TARIFF AUTHORITY FOR MAJOR PORTS

NOTIFICATION

Gazette No.99 New Delhi 08 December 1999

No.TAMP/90/99-TPT - In exercise of the powers conferred by Sections 48, 49, and 50 of the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (38 of 1963), the Tariff Authority for Major Ports hereby fixes the Scale of Rates for the Tuticorin Container Terminal operated by the PSA SICAL Terminals Limited as in the Order appended hereto.

Case No.TAMP/90/99-TPT

THE PSA SICAL TERMINALS LIMITED … APPLICANT

O R D E R

(Passed on this 8th day of December 1999)

The PSA SICAL Terminals Limited has submitted a proposal for fixation of tariff for their Container Terminal at the Tuticorin Port Trust (TPT). This case relates to their proposal.

2.1. The Tuticorin Container Terminal operated by the PSA SICAL Terminals Limited has an operations and maintenance contract with the TPT on BOT basis for 30 years. The terminal is reported to be ready to commence operations in December 99. Modifications work on the berth and the standing yard, and construction of an Administrative Building have been completed. The terminal has also received and installed two Quay Cranes and four Rubber-Tyred Gantry Cranes.

2.2. The PSA SICAL Terminals Limited has requested for approval of the Tariff in US Dollar denomination. It has been stated that they have proposed the **existing** Chennai Port Trust (CHPT) Scale of Rates (valid from 1992). The charges at this Terminal, it has been claimed, will be the lowest among the Chennai, Cochin and Tuticorin Ports. The Applicant company has also stated that its aim is to deliver higher productivity to their customers at the lowest possible price.

2.3. It has further been stated that its major capital cost is inevitable as its licence agreement requires import of at least six new container-handling equipment. The import duty of 53.82% will further increase the cost by a significant quantum. The cost of equipment forms a majority of the project capital expenditure.

2.4. The PSA SICAL Terminals Limited has further reported that it has been successful in obtaining the Export Promotion of Capital Goods (EPCG) Licence and, consequently, the import duties have been reduced to 11%. The reduced import duties have enabled it to reduce the project cost substantially. The terms of the EPCG licence require it to earn in US dollars, within five years from the date of issue of the EPCG licence, an amount equivalent to 4 times the CIF value of the imported equipment. Failing this, a penalty charge will be imposed which amounts to the duty saved plus a 24% interest rate thereon. The applicant has requested that, in order to avoid this penalty, the proposed tariff rates be denominated in US dollar as the existing practice of some Major Ports to charge only storage charges and vessel hatches in US dollars is insufficient to meet the EPCG condition. It has also pointed out that the TPT supports US dollar denominated tariff. According to the Applicant, this will have no adverse impact on Customers, Shippers, Consignees and the economy of India.

2.5. Stating that the proposed tariff structure is based on certain assumptions which will undergo changes as it gains some operating experience, this Authority has been requested to extend the same flexibility for the adjustment of tariff as has been done in the case of the Nhava Sheva International Container Terminal (NSICT).

3. The proposal was preliminarily examined by the Authority with reference to which examination appropriate corrections were made by the Applicant.

4. In accordance with our established procedure, this (amended) proposal was circulated for comments to the Tuticorin Port Trust (TPT), the Tuticorin Chamber of Commerce and Industry (TCCI), the Shipping Corporation of India (SCI), the Indian National Shipowners' Association (INSA), the Container Shipping Lines Association (CSLA), the Tuticorin Stevedores' Association, the Tuticorin Steamer Agents' Association, the Customs Licenced Agents' Association, and the Tuticorin Port Handling Agents' Association.

5.1. The important points raised by the above organisations in their comments are summarised below:

<u>The Tuticorin Steamer Agents' Association:</u>

(i). Container Handling charges shall be collected in Indian Rupees only and not in Dollar Terms.

(ii). The PSA SICAL container handling charges shall be at par with the present handling charges at the TPT. The proposed rate is much higher than the TPT rate.

(iii). The proposed rate is for delivery at the TCT only. Further additional charges will therefore have to be incurred to move the container to CY or vise versa. If these charges are taken into account, the proposed handling charges will be very high.

(iv). Proposed lashing / unlashing / stowage planning and supervision charges are to be eliminated in the tariff.

(v). For opening / closing Hatch Covers to be fixed as USD 75 (maximum) per vessel.

<u>The Shipping Corporation of India:</u>

(i). The proposed rates are very high (almost 100% more) as compared to existing Tuticorin Terminal Tariff.

(ii). Stevedoring charges at the TPT is presently Rs.375 / Rs.650 for 20' / 40' containers whereas as the proposed tariff is Rs.750 / Rs.1125 respectively.

(iii). The PSA SICAL Terminals Limited have formulated their tariff for transhipment containers on the basis of slabs of 400 TEUs per calendar month, per container operator. This aspect may be revised and reduced to 200 TEUs per calendar month per operator for attracting more traffic.

(iv). Proposed rates for loaded as well as empty container are same. As per international norms the rates for 20' / 40' empty containers are only 40-50% of a 20' / 40' loaded container.

(v). The PSA SICAL must allow facility to the exporters / importers to receive their containers directly at hook point and transport them from the port to private CFSs / factory premises.

(vi). Container related and handling charge including ground rent shall be charged in Indian rupees.

(vii). The proposed tariff does not contain a coastal tariff for containers forwarded from / to other Indian Ports as transhipment hub Ports. It is proposed that a Coastal Tariff for containers to be introduced.

(viii). The approved tariff may be valid for a minimum period of 3-5 years.

<u>The Customs Licenced Agents' Association:</u>

(i). They shall be taken into confidence to avoid imposing the rates and operational terms at Terminal, etc., at the last minute.

(ii). Since the trade is under recession any extra cost cannot be absorbed by the trade. Therefore to take all steps to maintain the present prevailing rates for the Cargo Related Charges.

(iii). The beneficiaries of this terminal will be the feeder operators, MLO who will be saving quite a lot. This should be taken into consideration while fixing the rates.

(iv). Ensure that the Terminal Handling Charges is maintained at the same rates in order to be competitive with the neighbouring Ports. This shall be collected in Indian Rupee only.

(v). Cut of time - Commencement of loading for feeder vessels.
- Commencement of discharge for main line vessels.

(vi). Free days - 10 working days for export and import.

(vii). Credit facility to be considered.

(viii). Volume / Group discount to be given.

(ix). Period for which the agreed rate will be valid.

The Container Shipping Lines Association:

(i). The tariff proposed represents a substantial cost increase as compared to present levels and recognise that the PSA SICAL will doubtless bring / warrant some productivity increase. However, the charge proposed seems unnecessarily steep.

(ii). The logic supporting a change to a dollar based tariff is unclear. This needs to be expressed more clearly as this is a fundamental change in current practice.

(iii). In the event that the Government of India rules that a dollar based tariff be allowed, then the Lines **must** reserve the right to charge THCs to the trade in the same currency as they cannot accept the financial risks involved if they are not allowed this right.

(iv). The proposed ground rent charges are too high, being apparently based upon a scale of rates in Chennai which are currently under litigation. This comparison would therefore appear to be misleading.

The Tuticorin Port Trust:

(i). The proposed tariff is more or less the same as that of the tariff given by the Port Trust in the Bid document. Hence there is no objection to the proposed tariff.

(ii). The TPT strongly opposes any reduction of the proposed tariff due to the following reasons:-

- (a). The pre-revised tariff of the TPT are higher only in the following items:

  - (i). 1.3 (b) – Lift on or Lift off charges by other equipments.
  - (ii). 1.10 – wharfage Empty Containers 20’ and 40’.
  - (iii). Storage Charges – 2nd slab for 20’.

- (b). If the pricing is made on the basis of the cost, efficiency and estimated traffic, the tariff should be three times more than the tariff proposed. The PSA SICAL has shown a good gesture to the trade by proposing the tariff on the principle of “what the trade can bear”. Any reduction shall be detrimental to the interest of the PSA SICAL and the Port Trust.

- (c). The proposed tariff is a competitive one in comparison with the neighbouring Ports of Cochin and Chennai.

(iii). The TPT has no objection to fix the terminal handling tariff in US dollar, subject to the fixation of royalty also in US dollar in the same exchange rate.

(iv). The TPT allows five days' free time for storage at the container yard. The PSA SICAL proposes to provide three days free time. Since both the yards are inside the security wall in the main line operators can plan the dwell time of the containers intended for stuffing / de-stuffing in the Port yard to enjoy the free time of both yards in full and monitor their stay in both the yards to evade the container rentals what they would have paid had there been one yard inside the security wall. It will, therefore, be necessary to issue orders to the effect that dwell time inside the security wall shall be considered in total. For example, a container landed on 1st of a month in the BOT Berth, coming to Port Yard after 5 days, shall not avail any free time in the Port Yard and it will be charged rent at rates specified in the appropriate slab considering the total dwell time inside the security wall.

5.2. The comments received from the above organisations were sent to the PSA SICAL Terminals Limited by way of feed-back information.

6.1. A joint hearing in the case was held on 15 November 99 at the TPT. During the course of the joint hearing the following submissions were made:-

<u>Tuticorin Port Trust:</u>

(i). The TPT strongly opposes any reduction in the tariff.

(ii). 'Cost plus' can be an approach.

(iii). 'What cargo can bear' cannot be the only factor. There has to be a balancing.

(iv). The TPT has asked for a 25% increase of tariff whereas the CHPT has asked for a 40% increase in container charges.

(v). There is no need to dollarise. There can always be a revision if the exchange rate fluctuates beyond a certain level.

(vi). There is a need to introduce uniform 'free days' between the Ports. This may take time. In the meanwhile, at least treat the TPT and the PSA as one unit. Introduce uniformity in free time.

(vii). Direct delivery at hook point is not desirable. This will cause confusion.

<u>The Shipping Corporation of India :</u>

(i). Peg PSA SICAL rate at current TPT rates.

(ii). Different charges may be levied for empty and loaded containers.

(iii). PSA SICAL shall not become a monopoly. Guard against this.

(iv). Direct delivery at hook point will avoid costs of travel to Container Yard, etc.

(v). THC is already high. If it is dollarised, it will become higher.

(vi). Free period for ground rent is only 3 days which is inadequate. Raise it to 5 or 7 days.

(vii). Transhipment containers normally are allowed 30 days period of stay. Provide accordingly.

(viii). Introduce coastal rates.

(ix). Two years cycle and initial flexibility are agreeable.

Tuticorin Steamer Agents' Association :

(i). Proposed rates are very high. Reduce them and make them competitive.

(ii). Eliminate lashing / unlashing charge.

(iii). Peg charge at US $ 75 for Hatch Cover operations as is done elsewhere.

(iv). Full convertibility of dollar will be allowed soon. So there will be no problem for PSA SICAL.

The Customs Licensed Agents' Association:

(i). The operation is not clear. Details must be spell out.

(ii). EPCG are for 5 years. What will happen after 5 years? Will the dollarisation be dropped? Will rates go down?

(iii). How often and on what basis will rates be revised? If exchange rate fluctuates, at what level will rates be revised?

(iv). PSA can compare with COPT or CHPT. But PSA has no labour problem. They must take this into account separately.

(v). Why only 3 days free days? TPT gives 5 days. Give 5 'working' free days. If not cleared within 3 days ground rent will apply from day one. This is too harsh.

(vi). Empty containers rate must be revised.

(vii). PSA does not allow stuffing / de-stuffing in their yard. This will mean one extra 'lift on' / transportation / 'lift off' (coasting about Rs.1,000) for cargo. This must be noted.

(ix). Charge for vehicle parking is too high.

Tuticorin Port Handling Agents' Association:

PSA must clearly cover vehicle entry, miscellaneous charges, etc.

Tuticorin Stevedores Association:

(i). Handling charges for empty and laden containers must be different. We differentiate. Why can they not?

(ii). There will be no traffic for our labour pool now. PSA must pay some royalty by way of compensation.

6.2. After the joint hearing, comments on the PSA SICAL proposal have been received from the INSA, Maersk India Limited, and the TCCI, which are also summarised below:

Indian National Shipowners' Association:

(i). The rates proposed are excessive being 100% more than the existing Tuticorin rates. Charges for container handling, stevedoring, transportation, and storage are double the existing Tuticorin tariff.

(ii). Suitable provision is required to be made for stowage planning, unlashing etc. to be charged from one vessel only when transhipment is involved and when two vessels are at different terminals. They will prefer such charges to be levied per container and collected directly from the container operators. If PSA SICAL or other Terminal Operators prefer to charge from vessel operators, then it shall be from the onward carrier only. There shall be no additional charge for moving the containers from one berth to another in case of transhipment container between ships at different terminals. The two terminals must share the 'one' rate collected.

(iii). Free days provided for transhipment containers shall be a minimum of 31 days as in other Ports in India. PSA SICAL has not provided any concessional tariff for movement of coastal container.

(iv). Container related charges and THC including ground rent shall be in Indian rupees.

(v). PSA SICAL has not provided option to take direct delivery of containers for their private CFS. This is often considered necessary for hazardous cargoes.

(vi). PSA SICAL has formulated its tariff for transhipment containers on the basis of slabs of 400 TEUs per calendar month per container operator. This is very high and 200 containers may be appropriate.

(vii). International norms provide a lower tariff for empties, whereas, PSA SICAL provided the same rate for loaded and empty containers. Rate for empties shall be 50% lower than full container.

(viii). The tariff shall have a validity for 3-4 years, for which there appears to be no provision.

MAERSK India Limited:

(i). No objection if rates for hatch covers, re-stows on board vessel, and dwell time charges for containers are denominated in US dollars. Denominating all other cargo-related charges in US dollars will be a "legal fiction" and such charge must be denominated in Indian rupees. This was a bid condition relating to tariff their currency of denomination.

(ii). The total cost of equipment working out to approximately 14.8 million. Customs duty at 11% under the EPCG scheme works out to 1.628 million.

(iii). USD denominated revenues with reference to container storage charges, hatch covers and dwell time charges are sufficient to cover PSA SICAL needs.

(iv). Bid condition specified that PSA SICAL may charge lower but shall not exceed the maximum rates as approved by the Government Tariff Regulatory Authority. If PSA SICAL charge US dollar denominated tariff the net rupee equivalent charged will be higher and contravene the terms and conditions under which this contract was awarded (in December 1997 Rs.39.19 = 1 USD and in November 1999 Rs.43.44 = 1 USD, thus PSA SICAL will benefit by 10.74% increase if rates are notified in US dollars).

Tuticorin Chamber of Commerce and Industry:

(i). In India we go by the basket of currencies and not by US dollars link alone after the Rupee was delinked from Pound long years back. To insist on dollar payment is to reverse the existing policy and hence payment in terms of rupee alone is sought.

(ii). There cannot be uniform rates both for loaded containers and empty containers.

(iii). The container operations charges will have to made uniform as ultimately it will fall on the shipper.

(iv). The Stevedores charges and Lift On or Lift Off charges for empty containers has to be lowered.

(v). If the shippers is not utilising all the services of PSA SICAL, the benefit shall be passed on to the shipper.

(vi). The shipper or his agent shall be given free passes.

(vii). No provision is made for arbitration for the disputes between shipper and PSA SICAL.

(viii). There shall be no out of turn allotment by SICAL for berthing. A litigation erupted between Seaways Shipping and the Port Trust and the CHPT when out of turn allotment was made.

7. Based on the records available, the totality of information collected during the proceedings of this case, and on a collective application of mind, the issues relevant to this case are analysed as set out hereinafter:

(i). As earlier stated, the proposal seeks to adopt the (pre-revised) CHPT rates. These rates were duly approved and notified. Ordinarily, therefore, there shall be no objection to their adoption. And, a comparison shows that the rates proposed compare well with the rates prevalent in other nearby ports as also with the rates of a modern port like the Jawaharlal Nehru Port Trust (JNPT). Some of the users have sought to compare the proposed rates with the TPT rates. Such comparison may not be valid because hi-tech PSA SICAL performance cannot be compared with a virtually no-equipment performance of the TPT. Nevertheless, even with reference to the TPT rates, except for a few items, the rates in all the others are lower. That being so, there can be no valid objection to adoption of the rates. Incidentally, the Project IRR and equity IRR based on the 1992-Chennai rupee tariff (escalated) scenario is around 9% which cannot be said to be excessive.

In this context, the efficiency factor has also to be taken into account. The Applicant has assured to provide high quality service by maintaining a performance standard of 20 moves per hour. The international standing and the proven track record of its Principal Partner as also the hi-tech equipment installed at the Terminal assure one of realisation of the quality standard of the service to be provided.

(ii). In the proposal, the Applicant has assumed a particular schedule and pattern of revision of tariffs in future. Approval of the tariffs to be adopted at this initial phase cannot be taken to be approval of the events (envisaged) to follow. It is not possible for this Authority to look ahead that long to give futuristic prescriptions. All that can be stated at this stage is that this Authority will grant the request of the Applicant for the same flexibility for (re)adjustments of tariffs as has been done in the case of the NSICT.

(iii). The most important feature of the proposal is about denomination of all the tariffs in dollar terms.
It has been the constant stand of this Authority that only vessel-related charges can be dollar-denominated; cargo-related charges can only be denominated in rupee terms.

Taking note of the 'legal fiction' evolved about a container being an extension of the hatch of a vessel, some items relating to container-handling were allowed by the Government to be denominated by the Mumbai Port Trust (MBPT) in dollar terms. These are, in the main, storage charges, hatch cover charges, container shifting charges, stowage planning charges, and container stevedoring (i.e., loading/unloading) charges. While the concept of this legal fiction has been contested, in the absence of any decision to the contrary, this arrangement has been allowed to continue at the MBPT.

The same approach was adopted in the case of the NSICT. But, the NSICT could not be given the full advantage of the MBPT model as it chose to adopt the JNPT's 'box rate' which incorporated elements of cargo-related charge like wharfage, (railway) haulage, etc.

The case of PSA SICAL is free of such hassles as the CHPT (whose rates have been adopted) has not introduced any such box rate.
The denomination of tariffs in dollar terms shall be done with reference to the 'Customs Rate' prevailing on the date of this order.

It has to be recognised in this context that the demand for dollar-denomination of tariffs virtually amounts to requiring the Government to absorb the risk of exchange rate fluctuations. This principle has not been accepted so far in any sector, at any rate not by this Authority. In our opinion, it is a normal business risk to reckon with exchange rate fluctuations. It is common practice to build into the bid currency and country risk factors. Significantly, the bids in this case were also notified only on rupee terms. That the TPT offered to support a request for a dollar-denomination of tariffs cannot be cited as an assurance in the matter. Bidders were clearly advised that the tariffs would be subject to final determination by the Tariff Authority. That being so, this Authority cannot go but by its stated approach in the matter. Any departure will be unjustified; and, it may also give rise to (avoidable) legal problems.

(iv). It will be necessary at this point to refer to the royalty issue. Even though some considerations relating to royalty have tariff-implications, we have not so far chosen to interfere in this regard; the royalty issue has been left to be settled by the Port Trust and the Government. That being so, in the light of the TPT's conditional support to the request for dollar-denomination, it will be necessary for us to clarify that our approval of the tariffs cannot be interpreted to amount to any implicit approval of royalty-related issues. Specifically, in the context of the TPT's condition about dollar-denomination of royalty, the method of conversion adopted by the Applicant for the purpose of financial statements based on tariffs denominated in dollar terms cannot be deemed to have been approved by us.

(v). Debt servicing, equity servicing, and expatriate expenses are generally the items to reckon with for the purpose of estimating foreign currency requirements of projects.

In this case, there is no such requirement flowing from debt servicing as all the loans are rupee loans.

The expatriate expenses are also found to be nominal. Even the upward revision of this figure, after our query on the point, does not materially alter the position. The revenue to be earned in dollar terms only on one item, viz., storage of containers, is more than adequate to cover the requirement in this regard.

Of the total Equity, only 62.5% is foreign currency. This needs to be serviced in foreign currency. However, the working results for 20 out of 30 years concession period based on rupee tariff, show loss (after tax) (probably due to higher royalty quoted). On the basis of US dollar tariff as proposed also, working results for 13 years show loss (after tax). In the years in which there is profit (after tax), only 10% is shown as retained as statutory reserves and balance disbursed as dividend. These amounts range from Rs.245 million in the year 2003 to Rs.380 million in the year 2010. This works out to about 50-80% of the Equity Capital. The Equity servicing factor, therefore, becomes less important.

The Project IRR and Equity IRR are computed at 25.32% and 33.74% on the basis of rupee tariff (unescalated) scenario with royalty also taken at a uniform rate of Rs.161/- per TEU arrived at on the basis of NPV of total royalty payments offered (with a discount factor of 16%) and the total TEUs are handled during the concession period. This is only a theoretical computation as royalty payable from year to year varies from Rs.102/- to

Rs.5,178/- per TEU. On the basis of actual royalty payments as quoted, when other costs and revenue remain constant, the Project IRR and Equity IRR become negative! This situation arises apparently because royalty, perhaps, has been quoted not on any scientific basis but on commercial considerations.

Incidentally, the factual position relating to equity is seen as follows: As seen from their Annual Accounts for 1998-99, the Authorised Equity Capital is only Rs.10 lakhs and paid up Equity of only Rs.700. An amount of Rs.15.17 crores is held as advance against Equity Capital. Out of total capital outlay of about Rs.115 crores, Rs.45 crores is to be met by Equity to be inducted equally during the years 1998, 1999, and 2000 as shown in the financial statements. On a query about this discrepancy, PSA SICAL have clarified that their Board has, in September 99, approved increase in the Authorised Equity Capital to Rs.30 crores and allotment of shares to the extent of Rs.15 crores will be decided in December 1999.

(vi). The main emphasis of the Applicant for dollar-denomination of tariffs is with reference to their EPCG obligation which works out to $ 46,600,000/- . In this context, it will be relevant to recognise the following points:

(a). Strictly speaking, the EPCG is a matter between the Applicant and the Ministry of Commerce. It cannot be an issue for the Tariff Authority to reckon with.

(b). The EPCG obligation has to be discharged within five years. Such a 5-year obligation cannot become a basis for tariff-setting in a 30-year perspective.

(c). Any revenue earned from vessel-owners/agents/container operators represents foreign exchange earning for the country. Irrespective of whether tariffs are dollar-denominated or otherwise, therefore, these earnings can be counted towards discharge of the EPCG obligation. Interestingly, the revenue earnings from two main items – container handling (stevedoring) and storage – alone aggregate to over Rs.116 crores in the first 5-year period.

(d). Even if the EPCG obligation is not discharged at all and penalty is required to be paid in terms of EPCG Licence, the Project IRR and Equity IRR reduce only by about 0.50% which cannot be said to be so vital as has been sought to be projected.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SCALE OF RATES (i.e. THE TARIFF BOOK)

(vii). (a). In the PREFACE to the Scale of Rates (called the 'Tariff Book' by the Applicant) attached as **Annex – 1,** the definition of 'port' will need to be amended to refer to the TPT. The Applicant's 'Terminal' can be defined to mean the Tuticorin Container Terminal (TCT).

(b). In the portion relating to 'DEFINITIONS', the serial numbering of items misses out on 1.5. and 1.6. The numbering will need to be corrected accordingly.

(viii). (a). The definition of 'transhipment container' will need to be amended to provide for containers coming from or going to the TPT yard. The proposed entry in the Scale of Rates envisages only operations at the TCT (i.e., the Applicant's 'Terminal'). But, experience of operation of two terminals within one port at the JNPT has projected the need to reckon with inter-terminal movements of containers, especially with reference to 'coastal arrivals' or 'coastal departures'. This unanticipated contingency resulted in users having to pay full charges separately at each of the terminals until the problem was considered subsequently by the two terminal operators to eliminate the double charge on the users. There is no reason why such a problem will not arise in the similar situation that prevails at the TPT. That being so, it will be necessary for the Applicant to anticipate this problem and amend the definition of 'transhipment container' appropriately to encompass cases of such inter-terminal movements of containers. The Applicant, in consultation with the TPT, is required to come up within six weeks with an appropriate formulation in this regard for incorporation in the Scale of Rates.

(b). The amendment suggested above will have implications for entries 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4. in the portion relating to 'APPLICATION'. These entries will also need to be amended accordingly when the definition is amended.

(c). With reference to 'transhipment container', it will become necessary to define 'coastal vessel' also. In addition to the existing definition, this Authority had given some specific formulations to cover cases of conversions of 'foreign-going' to 'coastal' vessels. These have been satisfactorily incorporated by the TPT in its (revised) Scale of Rates. The Applicant shall also adopt the same definitions and incorporate them in their Scale of Rates.

(ix). In the portion relating to 'APPLICATION', under item 2.4, there is an entry giving discretion to the PSA SICAL to vary the conditions as deemed necessary. Since such variations are not possible without the concurrence of the Tariff Authority, this entry will need to be deleted.

(x). As has been objected to by some of the users, the Scale of Rates does not provide tariffs in rupee terms at all for containers on coastal vessels. The Applicant has sought to explain this away with the observation that concessional tariffs for coastal vessels is relevant only for vessel-related charges. While this is indeed so, the objection will still be valid for the reason that some of the container handling activities draw their justification for dollar-denominated tariffs on the strength of the legal fiction about the container being an extension of the hatch of a (foreign-going) vessel. In other words, for containers on coastal vessels, the said legal fiction cannot be of any avail as there can be no extension of the hatch of a foreign-going vessel in a coastal vessel. It has, therefore, been the stated position of this Authority that 'transhipment' containers on a coastal vessel will not be eligible for such dispensation of dollar-denominated tariffs. That being so, it will be necessary for the Scale of Rates to indicate for each item the corresponding tariffs in rupee terms also. This will be relevant for 'coastal departure' on import containers, and 'coastal arrival' of export containers, and straight coastal traffic.

(xi). (a). The Scale of Rates provides only for handling of FCL containers. LCL containers appear to have been ignored. The Applicant has sought to explain away this position with the statement that they distinguish only between 'local' and 'transhipment' container; in all cases, the stevedorage charges will be billed to container operator and not to consignee; and, therefore, there need be no reference separately to LCL containers. The operational experience of this arrangement will need to be observed to see its implications for LCL consignees.

In this context, the TPT will hand over the container terminal operation to the PSA SICAL and will virtually withdraw from container handling. In other words, there will be no competition in this activity. The Applicant does not have facilities for stuffing/de-stuffing which will mean that for local LCL containers there will be a problem of apportionment of the additional expenditure for Customs examination, stuffing/de-stuffing, etc. It will, therefore, be necessary for the TPT and the Applicant to evolve an integrated arrangement and get it built into the Scale of Rates.

(b). Bearing in mind the two categories of distinction envisaged by the Applicant, it will be desirable for the Scale of Rates to refer only to 'local' and 'transhipment' containers without reference to FCL or LCL. The relevant entries will need to be amended accordingly.

(xii). In Section 'A' relating to 'CHARGES FOR CONTAINER OPERATIONS', under item 1.2, the entry relating to shut out charge does not appear to be clearly described. It will be preferable to represent it as follows:

"A shut out charge as per item 1.8 shall apply,

(a) if the carrier is changed after berthing of the originally nominated carrier; or,

(b) if the nomination is changed from a later vessel to an earlier vessel after the earlier vessel is berthed."

(xiii). Under Item 1.4, relating to 'Charges for Hatch Covers of Vessel', the column heading "per opening and closing operations" can be better expressed as "for one operation (both opening and closing)".

There can be a 'note' within parentheses at the bottom of this entry to the effect that 'half the rate will apply for only one activity'. It is relevant here to recognise that the CHPT, whose model has been adopted by the Applicant also levies only a 'per operation' charge. In fact, this point was forcefully canvassed at the joint hearing by the Steamer Agents' Association.

(xiv). Under item 1.5, relating to 'Charges for Shifting Containers', it will be better to add the words 'Within Vessel' to the title.

(xv). Under item 1.8, relating to 'Charges for Shut Out Containers', in entry B(ii), the words "… … from the time the container is first received… …" will need to be replaced by the words "… … after expiry of the free period… …". This point was conceded by the Applicant at the time of the joint hearing.

(xvi). Item 1.9 provides for 'Charges for CFS Containers'. It is not clear why this item has been introduced at all. Because of space constraints, the Applicant has decided not have to such activities in their yard. It has further been clarified that "existing procedures for port stuffing/de-stuffing will continue as agreed with the TPT and Customs". In the circumstance, this item 1.9 will need to be deleted from the Tariff Book. It can be reintroduced if and when the Applicant decides to commence CFS operations.

(xvii). In item 1.10 relating to 'Charges for Wharfage', in line with what has been stated in point (x) above, it will be necessary to introduce three footnotes reading as follows:

(a). "Note.1 – The charge for containerised cargo in all cases will be in rupee terms."

(b). "Note.2 – The charge for containers in cases of 'foreign arrival' and 'foreign departure' will be in dollar terms."

(c). "Note.3 – The charge for containers in cases of 'coastal arrival' and 'coastal departure' will be in rupee terms."

(xviii). Item 1.11 provides for charges for stowage planning, lashing/unlashing of containers, and supervision services. Strictly speaking, this is not a terminal service. This activity ought properly to be carried out by the ship. Based on such understanding, some of the users have objected to this entry. But, the Applicant has argued for retention of this entry as follows:

> "Our operational processes are designed to be fully integrated in order to provide a high level of service to our customers. It is important that we undertake these activities which allow us to fully integrate and control the entire vessel operations. This is a critical pre-requisite to achieve the productivity obligations as stipulated in our Licence Agreement with the TPT."
>
> "Lashing/unlashing operations is currently undertaken by Stevedores engaged by the ship and stowage planning is by private Surveyors. Such multi-parties arrangements do not augur well for terminal operations."

We see force in this contention. Also, significantly, we note that the crew of ships currently calling at the TPT do not carry out this activity; vessel operators are reportedly paying for such services provided by other shore-based parties.
In the light of what has been stated above, we approve this item subject to two conditions:

(a). There shall be a specific authorisation by the vessel for the terminal operator to undertake this activity.

(b). There shall be a 'Note' under this item to the effect that users will not be required to pay for this service separately either to the vessel or to any other Agent.

This entry in the Scale of Rates shall accordingly be amended to build in these two conditions.

(xix). (a). Item 1.12 relating to 'Storage Charges of Containers' states – "The free storage period shall commence from the time of completion of discharge of the vessel." Experience in other major ports has found such an arrangement to be impractical. They have accordingly come to adopt the position that 'the free storage period shall commence from the day following the day of landing'. Some users have demanded a similar amendment to this entry also. The Applicant has argued for retention of this entry as it is with the following contention:

> "With our advanced IT systems, we have the ability to track all container movements including their dwell time in the yard. We are confident that our method of computing the free storage period will not cause any inconvenience to our customers."

We see merit in this contention. Accordingly, this entry is allowed to be retained as it is.

(b). As in the case of item 1.8, here again, Part (a) will need to be amended to state that 'if the free storage period is exceeded, the store rent shall be calculated <u>after expiry of the free period</u> … …'. This point was conceded by the Applicant at the joint hearing.

(c). In the listing of slabs of periods, under part (b) of this item, the first slab shall be shown as 'first five days' (instead of 'first three days'); and, consequently, the second slab shall be shown as 'from 6-15 days' (instead of 'next 4-15 days').

As later recorded in this order, this issue was agitated at the joint hearing. The demand was that there shall be a uniform prescription of a 5-day free period for both the yards and, further, that the free periods shall run concurrently (and, **not** consecutively) to prevent exploitation of the facility.

(d). A similar correction in the slabs of period shall be made in the listing under part (b) of this item.

(e). As in the case of item 1.8, under part (b) of this item also, a similar amendment will be required. The relevant entry shall be amended to read as "if the free storage period is exceeded, the store rent shall be calculated from the time of expiry of free period to the time of lift on."

(f). As in the case of (b) above, under part (c) of this item again, a similar amendment shall be introduced.

(g). With reference to part (c) of this item relating to 'Transhipment/Re-export Laden and Empty Containers', some of the users have demanded a 30-day free period. This demand is not allowed because, in the adjoining TPT only a 15-day free period is allowed.

(xx). The currency denomination under the various items shall be as follows:

(a). Against every entry, there shall be a rupee denomination also for purposes of 'coastal' traffic.

(b). Item 1.1. (a)(i) shall be in dollar denomination.

(c). Item 1.1. (a)(ii) shall be only in rupee denomination.

(d). Item 1.1. (b)(i) shall be in dollar denomination.

(e). Item 1.1. (b)(ii). shall be only in rupee denomination.

(f). Items 1.2. (a) and (b) shall both be in dollar denomination.

(g). Items 1.3. (a) and (b) shall both be only in rupee denomination.

(h). Items 1.4. (a) and (b) shall both be in dollar denomination.

(i). Items 1.5. (a) and (b) shall both be in dollar denomination.

(j). Item 1.6 shall be only in rupee denomination.

(k). Item 1.7 (a), (b), (c), and (d), shall all be in dollar denomination.

(l). Item 1.8 (a) shall be in dollar denomination.
(m). Item 1.10 (a) shall be in dollar denomination.

(n). Item 1.10 (b) shall be only in rupee denomination.

(o). Item 1.12 (a), (b), and (c) shall all be in dollar denomination.

(p). Item 2.1. (a) to (i) shall all be only in rupee denomination.

8. Some of the other more important issues raised by the users also deserve to be addressed as follows:

(i). <u>The Terminal Operator must give concessions</u>

It lies in the discretion of the Terminal Operator to build concessions into his Scale of Rates. He cannot be compelled to do that. Grant of volume discounts is an accepted practice. There is no reason why the Terminal Operator in this case will not make use of this practice to attract traffic. In fact, there is an indication of such an intent in the provision of slabs per calendar month, per container operator for transhipment containers.

(ii). <u>The rates for empty and laden containers shall not be the same</u>

This observation appears to be valid only in respect of stevedorage for transhipment containers. If there is a pressure for reducing the tariff on empty containers in this regard, the Terminal Operator will in all probability be inclined to increase the tariff for laden containers. Such a change, as has been rightly stressed by the INSA, will discourage traffic in FCL transhipment containers which may not be in the long term interest of the port. Significantly, the arrangement proposed here is in conformity with that adopted by other major ports in the neighbourhood.

(iii). Consignees must be allowed the facility to receive containers directly at the hook point.

Admittedly, such an arrangement will reduce the handling cost for the consignee. But, operationally, it may become a messy proposition at the berth. The TPT has also been opposed to such an arrangement.

(iv). Terminal Handling Charges must be maintained at the same rates in order to be competitive. They shall be collected in Indian rupees.

There is provision in the law for regulation of certain types of Terminal Handling Charges. But, actually, regulation has not commenced for want of completion of certain pre-conditions. Attention to this requirement can be given only if and when such a regulation commences.

It is noteworthy in this context that all tariffs are in any case collected only in rupees. Terminal Handling Charges are, in fact, denominated also in rupee terms.

(v). The PSA SICAL shall not become a monopoly

Although the TPT has, on a point of fact, retained some container-handling activity, in the arrangement proposed, the container traffic has virtually been handed over to the PSA SICAL. There is likely to be very little competition to the PSA SICAL from the TPT. In effect, therefore, there is likely to be a monopoly situation. The Tariff Authority cannot alter this de facto position. We can only guard against its exploitation. From this point of view, we will be receptive to bona fide complaints from affected parties.

(vi). The charge for vehicle parking is too high

This is only a small item. This has been pitched high obviously to discourage congestion caused by parking. The motive does not appear to be to generate revenue. We are, therefore, not inclined to interfere in this matter.

(vii). <u>There is no provision for arbitration</u>

This is not a tariff-related issue. This Authority will, therefore, not like to get involved. This is a matter to be settled by the TPT and the PSA SICAL.

(viii). <u>Only 3 days' free time has been provided for whereas the TPT gives 5 days' free time. There shall be uniformity in this prescription. Also, the free period in the two yards must run concurrently (and, **not** consecutively) to prevent exploitation of the facility.</u>

This point has been canvassed by many users, prominently the SCI and the CLAA. Interestingly, the TPT has also forcefully agitated this issue.

The TPT has argued that, since both the yards are inside the security wall in the main line, operators can plan the dwell time of the containers intended for stuffing/de-stuffing in the port yard to enjoy the free time of both the yards in full and monitor their stay in both the yards to evade container rentals that they would have had to pay had there been one yard inside the security wall.

At the joint hearing, the PSA SICAL agreed to discuss this matter further with the TPT to evolve an agreed solution. Unfortunately, that did not happen. In the event, this issue has been left by both sides to be decided by this Authority,

We see merit in the demand for uniformity of prescription relating to free period. We have noted the users' plea for increase in the number of free days. We have seen the Terminal Operator's willingness to be accommodative on this score. Taking all this into account, and bearing in mind the scope for exploitation as described by the TPT, we decide that the free period shall be uniformly '5 days' in both the yards; and, the free periods shall run concurrently (and, **not** consecutively).

In accordance with this decision, the TPT will also be required to introduce appropriate amendments to the relevant item in their Scale of Rates.

Annex – 1

PREFACE

This Price List sets out the charges payable to PSA SICAL Terminals Limited from time to time for the use of Services and Facilities provided by Tuticorin Container Terminal.

1. DEFINITIONS

1.1. “Container” means any freight container complying with all relevant prevailing ISO standards. Generally, it is designed to facilitate the carriage of goods by one or more modes without intermediate reloading; fitted with devices permitting ready handling and with unique identification numbers and markings.

1.2. “Nearest Hour” means that subject to a minimum of one hour, a period of less than 30 minutes in excess of a complete hour shall not be considered for the computation of charges, whilst a period of 30 minutes or more in excess of a complete hour, shall be rounded up to the next hour.

1.3. “Nearest Tonne” means that subject to a minimum of one Tonne, cubic measurement or gross weight (whichever is the greater) of less than 0.5 Tonne in excess of a complete Tonne shall not be considered for the computation of charges, whilst weight of 0.5 Tonne or more in excess of a complete Tonne, shall be rounded up to the next Tonne.

1.4. “Per Day” means per calendar day.

1.5. “Per Shift” means per period of 8 hours.

1.6. “Port” means the Tuticorin Port Trust (TPT) whereas “Terminal” means Tuticorin Container Terminal (TCT), now or hereafter operated by PSA SICAL Terminals Limited.

1.7. “PSA SICAL” means PSA SICAL Terminals Limited, a company incorporated in India, its successors and assigns.

1.8. “Reefer” means any Container for the purpose of the carriage of goods, which require refrigeration.

1.9. “Tonne” means one metric Tonne of 1,000 kilograms or one cubic metre.

1.10. “Transshipment Container or Transshipment Goods” means Containers/Goods discharges from a Vessel and placed in the custody of the PSA SICAL for the purposes of shipment on another Vessel declared on a Transshipment manifest with the ultimate port of destination marked on each Container/ package or unit containing such Goods lodged with the PSA SICAL prior to or at the time such Goods are placed in its custody.

1.11. "Coastal Vessel" means a ship or steamer which is engaged in carriage of goods by sea from any Port in India to any other Port in India.

1.12. "Foreign Vessel" means a ship or steamer employed in trading between any Port in India and other Port or between Ports outside India.

1.13. 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.

1.14. A Foreign-going Vessel of foreign flag can convert to Coastal run on the basis of a Coast Voyage Licence issued by the Director General of Shipping.

1.15. In case of such conversion, coastal rates shall be chargeable by the load port from the time the vessel starts loading coastal goods.

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

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

2. APPLICATION

2.1. The rates to be levied by PSA SICAL to its Customers or Customers' Representatives for the use of premises, works or appliances and for Services or Facilities provided are categorised into the following sections:

SECTION A - CHARGES FOR CONTAINER OPERATIONS
SECTION B - CHARGES FOR GENERAL SERVICES

2.2. FCL Rates shall apply:

(a) when a loaded or empty container is discharged from a vessel, delivered directly out of TCT, or moved and stored in the container yard and eventually delivered out of TCT or;

(b) when a loaded or empty container is shipped and the reverse operations to (a) are performed.

2.3. Transshipment container rates shall apply to an empty or loaded container which fulfills the following conditions:

(a) when it is discharged from the first carrier onto PSA SICAL's premises and remained in the custody of PSA SICAL until it is transshipped in its original status by PSA SICAL;

2.4. Re-export container rates shall apply to a loaded Container which fulfills the following conditions:

(a) when it is discharged from the first carrier onto PSA SICAL premises and remained in the custody of PSA SICAL until it is Re-exported;

Re-export containers shall pay the normal FCL Container rates but shall enjoy the same free storage period applicable to Transshipment Containers.

3. GENERAL

3.1. Where charges are payable by the agent or owner of the Vessel, or the agent or owner of the Container, PSA SICAL shall be informed in advance of any change of agency or ownership of the Vessel or Container including the name and address of the new agent or owner. For the purpose of this paragraph, the change in agency shall be effective from the date such notification is received by PSA SICAL or such later date if PSA SICAL has been notified in advance.

3.2. For the purpose of calculating the duration of stay of Containers or Goods, the time of completion of discharge of the Vessel or the time of receipt of export Container or Goods shall be rounded up to the next nearest hour, e.g. 0705 hours shall be taken as 0800 hours.

3.3. All rates are stated in Rupees, unless otherwise specified. The ‘Reference Rate’ for conversion of dollar-denominated rates into Indian Rupees’ equivalent will be the prevailing ‘Customs Exchange Rate (Import)’. All charges are payable in Rupees.

3.4. In general, all charges for containers more than 20 feet and up to 40 feet in length will be 150 % of the applicable rates. Charges for containers more than 40 feet and up to 45 feet in length will be 200% of the applicable charges.

3.5. Containers or Uncontainerised Goods that can only be handled with a quay crane or transfer equipment spreader with special attachments or manual slings will be charged five times the applicable rates.

4. NOTES

4.1. The ‘Customs Exchange Rate (Import)’ on the date of Order by Tariff Authority for Major Ports (TAMP) is Rs.43.55 per US $. Accordingly, the US $ denominated charges have been adjusted to reflect the Bid Document rates.

SECTION A

CHARGES FOR CONTAINER OPERATIONS

1.1. STEVEDORAGE CHARGES FOR IMPORT AND EXPORT CONTAINERS

			Foreign		Coastal	
			Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
(a)	a loaded Container					
	(i)	QC Charges	US $ 17.22	US $ 25.83	Rs.750	Rs.1125
	(ii)	Transport from/ to CY and Lift-on/Lift-off	Rs.625	Rs.940	Rs.625	Rs.940
(b)	an empty container					
	(i)	QC Charges	US $ 17.22	US $ 25.83	Rs.750	Rs.1125
	(ii)	Transport from/ to CY and Lift-on/Lift-off	Rs.315	Rs.470	Rs.315	Rs.470

Export Container shall be accepted by PSA SICAL for loading if such Container is delivered to TCT 2 hours before berthing of the Vessel.

1.2. STEVEDORAGE CHARGES FOR TRANSSHIPMENT CONTAINERS

		Foreign		Coastal	
		Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
(a)	for Container Operator who transshipped more than 400 TEUs of loaded or empty Transshipment Containers per calendar month	US $ 18.71	US $ 28.01	Rs.815	Rs.1220
(b)	If transshipped less than 400 TEUs per calendar month	US $ 37.31	US $ 56.03	Rs.1625	Rs.2440

Any Transshipment Container sent to a container freight station for stuffing / unstuffing, or delivered locally, shall be charged the local Container rate.

A shut out charge as per item 1.8 shall apply :

(i) if the carrier is changed after berthing of the originally nominated carrier; or

(ii) if the nomination is changed from a later carrier to an earlier carrier after the earlier carrier is berthed.

1.3. LIFT ON OR LIFT OFF CHARGES

The following charges shall apply for all local Containers:

	Foreign		Coastal	
	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length (in Rs.)	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length (in Rs.)	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length (in Rs.)	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length (in Rs.)
(a) By Transfer Crane				
(i) a loaded Container	315	470	315	470
(ii) an empty Container	160	240	160	240
(b) By Other Equipment				
(i) A loaded Container	160	240	160	240
(ii) an empty Container	65	95	65	95

1.4. CHARGES FOR HATCH COVERS OF VESSEL

	Foreign One Operation (both Opening and Closing)	Coastal One Operation (both Opening and Closing)
(a) Without landing Hatch Cover on the quay	US $ 14.35	Rs.625
(b) With landing Hatch Cover on the quay	US $ 35.94	Rs.1565

Half the rate shall be applicable if there is only one activity, i.e. either an opening or closing operation.

1.5. CHARGES FOR SHIFTING CONTAINERS WITHIN VESSEL

		Foreign		Coastal	
		Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
(a)	for a Container shifted by landing and reshipping	US $ 25.83	US $ 38.81	Rs.1125	Rs.1690
(b)	for a Container shifted without landing and reshipping	US $ 8.61	US $ 12.97	Rs.375	Rs.565

1.6. EXTRA MOVEMENTS CHARGES

		Foreign		Coastal	
		Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
(a)	per Container Movement	Rs.500	Rs.750	Rs.500	Rs.750

1.7. CHARGES FOR REEFER CONTAINERS AND SERVICES

		Foreign Per Container	Coastal Per Container
(a)	Pre-trip inspection (including the supply of Electricity)	US $ 32.15	Rs.1400
(b)	Connection or disconnection Services Onboard a Vessel	US $ 2.30	Rs.100

	Foreign Per Container	Coastal Per Container (in Rs.)
(c) Supply of electricity (including connecting and Disconnecting, monitoring at Reefer yard)		
(i) not exceeding 20 feet in length	US $ 5.17	225
(ii) exceeding 20 feet in length	US $ 6.89	300
(d) Cleaning of Container		
(i) not exceeding 20 feet in length	US $ 1.50	65
(ii) exceeding 20 feet in length	US $ 2.99	130

1.8. CHARGES FOR SHUT OUT CONTAINERS

(a) Where an Export container or a Transshipment container or a Re-export container is shut out and subsequently delivered out of TCT, the following rates shall apply;

Foreign		Coastal	
Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
US $ 22.97	US $ 45.92	Rs.1000	Rs.2000

(b) Where a container is shut out by one vessel and subsequently shipped via another vessel, in addition to the stevedorage charge:

(i) the charge as per item (a) above shall also apply.

(ii) the free storage shall be given to the Container in accordance with item 1.11 from the time the container is first received. If the free storage period is exceeded, store rent shall be calculated after the expiry of the free period up to the time of lift on.

1.9. CHARGES FOR WHARFAGE

		Foreign		Coastal	
		Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
(a)	per Container	US $ 0.92	US $ 1.38	Rs.40	Rs.60
(b)	Per containerised Cargo	Rs.500	Rs.750	Rs.500	Rs.750

Note 1 - The charge for containerised cargo in all cases will be in Rupee terms.

Note 2 - The charge for containers in cases of ‘foreign arrival’ and ‘foreign departure’ will be in Dollar terms.

Note 3 - The charge for containers in cases of ‘coastal arrival’ and ‘coastal departure’ will be in Rupee terms.

1.10 CHARGES FOR STOWAGE PLANNING, LASHING/UNLASHING OF CONTAINERS, AND SUPERVISION SERVICES

		Foreign	Coastal
(a)	per Container	US $ 8.04	Rs.350

The above shall also apply on Containers shifted onboard Vessels.

The Vessel Operator shall authorise TCT to undertake the above services. The user of such services need not pay to any other parties other than TCT.

1.11 STORAGE CHARGES ON CONTAINERS

(a) Import Laden and Empty Containers

The free storage period shall commence from the time of completion of discharge of the Vessel. If the free storage period is exceeded, the store rent shall be calculated after the expiry of free period up to the Vessel to the time of delivery. The charges shall be calculated on 24-hours basis.

		Foreign		Coastal	
		Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
(i)	first 5 days	Free	Free	Free	Free
(ii)	from 6 to 15 days	US $ 0.75	US $ 1.15	Rs.32.66	Rs.50.08
(iii)	from 16 to 22 days	US $ 3.00	US $ 5.80	Rs.130.65	Rs.252.59
(iv)	more than 22 days	US $ 5.80	US $ 11.0	RS.252.59	Rs.479.05

(b) Export Laden and Empty Containers

The free storage period shall commence from the time such a container is received. If the free storage period is exceeded, the store rent shall be calculated after the expiry of free period up to the time of Vessel berths. The charges shall be calculated on 24-hours basis.

		Foreign		Coastal	
		Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
(i)	first 5 days	Free	Free	Free	Free
(ii)	from 6 to 15 days	US $ 0.75	US $ 1.15	Rs.32.66	Rs.50.08
(iii)	from 16 to 22 days	US $ 3.00	US $ 5.80	Rs.130.65	Rs.252.59
(iv)	more than 22 days	US $ 5.80	US $ 11.0	RS.252.59	Rs.479.05

(c) Transshipment/Re-export Laden and Empty Containers

The free storage period shall commence from the time of completion of discharge of the first carrier to the time of berthing of the second carrier. If the free storage period is exceeded, the store rent shall be calculated after the expiry of free period to the time of lift on. The charges shall be calculated on 24-hours basis.

		Foreign		Coastal	
		Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container NOT Exceeding 20 Feet In Length	Container Exceeding 20 Feet In Length
(i)	first 15 days	Free	Free	Free	Free
(ii)	from 16 to 30 days	US $ 4.00	US $ 6.00	Rs.174.2	Rs.261.3
(iii)	more than 30 days	US $ 6.00	US $ 8.00	Rs.261.3	Rs.217.75

CHARGES FOR GENERAL SERVICES

2.1. ADMINISTRATIVE FEES

Administrative fees shall be charged for the following:

		(in Rs.)
(a)	Film Shooting and Photography per day	10000
(b)	Taking Photographs of Goods Imported / Exported per day	500
(c)	Taking photographs of Crews and Others per day	250
(d)	Videography (related to operational activities)	3000
(e)	Application of Vehicle Entry Pass	100
(f)	Application of Visitor Entry Pass	50
(g)	Renewal of Visitor Entry Pass	50
(h)	Application of Temporary Pass	15
(i)	Vehicle Overnight Parking	125

S.SATHYAM, Chairman
[Advt./III/IV/Exty./143/99]