

**BEFORE THE GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
GANDHINAGAR**

**Petition No.1730 of 2018.**

**In the matter of:**

**Petition for determination of tariff for procurement of power by the distribution company/licensee from Raw Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) based power generating company in the State of Gujarat using Gasification route (Otto Cycle).**

Petitioner: Ankur Scientific Energy Technologies Private Limited  
Represented by: Mr. Ashok Chaudhary & Mr. Gaurav Patel

V/s.

Respondent No. 1: Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited  
Represented by: Ms. Girija Dave

Respondent No. 2: Madhya Gujarat Vij Company Limited  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 3: Uttar Gujarat Vij Company Limited  
Represented by: Mr. K.B.Chaudhari

Respondent No. 4: Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited  
Represented by: Mr. B.K.Patel

Respondent No. 5: Paschim Gujarat Vij Company Limited  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 6: Torrent Power Limited, Ahmedabad  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 7: Torrent Power Limited Surat  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 8: Torrent Power Limited Dahej  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 9: MPSEZ Utilities Pvt. Limited  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 10: Deendayal Port Trust  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 11: Jubilant Infrastructure Limited  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 12: ASPEN Infrastructure Pvt. Limited  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 13: GIFT Power Company Limited  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Respondent No. 14: Urban Development and Urban Housing  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

Objector : Shri Praveen Kumar Kulkarni, Vadodara.  
Represented by: Nobody was present.

**Coram:**

**Anil Mukim, Chairman**

**Mehul M. Gandhi, Member**

**Date: 05.05.2023**

**ORDER**

1. The present petition has been filed for determination of tariff for procurement of power by distribution companies/licenseses from Raw Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) based power generating company using gasification route (Otto Cysel). It is further requested by the Petitioner that if the Commission does not allow higher tariff on gasification/otto cycle technology, then the levellised tariff of Rs. 7.03/kWh as specified in Order No. 4 of 2016 dated 10.11.2016 for determination of tariff and other terms & conditions for Procurement of Power by Distribution Licensees from Municipal Solid Waste to Energy Projects in the State of Gujarat may be allowed.

2. In the daily Order dated 23.10.2018 in this matter, it is mentioned that-

*“2.2. Further, as the Petitioner has prayed for determination of the project specific tariff, it is necessary to determine the same as per the provisions of Section 62, 64 read with 86 (1)(a) of the Electricity Act, 2003. It is therefore, necessary for the Petitioner to publish a notice and invite comments & suggestions from all the stakeholders on the petition filed by him before the project specific tariff is determined by the Commission.*

3. Subsequently in the daily Order dated 06.08.2019 in this matter, it is observed that-

*7.6 Thus, it is apparent that the price relied upon by the Petitioner to arrive at the project cost based on the aforesaid quotation is not reliable and the Petitioner has failed to substantiate the authenticity of the price with supporting documents to justify the project cost. It is the duty of the Petitioner to justify the cost of each item of the project with supporting documents prior to deciding the tariff of the Petitioner project. The Petitioner has admittedly stated that they are claiming the tariff for Otto Cycle Technology where Gasifier Systems coupled with engine gensets are to be used and sought the tariff as determined by the Commission for MSW based project vide Order No. 4 of 2016 dated 10.11.2016 to be extended to the Petitioner's project. In the said Order, the Commission has determined the tariff for 'Mass Incineration' based project and 'RDF based Incineration' project which does not include the technology proposed by the Petitioner. It is, therefore, necessary to determine project specific tariff for the Petitioner's project, and for that the Petitioner is required to submit the latest cost data including the quotations invited from the OEMs and other parties who are carrying out the EPC work with supporting documents, specifications, etc. “*

4. We note that the Petitioner submitted the details justifying the cost of the project consisting of various items of the project alongwith supporting documents of the OEM, EPC Contractors, Suppliers, quotations etc. It is submitted that the cost of Engine Gensets in the total project cost of Rs. 16.38 3 Crore/MW is the cost for the entire package including control systems and as far as the Gasifier System is

concerned the price increase considered by GUVNL is not appropriate because for 1 MW power generation the system needed is four times bigger since it has to process adequate quantity of MSW to generate that much power and therefore, only 25% increase in 250 KW considered by GUVNL is not valid and justified. It is submitted by the Petitioner that the complete Gasifier System cost comprises of Gasifier System Package, Oxygen Plant, Cooling Tower, Chiller, Hydraulic Grate, Transformer, VCB etc. Moreover, the cost towards transportation, installation, commissioning is extra in most of the quotes submitted.

5. We further note that the Respondent GUVNL submitted that no proper justification has been filed by the Petitioner to substantiate the total project cost of Rs. 16.38 Crore/MW as against R. 10.48 Crore/MW worked out by GUVNL because no additional cost documents are submitted. The Petitioner has failed to justify what are 'Other Costs' and 'Overheads'. The quotation of M/s. Weifang Naipute Gas Genset 4 Co. Limited, China submitted by GUVNL is also for 'Comprehensive Package' including the cost of synchronisation panel etc. Even the cost details of EPC contract of NTPC for 250 kW submitted by the Petitioner is package cost and comparing with NTPC, the project cost proposed by the Petitioner is substantially on higher side. The Petitioner has submitted the quotations for only certain equipments but has not submitted any invoice/firm quotations for others. It is also submitted that the Commission may therefore determine the tariff less than Rs. 7.03 per unit considering the project cost of proposed technology lower than Rs. 16 Crore /MW.
6. It is noted that the determination of project specific tariff as prayed by the Petitioner is not concluded till date for the want of project specific supporting documents.
7. Now, recently the Petitioner submitted that due to delay and uncertainty, the stakeholders are not showing any interest in these projects and further requested this Commission to determine the Generic Tariff instead of Project specific tariff.
8. The Respondent GUVNL submitted that the Petition was all about the determination of Project specific tariff and now the Petitioner has changed the

prayer of the Petition, the fresh submission of relevant documents are needed to be filed in this matter.

9. We note the submission made by the parties. We note that the Petitioner has now requested to determine the Generic Tariff. The Petitioner has also submitted that the existing tariff for the big mass incineration or combustion-based plants may be extended to the small Gasification based plants.
10. It is noted that the requisite detail with all the supporting documents for the determination of project specific tariff is not submitted or available till date and hence it is not proper and reasonable to decide the present petition for determination of project specific tariff. Further for the determination of generic tariff for gasification based projects, we take the note of request from the Petitioner and appropriate action in this regard will be initiated.
11. In the meantime interested person has option to file fresh petition for determination of project specific tariff with all the supporting documents and details in accordance with the GERC Regulations.
12. In view of above the present Petition deserves to be dismissed.
13. The Petition is dismissed.
14. We order accordingly.

-Sd-

**[Mehul M. Gandhi]**

**Member**

-Sd-

**[Anil Mukim]**

**Chairman**

Place: Gandhinagar.

Date: 05/05/2023.