

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF THE
MUMBAI DISTRIBUTION NETWORK ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (M-DNAC)

Date :- 16 May 2025 at 12.00 Hrs.
Venue :- Through Video Conferencing.
Present :- Dr. Prafulla Varhade, Chairman (Commission's Officer)
Shri. Dineshchandra Saboo, Member (External)
Shri. Dilip Dumbre, Member (Ombudsman's Officer)
Shri. Rakesh Guhagarkar, Member (Commission's Officer)

Licensee's representatives:
Shri. Rajnish Jitra — AEML-D
Shri. Shishir Mahulkar — AEML-D
Smt Saroj Kadam—AEML-D

Shri Vikas Koul — TPC-D
Smt. Hawwa Inamdar — TPC-D
Smt Nisha Dubal — TPC-D

Discussion held:-

1. TPC-D had received the power supply application on 29 April 2025 from “SS Holy Education Trust, Malvani Village, Near Atharv College, Malad (W), Mumbai 400095” for total load requirement of 637 kW. TPC-D estimated the Maximum Demand (**MD**) as 304 kVA in accordance with the MD estimation guidelines issued by the Commission. Accordingly, TPC-D assessed its own network position and communicated to AEML-D by email on 7 May 2025 (with a copy marked to the M-DNAC) that the proposal is falling under Scenario 53 (D). TPC-D further stated that in order to connect the said consumer, TPC-D would be required to install CSS (Level 3 connection) and hence would be required to follow the procedure laid down by the Commission in terms of Para 6 of Annexure C of its Order dated 12 June 2017.
2. In response, AEML-D, vide its email on 12 May 2025, informed TPC-D (with a copy marked to M-DNAC) that its distribution network is also present in the vicinity of the applicant’s premise and it will be in a position to connect the applicant by commissioning a CSS in the plot (Level 3 connection). AEML-D stated that the present application falls under Scenario 53 (D).
3. As required under Case No. 182 of 2014, TPC-D and AEML-D submitted their cost proposals in sealed envelopes on 14 May 2025 providing the estimated expenditure for releasing the connection to the applicant consumer.

4. Thereafter, M-DNAC held its meeting in virtual mode on 16 May 2025 wherein the sealed envelopes submitted by AEML-D and TPC-D (Virtually present) were opened in the presence of the Licensees. The representatives of the Licensees briefly elaborated their respective cost estimations and responded to queries raised by the Committee during the meeting. In response to the specific query raised by the Committee, TPC-D also clarified that the temporary supply for construction purpose to the consumer has been provided by TPC-D.

5. M-DNAC Committee's observations and decision:-

Details of proposals submitted by both Licensees:

- i. It is observed that the assessed MD by TPC-D as well as AEML-D is same as both the licensees have considered the common norms as per the guidelines issued by the Commission on 9 October 2024.

ii. AEML-D's cost proposal dated 14 May 2025:

S N	Item	Unit	Quantity	Cost (Rs. Lacs)
1	11kV, 3c/400 sq. mm. XLPE Cable	Meters	240 (2 runs of 120 meters each)	5.97
2	11/0.4 kV 630 kVA Dry Type DT (incl. Import Duty)	Nos.	1	13.81
3	RMU	Nos.	1	7.11
4	Other material			7.87
5	Civil cost			10.67
6	Cost of services (labour, Installation, testing, commissioning)			1.89
7	Re-instatement (RI) Charges	Meters	30 meters	3.76
8	MCGM Access charges @ Rs. 100 / meter	Meters	60 meters	0.06
9	Contingency Charges @ 7% of project cost (excluding RI charges)			3.31
	Total (Rs. Lakh)			54.45

iii. TPC-D's cost proposal dated 13 May 2025:

S N	Item	Unit	Quantity	Cost (Rs. Lacs)
1	RMU, 22 kV, MOTOR, 21kA, 3W, 2ISO, 1BKR, 3S, ID	EA	1	7.07
2	Transformer 630 kVA, 22 kV/ 415V, Indoor	EA	1	23.65
3	Cable 22kV AL 3C 240 SQMM XLPE	Meters	190	4.46
4	Cable 22kV 1C, 185Sq. MM ALU AR XLPE	Meters	15	0.10

S N	Item	Unit	Quantity	Cost
				(Rs. Lacs)
5	Cable, 1.1kV, 4CX300Sq XLPE AL,PVC, AR, FRLS	EA	15	0.20
6	Other material			4.93
7	Cost of services (labour, Installation, testing, commissioning)			7.76
8	Re-instatement (RI) Charges	Meters	5	0.63
9	Contingency Charges @ 7%			3.37
	Total (Rs.)			52.17

- iv. After going through both the cost proposals, it is seen that the cost submitted by TPC-D is lower than the cost submitted by AEML-D. It is observed that length of HT cable in case of AEML-D is slightly higher than TPC-D. For TPC-D, it is about 190 Meters whereas in case of AEML-D, HT cable length is about 240 Meters. Further, RI charges for AEML-D is more as compared to TPC-D as the external length of HT cable on public footpath/road for AEML-D (30 Mtr.) is more than that of TPC-D (5 Mtr.).
- v. M-DNAC observed that the cost submitted by TPC-D is less than the cost submitted by AEML-D. Further, as the network of TPC-D is relatively closer to the point of supply, the cables required from its network are of shorter length and TPC-D's RI charges are lower than AEML-D's RI charges.
- vi. In view of the above, the M-DNAC has decided to allow TPC-D to release power supply connection to "SS Holy Education Trust, Malvani Village, Near Atharv College, Malad (W), Mumbai 400095" The total cost submitted by it of Rs. 52.17 Lacs shall be the ceiling cost (with no further incremental cost) for its ARR as mentioned in Case No. 182 of 2014. Further, both the Licensees need to adhere to the timelines stipulated in the Order dated 12 June 2017 and in the MERC (Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees including Power Quality) Regulations, 2021 and its amendment for processing the consumer's applications.

Sd/-
Shri. Rakesh Guhagarkar,
Member (Commission's Officer)

Sd/-
Shri. Dilip Dumbre,
Member (Ombudsman's Officer)

Sd/-
Shri. Dineshchandra Saboo,
Member (External)

Sd/-
Dr. Prafulla Varhade,
Chairman (Commission's Officer)