



**Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission**  
**Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 17**

No. F. 11(1397)/DERC/2016-17/

**Petition No. 32/2016**

**In the matter of:** **Petition seeking approval for implementation of DSM based Energy Efficient Air-Conditioner program in UT of Delhi under Demand Side Management Programme with an object to lower the overall cost of electricity to the consumer by economical and efficient use of resources.**

BSES Rajdhani Power Limited  
Through its: **CEO**  
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,  
New Delhi-110019.

**...Petitioner**

**Coram: Sh. B.P. Singh, Member**

**Appearance:**

1. Mr. Hasan Murtaza , Advocate
2. Mr. Adesh Golash, BRPL
3. Mr. Rajeev Chowdhury, BRPL
4. Mr. Arindham Das, BRPL
5. Mr. Hemant Verma, BRPL
6. Mr. Ravi, BRPL
7. Mr. Avinash Kumar, BRPL

**INTERIM ORDER**

(Date of Hearing: 25.04.2017)

(Date of Order: 28.04. 2017)

1. The instant Petition came up for hearing on 25<sup>th</sup> April, 2017, which was attended by Counsel and representatives of the Petitioner.
2. Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that in its "Energy efficient Air Conditioner Program", the savings due to AC exchange scheme will be 809 units per consumer per year, as a result of which the Petitioner can save 9.12 MU per year including saving in Transmission and distribution losses. Further, the initial investment through DSM fund required by the Petitioner will be Rs. 4.90 crore approx. which will be recovered with a payback period of 5.1 year (approx.) and after that an annual saving of Rs. 1.23 crore is estimated to the Petitioner.
3. Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that the summer season has started and it is awaiting the approval of the Commission for implementing the scheme this season.

4. The Commission enquired whether the payback period of 5.1 year to recover the rebate on different kind of air conditioners is calculated on global basis or individual basis because there may be possibilities that some kind of ACs may not get any taker. The Commission observed that in a similar scheme of TPDDL, the payback period is 4 year and therefore whether the proposed payback period of 5.1 year is practicable or not especially keeping in view the usual life of ACs.
5. The Commission directed the petitioner to provide calculations for the different payback periods namely 5.1 year and 4 year and also for the calculation of rebate considering the payback on global basis and on individual basis as well.
6. The Counsel for the petitioner submitted that they will provide fresh calculations and would like to have discussions with the officers of the Commission to explain the calculations.
7. The Commission acceded to the request of the Petitioner and directed the Petitioner to submit and explain the calculations to the officers of the Commission through meetings within 7 days.
8. The order is reserved.

**Sd/-**  
(B.P. Singh)  
Member