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India’s growing consumer base, coupled with the expected increase in industrial and infrastructure investment, will drive its power and steel consumption. In the power sector, while there has been a steady increase in the gas-based and renewable energy capacities, the bedrock of the planned capacity addition will continue to be coal. The government has also championed the increase in steel producing capacity from 110 million metric tonne per annum (MTPA) to 300 MTPA. High-grade metallurgical coal will be required for this purpose. To achieve these challenging and vital goals, it is essential that coal resources are available to industry and that it is extracted in a way that is economical, transparent and beneficial to all stakeholders including the state and central governments and the local population.

To bring in transparency in allocation of the national mineral wealth, the Government of India (GoI) introduced a transparent and effective e-auction framework in February 2015. This successful endeavour is progressing and the process is in the third round of auctions. As the auctions progress, we will suggest that the coal blocks having large reserves (greater than 100 MTPA and with annual production more than 3 MTPA) should be brought in for auction to sustain the raw material requirement of large integrated steel plants (ISPs). Putting more number of coal blocks in the upcoming auctions shall in a way only benefit end users. At the same time, a large number of coal fields earmarked for captive mining are notified under the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, or CBA. This may also be denotified to speed up groundwork.

There also exist issues of boundary overlap for captive blocks. Hence, before auctioning blocks for captive mining, boundaries should be fixed in the ground with geo-reference coordinates. The government has proposed challenging the targets of Coal India Limited (CIL) and the company has taken up the challenge in earnest. Through increased operational efficiencies and continued expansion of its mines, we believe that this vital part of India’s coal chain can achieve its targets.

After the coal block cancellation by the Supreme Court in August 2014, coal procurement through e-auction has increased both for steel and power companies. And due to the unavailability of coal from any other source, the cost of buying coal has also increased drastically, which in turn is leading to the blocking of substantial funds with coal companies in the form of advances. In this situation, it is prudent to evolve and devise alternative methodologies such as allowing utilisation of bank guarantees or letters of credit.

In this context, the Indian Chamber of Commerce (ICC), to further strengthen its support among industry representatives and policymakers, presents the ‘7th India Coal Summit’ on 23 September 2015 at Hotel Hyatt Regency, New Delhi. PricewaterhouseCoopers Private Limited is the knowledge partner in this initiative. I trust the conference will be able to generate new ideas and thoughts among various stakeholders to discuss, share and evolve suitable strategies and development models.
While coal is the main source of commercial energy in India, the coal industry entered 2015 after years of stagnation in growth. Past allocations had been marred with controversies and mostly seen to be discretionary and arbitrary; the Supreme Court judgment resulted in the deallocation of 204 coal blocks.

While there has been a long-standing demand for reforms in the mining industry, recent changes in legislation, mainly the Coal Mines Special Provisions Act and the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Amendment Act (MMDR), are only the beginning. The two legislations are aimed at transparent allocation of resources, with clarity on transfer and optimal utilisation.

While the changes are welcome, the need has always been for an overhaul of the sector to streamline approvals and development processes, which are still a major irritant in the development of resource sector.

It is evident from the fact that after over 2-3 decades, CIL was able to open new mines while even Schedule II coal blocks, auctioned in the beginning of the year, are yet to be operationalised fully. The key issue that winning bidders are facing is delay in the grant of all clearances and approvals that were expected to be granted as soon as the blocks were taken over by them.

Because of fuel security and comparatively lower developmental risks, Schedule II coal blocks saw aggressive bidding with expectations of immediate operationalisation. But delays in approval and lack of clarity on statutory dues—such as lease stamp duty and registration, regulatory matters relating to capping fixed charges and ongoing disputes on claim amounts—have posed serious challenges to the winners.

Further, falling global coal prices and easy availability of coal in the domestic market due to a significant increase in CIL’s production have sown doubt over the decision to go aggressive on coal auctions. Already, these factors are evident from the winning prices in the third round of auction, which are comparatively lower than previous rounds, indicating a more cautious approach and strategy adopted by bidders for keeping a check on the raw material cost.

While the coal auctions have seen aggressive bids, the challenge now lies in how to control the mining cost and ensure maximum recovery of resources. Certainly, a lot will depend on how efficiently and quickly these blocks can be developed to justify the nature of winning bid prices and level of investment required for developing these blocks. Adequate support will definitely be required from the government. However, there will be numerous challenges—such as selection of an appropriate mining contractor, keeping checks on processes and the entire mining value chain, having a stringent data measurement system, and an adequate risk analysis in place as part of project preparedness—though the answers to these challenges will depend on how systematic and organised an approach is taken for development, and subsequently, the operations of these mines.
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3. Recent reforms in the Indian mining sector

3.1. The mining sector: Contributing to the nation’s growth

The mining sector plays an integral role in the growth of the economy. It ensures fuel availability for power generation, and raw material for steel and other significant industries, apart from contributing a significant amount of taxes and royalties to the nation. The rapid pace of growth that the industry enjoyed for over a decade was arrested in 2008-09 with the advent of global recession. The world economic growth decelerated quickly, adversely affecting both developed and emerging economies. The Indian mining industry was also affected by this global phenomenon. The Economic Survey of India (2014) highlights that the growth of the mining sector declined from an average of 7.1% during the financial years 2007-10 to an average of 1.6% during the subsequent four years 2010-14. This decline is mainly attributed to legal, regulatory and environmental issues among other factors. In spite of the recent downside, many mining majors continue to be placed well above India when it comes to the mining industry’s percentage contribution to the GDP.

The Indian mining industry is undergoing a series of reforms across various components, such as coal mining laws, land acquisition and non-coal minerals laws. To attract foreign investment, 100% FDI is permitted in the mining sector. The National Mineral Policy, 2008, provides guidance for promoting research and development in the mineral sector directed towards the development of new technologies that can convert existing mineral resources into viable economic resources and improve the regulatory environment. In the last few months, we have seen significant changes in the laws governing the mining sector, paving way for auction as a mechanism of awarding resources, transfer of licences, optimal utilisation, and of bringing further clarity on several matters including exploration. Many of these changes are now being followed with detailed rules and guidelines being published.

3.2. The Coal Mines (Special Provisions) Act, 2015

The Supreme Court in September 2014 cancelled the allotment of 204 coal mines after declaring the allocation “arbitrary” and “illegal”. Subsequently, the government promulgated the Coal Mines (Special Provisions) Ordinance, 2014 (subsequently an Act), to provide for allocation of coal mines and vesting of the rights and title to and interest in the land and mine infrastructure, together with mining leases, in successful bidders and allottees through the auction process. The revenue generated through auctioning of coal blocks will benefit the state governments and will, in turn, be utilised for the betterment of project-affected people (PAP), development of infrastructure and exploration of mining areas.

3.2.1. Background

The Constitution allocates the subject of mineral development and regulation to state governments (entry number 23, State List II of Seventh Schedule) subject to the law of Parliament (entry number 54, Union List I of Seventh Schedule). The role of the union government is limited by the boundaries set by such a law, which in this case is the MMDR Act, 1957, including its amendments, with the MMDR Amendment Act, 2015, being the most recent. As mandated by the MMDR Act, 1957, the union government has framed rules for regulating the grant of all minerals other than atomic and minor minerals. The state governments have framed the rules for minor minerals. The Ministry of Mines, GoI, administers the MMDR Act, 1957, in India. The Ministry of Coal (MoC), GoI, administers the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1973, the Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1973, Auction by Competitive Bidding of Coal Mines Rules, 2012, and the Coal Mines (Special Provisions) Bill, 2014, for the development of coal resources in the country.

3.2.2. Introduction of auction of coal blocks

In September 2010, the MMDR Act, 1957, was amended to introduce competitive bidding. After this, the central government framed the Auction by Competitive Bidding of Coal Mines Rules, 2012. In February 2014, the first round of auction was conducted for three coal blocks for cement, steel and sponge iron. This round did not receive the kind of enthusiasm that was expected from the industry. As a result, two bids were received for one coal block, whereas the remaining two coal blocks did not receive any bids. The major reason for low partition can be attributed to:

- Technical limitation: Use of high-ash coal to replace imported coal affects production capacity and efficiency
- Risks in land acquisition (ownership, transfer and boundary)
- Change in law (no claims allowed)
- The agreement allowed a five-year period for securing all clearances, with MoC giving comfort only for environmental and forest clearances

Most importantly, the blocks were virgin blocks and no work had been done

The model adopted for the auctioning process is shown subsequently.

Evolution of auction by competitive bidding

- September 2010
- 2 February 2012
- 30 May 2012
- 23 November 2013
- Jan-Feb 2014

MMDR Act, 1957, amended to introduce competitive bidding
Central government frames Auction by Competitive Bidding of Coal Mines Rules, 2012
MoC identifies 54 blocks across seven states for allocation
Ridding methodology approved by Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA)
MoC releases draft Request For Proposal (RFP) and Coal Mine Development and Production Agreement
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3.2.5. How it is different for stakeholders: A bird’s eye view

The major difference between the previous allocation process and the recent reforms revolves around fuelling the mining industry’s growth, facilitating more investments, bringing in transparency, and creating benefits for consumers. The direct impact for various stakeholders is summarised in the table.

### 3.3. Major developments so far

The central government notified de-allocated mines in three schedules:

- **Schedule I:** contains all 204 coal blocks
- **Schedule II:** contains 42 of the 204 coal blocks that are operating or ready to operate
- **Schedule III:** contains 32 of the 204 coal blocks that have made progress towards development; later, 36 more blocks were added

The first round of auctions was focused on Schedule II and Schedule III coal blocks, which were initially 74 with total geological reserves of around 10.1 BT. The addition of 36 blocks to Schedule III meant that a total of 110 coal blocks with total geological reserves of 23.8 BT were available for auction by the government initially.
3.3.1. Schedule II and Schedule III coal blocks

So far, in the three rounds of coal auction conducted by the government, a total 18 coal blocks belonging to Schedule II have been auctioned (five to the power sector while 13 to non-regulated sectors). Apart from these, another 17 coal blocks have been allotted to government companies for the power sector. Of the total 18 blocks auctioned, five were won by steel users, three by the cement sector, while five by captive power users (aluminium industry). Another five were awarded to the power sector. Similarly, 15 coal blocks under Schedule III have been auctioned so far, with four to power sector while 11 to non-regulated sector. Of the 11 coal blocks to non-regulated sector, five were won by the steel, three by the cement sector and three were won by captive power users.

3.3.2. Bids received and the perceived strategies

The aggressive prices quoted for Schedule II coal blocks show that many factors were considered other than just the intrinsic value. These factors, such as savings in development risks, views on alternate fuel cost, fuel security, and realisation of production/returns, were reflected in the higher premiums/bid price quoted by the bidders. Another key factor for consideration was the value of capital invested in the end-use plant and value of the fuel itself for varied end-use industries, and the potential loss due to lack of fuel. Thus, a higher premium for raw material security was justified.

Strategies adopted during the initial rounds of auction may not be seen in future rounds. If we compare prices quoted in many of the bids, they were well beyond the comparative costs of import or replacement fuel. This may be justified for existing projects as they have the added advantages of fuel security and recovery of capital investments. However, new projects may not attract investors with such aggressive price quotes and lower returns from the proposed mining project as well as related end-use plant.

4. Need and effects: Industrial and economic perspectives

4.1. Recent reforms set to change coal market dynamics in the country

Recent reforms have the potential to redefine coal procurement strategies of various Indian companies that use coal as raw material. Each of the available coal sourcing options has its own pros and cons for various end users. However, options for long-term fuel security are limited and differ for various industries. Certainly, as a strategic decision, players have to consider their respective industries, location-based factors and acceptable profit margins.

Concerns were always raised on the existing production capacities vis-à-vis capabilities, with significant growth in demand year-on-year. Numerous discussions have taken place about securing fuel on a long-term, while the gap between supply and demand continued to widen over the years; it stood at 217 MT in FY ’15, against 48 MT in FY ’08.

While coal import has always been an option to bridge this gap, it was never seen as long-term and sustainable, considering the external uncontrollable factors such as price volatility, changing regulatory scenarios in major exporting countries, fluctuating logistics cost, depleting high-grade reserves and currency exchange loss. However, given the recent expansions, new projects from CIL and auction of blocks, the increase in coal import is expected to be arrested.

While the recent auctions are targeted to bridge the gap on a sustainable basis, MoC has proposed that the 500 MT target from non-CIL sources is difficult to achieve if only mining for end use is considered, which gives way to the need for commercial mining and also the hope to auction coal blocks for commercial mining in the current fiscal. The blocks earmarked for commercial mining will require a development phase of at least 3-5 years. These shall prove to be an attractive investment opportunity for global mining players as well as domestic miners, thus assisting in bridging the widening demand-supply gap.

Apart from these routes for supplying coal to the market, e-auction of coal has also been an option. However, the quantities put up for e-auction are limited to 10% of the production of CIL and SCCL, and combined with a premium of around 40-60% over taxed prices. E-auction of coal can thus be considered as a buffer source in case the company plans to ramp up its operational capacity. For long-term fuel security, alternative options such as linkages, commercial mining and coal block auctions had to be considered.

4.2. Implications for industries

4.2.1. Cement, sponge iron and CPPs

In the non-regulated sector, cement, sponge iron and aluminium are the most energy-intensive industries. The estimated unmet requirement of different industries in the current scenario has been illustrated below as per PwC’s analysis. The requirement mentioned against upcoming cement plants includes the capacity of plants announced by cement players on their official websites.
With cement and aluminium winning most of the blocks that were earlier allotted to players in the steel industry, fuel scarcity can become a predominant concern for steel producers, combined with falling price of steel and squeezing margins. India is the world’s largest producer of coal-based sponge iron, which does not deploy the most efficient technology, but was successful so far on account of the availability of cheaper domestic coal. If players in the steel industry opt for coal sourcing through spot market, imports or linkages, their fuel procurement costs are bound to increase significantly, in turn affecting the viability of this sector. Although alternate energy options are available to secure their fuel supplies such as wind, hydro, solar and biogas, there is always the need to secure supply arrangement at an arm’s length owing to technical limitations on the capacity that can be installed in CPPs.

A list of new allottees in the non-regulated sector for Schedule II and Schedule III bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Coal block</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Peak-rated capacity (MTPA)</th>
<th>Award price (INR/tonne)</th>
<th>New allottee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gare Palma N/1</td>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>BALCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gare Palma N/4</td>
<td>Hindalco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>Hindalco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gare Palma N/5</td>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>Hindalco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gare Palma N/7</td>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>Monnet Ispat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marki Mangl I</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>BS Ispat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chotia</td>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>BALCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kathua</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>Hindalco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Balgaji</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>Sunflag SCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sial Ghothri</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>Reliance Cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bishapur</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>UltraTech Cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mandla North</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>Jaiprakash Associates Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Archagram</td>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>OCL Iron and Steel Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marki Mangl I</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>Topworth Ujra and Metals Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With cement and aluminium winning most of the blocks that were earlier allotted to players in the steel industry, fuel scarcity can become a predominant concern for steel producers, combined with falling price of steel and squeezing margins. India is the world’s largest producer of coal-based sponge iron, which does not deploy the most efficient technology, but was successful so far on account of the availability of cheaper domestic coal. If players in the steel industry opt for coal sourcing through spot market, imports or linkages, their fuel procurement costs are bound to increase significantly, in turn affecting the viability of this sector. Although alternate energy options are available to secure their fuel supplies such as wind, hydro, solar and biogas, there is always the need to secure supply arrangement at an arm’s length owing to technical limitations on the capacity that can be installed in CPPs.

A list of new allottees in the non-regulated sector for Schedule II and Schedule III bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Coal block</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Peak-rated capacity (MTPA)</th>
<th>Award price (INR/tonne)</th>
<th>New allottee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sariatoli</td>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>CESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Talabira-I</td>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>GMR Chhattisgarh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tokaud North</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>Essar Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trans Damoder</td>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>Durgapur Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amelia (North)</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>Jayprakash PVL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2. Power

Coal blocks earmarked for the power sector were put on reverse auction, where the winning bidder was the one who quoted the lowest transfer price of coal. In negative bidding, power producers seeking to win captive coal blocks forgo their right to pass on mining costs to consumers and instead agree to pay the government an additional premium.

With cement and aluminium winning most of the blocks that were earlier allotted to players in the steel industry, fuel scarcity can become a predominant concern for steel producers, combined with falling price of steel and squeezing margins. India is the world’s largest producer of coal-based sponge iron, which does not deploy the most efficient technology, but was successful so far on account of the availability of cheaper domestic coal. If players in the steel industry opt for coal sourcing through spot market, imports or linkages, their fuel procurement costs are bound to increase significantly, in turn affecting the viability of this sector. Although alternate energy options are available to secure their fuel supplies such as wind, hydro, solar and biogas, there is always the need to secure supply arrangement at an arm’s length owing to technical limitations on the capacity that can be installed in CPPs.

A list of new allottees in the non-regulated sector for Schedule II and Schedule III bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Coal block</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Peak-rated capacity (MTPA)</th>
<th>Award price (INR/tonne)</th>
<th>New allottee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Adani Power Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandakini</td>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Mandakini Exploration and Mining Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ganeshpur</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>GMR Chhattisgarh Energy Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Utkal-C</td>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Monnet Power Company Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computation of energy charge for tariff determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of measurement</th>
<th>Linkage</th>
<th>Auction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCV (kcal/kg)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR assumed (b)</td>
<td>kcal/kWh</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM cost</td>
<td>INR/tonne</td>
<td>610 (CIL price: 0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty @14%</td>
<td>INR/tonne</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESC and Sed</td>
<td>INR/tonne</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other taxes and costs</td>
<td>INR/tonne</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost for energy charge (c)</td>
<td>INR/tonne</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy charge (b/a)*1000</td>
<td>INR/kWh</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, a notable point here is that the total capacity of coal put on auction for the power sector can only 5–6% of the total thermal generation capacity of the country, while the effect of reduced tariffs due to coal block auction will be localised in nature. A list of winning bids under Schedule II and III blocks, earmarked for auction in the regulated sector, has been provided below.

With cement and aluminium winning most of the blocks that were earlier allotted to players in the steel industry, fuel scarcity can become a predominant concern for steel producers, combined with falling price of steel and squeezing margins. India is the world’s largest producer of coal-based sponge iron, which does not deploy the most efficient technology, but was successful so far on account of the availability of cheaper domestic coal. If players in the steel industry opt for coal sourcing through spot market, imports or linkages, their fuel procurement costs are bound to increase significantly, in turn affecting the viability of this sector. Although alternate energy options are available to secure their fuel supplies such as wind, hydro, solar and biogas, there is always the need to secure supply arrangement at an arm’s length owing to technical limitations on the capacity that can be installed in CPPs.

A list of new allottees in the non-regulated sector for Schedule II and Schedule III bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Coal block</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Peak-rated capacity (MTPA)</th>
<th>Award price (INR/tonne)</th>
<th>New allottee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morla</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>JSW Steel Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brinda Sasi</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>Usha Martin Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mejal</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>Trimal Industries Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Niran Maleagun</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>Indralt Power Pvt Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Durni</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>Hindalco Industries Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mandla South</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>Jaypee Cement Corporation Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gare Palma N/8</td>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>Ambuja Cements Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lohari</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>Aaraya Mines Pvt Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bhaskarpura</td>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Crest Steel and Power Pvt Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Majra</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>Jaypee Cement Corporation Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With cement and aluminium winning most of the blocks that were earlier allotted to players in the steel industry, fuel scarcity can become a predominant concern for steel producers, combined with falling price of steel and squeezing margins. India is the world’s largest producer of coal-based sponge iron, which does not deploy the most efficient technology, but was successful so far on account of the availability of cheaper domestic coal. If players in the steel industry opt for coal sourcing through spot market, imports or linkages, their fuel procurement costs are bound to increase significantly, in turn affecting the viability of this sector. Although alternate energy options are available to secure their fuel supplies such as wind, hydro, solar and biogas, there is always the need to secure supply arrangement at an arm’s length owing to technical limitations on the capacity that can be installed in CPPs.

A list of new allottees in the non-regulated sector for Schedule II and Schedule III bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Coal block</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Peak-rated capacity (MTPA)</th>
<th>Award price (INR/tonne)</th>
<th>New allottee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Adani Power Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mandakini</td>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Mandakini Exploration and Mining Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ganeshpur</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>GMR Chhattisgarh Energy Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Utkal-C</td>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Monnet Power Company Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to address fuel/coal payments, certain modifications were made in the existing method of tariff determination, thus impacting computation of energy charges. The changes in the provisions for determination of energy charges are presented below.

Further, in order to capture the amount of fixed charge that can be passed through in the power tariff, GoI proposed to cap the fixed charge, which will inhibit the companies from recovering their entire costs. GoI recently published the new standard bidding documents which prescribe that the fixed cost will be capped based on the inputs from the state regulators. This might have some effect on the firms, especially those which bid aggressively. Very recently, Monnet Ispat proposed to surrender its Utkal C coal block owing to the proposed cap on fixed charge in the judiciary. On account of the uncertainty of coal cost recovery, firms are reluctant to proceed with the coal block takeover and subsequent operations.

### Non-recoverable premium paid: Schedule II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule II mine</th>
<th>Premium paid</th>
<th>Non-recoverable premium</th>
<th>ROM + finance charges*</th>
<th>Total non-recoverable expenses</th>
<th>Total non-recoverable expenses (per unit***)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talabra I</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasatoli</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans Damodar</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia North</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokisud North</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-recoverable premium paid: Schedule III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule III mine</th>
<th>Premium paid</th>
<th>Non-recoverable premium</th>
<th>ROM + finance charges*</th>
<th>Total non-recoverable expenses</th>
<th>Total non-recoverable expenses (per unit***)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utkal C</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganeshpur</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandakini***</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jitpur</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PwC analysis

*Charges for FY 2016–17/first year of operation
** Assuming 600 g per unit of electricity
*** Assuming 600 INR/tonne – ROM + financing for Mandakini

Going forward, it is expected that bidding will be less aggressive than that in the case of Schedule II and III mines, with a focus on maintaining an economically viable project profile with healthy margins.

### 4.3. Benefits to stakeholders

The ministry has redefined the framework for allocation of coal blocks with the objective of ensuring transparent allotment and meeting the fuel requirement of various industries. The initiative has also led to the redirection of cash inflows from the proceeds of auctions towards state governments. The resources that will flow to the coal-producing states such as Jharkhand, Odisha, Chhattisgarh, West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra will be many times higher than what the states, several of which have a large proportion below the poverty line, spend currently. The cash nature of inflows from auctions for the government is tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power sector</th>
<th>Non-regulated sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upfront amount (10% of intrinsic value)</td>
<td>Upfront amount (10% of intrinsic value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the quote is above (i.e. no premium), 100 INR/tonne of coal extracted has to be paid (to be escalated yearly)</td>
<td>Winning bid quote per tonne of coal extracted (to be escalated yearly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty and taxes as applicable</td>
<td>Royalty and taxes as applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As per the Ministry of Power’s statement, from the coal blocks auctioned and allotted thus far, electricity consumers in the nation are likely to benefit by about 69,311 crore INR, owing to the reduction in power tariffs based on negative bidding for coal blocks. In the case of coal for the regulated sector, estimates from the ministry suggest that Madhya Pradesh will get 39,900 crore INR; Chhattisgarh, 26,425 crore INR; Jharkhand, 14,498 crore INR; West Bengal, 13,210 crore INR; Maharashtra, 8,189 crore INR; and Odisha, 607 crore INR.

Direct consumer benefits: For each fall of 100 INR in the bid amount, the power tariff is expected to fall by 4-6 paisa.

In the unregulated sector, steel, cement and aluminium makers that have won blocks will have a greater control on profitability, given that coal accounts for a third to over half of their production cost (in different sectors).

4.4. Challenges: Was bidding aggressive?

In the power sector, all the block auctions till date have gone into forward bidding, i.e. the cost of coal will not be passed through to customers, while owners have committed an additional premium to the government, which is likely to reduce tariff. Similarly, non-regulated sectors won the blocks on stretched prices which are escalable. With the inputs negatively priced or priced at a high cost, the sustainability of their pricing strategy, though achievable, is now a challenge. The tariffs can be largely sustainable over the mine life, but they will be a burden on companies’ balance sheets and the players might seek to divert them over time. The aggressive bidding for coal blocks can be attributed to coal quality and supply security being sought by the companies that otherwise could have rendered their heavy investment in power plants loss-making. However, negative prices for inputs for a period of, say, 25 years, may not be a realistic solution, since this will lead to significant cost and cost recovery pressures. Combined with the proposed capping of fixed charges by GoI, cost recovery will be a challenge for the new allocators. As such, efficient mining, cost control and maximum recovery are key for success.

5. Way forward: Key points and gearing up

With the newly allocated blocks added to a company’s portfolio, the challenge is to sustain the basics—production, cost and safety measures. Project preparedness from day one will be critical, and adopting the best industrial processes and technologies will be key for success. As the new era begins, one might acquire some lessons from some of the global mining players as well. The focus has shifted not only to improving production but also to cost-cutting measures, manpower selectivity, best equipment maintenance practices, process checks and controls, etc. These measures have helped some of the major global players survive the challenging mining environment. Some of the key areas of focus that a new allocatee will need to appreciate and adhere to are summarised below.

5.1. Qualified/suitable mining contractor selection

Coal block allocation through auction will certainly lead to an increase in the cost of coal, given the premium committed to be paid, combined with firm award conditions which require timely development of coal assets to meet the fuel requirement. Thus, the strategies considered for bidding will be successful only if the blocks are developed in a timely and most efficient manner.

While owners have a choice to operate a block on their own or through outsourcing, given their limited experience in coal mining, most owners rely on the MDO model to develop their coal blocks. As the concept of mining through MDO, though evolving, is relatively new in India, very few steps have been taken for selecting the most suitable mining contractor, with an optimised/customised scope of work depending on the risk-sharing capabilities of the parties involved.

In this model, ownership of the mine resides with the entity to which it is allocated, and the owner of the mine contracts mine development to a third-party contractor. The contracted MDO tends to the assigned activities associated with mine development (such as mine design and planning, plant design and construction, mine infrastructure design and construction, overburden removal, coal mining, processing, delivery, ongoing mine operation and maintenance throughout the entire life of the mine), and delivers the stipulated quantum of coal of desired quality against the fee agreed upon in the MDO contract.

Contract mining capitalises on coal mining contractor’s skills, capabilities and capital for investment, and provides control over mining operations that can be tailored according to needs. It involves the flexibility to change mining contractors (or the business model) over time. The success of this model was essential as many end-user companies engaged in power generation or steel and cement manufacturing had no prior experience in coal mining.

Hence, the selection of a suitably qualified MDO assumes further importance. The most efficient model is one which allows appropriate risk sharing and hence reduces the cost of mining. Selection based on quality, wherein proper assessment of past performance in terms of technical and financial aspects, needs to be emphasised, apart from the allocation of clear and double roles (scope of work) to the selected MDO.
5.2. Project development: Planning and monitoring

In general, mining companies need to have a strong framework in place for project development planning and monitoring. As discussed earlier, how efficiently and quickly the coal blocks can be put into the operations stage will be key for the success of new allocates. A structured and phased approach to project development will ensure rigorous evaluation of the key milestones to be achieved during the development period and will minimise ‘cost blow-outs’.

Some of the important elements for phased project planning are:

• Establish a formal approach for project evaluation that can provide a strong structure and consistency throughout the development period.
• Identify and assess key project risks and conduct risk assessment at frequent intervals.
• Communicate the strategic objective of each stage to all individuals involved.
• Implement a day-to-day/weekly/fortnightly/monthly/milestone-based measurement and monitoring system.
• Assign clear accountability to key people/stakeholders involved.

To ensure more effective planning and project evaluation, many Australian coal-planning companies have introduced phased development, which is commonly described as a ‘stage-gate’ process. This is a step-by-step approach that enables companies to move their projects through the development pipeline and achieve a standardised way of evaluating achievements at each stage of various milestones.

5.3. Focus on processes and technology

The Indian mining sector needs a major boost and reform in terms of technology and processes across the mining value chain. As a new allocatee, one needs to really ensure that various checkpoints are introduced in the system to help improve the existing processes and further ensure that these checkpoints are regularly tested while considering the volatilities involved in mining operations. Adopting and improving the processes and technology will function as another critical parameter in keeping operations in control and ensuring the best safety standards.

Recently, Anglo American included a haul truck rolling-resistance solution, energy absorbing bumper and monitoring system to improve its existing safety standards and productivity. BHP Billiton designed a risk area map using acoustic and optical telemetry to protect personnel and machinery.

Further, Rio Tinto could reduce its capital expenditure by 9.4 billion USD and operating cost by 4.8 billion USD in 2014 through strategic maintenance planning to reduce reliance on contractors, a more robust vendor selection process and sourcing of goods and services from emerging markets.

5.4. Cost control measures

Increasingly, the mining industry involves large cash flows while showing a huge scope for cost control. Emphasis on cost control measures must be laid at various stages, e.g. at the project and planning stages, and also on timelines for clearance and approval of some of the critical aspects. Failure to meet these timelines and non-achievement of budgeted schedules can cause a huge impact on project inception, which in turn will follow into the operational stages, affecting cash flows.

Similarly, the major areas that take up a large share of working capital and revenue from cash flows in the operation stages are mainly:

• Labour cost
• Fuel and electricity cost
• Equipment maintenance cost
• Logistics and transportation cost
• Health, safety and environment
• Blasting and explosives cost
• Corporate social responsibility efforts are needed to keep these cost elements in control. It will be useful to examine the global shift in focus from achieving higher production as a means of reducing cost to achieving higher productivity at the lowest cost while improving safety standards. In 2014, BHP Billiton managed to reduce its capital expenditure by 28% and operating cost by 29% through a reduction in overhead and maintenance costs.

It is necessary to adopt best practices and perform a timely review of the various value chains from the development stage through operational stages. This will play a crucial role in maintaining the viability of projects.

5.5. Stringent and accurate data monitoring system: Development of MIS/ allocation of KPIs

We are living in the age of information. Information is a vital resource in any decision-making process. Survival in the 21st century depends on the ability of businesses to manage information and the way they interact with and react to changes. Information technology, as in other fields, can play a significant role in enhancing the productivity of the mining industry. The constantly increasing portfolio of computer applications in the mining industry includes analysing and mapping exploration data, mine planning and reserve estimation, controlling and maintaining equipment, managing human resources, supplies, inventories, all types of financial information and development of an MIS.

To achieve production targets and profitability, the mining industry needs to adopt an appropriately stringent and accurate data monitoring system. The global mining industry has already adopted real-time data-capturing tools that assist in taking immediate corrective measures during operations. Analysis of data and information flow at these levels improves productivity and system efficiency. Among the mining majors, Rio Tinto’s ‘Mine of the Future’ technology includes a facility that monitors real-time operations.

5.6. Getting the right people: Key experts/ skilled manpower

The contribution of mining, which is currently 1.86% of GDP, is likely to reach 5% in the near future. However, a lack of skilled workers is set to impact the industry, creating a demand-supply gap of over 2,200 people by 2025.1

Based on the estimated demand and current supply from various educational institutes which cater to the management level, a demand-supply gap of about 1,500 and 2,200 is expected during 2009–2017 and 2009–2025 respectively.2

The study clearly points out a lack of mineral-specific professionals like mine lawyers, mineral economists and mineral financial analysts in the industry. Along with this, there is a shortage of skilled manpower like heavy earth-moving machinery (HEMM) operators, shot-firers, blast engineers and surveyors, who are needed to develop a healthy mine.

Adequate training measures need to be adopted and time and money need to be invested to develop next generation miners. These measures will certainly help a fresh allocatee in both tangible and intangible ways.

The recent coal block auction is certain to increase demand for statutory and skilled personnel in the Indian mining industry.

5.7. Keeping the checklist ready: Post-allocation due diligence

After a coal block has been allotted, a number of approvals and permissions are required before the commencement of mining operations. Failing to get timely approval or to keep a check on timelines can result in a cost overrun. In the case of a captive project, this can have severe consequences as the end-use plant will be affected.

All clearances will require a detailed step-by-step approach for assessing and understanding the repercussions. Each mine will have its own requirements in terms of clearances and approvals to be obtained. Preparing a detailed checklist, in line with the transfer orders and regulatory provisions and regular follow-up on the same, is critical for any project.

5.8. Risk analysis and mitigating measures

Key risks which can derail a whole project need to be clearly brought out. They should be classified into various heads depending on their potential impact on a project. The risks associated with a project may include one or more of the following:

• Business risk
• Technology risk
• Commodity price risk
• Implementation/timing/ drop-dead risk
• Regulatory risk
• Environmental risk
• Resource risk
• Currency risk
• Contractual risk

The identification of these project development and operational risks is crucial at the project inception stage. As a fresh allocatee, one needs to be adequately aware of these risks in order to make appropriate preparations.

1. Source: Confederation of Indian Industry, as per a study on the mapping of human resources and skills for the mining industry in India
2. Source: Confederation of Indian Industry
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