to the town of Anguruwatote and some noise disturbance could be caused to it's residents. It is inevitable that the pipeline route will pass close to a number of institutions but, with careful planning, the noise disturbance should be of short duration.

It is important that all engines have effective silencing to minimize their noise output, regardless of their location.

The severity of vibrations caused by the movement of heavy plant and vehicles will depend on the ground conditions. As there are no concentrations of population close enough to any of the construction sites to feel such effects, no problems are anticipated from this source. The exception to this may be during the time when plant and equipment are delivered to site. Care must be taken to avoid towns and villages as much as possible when planning the delivery routes.

The greatest disturbances due to vibrations are caused by piling operations. It is unlikely however, that piling will be required at any of the three sites. Even if piling were to be necessary, there are no structures close enough to the sites to be endangered, though the noise caused by such operations will carry for some distance.

(22) Ground Subsidence

The prime cause of ground subsidence is generally the excessive abstraction of groundwater. No such abstraction will take place during construction.

(23) Noxious Odors

Exhaust fumes, the burning of plastic and rubber etc. and rotting waste are the only potential generators of noxious odors during the construction phase of the project. In reality, the exhaust fumes will be rapidly dispersed and should never reach concentration levels likely to cause a nuisance. The type of rubbish that may be burned can be controlled and thereby prevent problems from that source. Rotting waste can also be avoided by ensuring that such material is collected and removed from site to a designated disposal tip.

16.3.4 Operation Phase

(1) Resettlement

The operation of the treatment plant will not require the resettlement of any further people.

(2) Economic Activities

There should be no effect on economic activities when the treatment plant is in operation, though it may be argued that the increased provision of water could indirectly enhance economic growth in the supply areas.

(3) Transportation and Daily Life

Some traffic will be generated by the existence of the intake and the treatment plant, mainly vehicles delivering chemicals. It will however be minimal and should not affect the movement of local vehicles.

In the future, pipeline maintenance may give rise to temporary traffic problems, if and when it becomes necessary to excavate roadways to find and mend leaks.

(4) Interruption to the Community

No interruption to the community will result from the operation of the intake or the treatment plant.

(5) Cultural Assets and Archaeology

There will be no effect on cultural assets or archaeology.

(6) Common Rights

No common rights should be infringed when the treatment plant is in operation.

(7) Sanitation and Health

No direct sanitation or health risks will be associated with the components of the project when they are in use.

Indirectly, sanitation and health may suffer as a consequence of providing significantly greater quantities of water to the distribution areas. With the exception of a relatively small area of Colombo, there are no other sewerage systems and the majority of the inhabitants of the intended distribution areas have inadequate or non existent toilet facilities. The increase in the supply of potable water will lead to an equivalent increase in waste water production, with no acceptable means of disposal. Inevitably this will lead to greater pollution of the surface and groundwaters in certain areas and the probability of an increase in water borne diseases.

(8) Waste

The only waste generated in any significant quantity in the operation phase will be sludge from the treatment processes. The treatment of the liquid sludge is dealt with in detail in sub-section 16.3.3.19).

The end result of the sludge treatment will be a solid sludge cake which will periodically be dug out of the drying beds for disposal off-site. The final disposal of this sludge presents a significant problem, it has no commercial value and, in general, cannot be used as fill material as it has poor load bearing properties. On average some 16 m³ per day will be produced and the NWSDB must acquire a suitable acceptable disposal site at the earliest opportunity.

Solid waste in the form of empty chemical sacks may require disposal, though these may be recycled. This is not considered to be a significant problem provided it is recognized and accommodated for before the plant is put into operation.

(9) Dangers

The transportation and storage of chlorine at the treatment plant will constitute the main danger. The transportation danger can be reduced by selecting a delivery route which avoids main population centers. By careful design of the chlorine storage and dosing facilities, the threat posed by these installations can be minimized and any leaks contained.

No other hazardous chemicals will be used or stored on site with the exception of aluminum sulphate (alum). A solution of alum is acidic and safety showers should be provided in the chemical house in case workers get splashed.

(10) Topography and Geology

This aspect is not relevant to the operation of the treatment plant.

(11) Soil Erosion

Adequate means for disposing of overflows from the treatment plant and the high-level reservoir should be provided as the possibility of soil erosion could occur if the potentially large flows are not conducted safely to a suitable watercourse. A reasonably large stream flows in the vicinity of the treatment plant site which should prove satisfactory. No such stream flows close to the reservoir site and the problem should be addressed in detail at the earliest opportunity.

(12) Groundwater

No effects will be caused to the groundwater by the operation of the intake or treatment plant.

(13) Lakes Marshes and Rivers

The nominal output of the proposed new treatment plant will be 18,2000 m³/d. From published data (Hydrological Annual 1991/92, Hydrology Division, Irrigation Department, Sri Lanka) the minimum

average monthly flow at Putupaula is 200 million m³, equivalent to a daily flow of some 6,670,000 m³/d. Thus, under these conditions, the treatment plant will take only about 2.7 percent of the rivers flow. Not a significant amount.

The months of January to March 1991 were exceptional drought months and the river flow was reduced to 518,400 m³/d near Horana. Under this situation the water treatment plant abstraction would account for about 35 percent or the river flow. It may be anticipated that this would enhance saline intrusion and increase the threat to the Kalutara intake.

The simplest countermeasure that could be employed at times of abnormally low river would be to reduce the abstraction rate to the treatment plant. A theoretical possibility would be to provide a raw water storage reservoir from which the plant would draw at times of low river flow. Clearly such a reservoir would have to be very large indeed an may have to be formed by building a dam across the river. There are a considerable number of practical and financial difficulties associated with this approach and it cannot be recommended

Some concern has been expressed by the NWSDB that the abstractions for the treatment plant during low flow periods in the Kalu Ganga might affect the Bolgoda Lakes. This possibility has been assessed, as well as other potential environmental effects on the lakes, and is discussed in detail in Supporting Report (Volume III). No effects related to river flow are expected.

(14) Coastline and Sea

The operation of the treatment plant is not relevant to this item.

(15) Flora and Fauna

No effects will be caused to the flora and fauna by the operation of the intake, treatment plant, reservoir or the transmission pipelines.

(16) Weather

The weather will not be affected.

(17) View

The effect on the view is as detailed in sub-section 16.3.3.17).

(18) Air Pollution

The only possible cause of air pollution would be an escape of chlorine gas. The careful design of the chlorine storage and dosing facilities will minimize this risk.

(19) Water Pollution

1) Intake

The intake design includes the provision of grit chambers which will require cleaning from time to time. The highest load will be deposited at times of high river flow and it may be expected that it will consist of a significant quantity of sandy material. Whatever the composition of the material, it will be naturally occurring and not constitute pollution if it is returned to the river. If however the grit chambers have not been cleaned for some considerable period of time, caution should be exercised to ensure that the deposits have not turned anaerobic. If this is found to have occurred, it would be unwise to return them to the river as chemical changes can take place, generating toxins which could harm fish etc.

2) Treatment Plant

In general, between 5 percent and 8 percent of the flow entering a treatment plant will be discharged as wastewater from the sedimentation and filtration stages. The exact amount will depend on the design and efficiency of the settled sludge removal system, the frequency of filter washing and the quantity of water needed for each wash.

The design proposed for the new treatment plant incorporates a washwater return system to the plant inlet, thereby recycling a significant proportion of the wastewater. The solids content of the washwater will then be removed by the sedimentation stage.

Sludge discharges from the sedimentation basins will flow to batch thickening tanks, the thickened sludge then being discharged to a set of sludge drying beds. The supernatant water from the thickening tanks will be withdrawn for disposal to the small stream that passes to the east of the site. Sludge solids will be retained on the beds but a proportion of the water fraction will filter through to a series of underdrains. From the underdrains the filtrate will flow to a collection chamber and from there to the small stream. The water remaining in the sludge will be evaporated by the action of wind and sun, leaving a dry sludge cake which has to be removed periodically for disposal off-site.

The worst situation will occur should the drying beds be bypassed for any reason. Under these circumstances the sludge from the sedimentation basins will flow directly to the stream causing a highly noticeable discharge. During the dry season, when the flow in the stream is at it's lowest, the majority of the suspended particles may be expected to settle on the stream bed and along it's sides before reaching the Kalu Ganga.

Such a discharge would be contrary to the discharge standards contained in the Sri Lankan "National Environmental (Protection and Quality) Regulation, No 1, 1990". The standards set a limit for suspended solids of 50 mg/l with a minimum dilution of 8:1. Should the dilution be less than this figure, then the permissible level of suspended solids is reduced in proportion to the dilution factor. Unsettled sludge will have a suspended solids load in the region of 2,000 mg/l (0.2%) and the dilution factor during the dry season could be as low as 4:1.

Overflows will be provided from various points in the treatment process and these will also flow to the stream, via the filtrate collection chamber of the drying beds. It is unclear as to the effect that a flow of up to 190,000 m³/d would have on the stream and it's surroundings, though it is unlikely to be in excess of the natural flow in the stream during periods of heavy rain. The suspended solids load in such a discharge would be small and generally no worse than the Kalu Ganga river water. Quite how the discharge standards would be interpreted under such circumstances, particularly with respect to the dilution factor, is a matter for debate.

Drains and overflows from the chemical house are a potential source of water pollution. An interceptor tank should be provided to collect all such discharges for eventual removal, via a tanker, to an acceptable disposal site.

(20) Soil Pollution

None of the operations at the intake, treatment plant or high-level reservoir will lead to soil pollution.

(21) Noise and Vibration

The only significant noise generation will be from the pumps at the intake and the transmission pumps at the treatment plant. These will be enclosed in buildings and will not be close enough to any residential areas or institutions to cause a nuisance.

No vibrations will be caused other than minimal ones from the pump sets. These should not be felt outside of the pump houses.

(22) Ground Subsidence

This item is not relevant to the operation of the scheme.

(23) Noxious Odors

No noxious odors will be produced.

16.3.5 Conclusions

From the foregoing it may be concluded that:

- 1) During the Construction Phase
 - 1. Major environmental impacts:
 - None
 - 2. Minor environmental impacts:
 - Resettlement
 - Transportation and daily life
 - Disruption to the community
 - Water pollution
 - Noise and vibration
 - 3. Uncertain environmental impacts:
 - Economic activities
 - Sanitation
 - Soil pollution
- 2) During the Operation Phase
 - 1. Major environmental impacts:
 - None
 - 2. Minor environmental impacts:
 - River flow
 - Water pollution
 - 3. Uncertain environmental impacts:
 - None

The environmental impacts associated with the construction phase will be of limited duration with the exception of the resettlement requirements. None of them are judged to be serious.

The two factors highlighted for the operation phase of the project will be present for the life of the treatment plant. It should be recognized however that the river flow problem is only likely to occur on rare occasions and can be contained if necessary by reducing the output of the plant. The water pollution problem should also occur very infrequently and, at worst, will only significantly affect the small stream which runs close to the treatment plant site. This stream has no known abstractions and any sludge deposits will be scoured away during the high flows of the rainy season into the Kalu Ganga. No noticeable deterioration is expected in the river water quality at such times as the river will also be in flood.

Provided practical countermeasures are taken, the overall conclusion of the EIA is that the effects of both the construction and operation phases will cause no significant or lasting harm to the environment and should not rule against the implementation of the project.

.

CHAPTER 17 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

17. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

17.1 Conclusion

The financial viability of the Kalu Ganga Water Supply Project is much dependent on the tariff rate. The current tariff rate is regarded to be under the proper level in terms of the affordability and in comparison with other public utility charges. The results of the case study with a parameter of incremental rate of tariff, taking into account the current depressed tariff structure, indicates that the Project will be viable if the tariff rate is allowed to be increased at 8 - 10 percent per annum.

Further, the implementation of the Project will provide the Greater Colombo Water Supply System with two major water sources which will ensure more reliability for water supply in emergency or severe drought cases.

17.2 Recommendations

Recommendations towards the implementation of the Project are summarized in accordance with their importance and priorities as follows:

Taking necessary measures for ensuring the feasibility and financial viability of the Project

For the debt service management along with the implementation of the proposed projects and for clearing up the accumulated deficit by the year 2000, the routine efforts in the water supply management such as reduction in NRW, and implementation of the cost containment strategy will not be sufficient. The present depressed water tariff system will therefore need to be reviewed to set up a higher level of tariff structure at reasonable level considering the affordability of the consumers in the Greater Colombo Area. The viability of the proposed Kalu Ganga Project will then be assured with such measures to be taken.

In this connection, it is strongly recommended to establish in the NWSDB a financial management unit which will be fully in charge of debt service management, current and fixed assets management, cost containment strategy, future investment programming, etc.

2) Improvement of Non-Revenue Water (NRW)

Reduction in the amount of non-revenue water (unaccounted-for water) is a major subject to tackle in the management of the Greater Colombo Water Supply System. It will, if successfully implemented, result in increase in the revenue and reduction in the operation cost.

Most efficient and economical measures for reduction in NRW may be recommended as follows:

- 1. Provision of water meters to every consumer, repairing the defective water meters, and calibration of reading error.
- Conducting efficient meter reading and billing collection
- 3. Controlling the illegal connection
- 4. Provision or repair of the bulk flow meters to monitor the amount of supply.

Reduction in the physical water loss will need more operational efforts and actual cost compared with the measures above but will much contribute to the system life. It will give an allowance in the production and transmission capacity of the existing and newly constructed facilities. The more allowance the water supply system will be given, the longer the expansion in future will be deferred. An alternative scenario for the case of smaller water loss in 5 percent is presented in Section 15.3 in Chapter 15. It shows a considerable reduction in project size and therefore the project cost.

3) Protection of Water Source

It is necessary for the government to establish a policy for protection of the water source in terms of quality and quantity of the raw water. For water quality, in particular, the following possible sources of contamination must be paid attention:

- 1. Discharge of a large amount of domestic sewage from large cities or communities upstream of the intake.
- 2. Toxic or harmful wastewater discharge from industries in the catchment area at upstream.

For quantity of the raw water, a comprehensive water utilization plan for the Kalu Ganga, including water supply, irrigation, power generation, flood control, industry etc., must be established as well as an organizational arrangement of controlling the water right.

4) Role of the Greater Colombo Regional Support Center

The Greater Colombo Regional Support Center of the NWSDB is considered as the obvious and most appropriate agency that will be in charge of the Project during and after its implementation. However, the RSC (GC) which is now the largest RSC in terms of the number of service connections and share of revenues in the NWSDB still remains one of the weakest centers in terms of organizational and managerial capability because it has not received due attention in the earlier institutional development activities. After implementation of the Project, water supply capacity in the Greater Colombo Area will be doubled and the RSC (GC) should be geared to fully meet the increased roles, functions and activities it will be charged with. The involvement of the RSC (GC), therefore, from the initial stage of the planning and design of the Project is quite significant to reflect the real needs and problems experienced by the RSC (GC).

5) Conduct of detailed analysis on salinity intrusion

The salinity intrusion analysis conducted in this study is based on the presently available data and information. If a study on the salinity barrier is to be conducted in future, it is recommended that the analysis be conducted by one-dimensional, two-layer, unsteady flow hydraulic model analysis based on the detailed river bed profiles and cross sections and the actual hourly changes in salinity.

6) Establishment of salinity intrusion monitoring system

The salinity intrusion analysis in this report shows that the salinity wedge might reach the proposed intake point under some circumstances. However, such a situation will be foreseeable to some extent by checking the water level of the Kalu Ganga if the saline water monitoring will be added to the water quality monitoring program. The key location to identify the salinity wedge is the area with shallow river bed immediately downstream of Narthupana bridge which act as a natural barrier for the salinity intrusion. When the salinity wedge goes upstream over this point, there will be a possibility that it will reach the intake point. Although the proposed structure of the intake mouth is carefully designed to enable the intake from the surface layer which will be free from saline water, it is recommended to monitor salinity at different depths at Narthupana bridge so that it will be possible to foresee the level of the saline water.

7) Timely Review of the Feasibility Study Prior to the Implementation

This Feasibility Study is prepared on the basis of the presently available data and information and most reasonable projection made from such information. In future, there may be more development or changes in socio-economic or natural conditions in the project area which are now unforeseenable but might affect, if they occur, the recommendations presented in the study. It is therefore recommended that the Feasibility Study be timely reviewed in future to take into account the situation at the time of the implementation of the Project.

8) Establishment of water quality monitoring system for the Kalu Ganga

There is unlikely any serious pollutant sources which discharge the hazardous or toxic wastewater for health upstream of the proposed intake point. However, the future development in the upper reach of the Kalu Gang is unforeseenable; or there will be a possibility that some factory might discharges wastewater into the river. Those who are concerned with water supply operation should therefore be required to carefully monitor the water quality of the source. It is recommended to establish the water quality monitoring system strategically connecting some points allotted in the river stretch downstream of the confluence of major tributaries, factory-concentrated area, problematic factory-located area, etc.

The purpose of the water quality monitoring is to predict the abnormality in the raw water quality before it will reach the intake point, and to identify the discharging source. For this purpose, the testing system should be highly upgraded including both the instrument and staff. In addition, it is necessary to collect the information on the location of existing and new factories and the movement of projects developed in the upper reach of the Kalu Ganga in cooperation with the agencies concerned such as the Central Environmental Authority.

9) Kalutara Water Supply System in Future

The existing Kalutara intake station has experienced the saline water during the 1991 drought. By a large intake from the Kalu Ganga for Greater Colombo upstream of the Kalutara intake station, it will be expected to be placed on the severer situation as for the salinity intrusion as described in Chapter 6 which also suggests that there is few proper place even though moving the Kalutara intake station upstream. One solution will be the integration of the Kalutara Water Supply System which presently covers a part of Panadura P.S. across the Kalu Ganga to the Kalu Ganga Water Supply System.

10) Provision of Sewerage Services

The expansion of the water supply capacity will bring the increase in the sewage to be discharged in the service area. At present, a sewer system is provided in C.M.C. and only the northern coastal part of Dehiwala but not in service. According to the "Wastewater and Sanitation Master Plan for Greater Colombo" prepared in 1993, Dehiwala-Mt.Lavinia M.C. and a northern part of Moratuwa U.C. will be covered by a sewer system by 2000 and only the remainder of Moratuwa U.C. and Panadura U.C. will be added to them at last in the high development scenario by 2020. Other remaining areas are expected to be served by the on-site facilities which mainly treat excreta and do not treat other wastewater. The pollutant load to be discharged into watercourses will accordingly increase in the unserved area steadily. In addition, although the maintenance of those facilities is left to the responsibility of owners, their neglect of proper maintenance of those facilities will lead to the pollution of the surface water and groundwater. The high priority should be given to the provision of a sewer system within the service area by water supply.

ANNEX A COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

									• • • •	1 =				Т									
>						,				Grant Component		57.5%											
\dashv					(4.20.)					Year C													
5		.:		٠						ľ													
1			ects	nent		94	١,			¥.	15.0%		42.5%	42.5%									
-			y Pro	Local Component		100%	100%			TOTAL	21		4,	4									
0		٠.	r Supp	Local		Grant	Grant																
"			Form of Government Financing for Water Supply Projects			উ	Ö						.0	. 6					. :				
Σ			cing fo	Foreign Component	Sa Sa	15%	20%						50%	50%									
-			Finan	ට්ට			The second second						5	æ	٠.	٠.							
3			ртеп	Forei	Grant	858	\$\$ \$		•				Government Grant	NWSDB									
-			Gove			' 3	5		7		15%	85%	muna	١						٠.			
2			orm o			Rurai	Urban		LOA				Ŏ										
			1				-	-	RNAL		3	(F/C)											
7	- 1			•					EXTE		Gran	Loan			·								
2			·						FINANCIAL MECHANISM OF EXTERNAL LOAN	100%	Government Grant (L/C)	External Loan (F/C)								crest			12%
]	٠.					161	7		HANK	,,	Sove						(s)	3		, is		0	
E		(88U 000)	187.277	20,600	21.904	11.165	240.947		MEC	Project Cost							: 1	200	ĵ.	locatio	2,622,351		1.938.260
4		ł	,			1			VCIAL	Pig							Š	40 D. ATS 20 0, 1994	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	Capital Allocation Interest	57.5% 2.	0.0%	42.50, 1
4	SCT	CASE-2					TOTAL	-	FINA				٠.	:			000	200	S.7003	បី	57.5	Ö,	4
1	KALU GANGA PROJECT		-	C1	60	4		ş		L				J			(20 mg box) 2001/ 000/921/ 250 50	1 9	49 RS./US. 4.560.611 RS.'000		nent	Solos	A CINS
4	GA P					٠.		tíon C											4.560		bovernz	n Ager	Foreign Loan through Treasury
,	GAN	TOTAL	187,277	20,600	21 904	11.165	240.947	59% increase in percentage of Construction Cost								•	Stage 2	Capital Expeliques			Capital Grant from Government	Capital Grant from Foreign Agencies	inoni c
4	ALU	- 51 - 120						o o C							2016		N G	2			1 Grant	nd fron	EO LOS
-	OR K	Stage	72,580	7,984	8,461	4	93.074	39% rcenta			•						2	1			Capita	ital Gra	Fore
-	FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS FOR (BASE CASE)	1	_	12,617	13,443	7,117	147,873	ة 5. يوسي	•					·	DHASE I - TABGET VEAD	3		: '				Sap	
	VALY (BAS)	Stage 1		ဌ	13		147	ol % increase							TAB		(apida)	2					
,	Γ¥	at 1994 price ('000 US\$)						96 0		-					1.13	3	,	3 6	<u> </u>	nterest			12%
-	BILL	a 190)					ŀ]						Ha	71.	90	00 Do 4155 ac 2011004 3	5	ion I	332	0	163
1	EASI					-		/sis		٠							000.30		000.s	Allocat	4,166,		3.079
1	ji.	PROJECT COST CASE-1	cost)	/ices	cncy	otc.)	TOTAL	Sensitivity Analysis									(noing bould 1001) (1000 22 TE)	, 6	7.245.795 Rs.'000	Capital Allocation Interest	57.5% 4,166,332	0.0%	42.5% 3.079.463
4		SECT C	Direct	ngSen	Conting	on, Jamd,	2	nsítiviľ									*	Ì	7.245		Ś		4
-		PRO	Construction Cost (Direct cost)	Engineering Services	Physical Contingency	Others (Board administration, land, etc.)		S								,	T .	3			nent	Icies	, Vins
4			ruction	E	£	ś admit										ć	Todane	4			Capital Grant from Government	Capital Grant fr. Foreign Agencies	Foreign Loan through Treasury
-			Const			s(Board											ů.	3			from G	fr. Forei	Strongs
ì						Other									-		ζ	Š		1	Grant	Crant 1	nzo.l n
-		L															·* ile	arelia.	i e		Capital	Capita	Foreig
٥						: 1			**:												-		
٢			.: تيرا			<u></u>		T-	T ==	Γ		,,,1		<u>"</u> r	م ا د	<u> </u>	-T 6		্য প	اري.	ان	<u> </u>	00
ì	- w	85 8	36	87	88	8	8 3	92	93	9	95	98	97	88	99	1	5 5	102	104	105	106	107	108

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

	>		2010		2,848,911	0	178,057	2.670.854	341.869		2.727.214	8	136.361	2.590.853	327,266		5.576.125	ō	314,418	5.261.707	669,135		2010		1.162.109	1.162.109	1,1		7	2010	5.261.707	989,135	314,418	983.553	1.162.109	469.291	344,495	-320,813	-9.244.875	-2.0%	2010	1.162.109	983,553
	ລ		2002		3,026,968	0	178.057	2,848,911	363,236		2.863.575	0	136.361	2,727,214	343,629		5.890.543	0	314,418	5.576.125	706.865		2000		930,772	930,772			13	2009	5.576,125	706.865	314.418	1,021,283	930.772	469.291	344,495	-589,880	-8,924,062	-3.6%	5003	930,772	1,021,283
	<u>-</u>		2008		3,205,025		178.057	3,026,968	384,603		2,999,935	0	136.361	2.863.575	359.992		6.204.960	0	314,418	5,890,543	744.595		2008		729.861	729.861			압	2008	5.890.543	744,595	314,418	1.059.013	729,861	469.291	344 495	-828.521	-8,334,182	-5.1%	2008	729.861	1,059,013
	s		2007		3.383.082 3	O	178.057	3,205,025	405,970		2,999,935 2	ø	0	2:999,935 2	359.992		6.383,017 6	0	178.057	6.204.960 5	765.962		2007		555,775	555.775			:	2007	6.204,960	765,962	178.057	944.019	555,775	469.291	344,495	1,023,974	-7,505,660	-6.3%	2007	555,775	944.019
	Œ		2006		3,561,139	0	178,057	3,383,082	427,337		2.999.935	0	0	2.999.935	359,992		6.561.074	0	178.057	6.383.017	787.329		2000	0	405.578	405.578			01.	2006	6.383.017	787,329	178,057	965,386	405.578	469,291	344,495	-1.195.538	-6,481,687	-7.3%	2006	405,578	965,386
	0	٠	2002	٠.	3,739,196	0	178.057	3.561,139	448,703	-	2,636,925	363.010	0	2,999,935	338,212	÷	6,376,121	363,010	178.057	6.561.074	786.915		2002	854.142	276,615	-577.527		i*	Ø.	2005	6,561,074	786.915	178.057	964.972	276.615	469.291		-979.592	-5,286,149	-6.0%	2005	276,615	964.972
.	۵.		2004		3,917,253	0	178,057	3,739,196	470,070		2,020,376	616.549	0	2.636.925	279.438		5.937.629	616.549	178.057	6,376,121	749.508	٠.	2004	1,450,703	171,783	-1.278.920	.*		oo	2004	6.376.121	749.508	178.057	927.565	171.783	469,291		-1.047,017	4,306,557	-6.4%	2004	171,783	927.565
	0		2003		3.917,253	0	O	3,917.253	470,070		1,175,259	845,118	.0	2,020,376	191,738		5.092,512	845,118	0	5,937.629	808.199		2603	1.988.512	82.745	-1,905,767			7	2003	5.937.629	908,199	0	661,808	82,745	469.291		-1,048.355	-3,259,540	-6.4%	2003	82,745	808.199
	z		2002		3,917,253	0	0	3,917,253	470,070		124,739	1,050.520	0	1.175.259	78.000		4.041.992	1,050,520	0	5.092.512	548.070		2002	2,471.812	7,669	-2,464,142			 Vo	2002	5.092,512	548.070	0	548,070	7.669	469,291		-1,009,692	-2,211,185	-6.2%	2002	7,669	548.070
	2		2001	,	3,448.389	468,864	0	3,917,253	441,938		85,955	38,784	0	124.739	12.642		3,534,343	507,648	0	4,041,992	454.580		2001	1.194,466	0	-1,194,466			د	2001	4.041.992	454.580	0	454,580	0	٥		-454.580	-1,201,493	.2.8%	2001	0	454.580
	_		2000		2,649,752	798,636	0	3,448,389	365.888		0	85,955	٥	85.955	5,157		2,649,752	884.591	0	3,534,343	371.046		2000	2,081,391	0	-2,081,391			ব	2000	3.534.343	371.046	Ġ	371,046	0			-371.046	-746,912	-2.3%	2000	0	371,046
	×		1999		1,553.814	1.095.938	0	2,649,752	252,214		0	o	0	Ó	0	:	1,553,814	1,095,938	0	2,649,752	252.214		1999	2.578.678	0	-2,578,678			m	1999	2,649,752	252.214	0	252.214	0			-252,214	-375,867	-1.5%	1999	0	252,214
	7		1998		190,699	1,363,115	•	1,553,814	104,671		0		0		0		190,699	1.363,115	0 . (1.553,814	104,671		1998	3,207,329	0	1 -3,207,329			C 1		1,553,814	104.67	0 0	104,671	0 . 0			-104,671	2 -123,653	99.0-	1998	0 0	104.671
			1997		125,665	65.034	٥	190,699	18.982			0	0	0	0		125,665	65.034		190,699	18.982		1997	3 153.021	0	3 -153,021				1997	150.699	18.982	•	18.982				-18.982	-18,982	-0.1%	1997	•	18,982
	I		1996		0	125,665	.	125,665	7.540		0		٠				0	125,665	0	125.665	7.540		1996	295,683		-295,683						_		٠.	**	~	0		.=	#			50
	ڻ س	:							12%					4	12%						,		ç								Debt outstandings(end)	Interest	Repayment	Debt Services	Profit before depreciation & interest	Depreciation (1)	Depreciation (2)	Profit after depreciation & interest	Accu. surplus/deficit	Return on Investment		Marginal Profit	Debt Services
	w	DEBT SERVICES PROJECTION				3,917,253	178,057		Interest=			2,999,935	136,361		Interest=			6.917.188					CASHFLOW PROJECTION for FIRR Calculation			*	10.0%				žč			.*	Profit before dep			Profit after dep	¥	ŭ			
		TCES PR(.1:	Stage 1	dings(beg.)	gh Treasury	Repayment	Debt outstandings(end)	Interest	Stage 2	dings(beg.)	zh Treasury	Repayment	Debt outstandings(end)	Interest	TOTAL	dings(beg.)	gb Treasury	Repayment	Debt outstandings (end)	Interest		ECTION for	Capital Expenditures	Repayment	Net Cashflow	FTRR =	1		HEDULE					Depreciation	469,291	344,495			-			
	ပ	BT SERV			Debt outstandings(beg.)	Foreign Loan through Treasury		Debt outsta		٠	Debt outstandings(beg.)	Foreign Loan through Treasury		Debt outsta.			Debt outstandings(beg.)	Foreign Loan through Treasury		Debt outsta			LOW PROJ	Capital E	Revenues before Interest & Repayment		• •			DEBT SERVICES SCHEDULE			÷		Disbursed Amount Depreciation	9.385.830	6,889,907	16.275,737					
	æ	Ĭ				Foreig						Foreig						Foreig					CASHF		evenues bete					DEBT SE					Disbu				/			1.	
	4	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245 Rc	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256 Stage 1	257 Stage 2	258 Total	259	260	261	262	263

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

1998 1999 2000 2001 0 0 0
0 0 0 0 7.669 0 0 0 0 469.291 18.982 104.671 252.214 371.046 454.580 548.070 -18.982 -104.671 -252.214 371.046 454.580 -1.009.692 -26.522 -131.193 -383.407 -754.452 -1.209.032 -2.218725
1997 1998 2000 2001 2602 0 0 0 0 469.291 0 0 0 0 0 132.186 2.638.677 2.020.462 1.402.246 784.031 1.673.019 132.186 2.658.677 2.020.462 1.402.246 784.031 1.673.019
252.214 371.046 454.580
0615- 0 0 0 0 0
87.987 1.844.214 1.482.740 1.196.800 686.818 1.421.292 0 0 0 0 0 0
104.671 252.214 371.04
1998 1999 2000 2001 -1,948,885 -1,734,954 -1,567,846 -1,141,32
100,969 1,948,885 1,724,954 1,567,846 1,141,398
1.844.214 1.482.740 1
03,024 1,303,413 1,093,536 884,391 307,046 190,699 1,553,814 2,649,752 3,534,343 4,041,992
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 153.021 3.207.329 2.578.678 2.081.391 1.194.466
5.939.02

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

-	2			TOTAL		7.974.934	1.933,616	4,832,539	1,322,516		0	58.686		0	290.042	٥	198,377		1.069.892	123,643	677.027	78.241				9.044.826	2,405,988	5.509.566	1.599.135	0	85.329	49.102	51.977	32.635					
	-			Z008 T		7	p-4	4																:	2008	· 6	C1	Υ.									2008	:	
	, ,		•	2007																					7997						٠.	. •					2007	1 ·	
	r			2006		ı																			2006					٠		.11		:		. •	2006		
	- -			2005				483,254	132,252								39,675				101.554	11.736			2005	0	0	584.808	183,663	٠.	0	0	5.517	3,748	9.265		2005		
	1		Stage II	2007		-		966,508 48				٠.				:	39,675				101.554	11.736			2002	0	0	1.068,062 5	315.915		Ġ	0	10.076	6,447	16,523		2004 2		
			Stag						396,755 26			• •					39,675 3				101.554 10	11.736		: .		0		1,551,316 1.06	448,166 31		0	0	14,635	·	23,781				
ľ	7	0		2003				16 1,449,762														11.736			2003		0		:		0	. 0	19,194 14	11.845	31,039		2003	. •	
	2	TARGET YEAR 2010	1.	2002	٠.	. 9	S	1.933,016	529,006						88		39,675		:		3 101,554				2002			3 2,034,570	52 580.418			٠ \$	639 19,1	565 11.8			2002		
•	Σ	TARGET		2001		797 493	193,362						•		58.008		19,838		160,484	18.546	67.703	7.824			7007	716.126	269,917	67,703	27.662	٠	9.038	5.509			15.749		2001		
-	1			2000		1,594,987	386,723		:						58.008		19,838		160.484	18.546	203,108	23,472			2002	1,755,471	463.278	203,108	43,310		16.561	9,455	1,916	884	28,816		2000		
ļ	2		Stage I	1999		0 3,189,974 2,392,480 1,594,987	580,085								58,008			- :	160.484	18,546					1999	2.552.964	656,640	0	0		24,085	13,401	0	0	37,485		1999		ļ
	,	(Cnit: '000)		1998		3,189,974	773,446								58.008				160.484	18,546					1998	06.989 3,350,457 2,552,964	850.001	0	0		31.608	17,347	٥	0	48,955		1998		
	-			1997		0	0					29.343			29,004				106.989	12.364					1861	106.989	70.712	0	0		1.009	1.443	0	0	2,452		1997	٠	
				1996		¢	0		•		,	29,343			29,004				320,967	37,093					1996	320,967	95,440		0		3.028	1,948	٥	Φ	4.976		1996		
(2																						1984			. "					63.5%	36.5%	61.4%	38.6%	ı				
	-		price		100%	7,974,934	1,933,616	4,832,539	1,322,516		0	58.686	enses	0	290.042	•	198.377	11%	1,069,892	123,643	677.027	78.241	49.00 Rs./USS in 1994	106.00 Yen/US\$		F/C (Yen) 9.044.826		5,509,566	1.599.135		85.329	49.102	51.977	32,635	219,043				
	1		A. Cost allocation Schedule at 1994 price	94 price)	tion Cost	F/C (Yen)	2	F/C (Yen)	2	c	F/C (Yen)	አ አ	300 Board's Administrative Expenses	F/C (Yen)	2	F/C (Yen)	2	vices	F/C (Yen)	2	F/C (Yen)	Z	49.00	106.00	price	F/C (Yen)	2	F/C (Yen)	ន	Sub-Total (US\$)	F/C (USS)	L/C (USS)	F/C (USS)	L/C (USS)			t Price		
-		TEDOLE	Schedul	Project Cost (1994 price)	100 Direct Construction Cost			٠.		200 Land Acquisition	c 1		d's Admini	c 1		6.2		400 Engineering Services	c 1		613		Exchange rate		ost at 1994	e.1	÷	¢ 13		Sub-T	e 1		£3				t at Currer	:	
-		CSISC	allocation	Projec	100 Dire	Stage 1		Stage 2		200 Land	Stage 1		300 Bozr	Stage 1		Stage 2		400 Engi	Stage 1		Stage 2		Exchan		Total Base Cost at 1994 price	Stage 1		Stage 2			Stage 1		Stage 2	_			Total Base Cost at Current Price		
-		PROJECT COST SCHEDULE	A. Cost	-													٠								J.C												Tota		
4	1	ž												٠.									-			٠.						. :					i		
	3	စ္ခ	310	31,	312	313	314	312	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	328	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	349	

COMPUTATION OF FIRR AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

^	:		-			٠.			<u> </u>																																٠		
n		904.483	240.599	550,957	159.913	88	6 523	6.00	4.910	5.198	3.264	•		93,861	54.012	100%	57.175	35.899	1009	240.947		147.873	93.074	240.947	7.245.795	4.560,611	11.806.405																
	2008	-																			2008	0																					
S	2007																				2007	0					· · .			:								÷					
æ	2006					-															2. 3.	0			٥	0	0																
σ	2005			58,481	18,366	0	, c	>	0	552	375			0	0		690'9	4.123	11.0%	10.192	2005		10,192	10.192	٥	499,399	499,399																
۵	2004			106,806	31,591		7.00.1	5	0	1,008	\$			0	0		11.084	7.092	19.5%	18,176	2004	Φ	18.176	18.176	0	890,606	890,606						•										
0	2003		٠	155,132	44.817	i	9 0	Þ	0	1,464	915			0	0		16.099	190'01	18.1%	26.159	2003	0	26.159	26,159	0	1.281.813	1,281,813			-													
2	2002			203.457	58,042		\$ C	•	0	1.919	1.185			0	0		21,113	13.030	36.7%	34,143	2002	0	34,143	34.143	0	1.673.019 1.281.813	1.673.019 1.281.813					(3)11000	(660,000)	72.580	0	4,049	7.984	8,461		93.074			
2	2001	95.798	26.992	6.770	2.766	, 63	0.00	3	551	35	26			9.8	6.059	10.8%	703	621	1.49	17.324	2001	16.001	1.324	17,324	784.031	64.854	848.885									(penses							
	2000	175 547	46,328	20.311	4,331	0	7007	1.650	945	192	88 88			18,217	10,400	19.4%	2,108	972	3.3%	31,697	2040	28.617	3.080	31.697	1,402,246	150.920	1,553,166				5.0%	1000 1000 CHOVE	T) THOUSE	100 Direct Construction Cost	ition	300 Board's Administrative Expenses	Services	tingency	ion				
×	1999	255,296	65,664		**		76/76	2.408	1,340	0	0			26,493	14,741	27.9%	0	C	0.0%	41.234	1999	41.234		41.234	132,186 2,638,677 2,020,462	0					Average inflation rate=		- !	Direct Const	200 Land Acquisition	Board's Adm	400 Engineering Services	500 Physical Contingency	600 Price escalation	Total			
7	1998	335.046	85,000			ì	4.890	3,161	1.735	o . :	Φ			34 769	19,082	36.4%	O	0	0.0%	53,851	1998	53.851	0	53.851	2,638,677	0	132.186 2.638,677 2.020,462				Average in			80	900	300	\$	506	8				
-	1997	10,699	7.071				£ s	101	₹	0	0		٠.,	1.110	1.587	1.8%	0	0	0.0%	2.698	1997	2,698		2.698	132.186	0	132.186		Allocation	71%	29%												
Ŧ	19%	32,097	9.544			ç	869	303	195	0	0			3,331	2,143	3.7%	0	0	0.0%	5.473	1996	5.473	0	5.473	268.193	0	268,193																
ប	% of Base Cost	10%	10%	10%	10%		4	٠.						÷														Estimated Direct Cost	ск.Лтроп D	85.329	34.880	Sol I oco	25	114,697	1.198	5.919	12.617	13,443		147,873			
L	% of	904,483	240,599	550,957	159.913	700.00	41.50 41.50	8.5.35	4.910	5.198	3.264		:	93.861	54.012	147,873	57,175	35.899	93,074	240,947	(1994 price)	147,873	93,074	240.947	7,245,795	4.560,611	11.806.405	Estimated	mport Duties	14,221		(100/ 2012)	(1774 pilee,			cuses							
w	tingency	F/C (Yen)	ន	F/C (Yen)	ያ	(4012)	gencies (USA)	7C(E88)	L/C (US\$)	F/C (USS)	1./C (USS)		(1994 price)	FIC (USS)	L/C (USS)		F/C (USS)	L/C (USS)		Total		Stage 1	Stage 2	Total (USS)	Stage 1	Stage 2	Total ('000Rs.) 11.806.405		Direct Cost Import Duties ex. Import Duties	85,329	49.102	STAGE 1		inction Cost	ition	300 Board's Administrative Expenses	Services	ttingency	uoi				
a	500 Physical Contingency	Stage 1		Stage 2		Total C. di	Total Conungencies (USB)	Stage		Stage 2			GRAND TOTAL (1994 price)	Stage 1		% of Stage 1	Stage 2		% of Stage 2		B. Disbursement Schedule					7				3%	1 10%		(100 Direct Construction Cost	200 Land Acquisition	Board's Adn	400 Engineering Services	500 Physical Contingency	600 Price escalation	Total			
ပ	500									-			S. S.			-			-		Disbursen	(Punds to be Required)			-				Inflation Rate	Foreign	Local			X	er i	300	<u>&</u>	Š	\$				
В						L					╛	1		<u></u>							8	તું.							<u>.</u>														
٧		Ç. 1	<u>~</u> 1		IAI		. בריב	<u>.</u>	கா	<u>61</u>	, T	N.	തി	स्रो	in.	ای	<u>بام</u>	<u>ω</u> 1	6			নো	~~~	€	اکا	اق	K1 6	റി തി	O	-1	NI.	লা ব	FT 6	al a	011	Т	ωl	ത] -		- 1	NI 6	<u>े</u>	
	351	352	353	354	355	356	200	ő	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	379	380	381	382	383 483	3 8	0 0	2 6	387	388	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	300	391	392	2 C	;

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

_		
퓺		
83		
**		
Ω 8		
28		
88		
ВА		
AG		
AF		
ΨE		
ΨD		
AC		
AB		
AA		
Z		
٨		
×		
*		
	1 100 1 100	109

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

폾		
88	Total 3,917.253 3,917.253 3,917.253 2,999,935 2,999,935 2,999,935 6,917.188 6,917.188	20.219.453
383		
8		.
88		
88		
ВА		
AG	25 2021 890.285 178.057 712.228 106.834 106.834 2021 1.090.886 147.270 2021 2021 2.0	
AF	24 2020 1.068.342 178.057 890.285 128.201 2020 1.36.361 1.36.361 1.36.361 1.36.361 1.36.361 1.36.361 1.36.361 1.36.361 2.020 2.43.949 0 314.418 2.117.531 291.834	
AE	399 342 558 558 361 6607 6607 6607 6607 6607 6607 6607 66	
AD	3 456 1 456	
AC A		
L	66 69 1. 1.12 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	
AB		
AA	→ H Ω M + 4 €	
Z	િતં ને ઇં	
>	i ci ci ci d 4 4	
×	ું લું મું વ	
×	15 2011 2.670.854 178.057 2.492.797 330.502 2011 2.590.853 310.902 310.902 314.418 4.947.290 631.405	
	128 1128 1128 1128 1128 1138 1138 1138 1	165

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

																																•						
å	3												-								-																	
8	3			·													66.959,612	99.007.454	48.570.500	314.537.565	-	39,270,250	275,267,315												:			٠
La La	i.	!	2045	182.000	158.261	114,876	25,158	14,675	2,096	63%	41,930		2045	208.4	1062.0	1814.4	5,243,916 66,959,612	15.585.190 199.007.454	3.803.780	24,632,886	37.9	2,190,944	22,441,942 2	275.267,315			•				٠							
8	3		202	182.000	158,261	114,876	25.158	14,675	2.096	63%	41,930		2044	193.0	983.3	1680.0	4.855,477		3.522.018	22.808.227	36.1	2.086.613																
S	3	1	2043	182,000	158.261	114.876	25.158	14,675	2,096	63%	41,930	٠.	2043	178.7	910.5	1555.5	4,495.812 4	13,361,789 14,430,732		21,118,729 22	34.4	1.987,251	19.131,478 20,721,614	332,103,759 252,825,373														:
 88	8			182.000	158.261	114,876	25,158	14.675	2,096	63%	41.930		2042	165.5	843.0	1440.3	4.162.789	12.372.027	3.019.563	19,554,379 2	32.8	1.892.620	17,661,759	212.972.280														.*
48		·. :	2041	182.000	158.261	114,876	25.158	14 675	2.096	63%	41,930		2041	153.2	780.6	1333.6	3,854,435	11,455,580 12	2,795,892	18.105.906 19	31.2	1.802.495	16,303,411 17	195,310,521														
46	2			- 1	158.261	114,876	25,158	14.675	2.096	63%	41,930		2021	32.9	167.5	286.1	826,962 3	2,457,774 11	599.854 2	3.884.590 18	11.8	679.341	3,205,248 16	16,908,971	-										-			
AF .			••		158.261	114,876	25.158	14,675	2,096	63%	41,930		2020	30.4	155.1	264.9	765.706	2.275.717 2.	555,420	3.596,842 3.	11.2	646.992	2.949,851 3,	23,703,723		•			٠.,									
되	1			182,000	158.261	107,517	23,546	13,735	1,962	28%	39,244		2019	28.2	143.6	245.3	893,568	1.972.158 2.	481.332	3.117,059 3.	10.7	616.183	2,500.876 2	20,753,872	٠.													
QA.	_			1	158,261	107.517	23,546	13,735	1.962	29%	39.244		2018.	26.1	132.9	227.1	614,415	.826.073	445,678	2.886.165 3.	10.2	586.841	2,299,325 2.	18,252,997										٠				
50				1	158,261	107,517	23,546	13,735	1,962	29%	39,244		2017 . 2	24.2	123.1	210.3	568,903 €	808.069.	412,665 4	2.672.375 2.8	5.7	558,896	2,113,479 2,3	15.953,672								-		:				÷
A B		:		182.000 1	158.261	107,517	23,546	13,735	1.962	868	39,244		2016 2(22.4	114.0	194,7	526.762 5	1,565,563 1.6		2,474,422 2.6	9.2	532,282 5	1,942,140 2,1	13,840,192 15				٠ :										٠.
0	-			182.000	158.261	107,517	23,546		1.962	86%	39,244		2015 20	20.7	105.5	180.3	487,742 5.	1,449,595 1,5	353,794 3	2,291,131 2,4	8.8	506,935 5.	1.784,196 1.9	11.898.052											-			
4				1	158.261 15	107,517 10	23,546 2	13.735	1,962	\$65	39,244 3			19.2		167.0		1,342,218 1,44	327.587 35	2,121,418 2,29	8.4	482.795 50	1.638.622 1.78	10,113,856 11,0														
	7			İ	158,261 158	107,517 10	23,546 27		1,962	39%	39,244 39		3 2014	17.8	90.5	154.6				1.964.276 2.12	0'8	459,805 48;	'								٠							
*	1						23,546 23		1,962	29%	39,244 39		2013	16.4	83.8	143.1 I		,735 1,242,794			7.6	437,909 459	.864 1.504.471	0,763 8,475,234					٠									
X	4			-	261 158,261	517 107,517	23,546 23,		1,962 1,	59%	39.244 39.		2012	15.2	377.6	132.5	505 387.185	496 1,150,735		050 1.818,774	7.2	417,057 437,	993 1,380,864	\$589,899 6,970,763														. :
3		1	2011	182	158,261	107,517	23,	13	4	41	39.		2011	. •			358.505	1,065,496		1.684.050		:	1,266,993			_												
		180	8	83	184	185	186	187	188	188	190	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	201	202	203	204	205	506	207	208	209	210	7	2	7 1	2 2	7 0	1	2 0	220	221

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

표											•						٠																								
S	3			3,917.253	3,917.253		7.537.183			2.999.935	2,999,935		5.765.082	0	:	6.917,188	6.917.188		13,302,265		15 275 327	275.267.315	258,991,578						13.294.725	6,917.188	20.211.913	275.267.315	9.385.830	6.889,907	245,696,853	.*			71,433,392	20,211,913	
¥.				*																	2045	22.441.942	22,441,922			49	2045					22,441,942			22,441,942	245,696,853	137.9%	2045	22,441,942	0	
Ca	3										-										2044	19.131.478 20,721.614	19,131,478 20,721,614			48	204		•			16,303,411 17,661,759 19,131,478 20,721,614 22,441,942		-	19.131.478 20.721.614 22,441.942	77 223.254.911	% 127.3%	204 44	19,131,478 20,721,614	0 0	
8	3																		٠.		2043	19.131.47				47	2043					19,131,47				202,533,297	117.5%	2043			
gg	3												:								2042	17,661,759	17.661.759			46	2042					17,661,759			17,661.759	183,401,819	108.5%	2042	17.661,759	0	
Va				-											÷				: · ·		28 28	16.303.411	16,303,411			45	2041				٠.	16.303.411			16,303,411	165,740,059	100.2%	2041	16,303,411	0	
28	2	2021	890,285	0	178,057	712,228	106,834		1,227,246	0	136,361	1.090.886	147,270		2.117,531	0	314,418	1.803.113	254.104		2021	3.205.248	3,205,248			ĸ	2021	1.803.113	254,104	314.418	568,521	3,205,248	469,291	344,495	2,137,358	-480,762	13.1%	2021	3,205,248	568,521	5.62
AE		2020	1,068,342	0	178,057	890.285	128,201		1,363,607	0	136.361	1,227,246	163,633		2.431.949	0	314,418	2,117,531	291.834	٠	2020	2.949.851	2,949,851			8	2020	2.117,531	291.834	314,418	606,251	2,949,851	469,291	344,495	1,844,230	-2.618,120	11.3%	2020	2.949.851	606,251	4.87
u		2019	1.246,399	0	178,057	1,068,342	149,568		1,499,968	0	136.361	1.363.607	179.996		2.746.366	0	314,418	2,431,949	329.564	•	2019	2.500.876	2,500,876			23	2019	2,431,949	329.564	314,418	643.982	2.500,876	469,291	344,495	1,357,525	462,350	8.3%	2019	2.500.876	643,982	3.88
Q.	2	2018	1,424,456	0	178,057	1,246,399	170,935	:	1,636,328	Ó	136,361	1.499.968	196.359	: .	3,060,784	0	314,418	2,746,366	367,294		2018	2.299.325	2,299,325			55	2018	2,746,366	367.294	314,418	681.712	2,299,325	469.291	344,495	1,118,244	-5,819,875	6.9%	2018	2,299,325	681,712	3.37
24	}	2017	1,602,512	0	178.057	1,424,456	192,301		1,772,689	0	136.361	1.636.328	212,723		3.375,202	0	314,418	3.060.784	405.024		2017	2.113.479	2,113,479	٠		17	2017	3.060,784	405.024	314,418	719,442	2,113,479	469,291	344.495	894,668	-6,938,119	5.5%	2017	2.113,479	719,442	2.94
av		2016	1,780,569	Ġ.	178,057	1,602,512	213.668	:	1.909.050	0	136.361	1,772,689	229,086	: -	3.689,619	0	314,418	3,375,202	442.754		2016	1.942,140	1,942,140			8	2016	3,375,202	442.754	314,418	757 172	1,942,140	469,291	344,495	685,599	-7,832,787	4.2%	2016	1.942.140	757.172	2.56
9.0		2015	1,958,626	0	178,057	1,780,569	235,035		2,045,411		136,361	1,909,050	245,449		4,004,037	•	314,418	3.689.619	480.484		2015	1.784,196	1.784,196			61	2015	3.689.619	480,484	314.418	794.902	1,784,196	469,291	344,495	489.925	.8.518.386	3.0%	2015	1,784,196	794,902	2.24
		2014	2,136,683	0	178.057	1,958,626	256,402		2,181,771	0	136.361	2.045,411	261,813		4,318,455	0	314,418	4.004.037	518.215		2014	1,638,622	1,638,622			18	2014	4.004.037	518,215	314,418	832,632	1,638.622	469.291	344,495	306.621	9,008,311	1.9%	2014	1,638.622	832,632	1.97
>		2013	2,314,740	0	178,057	2,136,683	277,769	:	2,318,132	0	136,361	2.181.771	278,176	٠	4,632,872 4,318,455	0	314,418	4,318,455 4,004,037	555,945		2 2013	į	1.504.471			7	2013	4,318,455	555,945	314.418	870,362	1,504,471	469.291	344,495	134,739	-9,314,932	0.8%	2013	1,504,471	870,362	1.73
×		2012	2,492,797	0	178,057	2,314,740	299.136		2,454,493	0	136.361	2,318,132	294,539		4.947,290	0	314.418	4.632.872	593,675		2012	1.380,864	1,380.864			. 91	2012	4,632,872	593,675	314,418	908.092	1,380.864	469.291	344,495	-26.597	179,644.6-	-0.2%	2012	1,380.864	908.092	1.52
3		2011	2,670.854	0	178.057	2,492,797	320.502		2.590.853	0	136,361	2,454,493	310,902		5.261,707	0	314.418	4,947,290	631.405		2011 2012	1,266,993	1,266,993			প্র	2011	4,947,290	631,405	314,418	945.823	1,266,993	469,291	344,495	-178,199	-9,423,074	1.1%	2011	1,266,993	945.823	1.34
	222	223	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264

COMPUTATION OF FIRE AND ROE FOR THE KALU GANGA PROJECT

			٠														٠,				<u> </u>	~-																				-	\neg
器									٠.																						245,689,515										. •		
88			314.537,565	39,270,250	275,267,315	16,275,737	13,302,265	245,689,313				16.275.737	6.917.188	11.590,631	11.590.631	5.080.976		260.128.838				9.358.549	0	5.080.976	14,439.525	14.439.525		-14,439,525	260,128,838		245,689,513	% Q.K		6.917,188	1	6.917.188	16.275.737			0 16.275,737	. •		
W3	49	2045	(4.)	2.190,944	22,441.942.2	0	0	22,441,942 245,689,313	245,689,313		2945	0	0	0					260.128.838							٠	2045	0	22,441,942			rel 1527) n		0	O	0				٥			-
8	48	2044	72,808,22	2,086,613		0	0	10,721,614	223,247,371		2044	0	0	Φ			• .	17.661.759 ,19.131.478 20,721.614 22,441.942	216.965,282 237,686,896								2044	Ö		•	19,131,478 20,721,614	NOE (at the year of 1997)		0	o	0		•	٠	0			
8	47	2043		1,987,251	19,131,478 20,721,614	0	0	19,131.478 20,721.614	202,525,757		2043	0	0	0				19.131,478	216.965,232						-		2043	٥	17.661.759 19,131.478 20,721,614		19,131,478	ž		0	0	0				0			. -
22	46	2042	19,554,379	1,892,620	17.661,759	0	0	17,661.759	183,394,279		2042	0	0	Ċ					197,833,804								2042	0	17.661.759		17,661,759			0	0	0				O			
BA	45	2041	906 301 81	1,802,495	16,303,411	0	0	16,303,411	165,732,519		2041	• • •	0	0				16,303,411	180,172,645								2041	0	2.636,727 16,303,411		16,503,411			0	0	0				0	. :		
DA.	57	2021	3,884,590	679,341	3,205,248	813.787	254.104	2,137.358	-488,302		2021	813.787	314,418	0				2,636,727	14.376.355	:							2021		2.636,727	٠	2,636,727			0.	1,803,113	314,418			1,426,794	813,787			
AF	Z	2020	3.596,842	646,992	2,949,851	813,787	291,834	1,844,230	-2,625,660		2020	813.787	314,418	O				2.343,599	11,739,628			. •					2020	0	2.343.599		2,343,599			0	2.117,531	314,418			C1	813,787			
Æ	23	2019	3,117,059	616,183	2,500,876	813.787	329,564	1.357,525	4,469,890		2019	813,787	314,418	0				1.856.894	9,396,029								2019	0	1,856,894		1.856,894			٥	2,431,949	314,418			3,054,368	813,787			
AD	22	2018	2,886,165	586,841	2,299,325	813.787	367,294	1,118,244	-5,827,415		2018	813,787	314,418					1,617,613	7,539,134								2018	•	1.617,613		1,617,613	:		.0	2,746,366	314,418	:		3,868,154	813.787			
AC	21	2017	2,672,375	558,896	2,113,479	813.787	405,024	894,668	659'516'9-		2017	813.787	314.418					1,394,038	5,921,531								2017	0	1,394,038		1,394,038			٥	3.060.784	314.418			4,681,941	813,787			
AB	ส	2016	2,474,422	532,282	1,942,140	813,787	442,754	685.599	7,840,327		2016	813.787	314,418					1.184.968	43,227,484				-				2016	•	1.184.968		1,184,968			0	3,375,202	314,418			41	813,787			
AA	19	2015	2,291,131	506,935	1,784.196	813.787	480,484	489,925	-8.525,926		2015	813.787	314.418				· '.	989,294	3,42,16				٠.				2015		989.294		767680 680			0	3,689,619	314,418			6,309,515	813.787			
2	18	2014	2,121,418	482,795	1,638,622	813,787	518,215	306,621	-9.015,851	٠	2014	813,787	314,418		-			805.990	2,353,222		٠.						2014	0.	805.990		805,990			o .	4.318,455 4.004.037	314,418	:		7,937,089 7,123,302	813,787 813,787			
 >	17	2013	1,964,276	459,805	1,504,471	813,787	555,945	134.739	-9,322,472		2013	813,787	314,418	•		0		634.108	1,547,231					0	0		2013	0	634.108		901 109			0	4.318,455	314,418					; ;		
×	16.	2012	1.818,774	437,909	1,380,864	813,787	593,675	-26,597	-9.457.211		2012	813,787	314,418			0		472,772	913.123		-			0	0		2012	•	472,772		472,772			0	4,632,872	314,418				813.787	÷		
×	15	2011	1,684,050	417.057	1,266,993	813,787	631,405	-178.199	-9,430,614		2011	813.787	314,418			0		321.171	440.351					0	0		2011	•	321,171		321.171			0	4,947,290	314,418	:		9.564,662	813.787	. 1		-
	265	266	267	268	569	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	273	279	230	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	305	303	304	305	306	307	308

