पत्तन, पोत परिवहन
एवं जलमार्ग मंत्रालय
MINISTRY OF
PORTS, SHIPPING AND WATERWAYS

सत्यमेव जयते

SAGAR-AANKALAN

Logistics Port Performance Index
(FY 2024-25)

सत्यमेव जयते

SAGAR-AANKALAN

Logistics Port Performance Index
(FY 2024-25)

Government of India
Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Waterways

Contents

List of tables

Executive Summary

The Sagar Aankalan-Logistics Port Performance Index (LPPI) assesses the logistics efficiency and operational performance of Major and Non Major ports across India. The framework was introduced by the Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Waterways with the aim to modernize port evaluation, harmonize performance measurement, and align India's maritime sector with global standards. The initiative is rooted in the PM Gati Shakti National Master Plan and National Logistics Policy, ensuring integrated, multimodal logistics development.

The Sagar Aankalan Guidelines were launched in February 2024 and mandate annual performance assessment of all ports using a standardized methodology built around the (TOPSIS) Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution decision making model.
The methodology incorporates various performance based Key Performance Indicator (KPIs) where Weights & Impacts (+/-) were assigned to each parameter.

For LPPI of FY 2023-24, the Indian ports participated with cargo share of 67% of India's total cargo handled during the year, whereas in FY 2024-25, the total cargo share rose to 90% of India's total cargo handled during the year. This shows a substantial increase in Indian Ports participation as per their cargo share when compared with the previous year. The improved participation and higher cargo coverage set the foundation for a more robust and comprehensive evaluation in LPPI of FY 2024-25, strengthening the overall reliability of India's port performance benchmarking framework.

For FY 2024-25, LPPI evaluates port performance across six categories-Dry Bulk (<5 MT and ≥5 MT), Liquid Bulk (<5 MT and ≥5 MT), and Container Cargo (<0.5 Million TEUs and ≥0.5 Million TEUs). Each port was assessed using standardized KPIs such as Cargo handled, Berth productivity, Turn-Around time, Pre Berthing waiting time, and Container Dwell time.

Paradip Port Authority retained its leadership in Dry Bulk Cargo category ≥5 MT, reflecting continued operational excellence. In Liquid Bulk ≥5 MT, Sikka Port and Terminals Ltd emerged as the top performer, underscoring the efficiency of specialized private and non-major terminals in handling liquid commodities. Among Container Ports ≥0.5 Million TEUs, Mundra Port (APSEZL) secured the top rank, consistent with its strong infrastructure, high throughput, and competitive ship turnaround capabilities. For smaller container ports, Deendayal Port Authority led <0.5 Million TEUs category, demonstrating strong operational efficiency among Major Ports.

Overall, the LPPI provides a credible, transparent, and globally aligned mechanism for evaluating logistics performance. It enables ports, policymakers, and industry stakeholders to identify performance gaps, prioritize investments, enhance operational efficiency, and strengthen India's position in global trade. The report concludes with detailed rankings and TOPSIS scores for all ports across each cargo segment, offering a strategic baseline for future improvements and comparative analysis.

1. Introduction

1. Background

India's maritime sector forms the backbone of the country's logistics ecosystem, handling a significant share of its international trade-about 95% by volume and 70% by value. To enhance operational performance and align Indian ports with global standards, the Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Waterways (MoPSW) introduced Sagar Aankalan as a structured performance evaluation and benchmarking framework for Indian ports. The initiative is a vital part of the government's broader logistics reform landscape under the PM Gati Shakti National Master Plan and the National Logistics Policy, both of which aim to strengthen multimodal connectivity and improve supply chain competitiveness.

1.2. Sagar Aankalan Guidelines

The Ministry launched "Sagar Aankalan"- National Benchmarking Guidelines - Mapping Logistics Performance of Indian Ports in February 2024 for assessing Logistics Port Performance Index (LPPI) of Indian Ports based on their operational performance to enhance efficiency, competitiveness and overall performance of Indian ports.

The Sagar Aankalan Guidelines were launched to transform port performance assessment through a comprehensive, data driven methodology that replaces traditional fragmented evaluation systems. This initiative supports India's improving position in global logistics rankings, including its rise to 22nd place in the World Bank's Logistics Performance Index (2023) for international shipments, reflecting significant progress in port infrastructure and logistics capability. The guidelines mandate that all Major and Non-major ports be assessed annually based on operational data from April to March, encouraging ports to implement efficiency enhancement strategies based on benchmarking results.

1.3. Coverage of the report

The report is structured to provide a comprehensive assessment of the operational efficiency of the Major and Non-major ports and ranking them based on the performance of the ports in different key performance indicators. The subsequent key sections of the report are as follows:

Similar ranking adopted globally:
Examining similar rankings available at international levels like Container Ports Performance Index (CPPI), Logistics Performance Index (LPI), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

Approach and Methodology
Explaining the methodology used to rank the ports and discussing the TOPSIS methodology and Weights & Impacts used to calculate the final score.

LPPI Rankings 2023-24
Covers LPPI ranking of the ports for the FY 2023-24 and comparison of Ports (Major Ports and Non-major Ports) participated in FY 2024-25 with respect to FY 2023-24 in terms of cargo share

LPPI Rankings 2024-25
Showcasing the final ranking and TOPSIS score of the ports for each category in each cargo type.

2. Similar Rankings Adopted Globally

The LPPI under Sagar Aankalan has been developed in line with internationally recognized port-performance assessment models. Similar to the Container Port Performance Index (CPPI), which objectively measures container port efficiency based on vessel time in port using robust administrative and statistical methods, LPPI also relies on standardized, data-driven performance indicators for evaluating port efficiency. Additionally, LPPI aligns with the principles of the Logistics Performance Index (LPI), which assesses logistics systems through comparable, structured benchmarks across countries. Together, these similarities demonstrate that LPPI adopts internationally accepted best practices, ensuring Indian ports are evaluated through globally aligned, credible, and comparable performance standards.

2.1 Container Port Performance Index (CPPI):

CPPI provides an objective, data driven global assessment of container port efficiency, measuring how long vessels spend in ports and benchmarking over 400 ports worldwide using Automatic Identification System (AIS) and shipping line operational data. It is designed to help governments, port authorities and policymakers identify performance gaps, understand the impact of major disruptions such as COVID-19 and Red Sea crisis and track five-year trends in operational resilience and efficiency. By analysing vessel arrival times, berth productivity, waiting periods and regional performance shifts, the report offers actionable insights for planning investment and port sector reforms.

2.2 Logistics Performance Index (LPI):

LPI is a comprehensive benchmarking and diagnostic tool that evaluates trade logistics worldwide using both expert surveys and big data-based indicators. It helps countries understand how effectively they move goods across borders, highlights structural challenges such as customs, infrastructure gaps, logistics competence and quality score, scores on international shipments and provides actionable insights for policy reforms. Considering significant disruptions in recent years, global logistics system has shown resilience, through wide performance gaps remain particularly affecting low income, landlocked and small island economies.

The LPI serves as a critical tool for policy makers and industry leaders seeking to enhance supply chain reliability, strengthen trade competitiveness and guide strategic investments in trade logistics.

2.3 United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD):

UNCTAD provides a comprehensive assessment of the global maritime transport landscape, analysing how geopolitical tension, trade policy shifts, supply chain disruptions, decarbonisation requirements and digital transformation are reshaping shipping, ports and international trade. Developments from early 2024 to mid- 2025, the report tracks trends in seaborne trade, fleet composition, freight rates, port performance and critical minerals, while highlighting emerging vulnerabilities such as longer voyage distances, rising transport costs and concentrated supply chains. It offers forecasts, policy insights and evidence-based guidance to help governments, port authorities and industry stakeholders strengthen resilience, improve competitiveness and navigate structural transitions in maritime transport.

3. Approach and Methodology

The assessment undertaken by the Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Waterways (MoPSW) adopted a systematic, structured, and multi-stage framework to evaluate the logistics performance of Indian ports. This comprehensive approach covered both Major and Non-Major ports, ensuring a holistic understanding of operational efficiency across the national port ecosystem. As part of this process, the Ministry examined a wide range of operational performance indicators, focusing particularly on Cargo handling capabilities, Turn-Around efficiency, Dwell time, and other Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) routinely measured at Indian ports. To ensure objectivity, transparency, and uniformity in evaluation, the scores for each port were computed using the TOPSIS methodology a well-recognized multi-criteria decision-making tool.

3.1.Methodology

Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) is a multi-criteria-based decision-making method. It chooses the alternative of the shortest Euclidean distance from the positive ideal solution and greatest distance from the negative ideal solution. It is a way to allocate the ranks on basis of the weights and impact of the given factors. The steps are as follows:

Step 1

Create an evaluation matrix consisting of m alternatives and n criteria with the intersection of each alternative and criteria given as $x_{ij}(x_{ij})_{m\times n}$

Step 2

The matrix $(x_{ij})_{m\times n}$ is then normalised to form the matrix $R = (r_{ij})_{m\times n}$, using the normalisation method

$$r_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{m} x_{kj}^2}}, i = 1,2,\dots,m, j = 1,2,\dots,n$$

Step 3

Calculate the normalised decision matrix adjusted with weights and impacts.

$$t_{ij} = r_{ij} \cdot w_j, i = 1,2,\dots,m, j = 1,2,\dots,n$$

where $w_j = W_j / \sum_{k=1}^{n} W_k, j = 1,2,\dots,n$ so that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1$, and W_j is the weight given to the indicator $v_j, j = 1,2,\dots,n.$

Step 4

Determine the worst alternative (A_w)and the best alternative (A_b) :

$$A_w = \{\langle max(t_{ij} \mid i = 1,2,\dots,m) \mid j \in J_-\rangle, \langle min(t_{ij} \mid i = 1,2,\dots,m) \mid j \in J_+\rangle\} \equiv \{t_{wj} \mid j = 1,2,\dots,n\},$$

$$A_b = \{\langle min(t_{ij} \mid i = 1,2,\dots,m) \mid j \in J_-\rangle, \langle max(t_{ij} \mid i = 1,2,\dots,m) \mid j \in J_+\rangle\} \equiv \{t_{bj} \mid j = 1,2,\dots,n\},$$

where,

$J_+ = \{j = 1,2, \ldots, n \mid j\}$ associated with the criteria having a positive impact, and
$J_- = \{j = 1,2, \ldots, n \mid j\}$ associated with the criteria having a negative impact.

Step 5

Calculate the L^2-distance between the target alternative iand the worst condition A_w

$$d_{iw} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{n} (t_{ij} - t_{wj})^2}, i = 1,2, \ldots, m,$$

and the distance between the alternative iand the best condition A_b

$$d_{ib} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{n} (t_{ij} - t_{bj})^2}, i = 1,2, \ldots, m$$

where d_{iw} and d_{ib} are L^2- norm distances from the target alternative ito the worst and best conditions, respectively.

Step 6

Calculate the similarity to the worst condition:

$s_{iw} = d_{iw}/(d_{iw} + d_{ib}), 0 \leq s_{iw} \leq 1, i = 1,2, \ldots, m.$

$s_{iw} = 1$ if and only if the alternative solution has the best condition; and
$s_{iw} = 0$ if and only if the alternative solution has the worst condition.

Step 7

Rank the alternatives according to $s_{iw}(i = 1,2, \ldots, m)$.

Weights & Impacts

The tables below outline the assigned weights and corresponding impacts for each parameter across different cargo categories. These weights and impacts form the basis for normalizing the evaluation matrix and subsequently computing the TOPSIS scores.

3.2.Weights & Impacts

The tables below outline the assigned weights and corresponding impacts for each parameter across different cargo categories. These weights and impacts form the basis for normalizing the evaluation matrix and subsequently computing the TOPSIS scores.

Dry Bulk Cargo

Table 1: Dry Bulk Cargo Category: Weights & Impacts

S.No.	Parameters	Weights	Impacts
1.	Cargo Handled (in MT)	0.26	+
2.	Idle Time at Berth (in %)	0.16	-
3.	Average Turn Around Time (in Hours)	0.21	-
4.	Average Pre-Berthing Waiting Time (in Hours)	0.16	-
5.	Average Ship Berth-Day Output (in MT)	0.21	+

Liquid Bulk Cargo

Table 2: Liquid Bulk Cargo Category: Weights & Impacts

S.No.	Parameters	Weights	Impacts
1.	Cargo Handled (in MT)	0.26	+
2.	Idle Time at Berth (in %)	0.16	-
3.	Average Turn Around Time (in Hours)	0.21	-
4.	Average Pre-Berthing Waiting Time (in Hours)	0.16	-
5.	Average Ship Berth-Day Output (in MT)	0.21	+

Container Cargo

Table 3: Container Cargo Category: Weights & Impacts

S.No.	Parameters	Weights	Impacts
1.	Cargo Handled (in MT)	0.25	+
2.	Idle Time at Berth (in %)	0.15	-
3.	Average Turn Around Time (in Hours)	0.12	-
4.	Average Container Dwell Time (in Hours)	0.13	-
5.	Average Pre-Berthing Waiting Time (in Hours)	0.15	-
6	Average Ship Berth-Day Output (in MT)	0.20	+

3.3. List of Ports/Terminal Submitted Data

A total of 12 Major Ports and 35 Non-Major Ports terminals participated in LPPI for FY 2024-25. The below table exhibits ports (Major & Non-major ports) that submitted the complete data for LPPI of FY 2024-25

Table 4: Ports Participated for Ranking

Major Ports			
S. No.	Name	S. No.	Name
1	Chennai Port Authority	2	Cochin Port Authority
3	Deendayal Port Authority	4	Jawaharlal Nehru Port Authority
5	Kamarajar Port Ltd.	6	Mumbai Port Authority
7	Paradip Port Authority	8	New Mangalore Port Authority
9	Vishakhapatnam Port Authority	10	V.O. Chidambaranar Port Authority
11	Mormugao Port Authority	12	Syama Prasad Mookerjee Port Authority

Non-Major Ports			
S. No.	Name	S. No.	Name
1	Dhamra Port, Odisha	2	Gopalpur Port, Odisha
3	Adani Petronet Dahej Port Ltd., Gujarat	4	Angre Port Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra
5	Dighi Port, Maharashtra	6	AMNS Ports, Hazira, Gujarat
7	Indo Energy, Sanegaon, Maharashtra	8	JSW Jaigarh Port Ltd., Maharashtra
9	Karanja Terminal, Maharashtra	10	Kakinada Deep Water Port, Andhra Pradesh
11	Ambuja Cement Ltd. Magdalla, Gujarat	12	UltraTech Cement, Bhagawati bundae Ratnagiri, Maharashtra
13	Ultratech Cement Magdalla, Gujarat	14	Adani Gangavaram Port, Andhra Pradesh
15	Finolex Terminal, Ranpar port, Ratnagiri, Maharashtra	16	Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd., Puducherry
17	Adani Hazira Port Ltd., Gujarat	18	Krishnapatnam Port Ltd., Andhra Pradesh
19	MIDPL Katupalli Port, Tamil Nadu	20	JSW Revdanda Port, Maharashtra
21	Infrastructure Logistics Pvt. Ltd., Goa	22	JSW Dharamtar Port Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra
23	Redi Port Ltd., Maharashtra	24	Magdalla Port, Gujarat
25	Ambuja Ulwa Jetty, Maharashta	26	PNP Maritime Services Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra
27	Konkan LNG Ltd., Maharashtra	28	PNP Port, Maharashtra
29	Yogayatan Ports Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra	30	AEML Dahanu, Maharashtra
31	Sikka Port and Terminals Ltd., Gujarat	32	Hazira Pvt. Port Ltd., Magdalla, Gujarat
33	Reliance Shipping & Offshore Division, Hazira, Gujarat	34	Sri Vijayapuram Port, Andaman & Nicobar Islands
35	Mundra Port – APSEZL, Gujarat		

Amongst all the participants of LPPI 2024-25, only the ports that submitted complete set of data, are considered for ranking. With the dataset refined and the evaluation framework firmly established, the subsequent chapter presents the detailed results and analysis of LPPI for FY 2024–25.

4. Logistics Port Performance Index (2023-24)

The chapter covers gist of Logistics Port Performance Index (2023-24). Total number of Indian ports participated during last year were 32 and the rankings were assessed for two cargo types; Bulk Cargo category (less than 5 Million tonnes and more than & equal to 5 Million tonnes) and Container Cargo category (less than 0.5 Million TEUs and more than & equal to 0.5 Million TEUs). In Bulk cargo, Paradip Port Authority secured top rank in more than & equal to 5 Million tonnes category and JSW Revdanda Port ranked top in less than 5 Million tonnes category. In container cargo, Jawaharlal Nehru Port Authority secured top position in category of more than & equal to 0.5 Million TEUs and Deendayal Port Authority ranked top in category of less than 0.5 Million TEUs.

4.1 Cargo Share of Ports: LPPI FY 2023-24 vs LPPI FY 2024-25

For LPPI FY 2023–24, Indian ports that submitted complete datasets reported a total cargo handling of 1,056.55 Million tonnes, representing 67% of India's total cargo handled during the year. Major Ports contributed 819.27 Million tonnes, accounting for 100% of their cargo handled, while Non-Major Ports contributed 237.28 Million tonnes, representing 33% of the total cargo handled by them. In FY 2024–25, ports with complete datasets handled a higher total cargo volume of 1,445.29 Million tonnes, representing 90% of India's total cargo handled during the year. Major Ports again reported 100% data coverage, contributing 854.84 Million tonnes. Non-Major Ports handled 590.45 Million tonnes, accounting for 79% of the year's total cargo handled by them. This reflects an improvement in data coverage as well as a higher share of cargo contribution from Non-Major Ports in the subsequent year. The results for LPPI FY 2024–25 are presented in the next chapter.

5. Logistics Port Performance Index (2024-25)

The rankings of Logistics Port Performance Index (2024-25) are shown in this chapter. In LPPI FY 2024-25, the rankings assessed for three cargo types; Dry Bulk Cargo category (less than 5 Million tonnes and more than & equal to 5 Million tonnes), Liquid Bulk Cargo category (less than 5 Million tonnes and more than & equal to 5 Million tonnes) and Container Cargo category (less than 0.5 Million TEUs and more than & equal to 0.5 Million TEUs).

5.1.Dry Bulk Cargo: Less than 5 Million tonnes category

In the category of dry bulk cargo less than 5 Million tonnes, Chennai Port Authority secured the top rank with a score of 62.68. It was followed by MIDPL Katupalli Port (60.88) and Indo Energy (57.89) in the second and third positions, respectively. The below table represents the ranking of Indian Ports with less than 5 Million tonnes category in dry bulk cargo.

Table 5: Dry Bulk Cargo Ranking: Less Than 5 Million Tonnes

Ports	Score	Rank	Category
Chennai Port Authority	62.68	1	Major Port
MIDPL Katupalli Port, Tamil Nadu	60.88	2	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Indo Energy, Sanegaon, Maharashtra	57.89	3	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Jawaharlal Nehru Port Authority	55.65	4	Major Port
Cochin Port Authority	54.29	5	Major Port
Ambuja Cement Ltd. Magdalla, Gujarat	53.55	6	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Ultratech Cement Magdalla, Gujarat	52.88	7	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Redi Port Ltd., Maharashtra	52.70	8	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Infrastructure Logistics Pvt. Ltd., Goa	51.51	9	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Karanja Terminal, Maharashtra	48.59	10	Non-Major Port/Terminal
UltraTech Cement, Bhagawati bundae Ratnagiri, Maharashtra	48.49	11	Non-Major Port/Terminal
JSW Revdanda Port, Maharashtra	46.39	12	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Angre Port Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra	45.37	13	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Dighi Port Ltd., Maharashtra	36.97	14	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Finolex Terminal, Ranpar port, Ratnagiri, Maharashtra	32.68	15	Non-Major Port/Terminal

5.2. Dry Bulk Cargo: More than & equal to 5 Million tonnes category

For the larger dry bulk category of 5 Million tonnes or more, Paradip Port Authority maintained its leadership with a score of 66.57. Dhamra Port (61.13) and Kamarajar Port Limited (57.99) followed at second and third place. This category featured a wide range of participants, including Kakinada Deep Water Port and JSW Jaigarh Port Ltd. The below table represents the ranking of Indian Ports with more than equal to 5 Million tonnes category in dry bulk cargo.

Table 6: Dry Bulk Cargo Ranking: More Than Equal to 5 Million Tonnes

Ports	Score	Rank	Category
Paradip Port Authority	66.57	1	Major Port
Dhamra Port, Odisha	61.13	2	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Kamarajar Port Ltd.	57.99	3	Major Port
Kakinada DeepWater Port Ltd., Andhra Pradesh	56.43	4	Non-Major Port/Terminal
JSW Jaigarh Port Ltd., Maharashtra	55.68	5	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Deendayal Port Authority	53.62	6	Major Port
Krishnapatnam Port Ltd.	52.81	7	Major Port
Visakhapatnam Port Authority	52.52	8	Major Port
Syama Prasad Mookerjee Port Authority	50.88	9	Major Port
Adani Hazira Port Ltd., Gujarat	50.81	10	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Adani Petronet Dahej Port Ltd., Gujarat	50.05	11	Non-Major Port/Terminal
AMNS Ports Hazira, Gujarat	48.01	12	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Mumbai Port Authority	47.15	13	Major Port
Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd., Puducherry	47.04	14	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Mundra Port – APSEZL, Gujarat	47.04	15	Non-Major Port/Terminal
New Mangalore Port Authority	46.66	16	Major Port
Adani Gangavaram Port, Andhra Pradesh	46.57	17	Non-Major Port/Terminal
V.O. Chidambaranar Port Authority	43.25	18	Major Port
Mormugao Port Authority	41.05	19	Major Port
Gopalpur Port Ltd., Odisha	39.05	20	Non-Major Port/Terminal

5.3. Liquid Bulk Cargo: Less than 5 Million tonnes

Dhamra Port emerged as the leader in the liquid bulk category for volumes less than 5 Million tonnes, achieving a score of 66.61. Adani Hazira Port Limited (55.10) and Konkan LNG Limited (53.63) secured the second and third ranks, respectively. The below table represents the ranking of Indian Ports with less than 5 Million tonnes category in liquid bulk cargo.

Table 7: Liquid Bulk Cargo Ranking: Less Than 5 Million Tonnes

Ports	Score	Rank	Category
Dhamra Port, Odisha	66.61	1	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Adani Hazira Port Ltd., Gujarat	55.10	2	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Konkan LNG Ltd., Ratnagiri, Maharashtra	53.63	3	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Hazira Port Pvt. Ltd., Gujarat	50.20	4	Non-Major Port/Terminal
JSW Jaigarh Port Ltd., Maharashtra	49.30	5	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Krishnapatnam Port Ltd., Andhra Pradesh	47.86	6	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd., Puducherry	47.57	7	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Kakinada Deep Water Port Ltd., Andhra Pradesh	46.45	8	Non-Major Port/Terminal
V.O. Chidambaranar Port Authority	44.48	9	Major Port
MIDPL Katupalli Port, Tamil Nadu	39.98	10	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Finolex Terminal, Ranpar port, Maharashtra	38.95	11	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Mormugao Port Authority	33.18	12	Major Port
Dighi Port, Maharashtra	20.37	13	Non-Major Port/Terminal

5.4. Liquid Bulk Cargo: More than & Equal to 5 Million tonnes category

In the liquid bulk category for volumes greater than or equal to 5 Million tonnes, Sikka Port and Terminals Ltd. took the top spot with a score of 62.00. Visakhapatnam Port Authority followed at second place (56.54), with Mundra Port – APSEZL secured third rank (45.68). The below table represents the ranking of Indian Ports with more than & equal to 5 Million tonnes category in Liquid bulk cargo.

Table 8: Liquid Bulk Cargo Ranking: More Than Equal to 5 Million Tonnes

Ports	Score	Rank	Category
Sikka Port and Terminals Ltd., Gujarat	62.00	1	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Visakhapatnam Port Authority	56.54	2	Major Port
Mundra Port – APSEZL, Gujarat	45.68	3	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Mumbai Port Authority	42.34	4	Major Port
New Mangalore Port Authority	40.94	5	Major Port
Syama Prasad Mookerjee Port Authority	37.11	6	Major Port
Deendayal Port Authority	36.48	7	Major Port
Cochin Port Authority	35.87	8	Major Port
Paradip Port Authority	35.18	9	Major Port
Kamarajar Port Ltd.	35.04	10	Major Port
Chennai Port Authority	28.72	11	Major Port
Jawaharlal Nehru Port Authority	27.92	12	Major Port

5.5. Container Cargo: Less than 0.5 Million TEUs

Deendayal Port Authority led the rankings for container cargo less than 0.5 Million TEUs with a score of 64.43. New Mangalore Port Authority (54.70) and Paradip Port Authority (49.01) followed in the second and third positions. The below table represents the ranking of Indian Ports with less than to 0.5 Million TEUs category in container cargo.

Table 9: Container Cargo Ranking: Less Than 0.5 Million TEUs

Ports	Score	Rank	Category
Deendayal Port Authority	64.43	1	Major Port
New Mangalore Port Authority	54.70	2	Major Port
Paradip Port Authority	49.01	3	Major Port
JSW Jaigarh Port Ltd., Maharashtra	45.87	4	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Kakinada Deepwater Port Ltd., Andhra Pradesh	28.83	5	Non-Major Port/Terminal

5.6. Container Cargo: More than & equal to 0.5 Million TEUs category

For the larger container cargo category of 0.5 Million TEUs or more, Mundra Port – APSEZL secured the top rank with a score of 79.48. Jawaharlal Nehru Port Authority (65.02) and V.O. Chidambaranar Port Authority (54.01) followed as the second and third ranked ports in this high-volume segment.

The below table represents the ranking of Indian Ports with more than equal to 0.5 Million TEUs category in container cargo.

Table 10: Container Cargo Ranking: More Than Equal to 0.5 Million TEUs

Ports	Score	Rank	Category
Mundra Port – APSEZL, Gujarat	79.48	1	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Jawaharlal Nehru Port Authority	65.02	2	Major Port
V.O. Chidambaranar Port Authority	54.01	3	Major Port
MIDPL Katupalli Port, Tamil Nadu	53.13	4	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Chennai Port Authority	49.34	5	Major Port
Adani Hazira Port Ltd., Gujarat	49.30	6	Non-Major Port/Terminal
Syama Prasad Mookerjee Port Authority	45.95	7	Major Port
Cochin Port Authority	41.47	8	Major Port
Visakhapatnam Port Authority	39.39	9	Major Port
Kamarajar Port Ltd.	38.50	10	Major Port

Based on these consolidated results, the leading performers across all segments have demonstrated significant operational efficiency, providing a strategic baseline for future improvements across India's port sector.

Notes

सत्यमेव जयते

पत्तन, पोत परिवहन
एवं जलमार्ग मंत्रालय

MINISTRY OF
PORTS, SHIPPING AND WATERWAYS