

A4: PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

Submission of comments/suggestions and conduct of public hearing

- 4.1 The petition evoked response from several consumers, and a public hearing was held in Jamshedpur on December 20, 2009 wherein respondents put forth their comments and suggestions before the Commission in the presence of the petitioner. There were 44 members of public who took part in the public hearing process. The list of the attendees is attached as Annexure-I.
- 4.2 The Commission allowed persons/ representatives of entities who had not submitted prior written representations but attended the public hearing to express their views, regarding the ARR and tariff petition in person during the course of public hearing. There were in all 12 persons who filed written comments/made oral submission during public hearing process, as detailed hereunder:

Table 7 List of participants

S. N.	Participant/Organization	Represented by
1	National Metallurgical Laboratory	Sh. Vinod Kumar
2	Sh. S.K. Mahmood	Self
3	Sh. Dharmesh Kumar	Self
4	Sh. Dilip Kumar Jha	Self
5	Sh. Rajesh Kumar	Self
6	Sh. Appa Rao	Self
7	Sh. Srinivas Rao	Self
8	Sh. Niraj Kumar	Self
9	Sh. Imtiaz	Self
10	Sh. C.M. Dubey	Self
11	Sh. R. N. Singh	Self
12	Sh. Abhimanyu Kumar	Self

- 4.3 The comments/suggestion raised by the participants during public consultation process, along with the replies given by the petitioner and views of the Commission are given below.

Classification Issue

Public Comments/Suggestions

- 4.4 NML, a premier non-profit government research & development organisation, has submitted to the Commission to consider it as a “HT Domestic Consumer” instead of “HT Industrial Consumer”. NML has also submitted a copy of the agreement between CESC Ltd. – the distribution licensee of Kolkata and Central Glass & Ceramic Research Institute (CGCRI) – a sister concern of NML, in which CGCRI has been considered under domestic category.

TSL’s response

- 4.5 TSL in its ARR & Tariff petition has already proposed to consider government research organizations under the Domestic Supply- HT (DSHT) category. It has requested the Commission to take an appropriate decision in this regard.

Views of the Commission

- 4.6 The Commission shall separately take up this issue with the petitioner.

NOC and refund of security by JSEB for shifting of connection

Public Comments/Suggestions

- 4.7 Difficulty in obtaining NOC and refund of security, clearance certificate for shifting the connection from JSEB to the parallel licensee TSL.

TSL’s Response

- 4.8 The matter related to non-issue of NOC and non-refund of security deposit by the first licensee is not related to the petitioner.

Views of the Commission

- 4.9 There is already a provision in para 7.5 of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2005 regarding issue of NOC. The ATE vide its order dated January 16, 2008 passed in appeal no.122 of 2007 has also issued appropriate directions in this regard.

Other Issues

Public Comments/Suggestions

- 4.10 The following are the relevant comments and suggestions of the public on other issues:

- (a) The consumers face great difficulty in payment of bills because of lack of sufficient number of bill payment counters. It was suggested that drop boxes system should be adopted to facilitate payment of electricity bills in addition to on-line payment facility.
- (b) TSL should take up installation of street lights within its area of operation
- (c) The response of Customer Care Centre is not upto mark regarding information related to major / minor breakdowns and approximate time for correction of faults.
- (d) It was requested that the petition should also be made available in Hindi.
- (e) The petition is being signed by an authorized signatory of Tata Steel Ltd., but no detail of post/designation or appointment letter is being provided in the petition.
- (f) TSL is also distributing electricity in areas other than areas leased to it by the State Government, which it cannot undertake without permission of the Commission.
- (g) TSL is filing its ARR & Tariff petition after 3 years which it should be doing on annual basis.
- (h) TSL has outsourced its operational activities without permission of the Commission.
- (i) Several figures from the ARR & Tariff petition were also questioned on the ground pretext that these were not substantiated by sufficient proofs.
- (j) The requirement of capital expenditure proposed for future years was also questioned in the absence of any contract being awarded or tender process being undertaken by the licensee.

TSL's Response

4.11 The following is the point-wise response of TSL, on the above comments/suggestions:

- (a) Every effort has been made to minimize the waiting time at the bill deposit counters. The facility of making payment of electricity bills is being made available to the consumers throughout the month. However, TSL agrees that near the due dates of payment, the rush at collection counters increases which however is noted to be not more than half an hour in majority of the cases. TSL has taken note of the suggestion of providing drop-box facility and also online payment facility to its consumer and submitted that steps shall be taken in this respect.

- (b) TSL submits that installation of street lights is the function of the local municipal authority.
- (c) TSL submits that every effort is made to inform the consumers regarding any scheduled outage in a particular area through newspaper advertisements, etc. However, in case of major/minor faults and breakdowns, since a large part of its network consists of underground cables, etc. sometimes it is difficult to give a precise time frame for completion of the maintenance work. In such cases, a tentative time period which is usually the outer limit, for correction of fault is communicated to the customer care centres, which in turn is conveyed to the consumers.
- (d) The matter related to submission of Tariff petition in Hindi is the prerogative of the Commission and thus TSL has no comments to offer.
- (e) Regarding submission of detail of the authorised signatory of the petition, TSL submits that it has submitted the petition under an affidavit in the formats prescribed by the Commission.
- (f) Regarding the issue of distribution of electricity in the unauthorized areas, TSL submits that distribution of electricity is being undertaken only in the areas licensed by the Commission and it does not intends to spread outside its licensed area without prior and proper approval of the Commission.
- (g) TSL submits that the ARR & Tariff petition is being submitted to the Commission on annual basis and the same is not submitted after 3 years.
- (h) Regarding the issue of outsourcing of operational activities by TSL, it is submitted that decisions regarding day to day management of the operational activities are being taken duly considering the operational as well as financial efficiency in the best of the interest of the licensee and its consumers.
- (i) Regarding submission of proofs of various figures being mentioned in the petition, it is submitted that as far as practically possible TSL has provided the requisite supportive document required by the Commission and it is not practically feasible to make all these documents a part of the petition document.
- (j) TSL has proposed to undertake capital expenditure in anticipation of upcoming demand in the licensed area. TSL has projected lying of network infrastructure well in advance, so that when the demand arises it does find itself off guard. Moreover, these capital expenditure figures are under proposal stage only and TSL has not yet undertaken these activities till now.

Views of the Commission

- 4.12 The Commission directs the petitioner to initiate the drop-box facility for bill deposition and also develop a plan for online payment of bills.
- 4.13 The Commission expects that the petitioner to maintain the highest standard of consumer service delivered via enhancement in the services provided through the consumer care centres.