considered guidelines for Renovation and Modernization/Life extension works of Coal/Lignite Based Thermal Power Stations issued by Central Electricity Authority in 2009. We have also carefully considered the elaborate written as well as oral arguments submitted/made by the Petitioner, Respondents and Stakeholders for arriving at the decisions in the matter.

11. The provisions of Regulation 17 of Tariff Regulations 2019 are as under:-

“17. Additional capitalization

(1) -----------------------------------------------

(2) The additional capital expenditure incurred in respect of an existing project or a new project on the following counts within the original scope of work and after the cut-off date may be admitted by the Commission, subject to prudence check:

(a) Liabilities to meet award of arbitration or for compliance of the directions or order of any statutory authority, or order or decree of any court of law;
(b) Change in law;
(c) Deferred works relating to ash pond or ash handling system in the original scope of work;
(d) Liability for works executed prior to the cut-off date; and
(e) Liability for works admitted by the Commission after the cut-off date to the extent of discharge of such liabilities by actual payments;

Provided that the Generating Company shall file a Petition for in-principle approval of the Commission before incurring such additional capital expenditure.

(3) In case of replacement of assets deployed under the original scope of the existing project after cut-off date, the additional capitalization may be admitted by the Commission, after making necessary adjustments in the Gross Fixed Assets, Debt and Equity as per sub-Regulation (8) below, subject to prudence check on the following grounds:

(a) The useful life of the assets is not commensurate with the useful life of
the project and such assets have been fully depreciated in accordance with the provisions of these Regulations;

(b) The replacement of the asset is necessary on account of change in law or Force Majeure conditions; or

(c) The replacement of such asset has otherwise been allowed by the Commission based on sufficient grounds.

(4) Any expenditure admitted on account of committed liabilities within the original scope of work and the expenditure deferred on techno-economic grounds but falling within the original scope of work shall be serviced in the normative debt-equity ratio specified in Regulation 17.

(5) The capital expenditure incurred on the following counts beyond the original scope of the project, may be admitted by the Commission, subject to prudence check:

(a) Liabilities to meet award of arbitration or for compliance of the order or directions in the order of any statutory authority, or order or decree of any court of law;

(b) Change in law;

(c) Any capital expenditure to be incurred on account of need for higher security and safety of the plant as advised or directed by appropriate Indian Government Instrumentality or statutory authorities responsible for national or internal security;

(d) Deferred works relating to ash pond or ash handling system in additional to the original scope of work, on case to case basis;

(e) Any additions works/services, which have become necessary for efficient and successful operation of a generation station or transmission system but not included in the original capital cost:

Provided that the Generating Company shall file a Petition for in-principle approval of the Commission before incurring such additional capital expenditure:

Provided that any expenditure admitted by the Commission for determination of tariff on account of new works not in the original scope of work shall be serviced in the normative debt-equity ratio specified in Regulation 17.

Provided also that if any expenditure has been claimed under Renovation and Modernisation (R&M) or repairs and maintenance under O&M expenses, same expenditure cannot be claimed under this Regulation.

(6) Any expenditure admitted by the Commission for determination of tariff on renovation, modernization, life extension and restoration of assets
damaged due to natural calamities shall be serviced on normative debt-equity ratio specified in Regulation 17 after writing off the original amount of the replaced assets from the original cost.

(7) The additional capitalisation on account of revised emission standards shall be as under:
(a) A Generating Company requiring to incur additional capital expenditure in the existing Generating Station for compliance of the applicable revised emission standards shall share its proposal with the beneficiaries and file a petition for approval for undertaking such additional capitalization;
(b) The proposal under clause (a) above shall contain details of proposed technology as specified by the Central Electricity Authority, scope of the work, phasing of expenditure, schedule of completion, estimated completion cost including foreign exchange component, if any, detailed computation of indicative impact on tariff to the beneficiaries, and any other information considered to be relevant by the Generating Company;
(c) Where the Generating Company makes an application for approval of additional capital expenditure on account of implementation of revised emission standards, the Commission may grant approval after due consideration of the reasonableness of the cost estimates, financing plan, schedule of completion, interest during construction, use of efficient technology, cost-benefit analysis, and such other factors as may be considered relevant by the Commission;
(d) After completion of the implementation of revised emission standards, the Generating Company shall file a petition for determination of tariff. Any expenditure incurred or projected to be incurred and admitted by the Commission after prudence check based on reasonableness of the cost and impact on operational parameters shall form the basis of determination of tariff.

(8) In case of de-Capitalisation or retirement of assets of a Generating Company or Licensee, as the case may be,
(a) the original approved cost of such assets shall be deducted from the value of gross fixed assets;
(b) the original approved equity of such assets shall be deducted from the value of equity;
(c) the value of loan shall be reduced by the normative outstanding debt component i.e., original approved cost of such assets less accumulated depreciation allowed for such assets less approved equity of such assets.”
12. In view of above, the analysis and decision of the Commission on each of the issue is as detailed below.

A. Replacement of existing BHEL make Pro Control P-13 SG-TG system of KTPS Unit-5

Petitioner’s submissions

13. Petitioner submitted that the existing Human Machine Interface (HMI) system of KSTPS Unit-5 is very old and obsolete and manufacturer has phased out its production. Due to old/obsolete hardware and scarcity of spares, problems are being faced during start up and running of the unit resulting in generation loss and undesired oil consumption. In view of the above, it has become more essential and advisable to renovate the existing HMI for control of boiler and turbine (SG-TG) with latest technology microprocessor based MAXDNA system. The renovation will lead to safe, smooth and efficient operation of Unit-5.

Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions

14. O&M expenses have been allowed by the Commission in the ARR for KTPS and such expenses should have been covered in the approved amount. Further, a comprehensive cost benefit analysis with phasing of the capital expenditure, monetary savings, payback period and indicative impact on tariff should be provided by the Petitioner.

15. Useful life of 25 years is over for Unit 1, 2, 3, 4 and RVUN is requested to provide its plan for these units in future. Any renovation and modernization activities that are needed in future, considering current life time of equipment & systems may be provided with cost and respective benefits may be provided. Petitioner should also furnish the requisite certificate or submission from the OEM that equipment of existing system has become
obsolete and are no long being manufactured by them.

16. Commission vide its order dated 10.05.2012 passed in petition no. 273/11 approved various capital works including “up-gradation of Contronic E-K Type HMI system based on old computer architecture (main frame type) ABB make of unit-5 KSTPS with 800X A HMI system of M/S ABB” at the cost of Rs. 7.40 Crore. Commission has also approved aforesaid work in true –up for FY 2015-16 at a higher cost of Rs. 8.34 Crore vide order dated 20.06.2017. Therefore, Petitioner cannot state that the present HMI system of unit-5 is very old, aged and obsolete.

17. Petitioner has not supplied the comparison of the benefits anticipated vis-a-vis actual benefit derived in compliance to Commission’s order dated 10.05.2012. Therefore request for additional capitalization has to be dismissed.

RVUN’s reply

18. Proposed work is essential for successful and trouble free operation of the equipment as existing system is obsolete. This will benefit in stability of Unit and the benefits cannot be quantified. This expenditure is proposed to be incurred towards renovation and replacement for successful and efficient operation of units. This is also covered under CEA guidelines for Renovation and Modernisation (R&M) Programme.

19. Previous approval of Commission was for “Upgradation of Contronic-E K-type HMI system of Unit # 5” and expenditure was incurred in FY 2014-15. This system is being used for Station C&I system of Unit#5 (Systems other than Boiler & Turbine) and up-gradation of above said system was completed in year 2013.

20. Presently sought approval is for replacement of M/s BHEL makes Pro control P13 SG-TG system of Unit#5. This system is different from earlier replaced
system. This is being used for Boiler and Turbine controls of Unit. As this system is in service since commissioning of Unit #5 i.e. 1994, OEM M/s BHEL has suggested for up-gradation of the system to the latest platform as P13 system is obsolete and Cards/Spares are being phased out from their manufacturing range. Therefore, RVUN requested to grant in- Principle approval for additional capitalization for the work “Replacement of M/s BHEL make Pro control P13 SG-TG system of Unit#5” which is different from the earlier approved work.

21. The life of power plant is not strictly restricted to normal life of power plant i.e. 25 years. It is economical to produce power for state from such plants which tariff fall under the merit order dispatch. RVUN is planning small capital expenditure of Rs 11.52 Crore on U # 1-4 of KTPS for successful & efficient operation of the plant with meagre impact on tariff by Rs. 0.01 per unit. Thus, it is requested that such capital expenditure should be allowed.

Commission’s view

22. We observe that existing system is proposed to be replaced on the ground that technology has become obsolete and also that spares are not available. We find that the contention of the Petitioner is acceptable and accordingly approve the proposal in-principle.

B. Renovation of static excitation and AVR system of KSTPS Unit-3 & 4 by digital AVR system

Petitioner’s submissions

23. Petitioner submitted that these units were commissioned during the year 1988 & 1990, therefore, the existing static excitation system and AVR of 210 MW KTPS Unit-3 &4 are very old. The various parts of equipment are obsolete and equipment manufacturer has refused to repair various important electronic
module used in existing static excitation system & AVR of above units. Due to scarcity of spares, healthy modules & denial by OEM for their repair, it is proposed to renovate existing AVR by new digital AVR system (DAVR) of latest technology along with its remote operation and control from main control room and replacing existing air flow/cooling system by new compatible system for thyristor, field flashing & field breaker panels room. The above renovation will minimize the tripping of units and enhance the stability of running units which will facilitate smooth generation of electricity through these old 210 MW Unit-3&4.

**Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions**

24. Since the system has been installed by the OEM, it is the responsibility of the same agency to make repairs and renovate the system upon request. The same clause should be present in the contract agreement between the Petitioner and the OEM. Now that the OEM has refused to upgrade the system, the Petitioner should have taken legal measures to cater to the issue. Moreover, by undertaking the activities that should be undertaken by the OEM, Petitioner is indirectly adding a burden on the end consumers. Thus, the Discoms strongly oppose such measures.

25. Impact of the additional capitalization undertaken by the Petitioner on the tariff applicable to the beneficiaries has not been provided. A detailed computation of indicative impact on tariff should be provided by the Petitioner. Further, such impact should be provided station wise. It is understood that some stations of KTPS are nearing the end of their useful life. For such stations, additional capitalisation should only be allowed if after incurring such costs, it is still beneficial to run these stations, in terms of merit order.

26. Approval for proposal of capital expenditure in question is being sought under Regulation 17 (2) (iv) of RERC Tariff Regulations, 2014 and the said
Regulation is apply for those expenditure which are incurred after cutoff date and not covered under the original capital cost. It is submitted that the aforesaid proposal for capital expenditure is included in original capital cost, hence the said Regulation is not applicable.

27. It is the responsibility of the generating company to keep the system healthy, therefore replacement of damaged parts of AVR system cover under Repairs and Maintenance which is one of the components of O&M expenditure.

RVUN’s reply

28. Renovation of static excitation and AVR system of KSTPS Unit# 3 & 4 by digital AVR system and will help to run units smoothly and efficiently on rated capacity. This will benefit in stability of Unit and hence the benefits cannot be quantified. This is also covered under CEA guidelines for Renovation and Modernisation (R&M) Programme.

29. RVUN submitted that the system was installed under original scope of work at the time of commissioning of the project which has now become obsolete and this work is not covered under original scope of work, thus the same has been considered under Regulation 17 (2) (iv).

30. It is further submitted that the Repair and maintenance expenses are expenditure which are incurred on regular basis and which has benefit for a month or a quarter, or a year but not more than that, whereas expenditure proposed by RVUN are not incurred on yearly basis, these are for longer run and which shall retrieve benefit for longer period. Thus, the same do not qualify for O&M Expenditure and are eligible for capital expenditure. This is covered under CEA guidelines for Renovation and Modernisation (R&M) Programme. Therefore, it request to grant In-principle approval of additional capitalization under Regulation 17(2) (iv) of Tariff regulations, 2014 for renovation of static excitation and AVR system of KSTPS Unit-3 & 4 by digital
AVR system.

**Commission’s view**

31. Commission observes that the Unit-1 to 4 of KTPS has completed its useful life. Further, Northern Regional Power Committee (NRPC) constituted by Ministry of Power, GoI in its minutes of 36th meeting identified those units which have no space for FGD installation and has proposed to prepare phasing out plan for those units by the year 2022 which includes Unit 1 to 4 of KTPS.

32. In view of above recommendation of NRPC, Commission is of the view that being in the phase out plan, it will not to be appropriate to allow any additional capitalization for Unit 1 to 4. Thus, this proposal cannot be allowed.

**C. Replacement of 95 Nos. existing CTMM motor protection relays of HT and LT Motors of Stage-II (KSTPS Unit-3&4)**

**Petitioner’s submissions**

33. Petitioner submitted that presently, 95 Nos. CTMM/CTMF relays were installed at various feeders in the year 1988 & 1989 for LT & HT motor’s protection of stage-II (Unit-3&4). These relays are around 28-29 years old and require for Renovation & Modernisation. Now the manufacturing of these relays have been stopped. Every year, around 10-15 relay are being repaired through OEM and a very high cost is being incurred on repairing. This relay does not provide any monitoring/ analysis of parameters during running as well as during failure of equipment. Moreover, these relays malfunction and cause of tripping of main equipment which in turn, trip the unit. Under such circumstances, it has become necessary to renovate and modernize the relays for sustainable performance of KSTPS Unit-3&4.
Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions

34. Since the relays installed at the plants are 28-29 years old, there is a necessity of up-gradation. However, the cost of upgrading of such systems should be included under O&M expenses of ARR petition and the same should not be requested as additional capitalization as the burden is ultimately passed on to the end consumer. Further, the Petitioner should provide a comprehensive cost benefit analysis with phasing of the capital expenditure, monetary savings, payback period and indicative impact on tariff to be paid by the Discoms.

35. This expenditure can’t be claim under Regulation 17(2)(iv) of Tariff Regulation, 2014 as the proposed expenditure is already included in original capital cost.

36. As per Regulation 2 (a) (41) of RERC Tariff Regulations, 2014 O&M expenses include the expenditure on manpower, repairs, spares, etc. Hence repairs/replacement of existing CTMM motor protection relays covers under regular O&M expenses.

RVUN’s reply

37. Unit 3 & 4 were installed in the year 1988 & 1989 and has completed their useful life. Now, OEM M/s BHEL has stopped support for spares and services. It is also to mention that replacement of 95 Nos. existing CTMM motor protection relays of HT and LT Motors of Stage-II will help to run units smoothly and efficiently on rated capacity. This will benefit in stability of Unit and hence the benefits cannot be quantified. This is covered under CEA guidelines for Renovation and Modernisation (R&M) Programme.

38. Existing system was installed under original scope of work at the time of commissioning of the project which has now become obsolete and this work
is not covered under original scope of work, thus the same has been considered under Regulation 17 (2) (iv).

39. Presently, OEM has refused to provide support for repairing relays, so replacement is required for smooth and efficient operation of the plant. It is also pertinent to mention that Repair and Maintenance expenses are expenditure which are incurred on regular basis and which has benefit for a month or a quarter, or a year but not more than that, whereas expenditure proposed by RVUN are not incurred on yearly basis, these are for longer run and which shall retrieve benefit for longer period. Thus, the same do not qualify for O&M Expenditure and are eligible for capital expenditure.

Commission’s view

40. As stated above at para 31 and 32, this proposal cannot be allowed.

D. Supply and ETC of Variable Frequency Drive of ID fan motor (4 Nos.) of Unit-6&7.

Petitioner’s submissions

41. Petitioner submitted that the said proposal is for supply, erection, testing and commissioning of Variable Frequency Drive (VFD) system on HT motors of ID fan of Unit-7 of KSTPS. The installation of VFD on ID fan will serve the purpose of reducing the power consumption of ID fans in Unit-6&7 and consequently help to reduce the auxiliary power consumption (APC) of the unit. The cost will be recovered in approx. 3.2 years considering 20% reduction in energy consumption on ID fans.

Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions

42. Petitioner has mentioned that the renovation will reduce auxiliary consumption and improve the machine efficiency. However the indicative percentage by which the auxiliary consumption will reduce and the
subsequent benefit that may be passed on in the tariff have not been provided in the petition. It is also pertinent to mention that such expenses should be booked under O&M expenses while filing ARR petition and should not be requested as additional capitalization that will be a burden on the consumers of electricity.

43. Earlier Petitioner vide petition no. 273/11 while proposing for replacement of mechanical drives by variable frequency drives in respect of Unit 5 ensured that there will be saving in the auxiliary upto 30%. As per true-up petition it has been noted that from FY 2012-13 to 2016-17 the auxiliary consumption has been increased every year. Hence, the proposal of the Petitioner is not admissible.

44. Any such efficiency gains will not be passed on to consumers as the consumption of Auxiliary consumption is already capped on normative basis by the Commission. Therefore, the same may be taken into routine O&M expenses and not under the head of Additional Capitalization.

45. With the existing norms of 70:30 debt equity ratio and depreciation rates, the entire debt is paid off in 13 years by the provision of depreciation. From 13th year onwards, depreciation is still provided as part of the tariff component and no benefit is passed on to the beneficiaries. Further, in case any additional capital is required during the period of 14th year till the end of useful life that is also allowed by the Commission to be passed through as tariff. Therefore, it is suggested that the accrued depreciation may be utilized to fund such additional capitalization. Moreover, RoE is also being allowed as part of the tariff. It is pertinent to highlight that the purpose of allowing RoE throughout the useful life is to allow the Petitioner to earn reasonable returns which can then be ploughed back in the sector itself. As such, certain amount of such expenditure should be met out through the accrued RoE over the years.
RVUN’s reply

46. The installation of variable frequency drives on ID fan will serve the purpose of reducing the power consumption of ID fans in Unit-6&7 and consequently help to reduce the auxiliary power consumption of the unit. The cost benefit shall be shared as per Regulations.

47. RVUN had installed VFD drives for 600 kW CEP HT Motor and 120 kW LT Seal Air Fan Motor of Unit-5 which is running smoothly for last five years and substantial energy has been saved on account of this. On the observation of increase in auxiliary power consumption of the power station, it is to mention that auxiliary consumption increases due to backing down/ box up of the units. The machines are designed to run on 100% PLF to maintain normative auxiliary consumption and it increases at part load. Further, the comparison of auxiliary consumption made by stakeholder is not correct as it has been done for all units of KTPS instead of unit 5.

48. RVUN’s almost all plants are established on 80:20 debt equity ratio, additional capitalization in question is also proposed under same debt equity ratio. Regarding paying off entire debts, it is well in the notice of the Commission that as per prevailing Regulations, entire debts will only be paid off almost in 20 years. After useful life of machine, repair and maintenance expenditure are at their maximum. So, ultimately no extra amount is left with generator from depreciation. Depreciation and ROE are allowed through tariff as per RERC Regulation and are not meant for utilization of these against additional capitalization. Therefore, RVUN requested to allow additional capitalization of KTPS as claimed as per RERC Tariff Regulations, 2014.

49. Further, any auxiliary consumption being lower than normative is being shared with the consumers of the State. Thus, it would not be correct to say that effort towards reduction on auxiliary consumption has not been made.
Commission's view

50. We find that the contention of the Petitioner is acceptable and accordingly approve the proposal in-principle.

E. Replacement of existing Fuji Make 2x75 KVA UPS system installed in Unit-5 of KSTPS.

Petitioner’s submissions

51. The existing Fuji make 2x75 KVA UPS system of Unit-5 KSTPS is in service since commissioning of the unit in the year 1993 and has outlived its useful life. The system has now become obsolete and its Original Equipment Manufacturer M/s Fuji Electric has denied future service/spares. Previously, M/s Instrumentation Limited, Kota was providing service/spare support for these installed UPS through an AMC. M/s IL, Kota has been closed by Government of India. Therefore, now onwards there is no possibility of spares and service support system and no alternative is left other than to replace it by new UPS system. If any emergency arises in the form of failure of UPS, it will disrupt the complete process of Unit. Under such circumstances, it has become necessary to renovate and modernize the existing UPS system for sustainable performance of KSTPS Unit-5.

Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions

52. It has been stated by the Petitioner that the existing system has outlived its useful life. The OEM M/s Fuji has denied future services and the agency providing service/spare support M/s Instrumentation Ltd, Kota has been closed by the Government of India. In this regard, JVVNL submitted that the Petitioner should look for other agencies providing service/spare support for the system. Further, such expenses should be booked under O&M expenses while filing ARR petition and should not be requested as additional capitalization that will be a burden on the consumers of electricity.
53. This expenditure can’t be claim under Regulation 17(2)(iv) of Tariff Regulation, 2014 as the proposed expenditure is already included in original capital cost.

**RVUN’s reply**

54. Additional capitalization is required as useful life of the system is completed and the OEM M/s Fuji Electric India Pvt. Ltd was communicated for supply of spares but the firm has refused to support quoting that the system is obsolete. RVUN have requested to allow additional capitalization under CEA guidelines.

55. The system was installed under original scope of work at the time of commissioning of the project which has now become obsolete and this work is not covered under original scope of work, thus the same has been considered under Regulation 17 (2) (iv).

56. It is submitted that repair and maintenance expenses are expenditure which are incurred on regular basis and which has benefit for a month or a quarter, or a year but not more than that, whereas expenditure proposed by RVUN are not incurred on yearly basis, these are for longer run and which shall retrieve benefit for longer period. Thus, the same do not qualify for O&M expenditure and are eligible for capital expenditure. This is covered under CEA guidelines for Renovation and Modernisation Programme. Therefore, it is requested to grant In-principle approval of additional capitalization under Regulation 17(2) (iv) of Tariff regulations, 2014 for replacement of existing Fuji make 2 x 75 KVA UPS system installed in Unit-5.

**Commission's view**

57. Commission observes that existing system is proposed to be replaced on the ground that it has outlived its useful life. The proposed expenditure is not for
any additional services. Commission observes that repair and maintenance of the UPS system is in the nature of regular O&M, thus, the expenditure may be met out from O&M expenses allowed in the ARR. Therefore, the said proposal cannot be covered under Regulation 17 of RERC Regulations, 2019 and not acceptable.

F. Strengthening and repair of RCC & steel structure of crusher house, RCC structure of DM plant, RCC structure of acid alkali tank, RCC structure of SDG tank and RCC structure of plow feeder at KSTPS.

Petitioner’s submissions

58. The crusher house building CHP control room is about 35 years old. In the building, major cracks have been developed in cement concrete and reinforcement bars have also exposed on surface of concrete structure at many places. Similar to CHP control room, major cracks have also been observed in the RCC structure of DM plant building stage-II, Acid alkali tank foundation and S.D.G tank foundation. The condition of RCC structure of Plow feeder is also not good. Under such circumstances, it becomes necessary to renovate and modernize the RCC & steel structure of crusher house, RCC structure of DM plant, RCC structure of alkali tank, RCC of plow feeder at KSTPS

Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions

59. Such expenses should be booked under O&M expenses while filing ARR petition and should not be requested as additional capitalization that will be a burden on the consumers of electricity.

60. As per guidelines of Government of India, civil works should not be included for capital expenditure. The scope of work mainly includes scaffolding, sealing of cracks and honey comb patches etc. These works indicates that assets have not been attended on regular basis which has caused such
additional expenses. Therefore, these expenditure are not admissible being after cutoff date and no benefit is being passed on to beneficiaries.

61. Above works consist of repair and strengthening which are of routine nature. The same has to be considered under O&M head. This is further substantiated by the Commission’s Order dated 10.05.2012 issued the in the matter of in principle approval of capital works as additional capitalization for (1240 MW) Kota Super Thermal Power Station. All similar civil works had been denied by the Commission in aforesaid order.

RVUN’s reply

62. Repair and maintenance expenses are expenditure which are incurred on regular basis and which has benefit for a month or a quarter, or a year but not more than that, whereas expenditure proposed by RVUN are for longer run and which shall retrieve benefit for longer period. Thus, the same do not qualify for O&M expenditure and are eligible for capital expenditure.

63. These structures are more than 35 years old and require major renovation works. In a span of these 35 years, these structures have completed their designed life span and have deteriorated severely during the period. Now, to increase the life span of these structures, condition assessment was got carried out through CPRI, Nagpur. According to the report of CPRI, Nagpur carried out for major renovation, amounts to Rs. 3.90 Crores. Since, this work is a special kind of major renovation work and not a regular/ routine maintenance work, hence it has been proposed in the R & M works.

Commission’s view

64. Commission observes that repair or renovation of the RCC & steel structure is in the nature of regular O&M, thus, the expenditure may be met out from O&M expenses allowed in ARR. Therefore, the said proposal cannot be covered under Regulation 17 of RERC Regulations, 2019 and not acceptable.
G. Work of strengthening and repair of RCC framed structure of IDCT cooling tower of Unit # 6 at KSTPS

Petitioner’s submissions

65. The IDCT cooling tower of Unit # 6 is very old and was constructed by M/s Gammon India Ltd. In the cooling tower, major cracks have been developed in the main RCC columns and RCC beams of framed concrete structure of cooling tower, reinforcement bars have also exposed on surface of concrete structure at many places. Under such circumstances, it has become necessary to renovate and modernize the IDCT cooling tower of KSTPS requiring huge maintenance and strengthening.

Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions

66. Renovation work that are indispensable should be undertaken with priority and further, such expenses should be booked under O&M expenses while filing ARR petition and should not be requested as additional capitalization that will be a burden on the consumers of electricity.

67. As per guidelines of Government of India, civil works should not be included for capital expenditure. The scope of work mainly includes scaffolding, sealing of cracks and honey comb patches etc. These works indicates that assets have not been attended on regular basis which has caused such additional expenses. Therefore, these expenditure are not admissible being after cutoff date and no benefit is being passed on to beneficiaries.

68. Above works consist of repair and strengthening which are of routine nature. The same has to be considered under O&M head. This is further substantiated by the Commission’s Order dated 10.05.2012 issued the in the matter of in principle approval of capital works as additional capitalization for (1240 MW) Kota Super Thermal Power Station. All similar civil works had been denied by
RVUN’s reply

69. This proposed work is not a regular/ routine maintenance work. Looking to existing condition of cooling tower of Unit 6, condition assessment of this structure was got carried out through M/s CPRI, Nagpur. They have suggested that special nature of works like injection grouting by low viscosity epoxy grouting, jacketing by micro concreting is required for life extension and strengthening of structure. Hence, this work was proposed to be executed under the head “Additional Capitalization” i.e. R&M works. Further the budget available in the regular head “O&M works” is not sufficient and therefore, major renovation works amounting to Rs 2.74 Crores could not carried out in O&M head.

Commission’s view

70. For the same reason as stated at para 65, the said proposal is not acceptable.

H. Renovation/Retrofitting of Louise make Rotary Discharge Wheel machine No. 1 & 2 installed at KSTPS

Petitioner’s submissions

71. In the present system, Rotary Discharge Wheel machine (Plough feeder) No. 1&2 are used to feed the coal to Unit No. 1 to 4. These machines were commissioned in the year 1983 by the M/s Louise Fardertechnik GMBH & Co., Germany. Presently, spares of above Rotary Discharge wheel machines are not available in market. The aforesaid machines are only reliable and controlled means of feeding of stockyard coal to Unit No. 1 to 2 in the absent of coal rakes. Therefore, it is proposed to renovate/ retrofit the both Louise make Discharge Wheel machine for smooth coal feeding to bunkers of unit 1
to 4 as these machines have lived their useful life and OEM has also discontinued the spares of aforesaid machines.

**Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions**

72. Petitioner has stated that the spares are not available in the market and the agency which installed the system at the time of commissioning was requested for budgetary offer for spares. In this regard it is submitted that the Petitioner should look for more agencies providing such spares. Also, such expenses should be booked under O&M expenses while filing ARR petition and should not be requested as additional capitalization that will be a burden on the consumers of electricity.

73. This expenditure can’t be claim under Regulation 17(2)(iv) of Tariff Regulation, 2014 as the proposed expenditure is already included in original capital cost.

74. Nowhere in the petition it is submitted that there is any deficiency/defect in machine no. 2 and it has not been working at its full capacity. Further, these machines are only for alternate arrangement in absence of coal rakes which cannot be said a justification.

75. Comprehensive cost benefit analysis with IRR and payback period of the investments undertaken has not been provided. Further, as the extent of capitalisation requested is significant, the Petitioner should appoint independent consultants to carry out the detailed cost benefit analysis. DPRs of the additional works undertaken should be provided with the petition. The proposed expenditure is not providing any benefit to the beneficiaries, therefore not admissible.

**RVUN’s reply**

76. These machines were commissioned in the year 1983 by the M/s Louise
Fardertechnik GMBH & Co., Germany. Since then, these are in continuous operation and are kept in service by periodically overhauling and replacing worn out spares. But presently OEM has discontinued manufacturing the spares and has suggested retrofiting of above machines without alteration in civil structure. As the spares of above machines are offshore supply so no alternate arrangements are available for providing the spares. The additional capitalization is covered under CEA guidelines for R&M under clause 4.1.1 and 4.1.3 as quoted above.

77. The system was installed under original scope of work at the time of commissioning of the project which has now become obsolete and this work is not covered under original scope of work, thus the same has been considered under Regulation 17 (2) (iv).

78. Presently, both the machines are in operation but run on part load i.e. only 100 TPH against their rated capacity 750 TPH. Due to this utilization factor of bunker feeding system to unit No.1 & 2 is very low, which increase the auxiliary energy consumption and lead to increase in the generating cost.

79. It is submitted that this is a full coal reclamation system and is not an alternate arrangement. Coal reclamation is an essential process of power plant.

80. In context of the benefits in term of monetary saving, payback period etc., it is submitted that proposed work is essential for successful and trouble free operation of the Unit as existing system is obsolete. This will benefit in stability of Unit and hence the benefits cannot be quantified. This is covered under CEA guidelines for Renovation and Modernisation (R&M) Programme.

81. Cost benefit analysis/ advantage of up-gradation of each item of additional capital expenditure have been provided with the petition. In most of the items, the benefits cannot be quantified. Appointment of any independent
or external consultant for the work will only increase the cost of the work/additional capitalization. proposed expenditure is of Renovation & Modernization nature and different from Repair and Maintenance system. Such capital expenditure shall have enduring benefits for efficient and successful operation of units.

Commission's view

82. As stated above at para 31 and 32, this proposal cannot be allowed.

I. Conversion of Relay Logic Control System of CHP into PLC based system

Petitioner’s submissions

83. Presently, the entire CHP electrical system is running on old relay logic system and consists of five control desks and these control desks are distributed in two control rooms which are almost 200 meter away from each other. Due to aforesaid system KSTPS faces problems in troubleshooting of any fault as this system contains many relays and take more time for rectify the fault. Data monitoring and analysis cannot be done for operational point of view as presently CHP electrical system is running on old relay logic system. Erection & Commissioning process of new Wagon Tipplers No. 6, 7 and Stacker Reclaimer are going of under new CHP package. The new CHP package shall work on new technology of PLC & SCADA. Under such circumstances, it becomes necessity for required Renovation and Modernization of CHP electrical system.

Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions

84. Petitioner has mentioned the need for upgradation of the existing system on grounds of data monitoring and analysis. It is pertinent to mention that the Petitioner should provide a comprehensive cost benefit analysis with phasing
of the expenditure and monetary savings due to such expenditure. Further, such expenses should be booked under O&M expenses while filing ARR Petition and should not be requested as additional capitalization that will be a burden on the consumers of electricity.

85. This expenditure can’t be claim under Regulation 17(2)(iv) of Tariff Regulation, 2014 as the proposed expenditure is already included in original capital cost. Further, expenditure proposed is not for any additional services, and not passing any benefit to the beneficiaries, hence not admissible.

RVUN’s reply

86. The system was installed under original scope of work at the time of commissioning of the project which has now become obsolete and this work is not covered under Original Scope of Work, thus the same has been considered under Regulation 17 (2) (iv).

87. In context of the benefits in term of monetary saving, payback period etc., it is submitted that proposed work is essential for successful and trouble free operation of the Unit as existing system is obsolete and covered under clause 4.1.1 of the CEA guideline for R&M. This will benefit in stability of Unit and hence the benefits cannot be quantified. It is also submitted that this expenditure is proposed to be incurred towards Conversion of Relay Logic Control System of CHP into PLC based system which are for longer period and shall have enduring benefits. Therefore the same cannot be carried out under the head “O&M expense”.

88. Presently, entire CHP electrical system is running on old relay logic system and consists of five control desks. These control desks are distributed in two control rooms which are almost 200 meter away from each other and as a result, data monitoring and analysis cannot be done and troubleshooting of any fault takes more time. PLC based system is of latest/advance
technology and is having following merits:-

(a) Electrical system can be operated at one control room.

(b) PLC & SCADA make it easier to troubleshoot the systems with minimum breakdown time.

(c) Data monitoring and analysis can be done on daily /monthly/annually basis.

89. Thus, installation of PLC & SCADA in place of relay logic system, the units can be operated smoothly. Therefore, it is requested to grant in-principle approval of additional capitalization under regulation 17(2) (iv) of Tariff Regulations, 2014 for conversion of Relay Logic Control System of CHP into PLC based system.

Commission’s view

90. Commission observes that existing system is running on relay logic system which is proposed to be replaced into the PLC based system on the ground that it had become old and needs to be replaced. Commission observes that repair and maintenance of existing Relay Logic Control System of CHP is in the nature of regular O&M, thus, the expenditure may be met out from O&M expenses allowed in the ARR.

91. Further, expenditure proposed is not for any additional services and not passing any benefit to the beneficiaries, hence not admissible. Therefore, Commission is of the view that the said proposal is not covered under Regulation 17 of RERC Regulations, 2019 hence not acceptable.

J. Purchase of three (03) Nos. new bulldozers

Petitioner’s submissions

92. At present 08 Nos. Bulldozers are available at the KTPS out of which 02 Nos. existing bulldozers have lived their useful life and worn out completely.
Further, 01 No. Bulldozer will be required for new upcoming system of stacker & reclaimer and wagon tippler. Therefore, 03 Nos. Bulldozers will be required for smooth feeding/ stacking of coal.

**Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions**

93. Petitioner should plan and book such expenses while filing ARR under O&M expenses and should not ask for additional capitalization due to the same. The Discoms strongly oppose such moves that will add a burden to the consumers ultimately.

94. Earlier Petitioner had filed petition (273/11) for approval of additional capitalization wherein it has proposed for purchase of 2 nos. Bulldozers which was allowed by Commission vide its order dated 10.05.2012. Hence, justification for again purchase of 2 nos Bulldozers are therefore required. Further, requirement of one no. Bulldozer for upcoming system cannot be accepted in advance. Therefore, additional capitalization as sought for purchase of 3 nos. Bulldozers is not admissible.

**RVUN’s reply**

95. Two nos. Dozzers were purchased against Commission’s order dated 10.05.12 are very much in operation and their useful life is approximately 10-12 years. It is further submitted that total 08 Nos. Dozzers are required for smooth operation of CHP plant. Out of these, 02 Nos Dozzers have completed more than their useful life and currently only 06 Nos Dozzers are in operation, therefore, 02 Nos. Dozzers are required. Repairing of these dozzers is not economical as it is a full replacement of machines which have already completed their useful life.

96. The work of new upcoming system has already started in 2014 and expected to be completed soon. Therefore, there shall be need of 01 No Dozer in advance, so that new system can be started without delay after
completion. In view of above, it is requested to grant in-principle approval of additional capitalization for 03 Nos. of Bull Dozers as claimed since they are covered under clause 4.1.1 and 4.1.3 of the CEA guideline for R&M.

Commission’s view

97. Commission observes that repair and maintenance of Bulldozers is in the nature of regular O&M, thus, the expenditure may be met out from O&M expenses allowed in the ARR.

98. Further, Commission observes that Northern Regional Power Committee has included Unit 1 to 4 of KTPS in phasing out plan, therefore in that case Bulldozers allotted to Unit 1 to 4 will become spare and there will be no requirement to purchase new Bulldozers. In view of above, Commission does not accept the proposal of the Petitioner.

K. Supply, Erection & Commissioning of 14 Nos. Belt Weigher at KSTPS

Petitioner’s submissions

99. At present, 07 Nos. belt weighers are installed on various conveyor systems for crushed coal in CHP area for measurement of coal flow. These belt weighers were installed at the time of commissioning of units and are not in working condition. As a result, measurement of coal cannot be done. The above Belt weighers are old and lived their useful life. Spares have been discontinued by the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM). Under such circumstances, it has become necessary to renovate and modernize the CHP belt weighers.

Stakeholders’ comments/suggestions

100. Petitioner should provide a comprehensive cost benefit analysis with phasing of the capital expenditure, monetary savings, payback period and
indicative impact on tariff to be paid by the Discoms. Further, such expenses should be booked under O&M expenses while filing ARR petition and should not be requested as additional capitalization that will be a burden on the consumers of electricity.

101. This expenditure can't be claim under Regulation 17(2)(iv) of Tariff Regulation, 2014 as the proposed expenditure is already included in original capital cost. Further, expenditure proposed is not for any additional services, and not passing any benefit to the beneficiaries, hence not admissible. Such expenses should be meat through O&M expenses, or from depreciation fund.

**RVUN’s reply**

102. The system was installed under original scope of work at the time of commissioning of the project which has now become obsolete and this work is not covered under Original Scope of Work, thus the same has been considered under Regulation 17 (2).

103. Old installed system of belt weighers are not in working condition and have completed its useful life and have also become obsolete. It is submitted that proposed work is essential for successful and trouble free operation of the Unit as existing system is obsolete. This will benefit in stability of Unit and hence the benefits cannot be quantified. The replacement with completely new system is of capital in nature and is covered under clause 4.1.1 and 4.1.3 of the CEA guideline for R&M.

104. Measurement of coal quantity is an important factor for computing the generation cost of a power station, therefore, it is utmost requirement that weighment of coal, fed from Stockpile and received at coal bunker should be accurate. Further, it helps to improve the utilization factor and reduce the specific energy consumption (kWh/MT) which ultimately affects the
generation cost of plant. The installation of 14 Nos Belt weighers is very much of the capital nature. It is pertinent to mention that the installation of new belt weighers will improve system monitoring and thus will lead to save the cost of power with better coal feeding planning. Therefore the same will be in benefit of beneficiaries. Since this is not a repair work and being the full replacement of old system, it will need quite a big fund and hence the expenditure cannot be met from R&M/O&M.

Commission’s view

105. Commission observes that keeping the belt weighers in working condition is part of regular O&M, thus, the proposed expenditure should be met out from O&M. Further, expenditure proposed is not for any additional services and not passing any benefit to the beneficiaries. Petitioner has also not produced the cost benefit analysis of the proposed expenditure. In view of above, Commission does not accept the proposal of the Petitioner.

L. Supply, Design, Installation & Commissioning of Online Energy Accounting and Management System of KSTPS

Petitioner’s submissions

106. Presently, auxiliary consumption of KTPS is around 11% and there is always a margin to reduce the auxiliary consumption if monitored properly. There are several factors contributing to auxiliary consumption and through proper Energy Accounting and Management, it can be reduced. Energy Accounting is an integral part of Energy Management and Conservation. It measures and accounts for energy inputs, energy consumption and energy losses. The Energy Accounting enables the qualification of losses in different segments of the system. The first and foremost reason for Energy Accounting in a power utility is to record the available energy and attribute energy consumption & losses in the system. At present, there are no means
available to measure the segment wise energy consumption. Therefore, it is proposed to install the “On Line Energy Accounting and Management System” at all the seven units of KTPS, Kota. The primary objective of energy management is to achieve and maintain optimum energy utilization, throughout the power plant which may help in minimizing auxiliary power consumption and mitigating environmental effects.

**Stakeholders' comments/suggestions**

107. Measures to reduce auxiliary energy consumption should always be taken on priority. However, such investments should not be requested as additional capitalization but rather be planned and booked under O&M expenses while filing ARR. Further, a comprehensive cost benefit analysis should be provided along with monetary savings, payback period and indicative impact on tariff to be paid by the Discoms.

108. Petitioner admitted that there is a margin to reduce auxiliary consumption if monitored properly through proper energy accounting. Further, the Hon’ble APTEL in its orders dated 08.05.2014 and 22.03.2016 disallowed expenditure towards energy monitoring system. Therefore additional capitalization is not admissible.

109. Same cannot be part of Additional Capitalization as per APTEL Order dated 08.05.2014 passed in Appeal No. 173 of 2013.

**RVUN’s reply**

110. Online accounting system will help in standardization of energy consumption by each drive at any instance and ultimately help in to take action on any deviation on various load conditions. This will also help us in declaring generation within range of 1% as required in new ABT regime. This way lot of energy can be saved by accurate computation. This will benefit in stability of Unit and hence the benefits cannot be quantified. Hence the
proposal should be considered as additional capitalization under the RERC Tariff Regulations, 2014.

111. Judgment passed by Hon’ble APTEL in appeal 173 of 2013 NTPC v/s CERC, which was controlled by CERC Regulation 9(2) of Tariff Regulations, 2009, is not relevant with the current petition.

Commission’s view

112. We find that the contention of the Petitioner is acceptable and accordingly approve the proposal in-principle.

113. In consideration to the position discussed in forgoing paras, we accord in principle approval for the following capital works at KSTPS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Description of Proposal</th>
<th>Commission Decision</th>
<th>Estimated Cost allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Replacement of BHEL makes Pro Control P-13 SG-TG system of KSTPS Unit-5 (210 MW).</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>12.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Renovation of static excitation and AVR system of 210 MW Unit-3&amp;4, KSTPS, Kota by digital AVR system.</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Replacement of 95 Nos. existing CTMM motor protection relays of HT and LT motor Stage-II (KSTPS Unit-3&amp;4).</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Supply and ETC of variable frequency drive of ID fan motor (4 Nos.) of Unit-6&amp;7.</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Replacement of existing Fuji Make 2x75 KVA UPS system installed in Unit-5 of KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Strengthening and repair of RCC &amp; steel structure of crusher house, RCC structure of DM plant, RCC structure of acid alkali tank, RCC structure of SDG tank and RCC structure of plow feeder at KSTPS , Kota.</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Strengthening and repair of RCC framed structure of IDCT Cooling Tower of Unit-6 at KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Renovation /Retrofitting of rotary discharge machine No. 1&amp;2 at KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
114. Petitioner shall comply with the provisions of the Regulation 17 of Tariff Regulations, 2019.

115. Further, Commission directs the Petitioner to award the contracts for the aforesaid works complying with the provisions of Rajasthan Transparency in Public Procurement Act. Further, the Commission also directs the Petitioner to submit the quarterly status report to the Commission on the progress of the work once the work is started and also report completion of the work.

116. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(Prithvi Raj)  
Member

(S.C. Dinkar)  
Member

(Shreemat Pandey)  
Chairman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Conversion of Relay logic control system of CHP into PLC based system.</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Purchase of three (3) Nos. New bull dozers (BEML Make-Model BD-155).</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Purchase, Erection and commissioning of 14 Nos. Belt weigher at KSTPS, Kota.</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>IDC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>