(Published in Part - III Section 4 of the Gazette of India, Extraordinary)

Tariff Authority for Major Ports

G.No. 89 New Delhi, 17 March 2015

NOTIFICATION

In exercise of the powers conferred by Sections 48 and 50 of the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (38 of 1963), the Tariff Authority for Major Ports hereby amends the Order No. TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28 November 2014 passed by this Authority relating to fixation of reference tariff for Operation and Maintenance of Berths 11 and 12 in Kandla Port as Container Terminal on PPP mode on "As is where is" basis, as in the Order appended hereto. This Notification should be read along with the tariff Order No. TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28 November 2014 notified in the Gazette of India on 5 January 2015 vide Gazette No. 8.

(T.S. Balasubramanian)
Member (Finance)

Tariff Authority for Major Ports

Case No. TAMP/43/2014-KPT

United Liner Agencies of India (Private) Limited
And ----- **Applicants**
Kandla Port Trust

QUORUM:

(i). Shri. T. S. Balasubramanian, Member (Finance)
(ii). Shri. C. B. Singh, Member (Economic)

O R D E R

(Passed on this 5th day of February 2015)

This case relates to amendment to the Order no. TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28 November 2014 passed by this Authority relating to fixation of reference tariff for Operation and Maintenance of Berths 11 and 12 in Kandla Port as Container Terminal on PPP mode on "As is where is" basis.

2. This Authority had passed an Order no.TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28 November 2014 fixing reference tariff for Operation and Maintenance of Berths 11 and 12 in Kandla Port as Container Terminal on PPP mode on "As is where Basis is." based on the proposal filed by the Kandla Port Trust (KPT). This Order was notified in the Gazette of India on 5 January 2015 vide Gazette No. 8.

3.1. With reference to the said Order dated 28 November 2014, one of the prospective bidders consulted during the proceeding of the case viz. the United Liner Agencies of India (Private) Ltd. (ULAIPL), vide its letter no.PDG/ULA/KPT/CTP/2014 dated 8 December 2014 has requested this Authority to review the Reference Tariff approved in the said Order citing that the reference tariff notified by this Authority is lower than the rates proposed by the Kandla Port Trust (KPT) and this would affect the viability of the Project.

3.2. A copy of the said representation received from the ULAIPL was forwarded to the KPT vide our letter dated 15 December 2014 seeking their comments thereon.

3.3. The KPT vide its letter dated 5 January 2015 and 22 January 2015 has furnished its comments on the representation of the ULAIPL. In its letter dated 22 January 2015, the KPT has stated that the Project is still under the Bidding process and due date for bidding is on 16 February 2015. A summary of points made by ULAIPL in its representation and the comments of KPT thereon is given below:

Sl. No.	Comments of users	Reply furnished by KPT
1.	**M/s. United Liner Agencies of India (Private) Ltd. (ULA)**	
(i).	TAMP had arrived at the capacity of the berths at 6,37,728 TEUs whereas the KPT has designated the capacity of the Terminal at 6,00,000 TEUs. Assumption of higher capacities has led to fixation of lower tariffs. The Optimal capacity of the Terminal will be much less because of the following reasons.	--

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>(a). TAMP Guidelines specify the calculation of quay Capacity as 70% of the maximum number of TEUs that can be handled along the berth in an year considering the number of gantry cranes. Kandla port is a tidal port. In addition, there are night navigation restrictions. These factors reduce the quay capacity of the Terminal as compared to traditional Terminals. Hence a factor of 0.65 rather than 0.7 in the formula for calculation of optimal quay capacity needs to be taken. The capacity would work out to 592,176 TEUs using this factor.</td><td>Utilization may not get affected due to factor like tidal window or night navigation restrictions, etc. since priority movement for navigation of container vessels is provided for the Project.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>(b). KPT had assumed a productivity parameter of 25 moves per hour crane as per TAMP norms. When the bidders pointed out that such high productivity is not possible with the old equipment, TAMP had agreed with the view and asked KPT to review the matter. KPT has now come up with a figure of 20 moves per hour. In our view even this figure is unrealistic considering the condition and vintage of the equipment to be inherited as a part of the Project. A figure of 18 moves/hour will be more realistic.</td><td>The figure of average 20 moves / hour per crane is considered after considering the facts that the cranes are old, idle since a year and some of the cranes are less than Panamax size. Thus, KPT sticks to the submission of 20/moves/hr/crane.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>(c). As per the TAMP Guidelines, optimal capacity of the Terminal is taken into account for the calculation of tariff basis full capacity utilisation from day one; whereas the reality is that the container traffic at present is NIL and traffic build up would only happen over a period of about 10 years. Also the peak volumes handled in the past (with all project assets in place) has never exceeded 200,000 TEUs, which is less than half the envisaged capacity. There is a strong belief that 600,000 TEUs is also overrated; to assume higher volume than peak project capacity is not prudent.</td><td>As per TAMP Guidelines 2008, the volumes considered to fix the upfront tariff is optimal capacity. Year by year expected traffic is never considered for fixation of upfront tariffs.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>(d). Yard capacity calculated by TAMP is on the basis of 360 Total Ground Slots (TGS) per hectare. This calculation is made on the presumption that the yard is handled by RTGs at an average stack height of 2.5. Achieving 360 TGS per hectare (Ha) is very difficult. This is theoretically possible but then basic safety standards would be compromised. Also it is not possible to optimise the operational KPIs. Internationally, 240 TGS per hectare is considered for RTG layout. This allows for the traffic lane within the gantry, traffic bypass lane for the Tractor Trailers (TT) to the adjacent stacks, RTG to RTG safety margin, RTG beam widths, high mast foundations and new jersey barriers placed to prevent wrong entry of trucks. On the contrary, the Container Terminal Project at Kandla envisages only 2 RTGs per RMQC. This is one short per quay crane; instead Reach stackers are provided to compensate the shortfall of equipment. It has to be reviewed in perspective that RTG effective stacking height is 2.5 and Reach stackers 1.5 only; therefore the same stack density cannot be achieved. Reach stackers require a manoeuvring width of 20m on either side of the 6 across stack.</td><td>(a). TGS of 285 TEUs per Ha may be considered which KPT had also proposed in its proposal. Justification of area required for stacking TEU is tabulated below:
(i). <u>Order no.TAMP/40/2008-JNPT dated 25 February 2009 (upfront tariff fixed for container terminal at JNPT)</u>:
The Calculation of TEU's per Hectar:
<table>
<tr><td>Length</td><td>20 Ft</td></tr>
<tr><td>Width</td><td>8 Ft</td></tr>
<tr><td>TEU Area</td><td>160 Ft</td></tr>
<tr><td>In Sq m</td><td>14.86 Sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>Add: For ease of Operation, avoiding damage to container safety</td><td>2.64 Sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>17.5 Sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total Area</td><td>35 Sqm*</td></tr>
</table>
Note: Additional 100% to area of 17.5 sqm is required for ease of movement of TT's, RTGS, and for smooth operation. This is as per the international standards.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTGs on the other hand requires only 12m for operating over a 6 across stack. In effect stack density will be reduced to half. The overall equipment mix would be comprising of 8 RTGs and 4 Reach stackers, supporting the 4 RMQCs on the berth. Assuming 360 TGS per hectare for a pure RTG layout, the composite equipment will therefore have a utilisation of not more than 285 TGS per hectare. Secondly, the tariff adopted for Kandla Container Terminal is a percentage of Tuna Tekra i.e. the reference tariff is Tuna Tekra, which is further referenced to JNPT i.e., the norms for Tuna Tekra is the same as JNPT and therefore it assumes 285TGS per hectare. KCT being a inferior terminal, has to be downscaled in norms when referencing and not vice versa. There is no reason why the same stack density cannot be adopted. By doing so, the yard capacity comes down to 600,000 TEUs per annum and not 757,656 TEUs per annum, which is also the project design capacity/tendered capacity. Therefore the yard capacity becomes the governing (optimal) capacity of the Terminal and therefore tariff may be calculated on the basis 600,000 TEUs and not 637,728 TEUs per annum.</td>
<td>(ii). <u>Order no. TAMP/33/2008-NMPT dated 30 December 2009 (upfront tariff fixed for container terminal at NMPT):</u>
The Calculation of TEU’s per Hectar:
<table>
<tr><td>Length</td><td>5.9 m</td></tr>
<tr><td>Width</td><td>2.35 m</td></tr>
<tr><td>TEU Area</td><td>13.87 sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>In Sq m</td><td>13.87 Sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total Area</td><td>27.73 Sqm*</td></tr>
</table>

Note: Additional 100% to area of 13.87 sqm is required for facilitating the movement cranes and trailers and space between the containers in longitudinal and transverse direction etc.

(b). Comparing the basis of norms considered by JNPT and NMPT, the KPT submitted that NMPT’s calculation considers 5.9 m as length and 2.35 m as width of a 20’ container i.e. 19.36 ft and 7.7 ft which is not correct based on standard container size i.e. 20ft length and 8 ft width while JNPT has considered the correct size of a standard container. Moreover, NMPT has considered less additional area compared to JNPT for smooth and easy operation, movement of cranes, RTGC’s, TTs, safety margins, etc. over and above actual area required for a slot. Considering in-depth experience and expertise of JNPT as compared to NMPT, the KPT is of view to consider 285 slots per Ha.

(c). KPT therefore, submits considering the TGS of 285 slots per Ha and to consider the Optimal capacity of 600000 TEUs.

(d). The KPT vide its letter dated 22 January 2015 has clarified that average Stack height taken as 2.5 is as per the TAMP Guidelines 2008 which in its view is practical and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e). A recent analysis of container terminal key assets done by Drewry Maritime Research showing the global average in respect of the norms and productivity parameters is enclosed. A perusal of the key performance indicators world over indicates that there is an unreasonable expectation from the BOT Operators in India. The performance indicators prescribed for them are grossly overestimated and therefore the relevant norms/productivity parameters need to be toned down.</td>
<td>Considering overall comment of ULA, we are of the view that already designated and earlier proposed capacity of 600000 TEUs may be considered as Optimal Capacity for fixation of tariffs. Further, TAMP may direct in this regard.</td>
</tr>
</table>

(ii).	Under clause 3.2 of the Tariff Guidelines, 2008, TAMP is empowered to make necessary adjustment in the norms in view of port specific conditions. In view of the peculiar circumstances of the case, TAMP has already agreed to make a deviation from the norms.	

4.1. Subsequently, the ULAIPL vide its letter dated 21 January 2015 filed another representation to review the capital cost considered in the Reference tariff Order dated 28 November 2014. In this regard, the ULAIPL was informed vide our letter dated 28 January 2015 that the Capital Cost considered in the Reference tariff computation in the said Order is as estimated by KPT except for modification in the Capital Cost of Tractor Trailer for reasons stated in para 15 (vi)(b)(vii) of the said Order. The Capital Cost considered in the cost statement for arriving at the Reference tariff is ₹316.65 crores as against ₹315.14 crores estimated by KPT. It was also brought out to the ULAIPL that as per clause 2.2 of the tariff guidelines of 2013 issued by the Ministry of Shipping, the Reference Tariff to be approved by this Authority has to be based on the proposal filed by the concerned Major Port Trusts and the Reference Tariff determined by this Authority in the tariff Order no.TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28 November 2014 is based on the proposal filed by the KPT. The ULAIPL was, therefore, requested to take up this as well as any other matter relating to this project directly with the proposer port i.e. KPT. A copy of the said letter of the ULAIPL was forwarded to the KPT for its comments.

4.2. In relation to this, the KPT vide its email dated 28 January 2015 has furnished its comments on the representation of the ULAIPL dated 21 January 2015. A summary of points made by ULAIPL in its said representation and the comments of KPT thereon is given below:

Sl. No.	Comments of users	Reply furnished by KPT
1.	**M/s.United Liner Agencies of India (Private) Ltd. (ULA)**	
(i).	Please refer to our letter No.PDG/ULA/KPT/CPT/09/2014 dated 8 December 2014 requesting for reconsideration of Reference Tariff fixed by TAMP vide their Order No.TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28-11-2014 for the Kandla container Terminal. A copy of this letter is enclosed for ready reference. We made a plea for review of the Tariffs in order to improve the viability of the Project.	The referred letter from ULA has been replied to TAMP vide KPT Letter No.FA/COST/1127/08 dated 05.01.2015 and of even no.54 dated 22.01.2015 with KPT's comments**.**
(ii).	TAMP had arrived at the capacity of the berths at 6,37,728 TEUs whereas the KPT has designated the capacity of the Terminal at 600,000 TEUs. Assumption of higher capacities has led to fixation of lower tariffs. Actually, the Optimal capacity of the Terminal will be much less because of the reasons explained by us in detail in our representation dated 8-12-2014 mentioned above.	KPT has already communicated its stand regarding capacity of the terminal vide its letter No. FA/COST/1127/08 dated 05.01.2015 in response to the ULA letter dated 8-12-14.
(iii).	Another factor which will have a major impact on the financial viability of the Project is the overall capital cost involved in the Project. Although the initial capital cost has been estimated to be ₹316.65 crores, the actual capital cost would be much higher and in the range of about ₹700 crores taking the replacement cost of the equipment into consideration. The Project envisages taking	Reference tariffs have been fixed by TAMP in line with TAMP Guidelines 2013 following the principles of Upfront Tariff Guidelines 2008 wherein future expansion / replacement costs are not considered for tariff fixation. Secondly, depreciation provided in approved tariffs has been considered

	over of the existing old equipment and they will be needing replacement earlier than the period envisaged in new Projects. 8 of the equipment, consisting of 4 Nos. of RMQCs and 4 Nos. of RTGCs will require replacement within 10 to 15 years. If this factor had been taken into account, the Reference Tariffs worked out would have been higher and the financial viability of the Project would have improved. The Project IRR at the tariffs notified by TAMP is working out to be too low and cash losses are projected for a number of years, which makes the financial model unsustainable and it any not be possible to achieve financial closure. The Project will be viable only if the tariffs are revised upwards to a level of about ₹3600/-TEU. If the tariffs are not revised prior bid submission date, there may not be any bidders for the Project.	based on the balance life of the equipments.
(iv).	Under 3.2 of the Tariff Guidelines, 2008, TAMP is empowered to make necessary adjustment in the norms in view of port specific conditions. In view of the peculiar circumstances of the case, TAMP has already agreed to make a deviation from the norms. We therefore request TAMP to kindly review the Reference Tariff Notification in the light of position explained above as well as in our representation dated 8-12-2014 and issue necessary amendments.	Regarding reference Tariff, KPT vide letter No.FA/COST/1127/131 dated 20.12.2013 has sent the tariff proposal based on the Container Handling rates of JNPT. However, TAMP vide letter dated 15 January 2014 has returned the proposal stating that the "proposal of KPT does not come under the purview of Revised Tariff Guidelines of 2013".

5. With reference to the totality of information collected during the processing of this review case, the following position emerges:

(i). The tariff guidelines of 2013 do not provide for review of the reference tariff notified by this Authority particularly in a post bid scenario. In the instant case, the KPT has reported that bidding process of the said Container Terminal Project at Berth Nos.10 and 11 is not yet completed and the due date for bidding is on 16 February 2015. Thus, the representation received from M/s.ULAIPL and the request of KPT thereon to review the said tariff Order is not a post bid scenario. That being so and in the interest of a good tariff Order, the tariff Order dated 28 November 2014 is taken up to the limited extent of review of optimal capacity considered at 637,728 TEUs per annum in the Order dated 28 November 2014.

(ii). The main points made by the M/s.ULAIPL in its review application seeking review of the Order approved by this Authority in the Order dated 28 November 2014 are as follows:

(a). <u>To consider productivity parameter of 18 moves/ hour/ crane</u> as the equipment to be taken over from KPT are old <u>as against productivity parameter of 20 moves/ hour/ crane</u> considered in assessing the optimal quay capacity in the reference tariff Order dated 28 November 2014.

(b). The container terminal project of KPT envisages 2 RTGS per RMQC instead of the norms of 3 RTGS per RMQC as per norms. Since KPT is short by 1 RTG per quay crane and instead reach stacker are provided, the stack height of 1.5 as per norm considered in the yard capacity calculation cannot be achieved. Citing this, it has requested to consider stack height of 1.5 instead of 2.5 considered as per the norms.

(c). The capital cost considered in the Reference tariff fixation is ₹316.65 crores. Actual capital cost would be much higher and in the range of about ₹700 crores taking the replacement cost of the equipment into consideration.

(d). Consider ground slots at 285 ground slot / per hectare as considered by the Authority for fixation of upfront tariff for container terminal at JNPT instead of ground slot at 360 TEU's per hectare adopted by the Authority. Consequently the optimal yard capacity will come to 6,00,000 TEU's and not 7,57,656 TEUs assessed by the Authority. Since optimal yard capacity is the lower of two capacity that should form the base to compute the reference tariff.

(iii). As regard, the point made by M/s.ULAIPL in para 5 (ii) (a) above, it is relevant to state that the output norms prescribed for container terminal in the 2008 tariff guidelines is 25 moves/ hour/ crane. For reasons stated in para 15 (v) (a) (ii) of the Order dated 28 November 2014, the productivity norm of 20 moves/ hour/ crane was considered as proposed by the KPT.

The KPT has also emphasised that the productivity parameter of 20 moves/ hour/ crane is after taking into consideration the fact that the cranes to be taken over by the BOT operator are old, idle for a year and also that some of the cranes are with lower capacity i.e. less than that required for handling Panamax vessel. This aspect has also been recorded in the reply furnished by the KPT to our query at para 11 Sr. No.B(i) of the said Order. Thus, with reference to the submissions made by the ULAIPL to review the productivity parameter, the KPT has maintained that the productivity parameter of 20 moves/ hour/ crane considered in the reference tariff is in order. That being, there is no case to review this parameter as suggested by ULAIPL.

(iv). With reference to the point made by the by M/s.ULAIPL brought out at para 5 (ii) (b), the ULAIPL has argued that the number of RTGCs proposed is 2 as against the prescribed norm of 3 RTGCs per QCs; and, the shortfall is proposed to be met by reach stacker which the ULAIPL says can achieve stack height of 1.5 only. Hence, it has requested to review the stack height and consider it at 2.5.

As regards the deviation in the number of equipment referred by ULAIPL, it is relevant here to state that the KPT during the proceedings relating to the reference tariff proposal for Container terminal at berth nos.11 and 12 has, on more than one occasion, stated that equipment requirement for the Project has been determined based on opinions expressed by RFQ applicants in the Pre-Application Conference and that deviations from the normative list of Guidelines has been proposed to rationalize the cost of investment to make the project viable.

As regards the stack height parameter of 2.5 it is considered in the reference tariff computation as proposed by KPT following norms prescribed in the 2008 guidelines. With reference to the review sought by M/s.ULAIPL in this regard, the KPT has maintained its stand that average stack height of 2.5 considered in the reference tariff computation is as per the tariff Guidelines of 2008 and has viewed that the stack height parameter of 2.5 considered by it is practical and appropriate. In view of the above clarification furnished by the proposer port KPT which firmly is of the opinion that stack height of 2.5 is practical and achievable and also recognising the stacking height considered is as per the norms, there is no case to review this parameter.

(v). (a). To elaborate the point made at 5 (ii) (c) above, the ULAIPL has stated that the project envisages taking over of the existing old equipment. Hence, equipment will have to be replaced earlier than the period envisaged in other new Projects. Citing this as a reason, the ULAIPL has submitted that the actual capital cost of the project will be more than ₹700 crores as against ₹316.65 crores considered by this Authority in the reference tariff fixation. The ULAIPL has stated that if the capital cost is revised upwards the reference tariff will be much higher. It has also stated that the project will be viable only if the tariffs are revised upwards to a level of about ₹3600/- TEU.

(b). The point made by the ULAIPL to capture the cost of replacing the assets is elaborately dealt with in para 15(vi)(b) (ix) of the November 2014 Order which is reproduced below for ease of reference:

"*With reference to the point made by the ULAIPL to capture the cost of replacing the new equipment to be purchased by the operator during the concession period assuming a certain inflation per annum, the KPT has rightly clarified that the upfront tariff guidelines of 2008 do not allow to consider the cost of replacing the assets during the project period in the reference tariff computation. The point made by the ULAIPL is beyond the scope of the tariff guidelines of 2008 and 2013. Under 2013/ 2008 guidelines, once reference tariff is fixed, there is no scope to reassess and consider replacement value of assets. The reference tariff fixed is applicable for the entire project period subject to annual indexation and performance linked tariff increase.*"

(c). Thus, it can be seen that the point made by ULAIPL to capture the effect of cost of replacing the assets was already dealt with in the Order of November 2014. This Authority relies on the capital cost estimated by Major Port Trusts while fixing the reference tariff under 2013 guidelines following the norms prescribed in the 2008 guidelines. The Capital Cost considered in the cost statement for arriving at the Reference tariff is ₹316.65 crores as against ₹315.14 crores estimated by KPT. The Capital Cost considered in the Reference tariff computation in the said Order is also as estimated by KPT except for modification in the Capital Cost of Tractor Trailer for reasons stated in para 15 (vi) (b)(vii) of the said Order.

As stated earlier, the capital cost estimated by the KPT are reportedly based on opinions expressed by RFQ applicants in the pre-application conference with a view to rationalize the cost of investment to make the project viable.

(d). Interestingly, the ULAIPL in its comments furnished while processing the reference tariff proposal which is recorded in para 1(vii) of the summary of the comments has stated that the Project will be just sustainable at the tariffs proposed by the KPT. At the joint hearing held on 10 November 2014, the ULAIPL had submitted the tariff proposed by KPT is viable which is recorded in para 3(vi), of the summary of the comment and is reproduced below -

"(vi). Tariff proposed by the KPT are viable. It is nether too low nor very high."

Ironically, the point now made by the ULAIPL seeking for higher level of tariff is completely contradictory to its earlier submissions wherein it has was in agreement with the tariff level proposed by the KPT for this project.

It is relevant hereto state that the reference tariff approved after review of the optimal quay capacity as discussed in the subsequent paragraphs comes to ₹2731.04 for a 20' foreign laden container which is very much close to ₹2757.22 for the corresponding size of container proposed by the KPT in its revised proposal dated 15 November 2014 considered for the tariff Order of 28 November 2014.

(e). As rightly stated by the KPT, Reference tariff fixed by this Authority is in line with Tariff Guidelines of 2013 and following the principles of Upfront Tariff Guidelines of 2008 wherein capital cost for future expansion / replacement costs are not allowed for tariff fixation on upfront/ reference basis. The matter relating to replacement of assets is relevant not only for this specific project but for that matter in all the PPP projects for which tariff is determined upfront. Only the timing of replacement may vary depending upon the life of the equipment considered in the concerned project. Even the proposer port (KPT) has rightly not agreed to the request made by the ULAIPL for any review in the capital cost. In view of the above, and also recognising that request made by the ULAIPL to consider the effect of capital cost of replacing the assets does not fit in the scope of 2008 or 2013 guidelines, the request of ULAIPL is not accepted.

(vi). (a). As regards the point made by M/s.ULAIPL brought out at para 5 (ii) (d) above, it is relevant to state that the reasons for considering ground slots of 360 TEUs per hectare instead of 285 TEUs per hectare proposed by KPT for assessing the optimal yard capacity are elaborately dealt with in para 15(v)(b)(i) of the Order dated 28 November 2014. For ease of reference, the relevant extract of the Order is reproduced below:

"It is relevant here to state that in the case of upfront tariff determined for the container terminal at JNPT, though the ground slot was 285 TEUs per hectare was shown in the calculation, it did not influence the result substantially as the optimal quay capacity remained as the limiting factor in that case. In the case of upfront tariff fixation for the container terminal at New Mangalore Port Trust (NMPT) passed by this Authority vide its Order dated 30 December 2009, ground slots of 360 TEUs per hectare was considered based on the analysis done by the NMPT with reference to the area occupied by a container and additional area required for movement of container handling equipment, space between containers etc. The logic put forth by the NMPT was that 360 TEUs can be safely accommodated per hectare which was accepted by this Authority. The same number of ground slots of 360 TEUs per hectare has been considered while fixing upfront tariff subsequently for the Mega Container terminal at Chennai Port Trust (CHPT) in the Order dated 3 March 2010. That being so, it is not appropriate to consider the ground slots at 285 TEUs per hectare. Therefore, ground slots of 360 TEUs per hectare is considered in the instant case also as against 285 TEUs per hectare considered by the KPT."

(b). On examining the review application filed by M/s. ULAIPL to modify this parameter, the KPT has furnished detailed justification to consider the ground slot at 285 TEUs per hectare as considered in the fixation of upfront tariff for container terminal at Jawaharlal Nehru Port Trust (JNPT) instead of 360 TEUs per hectare considered in the upfront tariff case of container terminal at New Mangalore Port Trust (NMPT) and subsequent container terminal cases. A comparative position of total area for stacking one 20' container based on the parameter considered by JNPT and NMPT in their respective Order as now furnished by KPT is given below:

Order No.TAMP/40/2008-JNPT dated 25 February 2009 (upfront tariff fixed for container terminal at JNPT):		**Order No.TAMP/33/2008-NMPT dated 30 December 2009 (upfront tariff fixed for container terminal at NMPT):**	
The Calculation of TEU's per Hectar:		The Calculation of TEU's per Hectar:	
Length	20 Ft	Length	5.9 m
Width	8 Ft	Width	2.35 m
TEU Area	160 Ft	TEU Area	13.87 sqm
In Sq m	14.86 Sqm	In Sq m	13.87 Sqm
Add: For ease of Operation, avoiding damage to container safety	2.64 Sqm	Total Area per 20' container	27.73 Sqm*
Total	17.5 Sqm	Note: Additional 100% to area of 13.87 sqm is required for facilitating the movement cranes and trailers and space between the containers in longitudinal and transverse direction etc.	
Total Area per 20' container	35 Sqm*		
Note: Additional 100% to area of 17.5 sqm is required for ease of movement of TT's, RTGS, and for smooth operation. This is as per the international standards.			
Number of Grounds slots computed on the above parameter in the JNPT case in TEUs/ hectare		**Number of Grounds slots computed on the above parameter in TEUs/ hectare in NMPT**	
10,000 sq. mtrs. / 35 sq. mtrs. =	285.7 TEUs rounded off to **286 as proposed by the JNPT.**	10,000 sq. mtrs. / 27.73 sq. mtrs. =	360.6 TEUs considered as **360 TEUS as proposed by the NMPT.**

(c). The KPT has stated that as per the NMPT's calculation, length and width of container given is in meter. When this is converted to sq. feet (applying conversion factor of 1 meter= 3.28084 feet), the length of a container comes to 19.36' and width comes to 7.7' which is not correct as it does not match with the standard size of 20' container of 20' length and 8' width. It has also submitted that the additional area considered by NMPT for smooth and easy operation of crane, movement of equipment etc., is also less as compared to JNPT. Considering the fact that JNPT have in-depth experience and expertise in container handling in comparison to NMPT, the KPT has submitted to consider ground slot of 285 TEUs per hectare.

It is relevant here to state that the ground slots considered in the upfront tariff Order of February 2009 for JNPT container terminal is 286 ground slots/ hectare and not 285 stated by the KPT in its entire submissions.

While processing the reference tariff Order of 28 November 2014 when the KPT was requested to modify the ground slot to 360 TEUs / hectare, at that point of time the KPT did not furnish detailed analysis and justification for considering ground slot of 285 TEUs / hectare (correct figure is 286 TEUs / hectare). However, in view of the submissions now made by the KPT which is supported with detailed analysis for considering the ground slots of 286 TEUs per hectare, the reference tariff Order approved in the tariff Order of November 2014 is reviewed to the extent of this parameter i.e. ground slot hectare of 286 TEUs per hectare is considered instead of 360 TEUs / hectare considered in the computation in the November 2014 Order. Consequently, the optimal yard capacity comes to 6,01,915 TEUs per annum as against 5,99,811 TEUs estimated by KPT. The variation is because the KPT has considered the ground slots of 285 TEUs / hectare instead of 286 TEUs/ per hectare considered by us now as followed in the JNPT case.

Based on the above analysis the optimal yard capacity of the terminal assessed at 6,01,915 TEUs per annum will become a limiting factor and can be considered as the optimal capacity of the terminal. The KPT has, however, strongly insisted that the optimal capacity should be considered at 6,00,000 TEUs. The optimal capacity of the terminal is, therefore, considered as 6,00,000 TEUs per annum as assessed by KPT as against 6,37,728 TEUs per annum considered in the November 2014 Order.

(vii). As regards one another point made the ULAIPL to consider utilization factor of 65% instead of 70% for assessing the optimal quay capacity, the KPT has clarified that the utilization of the terminal may not get affected due to factors like tidal window or night navigation restrictions etc., since priority movement for navigation of container vessels is provided for the Project. It is relevant to state that 70% utilisation factor for assessing the optimal quay capacity is as per the norms prescribe in the 2008 tariff guidelines and is uniformly followed for determination of upfront tariff in all the Major Port Trusts. In view of the above guideline position and in view of the clarification furnished by the KPT there is no extraordinary circumstances warranting to deviate from the prescribed norm only in this case.

(viii). In view of the modification in the Optimal capacity of the terminal as brought out in the above analysis, the power and fuel cost estimated in the Order dated 28 November 2014 also stand modified. The only modification done in these two cost items is on optimal capacity considered for estimation. The power and fuel cost is now estimated for the revised Optimal Capacity of 6,00,000 TEUs instead of 6,37,728 TEUs per annum. Consequently the revised operating cost is estimated at ₹94.82 crores as against ₹95.98 crores in the November 2014 Order.

As stated earlier, the analysis here is restricted to review the optimal capacity arising on account of representation made by ULAIPL and endorsed by the KPT. Consequently, the power and fuel cost and the estimated ARR undergo a modification. There is no change in any other element. Hence, all the other analysis / annexes will remain as contained in Order dated 28 November 2014. A copy of the cost statement amending the reference tariff computation approved by this Authority vide Order dated 28 November 2014 in view of considering the modified optimal capacity is attached as **Annex - I**.

(ix). The revised ARR is estimated at ₹145.48 crores per annum as against the ₹146.64 crores estimated in the Order dated 28 November 2014. Following the approach of apportionment of ARR to the three activities followed in the tariff Order of 28 November 2014, the revised ARR is apportioned to the three activities. The revised ARR apportioned to handling charges is ₹130.93 crores, ₹10.18 crores to storage charges and ₹4.36 crores to miscellaneous charges.

(x). The revised Scale of Rates for reference tariff is drawn up following the approach followed in the tariff Order of November 2014. The percentage correction factor adopting the approach followed in the November 2014 Order comes to 72.73% as against 68.98% considered in the last Order. The revised correction factor of 72.73% is applied to reference tariff approved for the Container terminal at Tuna Tekra to arrive at the revised reference tariff for Container handling charges for berth nos.11 and 12 in line with the approach followed by KPT and adopted in the November 2014 Order. A detailed computation of tariff for handling charge along with the revenue computation at the approved tariff is attached as **Annex - II** which shows that the revenue estimates match with the estimated ARR of ₹130.93 crores from the handling charge. This Annex also indicates the tariff computation of storage and miscellaneous services arrived by applying the percentage correction factor determined for handling charge in line with the approach adopted by the KPT which was accepted by this Authority in the November 2014 Order.

(xi). As stated earlier, the analysis here is restricted to review the optimal capacity arising on account of representation filed by ULAIPL and endorsed by the KPT. Hence, Performance standards approved in the November 2014 Order and other analysis contained in the said Order dated will remain continue to be valid here also, since the KPT has not considered the request made by ULAIPL to scale down the performance standards.

6.1. In the result, and for the reasons given above, and based on a collective application of mind, this Authority approves amended upfront tariff schedule caps for Container Terminal attached as **Annex - III**.

6.2. This order should be read along with the tariff order No. TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28 November 2014 notified in the Gazette of India on 5 January 2015 vide Gazette No. 8.

(T.S. Balasubramanian)
Member (Finance)

ANNEX -I

COST STATEMENT FOR AMENDMENT TO THE REFERENCE TARIFF APPROVED FOR CONTAINER TERMINAL AT KANDLA PORT TRUST FOR BERTH NOS 11 AND 12 FOLLOWING THE PRINCIPLES OF 2008 GUIDELINES APPROVED VIDE ORDER DATED 28.11.2014

Sr. No	Particulars	Norms prescribed in the guidelines	Estimates in IInd Revised Proposal of KPT dated 15.11.2014	Estimates in Reference Tariff Order TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28.11.2014	Estimates considered in Order No.TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28.11.2014 modified
I	Optimal capacity				
(i)	Optimal Quay Capacity		Values considered by KPT		
(a)	Values for detemining the quay capacity				
	A = Number of Gantry Cranes deployed for work in an year.	= Berth Length / 100	4.00	4.00	4.00
			=545/100	=545/100	=545/100
			Comes to 5 but considered 4 Nos		
	B = Number of working hours of gantry cranes in an year.	= 24 * 365 hours	8760.00	8760.00	8760.00
			= 24 * 365 hours	= 24 * 365 hours	= 24 * 365 hours
	C = Average number of moves per gantry crane.	= 25 moves per hour	20.00	20.00	20.00
	D = TEU ratio	= 1.3	1.30	1.30	1.30
	E = 70%	= 70%	70%	70%	70%
	Optimal Quay Capacity = A * B * C * D * E in TEUs		637,728	637,728	637,728
	Optimal Quay Capacity considered in tariff comutation (in TEUs)		600,000	637,728	637,728
(ii)	Optimal Yard Capacity				
	G = Total Ground Slot in TEUs	= 720 TEUs per hectare	3662.25	4626	3675.1
			= 285 TEUs* 12.85 hectares	= 360 TEUs* 12.85 hectares	= 286 TEUs* 12.85 hectares
	H = Average Stack height	= 2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
	P = Period in number of days	= 365	365.00	365.00	365.00
	S = Surge factor	= 1.3	1.30	1.30	1.30
	D = Average Dwell Time	= 4 days for Export & 2 days for Import	3.00	3.00	3.00
	Optimal Yard Capacity = 0.7 * G * H * P / S * D In TEUs		599,811	757,656	601,915
	Optimal Yard Capacity (Rounded off)		600,000	757,656	601,915
(iii)	**Optimal capacity of the Terminal - lower value of the optimal quay capacity and optimal stack yard capacity. In the review Order it is considered at 6,00,000 TEUs as considered by the KPT (in TEUs).**		**600,000**	**637,728**	**600,000**
II	Capital Cost				
(i).	Container Handling Activity	Norms wherever prescribed	Rs. In crores	Rs. In crores	Rs. In crores
	(a). Civil Cost	As estimated by the terminal			
	(i). Back up area Devlopment (This includes supporting assets also)	--	64.76	64.76	64.76
	(ii). Water supply civil works	--	0.15	0.15	0.15
	(iii). Devlopement of Land area along the rail siding.	--	3.91	3.91	3.91
	Subtotal (a)		**68.83**	**68.83**	**68.83**
	(b). Mechanical cost				
	(i). Cost of existing equipments to be taken over from KPT -	--	164.42	164.42	164.42
			Upfront payable to KPT Rs. 143.63cr at fair value of assets + estimated repairs on equipments Rs. 20.34cr + 0.45cr repairs of tractor trailers	Upfront payable to KPT Rs. 143.63cr at fair value of assets + estimated repairs on equipments Rs. 20.34cr + 0.45cr repairs of tractor trailers	Upfront payable to KPT Rs. 143.63cr at fair value of assets + estimated repairs on equipments Rs. 20.34cr + 0.45cr repairs of tractor trailers
	(ii) Rubber Tyred Gantry Crane - 4 Nos	3 nos. for each Quay Gantry crane	43.20	43.20	43.20
	(iii) Tractor Trailers- 9 Nos	6 nos. for each Quay Gantry Crane	1.98	3.33	3.33
			9 nos * Rs. 22.0 lakhs	9 nos * Rs. 37.0 lakhs	9 nos * Rs. 37.0 lakhs
	(iv). Installation of Electrical sub-station (LS provided by CME dept.)	--	1.00	1.00	1.00
	(v). Firefighting	--	0.95	0.95	0.95
	(vi). Electrical and illumination systems	--	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Subtotal (b)		**212.55**	**213.90**	**213.90**
	Subtotal (a +b)		**281.38**	**282.73**	**282.73**
	(c) IT System Cost	2% of Civil & Equipment Cost	**5.63**	**5.65**	**5.65**
			2% * Rs. 281.38cr	2% * Rs. 282.73cr	2% * Rs. 282.73cr
	(d). Other Cost	10% of Civil & Equipment Cost	**28.14**	**28.27**	**28.27**
			10% * Rs. 281.38cr	10% * Rs. 282.73cr	10% * Rs. 282.73cr
	(e). Total Capital Cost of the Project (a + b + c + d)		**315.14**	**316.65**	**316.65**

Sr. No	Particulars	Norms prescribed in the guidelines	Estimates in IInd Revised Proposal of KPT dated 15.11.2014		Estimates in Reference Tariff Order TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28.11.2014		Estimates considered in Order No.TAMP/43/2014-KPT dated 28.11.2014 modified	
III	**Operating Cost Estimation**							
	(a). Power Cost	8 KWH per TEU *	4.56		4.84		4.56	
			8 KWH * Rs. 9.49/KWH * 600000TEU's		8 KWH * Rs. 9.49/KWH * 637728TEU's		8 KWH * Rs. 9.49/KWH * 600000TEU's	
	(b). Fuel	4 litres per TEU *	15.16		14.82		13.95	
			4 litres * Rs. 63.15 per litre * 600000TEU's		4 litres * Rs. 58.11 per litre * 637728TEU's		4 litres * Rs. 58.11 per litre * 600000TEU's	
	(c). Repair & Maintenance							
	(i). Civil Assets	1% of cost of Civil assets	0.76		0.76		0.76	
			1% *75.71cr [i.e.Rs 68.83 + 6.88(10% of civil cost towards other cost)]		1% *75.71cr [i.e.Rs 68.83 cr + 6.88(10% of civil cost towards other cost)]		1% *75.71cr [i.e.Rs 68.83 cr + 6.88(10% of civil cost towards other cost)]	
	(ii). Mechanical & Electrical works	2% of cost of	6.16		6.19		6.19	
			2% * 308.16cr [i.e.Rs 212.55cr + 21.26cr (i.e.10% of Mechanical & Electrical cost towards other cost)+74.35cr being the diff. between replacement cost of assets to be handed over by KPT assessed by the valuer appointed by the KPT and fairvalue of assets considered in capex]		2% * 309.64cr [i.e.Rs 213.90cr + 21.39cr (i.e.10% of Mechanical & Electrical cost towards other cost)+74.35cr being the diff. between replacement cost of assets to be handed over by KPT assessed by the valuer appointed by the KPT and fairvalue of assets considered in capex]		2% * 309.64cr [i.e.Rs 213.90cr + 21.39cr (i.e.10% of Mechanical & Electrical cost towards other cost)+74.35cr being the diff. between replacement cost of assets to be handed over by KPT assessed by the valuer appointed by the KPT and fairvalue of assets considered in capex]	
	(iii). IT		0.11		0.11		0.11	
			2% of 5.63		2% of 5.63		2% of 5.63	
	(c). Insurance	1% of Gross fixed assets	3.15		3.17		3.17	
			1% * Rs. 315.14cr		1% * Rs. 316.65cr		1% * Rs. 316.65cr	
	(d). Depreciation	As per Companies Act or						
	(i). Civil works		2.53		2.53		2.53	
			3.34% of Rs75.71cr		3.34% of Rs75.71cr		3.34% of Rs75.71cr	
	(ii). Mechanical & Electrical works		24.18		23.53		23.53	
			10.34% of Rs 233.80cr [i.e.Rs 212.55cr + 21.26cr (i.e.10% of Mechanical & Electrical cost towards other cost)]		10% of Rs 235.29cr [i.e.Rs 213.90cr + 21.39cr (i.e.10% of Mechanical & Electrical cost towards other cost)]		10% of Rs 235.29cr [i.e.Rs 213.90cr + 21.39cr (i.e.10% of Mechanical & Electrical cost towards other cost)]	
	(iii). IT		0.91		0.94		0.94	
			16.21% of Rs 5.63cr		16.67% of Rs 5.65cr		16.67% of Rs 5.65cr	
	(e). License Fee	As per the Rates						
	(i).Land area		7.42		7.42		7.42	
			212034 sq. mtr. * Rs 350.16/ sq. mtr.		212034 sq. mtr. * Rs 350.16/ sq. mtr.		212034 sq. mtr. * Rs 350.16/ sq. mtr.	
	(ii). Water area		--		--		--	
	(f). Other Expenses (for terminals having capacity more than	10% of Gross fixed	31.51		31.66		31.66	
			10% * Rs. 315.14 cr		10% * Rs. 316.65 cr		10% * Rs. 316.65 cr	
	Total Operating Cost (a to f)		**96.45**		**95.98**		**94.82**	
IV	**Annual Revenue Requirement**							
(a).	**Annual Revenue Requirement ARR**							
	(i). Total Operating Cost		96.45		95.98		94.82	
	(ii). Return on capital Employed @ 16%		50.42		50.66		50.66	
	(iii).Total Revenue requirement		**146.87**		**146.64**		**145.48**	
(b).	**Apportionment of Revenue Requirement**	**% of total ARR**						
	(i) Container Handling Charges	90%	90%	132.19	90%	131.98	90%	130.93
	(ii) Storage Charges	7%	7%	10.28	7%	10.27	7%	10.18
	(iii) Miscelleneous Charge	3%	3%	4.41	3%	4.40	3%	4.36
	(iv).Total Revenue requirement (Rs. In lakhs)		**100%**	**146.87**	**100%**	**146.64**	**100%**	**145.48**

ANNEX-II

Detailed computation of tariff for Container Terminal at Berth nos 11 and 12 as furnished by the KPT and modified by TAMP

Particulars	Considered by KPT		Considered by TAMP	
Optimal Capacity	600000	TEUs/Annum	600000	TEUs/Annum
TEUs	323077	70%	323077	70%
FEUs	138462	30%	138462	30%
Total Containers	461538		461538	

Volume Break Up - Assumed for SOR Calculation as furnished by KPT and considered by TAMP		
FEU Rates	1.5	times TEU
Foreign	41.60%	
Coastal	58.40%	

TARIFF COMPUTATION

Sr. No.	Particulars	% of Vol.	Vol. in boxes	Break up of volume		Reference tariff approved in Order No TAMP/43/2013-KPT dated 04.10.2013 for Tuna Tekra Container Terminal (CT)		Revenue estimate at upfront tariff approved for Tuna tekra for traffic reportedly as per the Feasibility Report for CT at Tuna Tekra	Proposed rate arrived by KPT for Berth nos 11 and 12 applying correction foctor of 73.43% for optimal capacity of 6 lacs TEUs		Revised Rate derived by TAMP applying correction factor of 72.73% for optimal capacity of 6,00,000 TUEs		Cross check of Revenue Estimates at rates approved by TAMP		
				20' (in boxes)	40' (in boxes)	Rs./TEU	Rs./FEU	in Rs. Crs.	Rs./TEU	Rs./FEU	Rs./TEU	Rs/ FEU	Rs. in crores for 20'	Rs. in crores for 40'	Total
1	**Total Containers**		**461,538**	323077	138462										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A.	**Handling Charges:**			=3*70%	=3*30%		=6*1.5times	9=((4*6)+(5*7))/10^7					=4*11/10^7	=5*12/10^7	=13+14
2	**Laden:**	**64.07%**													
(i)	**Foreign**	**41.60%**													
(a)	Normal	59.65%	114,547	80,183	34,364	3,755.04	5,632.56	49.46	2,757.22	4,135.84	2,731.04	4,096.56	21.90	14.08	35.98
(b)	ODC	1.56%	2,986	2,090	896	7,510.09	11,265.14	2.58	5,514.46	8,271.68	5,462.09	8,193.13	1.14	0.73	1.88
(c)	Hazardous	0.78%	1,493	1,045	448	4,694.65	7,041.98	0.81	3,447.15	5,170.73	3,414.42	5,121.63	0.36	0.23	0.59
(d)	Reefer	2.08%	4,001	2,801	1,200	3,755.04	5,632.56	1.73	2,757.22	4,135.84	2,731.04	4,096.56	0.76	0.49	1.26
(ii)	**Coastal**	**58.40%**							-	-			-	-	-
(a)	Normal	59.65%	160,778	112,545	48,234	2,253.03	3,379.55	41.66	1,654.34	2,481.51	1,638.63	2,457.94	18.44	11.86	30.30
(b)	ODC	1.56%	4,191	2,934	1,257	4,506.05	6,759.08	2.17	3,308.67	4,963.01	3,277.25	4,915.88	0.96	0.62	1.58
(c)	Hazardous	0.78%	2,096	1,467	629	2,817.13	4,225.70	0.68	2,068.54	3,102.81	2,048.90	3,073.35	0.30	0.19	0.49
(d)	Reefer	2.08%	5,616	3,931	1,685	2,253.03	3,379.55	1.46	1,654.34	2,481.51	1,638.63	2,457.94	0.64	0.41	1.06
(iii)	Transhipment	0.00%	-	-	-	4,043.89	6,065.84	-	2,969.32	4,453.98	2,941.12	4,411.68	-	-	-
3	**Empty:**	35.93%	165,830	116,081	49,749				-	-			-	-	-
(i)	**Normal including Reefer**	35.06%	161,805	113,263	48,541				-	-			-	-	-
(a)	Foreign	41.60%	67,317	47,122	20,195	3,032.92	4,549.38	23.48	2,226.99	3,340.49	2,205.84	3,308.76	10.39	6.68	17.08
(b)	Coastal	58.40%	94,487	66,141	28,346	1,819.75	2,729.63	19.77	1,336.19	2,004.29	1,323.50	1,985.26	8.75	5.63	14.38
(ii)	**ODC**	0.87%	4,025	2,817	1,207				-	-			-	-	-
(a)	Foreign	41.60%	1,675	1,172	502	6,065.83	9,098.75	1.17	4,453.97	6,680.96	4,411.68	6,617.52	0.52	0.33	0.85
(b)	Coastal	58.40%	2,350	1,645	705	3,639.50	5,459.25	0.98	2,672.39	4,008.58	2,647.01	3,970.51	0.44	0.28	0.72
4	**Transport to rail flat from Container Yard and vice versa for lift on / lift off of Rail borne container cargo**	**4.10%**	18,920	13,244	5,676										
(i)	Laden	**64.07%**	**12,122**	**8,485**	**3,637**										
(a)	Normal and Reefer	61.74%	**11,681**	8,176	3,504	1,877.52	2,816.28	2.52	1,378.61	2,067.92	1,365.52	2,048.28	1.12	0.72	1.83
(b)	Hazardous	0.78%	**147**	103	44	2,346.48	3,519.72	0.04	1,722.96	2,584.43	1,706.59	2,559.89	0.02	0.01	0.03
(c)	ODC	1.56%	**294**	206	88	3,755.04	5,632.56	0.13	2,757.22	4,135.84	2,731.04	4,096.56	0.06	0.04	0.09
(ii)	Empty	**35.93%**	**6,798**	**4,758**	**2,039**	1,877.52	2,816.28	1.47	1,378.61	2,067.92	1,365.52	2,048.28	0.65	0.42	1.07

Sr. No.	Particulars	% of Vol.	Vol. in boxes	Break up of volume		Reference tariff approved in Order No TAMP/43/2013-KPT dated 04.10.2013 for Tuna Tekra Container Terminal (CT)		Revenue estimate at upfront tariff approved for Tuna tekra for traffic reportedly as per the Feasibility Report for CT at Tuna Tekra	Proposed rate arrived by KPT for Berth nos 11 and 12 applying correction foctor of 73.43% for optimal capacity of 6 lacs TEUs		Revised Rate derived by TAMP applying correction factor of 72.73% for optimal capacity of 6,00,000 TUEs		Cross check of Revenue Estimates at TAMP rates (to be) approved		
				20' (in boxes)	40' (in boxes)	Rs./TEU	Rs./FEU	in Rs. Crs.	Rs./TEU	Rs./FEU	Rs./TEU	Rs/ FEU	Rs. in crores for 20'	Rs. in crores for 40'	Total
5	**From Container yard to Truck or vice versa (direct delivery and export intake)**	**95.90%**	442,619	309,833	132,786										
(i)	Laden	**64.07%**	**283,587**	**198,511**	**85,076**										
(a)	Normal and Reefer	61.74%	273,262	191,283	81,979	577.70	866.55	18.15	424.19	636.28	420.16	630.24	8.04	5.17	13.20
(b)	Hazardous	0.78%	3,442	2,409	1,032	722.12	1,083.18	0.29	530.23	795.35	525.20	787.80	0.13	0.08	0.21
(c)	ODC	1.56%	6,883	4,818	2,065	1,155.40	1,733.10	0.91	848.38	1,272.57	840.32	1,260.48	0.40	0.26	0.67
(ii)	Empty	**35.93%**	**159,032**	**111,322**	**47,710**	577.70	866.55	10.57	424.19	636.28	420.16	630.24	4.68	3.01	7.68
6	**Total revenue estimated from Container Handling Charges at the rate approved for Tuna Tekra Container Terminal**							**180.02**					79.70	51.23	**130.93**
7	Revenue Requirement from Handling charge as estimated by TAMP (Refer Sl No (IV) (b) (i) in Annex - II)							**130.93**							
								72.73%							
8	**Correction Factor for Rates arrived by TAMP following the approach of the KPT as against 73.43% by KPT**							**72.73%**							

Sr. No.	Particulars	% of Vol.	Vol. in boxes	20'	40'	Ref. Rs./TEU	Ref. Rs./FEU	Revenue	KPT Rs./TEU	KPT Rs./FEU	TAMP Rs./TEU	TAMP Rs./FEU	Cross check 20'	Cross check 40'	Total
Tariff arrived for Miscellaneous Services applying the correction factor of 68.98% arrived for handling charge															
B.	**Miscellaneous Services**														
						Per Box Rate			Per Box Rate		Per Box Rate				
9. (i)	**Hatch cover handling-** Without landing on quay														
(a)	Foreign						4,225.48			3,102.66		3,073.19			
(b)	Coastal						2,535.29			1,861.59		1,843.92			
(ii)	With landing on quay									-		-			
(a)	Foreign						1,689.94			1,240.88		1,229.09			
(b)	Coastal						1,013.97			744.53		737.46			
						Rs./TEU	Rs./FEU		Rs./TEU	Rs./FEU	Rs./TEU	Rs./FEU			
10	**Shifting of Containers**								-		-				
(i)	Containers shifted from one yard to another yard within the terminal for the purpose of custom inspection or any other purpose and subsequent loading of containers for delivery.					2,432.46	3,648.69		1,786.09	2,679.13	1,769.13	2,653.69			
(ii)	Containers stacked in designated yard for custom examination or for any other purpose by prior arrangement.					286.10	429.15		210.08	315.11	208.08	312.12	No detailed Revenue estimation furnished by KPT. Hence not possible to cross check. The approach adopted by KPT of applying Correction Factor of handling charged is applied misc. services as done by the KPT.		
11	**Restow handling**														
(i)	**Hatch to Hatch (involving one move only)**														
(a)	Foreign					1,408.30	2,112.45		1,034.08	1,551.11	1,024.26	1,536.38			
(b)	Coastal					844.98	1,267.47		620.45	930.67	614.55	921.83			
(ii)	**Other than that mentioned in (i)**								-	-	-	-			
(a)	Foreign					5,633.77	8,450.66		4,136.72	6,205.09	4,097.44	6,146.16			
(b)	Coastal					3,380.26	5,070.39		2,482.03	3,723.05	2,458.46	3,687.69			
12	**Refer Containers - Electricity connection, monitoring & Disconnection**					281.66	422.49		206.82	310.22	204.85	307.28			

STORAGE CHARGE COMPUTATION

Sl. No.	Particulars	Reference tariff approved in Order No TAMP/43/2013-KPT dated 04.10.2013 for Tuna Tekra Container TerminalReference tariff approved in Order No TAMP/43/2013-KPT dated 04.10.2013 for Tuna Tekra Container Terminal			Proposed rate arrived by KPT for Berth nos 11 and 12 applying correction factor of 73.43% as arrived for Handling Charge			Revised Rate derived by TAMP applying correction factor of 72.73% as arrived for Handling Charge		
		Rate per container per day or part thereof (in `)			Rate per container per day or part thereof (in `)			Revised Rate per container per day or part thereof (in `)		
		Upto 20' in length	Over 20' to upto 40' in length	Above 40' in length	Upto 20' in length	Over 20' to upto 40' in length	Above 40' in length	Upto 20' in length	Over 20' to upto 40' in length	Above 40' in length
1	Non-ICD/ CFS Import - loaded	Non-ICD/ CFS Import - loaded								
	First 2 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	3-6 days	459.19	918.37	1377.56	337.17	674.33	1011.50	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	546.23	1092.46	1638.69	401.08	802.16	1203.25	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	649.67	1299.35	1949.02	477.04	954.08	1431.11	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	772.04	1544.08	2316.11	566.89	1133.78	1700.66	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	1091.2	2182.4	3273.59	801.24	1602.48	2403.71	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	1298.08	2596.17	3894.25	953.14	1906.30	2859.44	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1542.81	3085.63	4628.44	1132.84	2265.69	3398.54	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
2	Non-ICD/ CFS Import - Empty	Non-ICD/ CFS Import - Empty								
	First 2 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	3-6 days	459.19	918.37	1377.56	337.17	674.33	1011.50	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	546.23	1092.46	1638.69	401.08	802.16	1203.25	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	649.67	1299.35	1949.02	477.04	954.08	1431.11	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	772.04	1544.08	2316.11	566.89	1133.78	1700.66	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	1091.2	2182.4	3273.59	801.24	1602.48	2403.71	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	1298.08	2596.17	3894.25	953.14	1906.30	2859.44	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1542.81	3085.63	4628.44	1132.84	2265.69	3398.54	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
3	Non-ICD/ CFS Export - Loaded	Non-ICD/ CFS Export - Loaded								
	First 3 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	4-6 days	459.19	918.37	1377.56	337.17	674.33	1011.50	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	546.23	1092.46	1638.69	401.08	802.16	1203.25	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	649.67	1299.35	1949.02	477.04	954.08	1431.11	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	772.04	1544.08	2316.11	566.89	1133.78	1700.66	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	1091.2	2182.4	3273.59	801.24	1602.48	2403.71	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	1298.08	2596.17	3894.25	953.14	1906.30	2859.44	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1542.81	3085.63	4628.44	1132.84	2265.69	3398.54	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
4	Non-ICD/ CFS Export - Empty	Non-ICD/ CFS Export - Empty								
	First 3 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	4-6 days	459.19	918.37	1377.56	337.17	674.33	1011.50	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	546.23	1092.46	1638.69	401.08	802.16	1203.25	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	649.67	1299.35	1949.02	477.04	954.08	1431.11	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	772.04	1544.08	2316.11	566.89	1133.78	1700.66	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days *****	1091.2	2182.4	**33273.59**	801.24	1602.48	**24431.89**	793.63	1587.26	**2380.88**
	23-26 days	1298.08	2596.17	3894.25	953.14	1906.30	2859.44	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1542.81	3085.63	4628.44	1132.84	2265.69	3398.54	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
5	CFS Import loaded - moved by road	CFS Import loaded - moved by road								
	First 2 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	3-6 days	459.19	918.37	1377.56	337.17	674.33	1011.50	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	546.23	1092.46	1638.69	401.08	802.16	1203.25	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	649.67	1299.35	1949.02	477.04	954.08	1431.11	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	772.04	1544.08	2316.11	566.89	1133.78	1700.66	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	1091.2	2182.4	3273.59	801.24	1602.48	2403.71	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	1298.08	2596.17	3894.25	953.14	1906.30	2859.44	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1542.81	3085.63	4628.44	1132.84	2265.69	3398.54	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
6	CFS Import empty - moved by road	CFS Import empty - moved by road								
	First 2 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	3-6 days	459.19	918.37	1377.56	337.17	674.33	1011.50	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	546.23	1092.46	1638.69	401.08	802.16	1203.25	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	649.67	1299.35	1949.02	477.04	954.08	1431.11	472.50	945.02	1417.52

	13-15 days	772.04	1544.08	2316.11	566.89	1133.78	1700.66	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	1091.2	2182.4	3273.59	801.24	1602.48	2403.71	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	1298.08	2596.17	3894.25	953.14	1906.30	2859.44	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1542.81	3085.63	4628.44	1132.84	2265.69	3398.54	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
7	CFS Export loaded - moved by road	CFS Export loaded - moved by road								
	First 3 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	4-6 days	459.19	918.37	1377.56	337.17	674.33	1011.50	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	546.23	1092.46	1638.69	401.08	802.16	1203.25	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	649.67	1299.35	1949.02	477.04	954.08	1431.11	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	772.04	1544.08	2316.11	566.89	1133.78	1700.66	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	1091.2	2182.4	3273.59	801.24	1602.48	2403.71	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	1298.08	2596.17	3894.25	953.14	1906.30	2859.44	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1542.81	3085.63	4628.44	1132.84	2265.69	3398.54	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
8	CFS Export empty - moved by road	CFS Export empty - moved by road								
	First 3 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	4-6 days	459.19	918.37	1377.56	337.17	674.33	1011.50	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	546.23	1092.46	1638.69	401.08	802.16	1203.25	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	649.67	1299.35	1949.02	477.04	954.08	1431.11	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	772.04	1544.08	2316.11	566.89	1133.78	1700.66	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	1091.2	2182.4	3273.59	801.24	1602.48	2403.71	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	1298.08	2596.17	3894.25	953.14	1906.30	2859.44	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1542.81	3085.63	4628.44	1132.84	2265.69	3398.54	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
9	ICD Import and Export loaded or empty - moved by rail	ICD Import and Export loaded or empty - moved by rail								
	First 5 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	6-15 days	917.11	1834.22	2751.33	673.41	1346.82	2020.23	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	16-30 days	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
	Thereafter	3670.97	7341.93	11012.9	2695.49	5390.98	8086.47	2669.90	5339.79	8009.68
10	Transhipment - Loaded	Transhipment - Loaded								
	First 15 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	16-30 days	1835.48	3670.97	5506.45	1347.74	2695.49	4043.24	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
	Thereafter	3670.97	7341.93	11012.9	2695.49	5390.98	8086.47	2669.90	5339.79	8009.68
11	Transhipment - Empty									
	First 7 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	8-15 days	1091.2	2182.4	3273.59	801.24	1602.48	2403.71	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	Thereafter	3670.97	7341.93	11012.9	2695.49	5390.98	8086.47	2669.90	5339.79	8009.68

Note: * The rate for above 40' container at Sr. No. 4 of the slab 19-22 days in the Order No.TAMP/43/2013+A93-KPT dated 04.10.2013 at Tuna Tekra shows typographical error. The revised rate by TAMP is arrived by considering the correct rate of Tuna Tekra which should be Rs.3273.59 instead of Rs.33273.59 and applying Revised correction factor of 72.73% and revised rate comes to Rs.2380.88

Annex - III

KANDLA PORT TRUST

Reference Tariff Schedule for Operation and Maintenance of Container Terminal at 11th and 12th Berths on BOT Basis at Kandla Port on "as is where is" basis

CHAPTER 1 – DEFINITIONS & GENERAL TERMS & CONDITIONS

1.1. DEFINITIONS – GENERAL

(i). **“Coastal vessel”** shall mean any vessel exclusively employed in trading between any port or place in India to any other port or place in India having a valid coastal licence issued by the competent authority.

(ii). **“Foreign-going vessel”** shall mean any vessel other than Coastal vessel.

(iii). **“FCL”** means Containers said to contain Full Container Load.

(iv). **“LCL”** means Containers said to contain Less than full Container Load (Container having cargo of more than one importer/exporter).

(v). **“Hazardous container”** means a Container containing hazardous goods as classified under IMO.

(vi). **“Import container”** means a container discharged from one vessel, stored in container yard and transported out through Road or Train.

(vii). **“Export container”** means a container arrived by road or Train, stored in container yard and loaded on the assigned vessel.

(viii). **“Port area”** means the custom bound area / Port operational Area of the Port.

(ix). **“Normal Container”** shall mean general type containers, not falling under special categories mentioned subsequently.

(x). **“Reefer Container”** shall mean a refrigerated container used for carriage of perishable goods with provision for electrical supply to maintain the desired temperature.

(xi). **“Hazardous Container”** shall mean a container containing hazardous goods as classified under IMO.

(xii). **“Transhipment Container”** shall mean a container, which is discharged from one vessel, stored in the yard and transported through other vessel.

(xiii). **“Over dimensional Container”** shall mean a container carrying over dimensional cargo beyond the normal size of standard container and needing special devices like slings, shackles, lifting beam etc. They also include damaged containers and other types which require special devices.

(xiv). **“Shut out Container”** shall mean a container which enters into the port as an export intake for a particular vessel (as indicated by the Vessel Identification Advice Number, i.e. VIA No.) and is not connected to the particular vessel for reasons whatsoever, then the container is termed to be a shutout container.

(xv). **“Back To Town Container”** shall mean a container entering the port for export but unable to be exported for whatever reason and taken back to town.

(xvi). “**VIAN**” means Vessel Identification Advise Number**.**

1.2. GENERAL TERMS & CONDITIONS

(i) (a). A foreign going vessel of Indian Flag having a General Trading Licence can convert to Coastal run on the basis of a Customs Conversion Order.

(b). A foreign going vessel of Foreign Flag can convert to coastal run on the basis of a Coastal Voyage Licence issued by the Director General of Shipping.

(c). In cases of such conversion, coastal rates shall be chargeable by the load port from the time the vessel starts loading coastal goods.

(d). In cases of such conversion coastal rates shall be chargeable only till the vessel completes coastal cargo discharging operations; immediately thereafter, foreign going rates shall be chargeable by the discharge ports.

(e). For dedicated Indian coastal vessels having a Coastal Licence from the Director General of Shipping, no other document will be required to be entitled to Coastal rates.

(ii). The status of the vessel, as borne out by its certification by the Customs or the Director General of Shipping, shall be the deciding factor for classifying into 'coastal' or 'foreign going' category for the purpose of levying vessel related charges; and, the nature of cargo or its origin will not be of any relevance for this purpose.

(iii). Vessel related charges shall be levied on Shipowners/Steamer Agents.

(iv). (a). The Vessel related charges for all Coastal vessels should not exceed 60% of the corresponding charges for other vessels.

(b). The container related charges for all Coastal should not exceed 60% of the normal container related charges.

(c). In case of container related charges, the concession is applicable on composite box rate. Where itemized charges are levied, the concession will be on all the relevant charges for ship-shore transfer, and transfer from / to quay to / from storage yard as well as wharfage on cargo and containers.

(d). For the purpose of this concession, container from a foreign port which reaches an Indian Port 'A' for subsequent transhipment to Indian Port 'B' will also qualify insofar as the charges relevant for its coastal voyage. In other words, cargo/containers from/to Indian Ports carried by vessels permitted to undertake coastal voyage will qualify for the concession.

(e). The charges for coastal containers / vessels shall be denominated and collected in Indian Rupee.

(v). Interest on delayed payments / refunds:

(a). The user shall pay penal interest on delayed payments under this Scale of Rates. Likewise, the operator shall pay penal interest on delayed refunds.

(b). The rate of penal interest will be 2% above the Prime Lending Rate of State Bank of India (SBI). The penal interest rate will apply to both the operator and the port users equally.

(c). The delay in refunds will be counted only 20 days from the date of completion of services or on production of all the documents required from the users, whichever is later.

(d). The delay in payments by the users will be counted only 10 days after the date of raising the bills by the operator. This provision shall, however, not apply to the cases where payment is to be made before availing the services / use of Port Trust's properties as stipulated in the Major Port Trust Act and / or where payment of charges in advance is prescribed as a condition in this Scale of Rates.

(vi). All charges worked out shall be rounded off to the next higher rupee on the grand total of each bill.

(vii). (a). The rates prescribed in this Scale of Rates are ceiling levels; likewise, rebates and discounts are floor levels. The operator may, if he so desires, charge lower rates and / or allow higher rebates and discounts.

(b). The Operator may also, if it so desires, rationalize the prescribed conditionalities governing the application of rates prescribed in the Scale of Rates if such rationalization gives relief to the user in rate per unit and the unit rates prescribed in the Scale of Rates do not exceed the ceiling levels. Provided that the operator should notify the public such lower rates and / or rationalization of the conditionalities governing the application of such rates and continue to notify the public any further changes in such lower rates and / or in the conditionalities governing the application of such rates provided the new rates fixed shall not exceed the rates notified by the TAMP.

(viii). The users will not be required to pay charges for delays beyond a reasonable level attributable to the operator.

CHAPTER 2 – VESSEL RELATED CHARGES

Vessel Related Charges shall continue being collected by Kandla Port Trust as per the terms and conditions of Scale of Rates of KPT as revised from time to time.

CHAPTER 3 – CHARGES FOR SERVICES RENDERED TO CONTAINERS AND CONTAINERIZED CARGO

GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS:

(i). A container originally declared as transhipment container, subsequently moved by rail or road will lose its identity as a transhipment container and shall be treated as a normal import container and prescribed charges as applicable shall be payable.

(ii). Containers less than and up to 20' will be reckoned as one TEU (Twenty Equivalent Unit) and more then 20' and up to 40' will be reckoned as one FEU (Forty Equivalent Unit) for the purpose of tariff.

(iii). All charges for containers more than 20' in length and upto 40' in length will be 150 per cent of the applicable charges prescribed.

(iv). Containers other than that of standard size requiring special devices/slings/handling will be charged twice the applicable rates. Such containers will also include damaged containers and any other type requiring special devices.

3.1. CHARGES FOR HANDLING AND MOVEMENT OF CONTAINERS:

The following consolidated charges for handling and movement of container shall be payable by the Shipping Lines or Agents of vessels or cargo agents for services rendered in respect of containers and containerised cargo passing through the port.

A. Normal Containers

Sl. No.	Description	Rate per TEU (in ₹)			
		Foreign Container		Coastal Container	
		Loaded	Empty	Loaded	Empty
1	From Ship to container yard or vice versa	2731.04	2205.84	1638.63	1323.50
2	From container yard to Railway flat or vice versa (ICD Container Rail only)	1365.52	1365.52	1365.52	1365.52
3	From Container yard to Truck or vice versa (direct delivery and export intake)	420.16	420.16	420.16	420.16

B. Reefer Containers

Sl. No.	Description	Rate per TEU (in `)			
		Foreign Container		Coastal Container	
		Loaded	Empty	Loaded	Empty
1	From Ship to container yard or vice versa	2731.04	2205.84	1638.63	1323.50
2	From container yard to Railway flat or vice versa (ICD Container Rail only)	1365.52	1365.52	1365.52	1365.52
3	From Container yard to Truck or vice versa (direct delivery and export intake)	420.16	420.16	420.16	420.16

C. Hazardous Containers

Sl. No.	Description	Rate per TEU (in `)	
		Foreign Container	Coastal Container
		Loaded	Loaded
1	From Ship to container yard or vice versa	3414.42	2048.90
2	From Container yard to Railway flat or vice versa (ICD Container Rail only)	1706.59	1706.59
3	From Container yard to Truck or vice versa (direct delivery and export intake).	525.20	525.20

D. Transhipment Containers

Sl. No.	Description	Rate per TEU (in `)			
		Foreign Container		Coastal Container	
		Loaded	Empty	Loaded	Empty
1	1 – 3000 TEUs	3151.20	2731.04	1890.72	1638.63
2	3001 – 6000 TEUs	2941.12	2520.97	1764.67	1512.58
3	6001 – 9000 TEUs	2731.04	2310.88	1638.63	1386.52
4	Thereafter	2520.97	2100.80	1512.58	1260.48

Notes:

(1). Rate is based on total TEUs brought by the Shipping Lines or agents in the same financial year.

(2). A container originally declared as transhipment container, subsequently moved by rail or road will lose its identity as a transhipment container and shall be treated as a normal import container and prescribed charges as applicable shall be payable.

E. Over Dimensional Cargo Containers

Sl. No.	Description	Rate per TEU (in `)			
		Foreign Container		Coastal Container	
		Loaded	Empty	Loaded	Empty
1	From Ship to container yard or vice versa	5462.09	4411.68	3277.25	2647.01
2	From container yard to Railway flat or vice versa (ICD Container Rail only)	2731.04	2731.04	2731.04	2731.04
3	From Container yard to Truck or vice versa (direct delivery and export intake)	840.32	840.32	840.32	840.32

Note: The consolidated charges as above include the following elements, viz. stevedoring, use of Gantry crane, use of transfer crane, wharfage on tare weight of containers, wharfage on containerized cargo, transportation and contribution towards railway infrastructure.

3.2. DWELL TIME CHARGES FOR CONTAINER, STORED IN THE PORT PREMISES:

Sl. No.	Particulars	Rate per container per day or part thereof (in `)		
		Upto 20' in length	Over 20' to upto 40' in length	Above 40' in length
1	Non-ICD/ CFS Import - loaded			
	First 2 days	Free	Free	Free
	3-6 days	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
2	Non-ICD/ CFS Import - Empty			
	First 2 days	Free	Free	Free
	3-6 days	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
3	Non-ICD/ CFS Export - Loaded			
	First 3 days	Free	Free	Free
	4-6 days	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	472.50	945.02	1417.52

Sl. No.	Particulars	Rate per container per day or part thereof (in `)		
		Upto 20' in length	Over 20' to upto 40' in length	Above 40' in length
	13-15 days	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
4	Non-ICD/ CFS Export - Empty			
	First 3 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	4-6 days	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	793.63	1587.26	**2380.88**
	23-26 days	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
5	CFS Import loaded - moved by road			
	First 2 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	3-6 days	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
6	CFS Import empty - moved by road			
	First 2 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	3-6 days	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
7	CFS Export loaded - moved by road			
	First 3 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	4-6 days	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	472.50	945.02	1417.52

Sl. No.	Particulars	Rate per container per day or part thereof (in `)		
		Upto 20' in length	Over 20' to upto 40' in length	Above 40' in length
	13-15 days	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
8	CFS Export empty - moved by road			
	First 3 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	4-6 days	333.97	667.93	1001.90
	7-9 days	397.27	794.55	1191.82
	10-12 days	472.50	945.02	1417.52
	13-15 days	561.50	1123.01	1684.51
	16-18 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	19-22 days	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	23-26 days	944.09	1888.19	2832.29
	27-30 days	1122.09	2244.18	3366.26
	Thereafter	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
9	ICD Import and Export loaded or empty - moved by rail			
	First 5 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	6-15 days	667.01	1334.03	2001.04
	16-30 days	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
	Thereafter	2669.90	5339.79	8009.68
10	Transhipment - Loaded			
	First 15 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	16-30 days	1334.94	2669.90	4004.84
	Thereafter	2669.90	5339.79	8009.68
11	Transhipment - Empty			
	First 7 days	**Free**	**Free**	**Free**
	8-15 days	793.63	1587.26	2380.88
	Thereafter	2669.90	5339.79	8009.68

Notes:

(1). The total storage period for a container shall be reckoned from the day following the day of landing upto the day of shipment/delivery/date of removal of the container and includes Sundays and Holidays but excludes Custom notified holidays and port non working days.

(2). Transhipment containers subsequently changing the mode of dispatch locally or to the container freight station for destuffing/stuffing shall loose the concessional dwell time as prescribed in Item (4) above. Dwell time charges for such containers shall be recovered at par with import containers as prescribed in item no. 1 or 2 as applicable.

(3). Transhipment containers subsequently changing the mode of dispatch by rail to ICD shall be treated as other ICD containers for the purpose of levy of Dwell time charges fees and shall be charged at the rates in item (4) above. In such cases additional shifting charge will be applicable for movement of container to container yard to ICD yard.

(4). A container from foreign port landing at the container terminal for subsequent transhipment to an Indian Port on a coastal voyage or vice versa would be charged at 50% of the transhipment charges prescribed for foreign going vessels and 50% of that prescribed for coastal category.

(5). Normal import containers subsequently changing the mode of dispatch by rail to ICD will enjoy the free period applicable to normal import container only. In such cases additional shifting charges will be applicable for movement of container from container yard to ICD yard.

(6). The total storage period for a shutout container shall be calculated from the day following the day when the container has become shutout till the day of Shipment/ delivery.

(7). Over high and over dimensional containers shall attract thrice the normal applicable charges.

(8). Hazardous containers shall attract 1.25 times the normal applicable charges.

(9). In case of stuffing the containers inside the port, the dwell time charges will be applicable as follows:
   (i). Prior to stuffing, dwell time charges as applicable to empty containers will be charged.
   (ii). Free period and dwell time charges as applicable to loaded export containers will be charged from the day following the day of completion of stuffing and intimation to Port.

(10). In the case of auction containers, after the auction is over, the empty containers will attract the dwell time charges as empty containers from the following day the destuffing is completed.

(11). The storage charges shall not accrue for the period during which the Terminal is not in a position to deliver containers for reasons attributable to it when requested by the user.

(12). The storage charges on abandoned FCL containers/shipper owned containers shall be levied upto the date of receipt of intimation of abandonment in writing or 75 days from the day of landing of the container, whichever is earlier subject to the following:

   (i). The consignee can issue a letter of abandonment at any time.

   (ii). If the consignee chooses not to issue such letter of abandonment, the container Agent/MLO can also issue abandonment letter subject to the condition that,

      (a). the Line shall resume custody of container along with cargo and either take back it or remove it from the port premises; and

      (b). the line shall pay all port charges accrued on the cargo and container before resuming custody of the container.

   (iii). The container Agent / MLO shall observe the necessary formalities and bear the cost of transportation and destuffing. In case of their failure to take such action within the stipulated period, the storage charge on container shall be continued to be levied till such time all the necessary actions are taken by the shipping lines for destuffing of cargo.

   (iv). Where the container is seized/confiscated by the Custom Authorities and the same cannot be destuffed within the prescribed time limit of 75 days, the storage charges will cease to apply from the day the Custom order release of the cargo subject to lines observing the necessary formalities and bearing the cost of transportation and de-stuffing. Otherwise, seized/confiscated containers should be removed by the line/consignee from the port premises to the Customs bonded area and in that case the storage charge shall cease to apply from theday of such removal.

3.3 CHARGES FOR MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES RENDERED TO THE CONTAINER VESSELS:

A. Reefer Monitoring and Connection

Sl. No.	Description	Rate Per TEU (in `)			
		Foreign Going Vessel		Coastal Vessel (in `)	
		Loaded	Empty	Loaded	Empty
1	Additional charges per 4 hours or part thereof for electricity consumption and monitoring of reefer containers	204.85	204.85	204.85	204.85

Note:

Additional electricity charge at the prescribed rates will be applicable in case of Reefer Containers also.

B. Other Services Rendered

Sl. No.	Description	Rate Per TEU (in `)			
		Foreign Going Vessel		Coastal Vessel	
		Loaded	Empty	Loaded	Empty
1	Shifting of containers from one yard to another yard within the terminal for customs inspection or any other purpose and subsequent loading of containers for delivery.	1769.13	1769.13	1769.13	1769.13
2	Additional service charges for stacking containers in designated yard for custom examination or for any other purpose by prior arrangement.	208.08	208.08	208.08	208.08

C. Opening of Hatch Cover and Replacing it

Sl. No.	Description	Rate per Hatch Cover (in `)	
		Foreign Going Vessels	Coastal Vessels
1	When placing it on the Quay	3073.19	1843.92
2	Without placing it on the Quay	1229.09	737.46

Note: If only one operation is carried out, half of the hatch cover handling charges as above shall be levied.

D. One Hatch to Another Hatch or within the Same Hatch

Sl. No.	Description	Rate per TEU (in `)			
		Foreign Going Vessels		Coastal Vessels	
		Loaded	Empty	Loaded	Empty
(a)	Hatch to hatch shifting (involving 1 move only)	1024.26	1024.26	614.55	614.55
(b)	Other than (a) mentioned above	4097.44	4097.44	2458.46	2458.46

4. GENERAL NOTE TO CHAPTER- 2 AND 3:

The tariff caps will be indexed to inflation but only to an extent of 60% of the variation in Wholesale Price Index (WPI) occurring between 1 January 2014 and 1 January of the relevant year. Such automatic adjustment of tariff caps will be made every year and the adjusted tariff caps will come into force from 1 April of the relevant year to 31 March of the following year.
