

Minutes of the Meeting

(for conclusion on TN Sites Pricing, Revenue & Allocation)

Tamil Nadu State

On current progress of
of project after August 2025

All Partners Urgent Meet

Saturday, 21st Feb 2026 | 1-7 PM
Conference Hall, Marriott Hotel, Coimbatore

Attendance & Introduction of attendees

All Partners of Tamil Nadu state were present except TURIYA EVCP official representatives. Attendees' details are **annexed (I)** with these minutes of meeting (MoM). In the absence of any board member or formal representative from TURIYA EVCP no explanation or reason of failure in procurement progress is available for record in this MoM. Representative wanted to represent EVCP was unknown / unauthorized / undesignated and was unaware about the project.

PART - 1: Clarity for partners regarding the delay till August 2025

A timeline of Tamil Nadu state partners onboarding till August 2025 was run and revised on screen digitally and recounted by the Program Director orally for MoM and partners. Summary is being attached as **annexure - II** for records. Detailed materials and spreadsheets shall be published on 27th Feb 2026 along with replies from TURIYA EVCP.

1.1 Resolution on optional fee matters

State Nodal Partner was cautioned in August 2025 to refrain from bringing their internal partner-to-partner sales and services matters in national level project meetings. 3 partners who have refused to take services from TURIYA EVCP or sought details of services have also been **reporting discrimination, exclusions, non-cooperation, misinformation and abuse of position** by TURIYA EVCP. Aforementioned pattern was noticed in the online preparation meet to finalise agenda of this meeting as well. EVCP representative Mr. Narendran who pointed out 2 companies in writing that 1) Pinaka Innovation Private Limited, 2) Aksaratex have been expelled and will not join meeting or TN projects. Before passing on such serious and concerning remarks in writing, he didn't find it professionally important to obtain any consent from those partners or NHEV. This also happened previously with 3) Lakshmi Electrical Control Systems Limited.

Looking at these concerning and continued attempts to derail the meeting from Project's actual progress and EVCP accountability, it was agreed to hear other side of matter from those 3 partners whom he has been reportedly targeting for taking some unpaid services from TURIYA EVCP.

P1 - Pinaka Innovation Private Limited MD, Ms. Sreepriya Kowshik clarified their stand for the first-time in the meeting and clearly denied receipt of any service from TURIYA EVCP till date; as she is still awaiting details that they sought about their services. MD Ms. Sreepriya Kowshik also expressed some serious concerns on disrespectful behavior of TURIYA EVCP as aforementioned and same is being sent to TURIYA EVCP for written clarification before putting them both on record together. She also clarified that Pinaka never denied its interest in taking additional services but just asked for service details and since then repeatedly facing humiliations in meetings. She also informed that despite of urgent need to close pending procurement - TURIYA EVCP privately asked them not to pay Piloting Services fee to NHEV; as they are not confident about the project. But EVCP refused to place their advice on the email that came from NHEV transparently keeping TURIYA EVCP in loop. She was cautioned by TURIYA EVCP and advised not to take the risk, still when she submitted fee, she was removed from official group of TN State partners, and this aforementioned sequence of humiliation started.

P2 - AKSARATEX MD. K. Kannan expressed their 2 reasons of delay in sending confirmation to take State Partner Services or make its advance payment. Firstly, they sought details and timelines of State Partner's services, which never came till their last follow up email on 16th Dec 2025. He was told that all Aksaratex services are barred until they purchase TURIYA EVCP services. Aksaratex was informed until they make payment to TURIYA EVCP, they will not respond to a single routine or basic query about the NHEV project; regardless of categorization that the queries are local / central / optional or mandatory to be given by the State Nodal agency.

Aksaratex asked for the reason which became second and key factor for them to hold acceptance of the invoice / services offered by TURIYA EVCP. The reason given to them by Mr. Narendran was that " We TURIYA EVCP are about to exit from NHEV and we have already informed about it to NHEV in writing months ago." But on the question of - **How EVCP will run the project without NHEV as National Agency?** Mr. Narendran responded that we are already in Charging business and his usual reply, that I will ask my board and give you more details if you want, which eventually never came.

P3 - Lakshmi Electrical Control Systems Limited (LECS) has also reported similar occasions of aforesaid disrespect and lack of professional conscience. But LECS clarified that they locally checked with TURIYA EVCP regarding the services they were offering and didn't find any value-addition offered by TURIYA EVCP that LECS can't source on its own. Then they decided to go ahead and join as National Partner of NHEV. They also placed a request before NHEV to formally introduce LECS to State Nodal Agency after completion of their onboarding. But in the very first introduction meeting TURIYA EVCP started portraying their Chennai visit (which was aimed to know about their services) as a professional service delivery meeting which according to them should have costed Rs. 5 Lac to LECS.

Since then, TURIYA EVCP representatives are discriminating and humiliating LECS in the name of this baseless follow-up in meetings. TURIYA EVCP organized Program Director meeting with all partners at Niketana – Boat Club, Chennai but LECS was not invited and visibly discriminated. They directly had to coordinate from Program Director's Delhi Program Office and asked for a separate meeting session next day. If no service was ever given by EVCP then there is no point in any service fee follow-up. LECS Representatives took notes and shall confirm from their management regarding LECS' participation of working on those assets/highways allocated to TURIYA EVCP (if any) in future.

1.2 Conclusion of Part - I

After taking above-concerning submissions from 3 partners, Director approached other 6 partners present in the meeting, where it was found that they were not transparently informed about actual NHEV Piloting fee or any other optional paid services that EVCP has invoiced them separately. In order to bring transparency in any fee collected by EVCP if not utilized for the project related services, partners who made any such payment can send their invoice along with an authorization letter to EoDB to audit services against fee paid, only if it's collected in the pretext of project related services, not otherwise.

Above mentioned audit is mandatory for NHEV to decide next course of action and relief to partners. As partners looked verbally and visibly shaken with the anxiety of losing their candidature, fee and resources invested on EVCP directions after knowing the procurement has not yet travelled at par to reach to issuance of provisional awards; despite of all reasonable extension given by NHEV to close pricing. They are also clueless about their advance fee paid to EVCP and lingering services, if new state nodal partners would pro-bono complete remaining services or EVCP would transfer their fee to new partners or EVCP will complete them or else they will have to purchase it again from highway partners as these terms were not outlined or described by EVCP anywhere at the point of their fee collection.

PART - 2: Final decision on Tamil Nadu State Nodal Partner

This agenda item was placed in prep-meeting with consent for two-way conversation on decisions NHEV expected to take with respect of shortfalls and continued delays, so that challenges can be resolved. But it turned out again to be a one-way communication as the meeting concluded without presence of any authorized representative to share EVCP response or side on critical questions from NHEV Piloting Agency and TN Partners on the project further timeline. None of practical on ground challenges were brought by any partner to justify that despite of reduction of EVCP target from 100% to 20% in the month of August 2025; where 15% was already met – still why rest 5% of procurement could not happen in last 6 months? Failing to which TN portfolio could not go to next phase of commercial prototyping and asset pricing.

2.1 Appointment of State Partners as Nodal Agency(s)

Final Appointment of Working Group Members (WGMs) as Nodal Partners for all 6 highways shall be announced on 27th Feb 2026 from various recommendations, nominations and combinations as discussed with TN partners in the meeting. New partners shall have same roles and responsibilities as previous State Nodal Partner. If needed, a state level nodal agency shall be appointed for coordination with above key partners for handling procurement in Tamil Nadu. Outperforming highways operating partners may mutually nominate one state nodal partner. In case of no mutual consent obtained, NHEV shall appoint custodian of the stretch / highway on the basis of fastest completion of procurement on their highway or asset.

Both existing National Working Group Members (WGMs) from TN shall initiate the screening and selection of needed procurement to complete Technology, Product and Services from new partners required for final pricing in the following order of interest and suitability A. **Existing local TN Partners**, B. **National Partners pool**, C. **By inviting new applications**. In order to close needed procurement in accelerated manner for inviting applications, separate orders shall be issued to appoint these partners. Their company details at onboarding web portal shall be updated this week along with routes and highways allocated to them for NHEV procurement. For other two positions in the national Working Group Members (WGMs) from Tamil Nadu, partners who are already nominated may speedily complete their formalities related to time commitment and appointment from Program Office before 27th Feb 2026 to contribute.

2.2 Decision on TURIYA EVCP status

Final decision on extension or re-appointment of TURIYA EVCP again as Senior Partner / State Nodal / Highway Partner (as orally requested) could not be taken in the meeting in absence of formal request from TURIYA EVCP for extension and clarification of state agency's time, commitment and failure on previous extension. In the absence of above; all unsettled deliberations and questions related to TURIYA EVCP performance and future commitment are being sent to them directly and all responses needed and discussed, were also noted by Mr. Kalaiselvan. They can share their response via email to NHEV Director Office latest by Thursday, 26th February 2026 before appointment of Nodal Partners for all 6 highways on 27th February, 2026; failing to which it shall not be considered.

2.3 Conclusion of Part - II

In the light of concerning incidents, practices and misinformation reported by partners before and during the meeting itself, a formal notification regarding this temporary removal of EVCP is inescapable till their response regarding maintaining transparency in fee collection and rendering their company services are documented alongwith partner's substantiation who are reporting misinformation and opacity. EVCP's efforts are quite visible now that - why right from travel to venue arrangement, they were deterrent about organizing this meeting and the way representative sent in meeting without authorization, MD is available on phone with another unauthorized representative for lobbying and airing rumors. But when asked about actual reasons of delays and shortcomings, no representative, online or on mobile responded, which clearly indicates intent in their destructive interruptions, and interests to derail the project. Therefore, moving forward, project information only need to be shared on need-to-know basis with them and same is being strictly advised to partners.

PART - 3: Evaluation framework for monthly progress review

This agenda section was dedicated to learn from previous shortcomings and challenges that resulted in unacceptable delays by introducing extensively planned reviews and hand holding. But the amount of dissatisfaction due to lack of transparency and misinformation, expressed by partners and experienced by the meeting attendees during the meeting; constrained the director to establish following restraints and resistance against misinformation first.

3.1 Caution & Restraints against misinformation

Two partners during the meeting approached the chair to crosscheck as they were informed by Sri Sasthaa Constructions MD Mr. CT NARAYANAN - "That some official from Private Secretary rank at PMO and equivalent to Personal Secretary to MoRTH Minister just called the NHEV Program Director during the meeting when he last stepped out of meeting hall to attend the call on his phone".

Director denied any merit in such rumor or out of context intervention call received. MD Sri Sasthaa Constructions Mr. CT Narayanan then clarified before all partners that what he projected to above 2 partners were not correct and he was told by MD TURIYA EVCP Mr. Sashi Kumar CK that - "Director has got these 2 very high-level calls lobbied by EVCP to not remove them from the project on poor-procurement ground and give extension". Program Director denied and advised not to entertain such rumors and cautioned both involved partners that this may lead to disciplinary disqualification from project if repeated as zero tolerance is already mentioned in application for any such lobby or unethical influence to bypass Merit, Productivity and Performance.

In order to maintain complete restraint against any misinformation spread with vested interest - going forward no partner shall entertain any communication regarding portfolio, budgets, fees, onboarding, selection, allocation, Scope of Work, Service Level Agreements(SLAs), Terms of Reference(ToR) Letter of Recommendations (LoRs), Provisional or final Letter of Award (LoA) without documenting it in monthly progress notification and quarterly progress reports compiled and published by NHEV with complete transparency and disclosure for other partners.

3.2 Requested Morning Meeting

TURIYA EVCP MD Mr. Sashi Kumar CK met Program Director in the morning to express his unavailability for the meeting due to personal reason and also assured that he would send Mr. CT Narayanan, MD, Sri Sasthaa (with a junior staff) to represent TURIYA EVCP as Mr. CT Narayanan is aware about TURIYA EVCP challenges and solutions those can be offered to revive. But despite of repeated requests by meeting organiser the official communication to authorize him to represent TURIYA EVCP was not shared via, e-mail, message or any written communication. This resulted in removing all efforts from MoM that Mr. Narayanan volunteered to express on behalf of EVCP, to revive the project portfolio without changing EVCP status.

3.3 Conclusion of Part- III

It is inevitable to push the project forward on ground without introduction of new state nodal partner for all 6 highways. Already more than sufficient time and extension have been given to previous senior partner at state level. But instead of showing positive efforts and accelerated closure of procurement, EVCP seems more occupied in covering facts and concealing information from partners regarding fee, services, allocation, portfolios and spread of approving authorities between center and state agencies. Now in the process of appointing new state level agencies, it's expected from NHEV to adhere to strict action plans and ensure complete transparency, so that partners can reclaim their confidence in the new state partners and move forward with positivity and precision. A very strict and comprehensive line of order needed to be issued at this stage to protect partners' business interest who have invested their resources and have ability to deal with such intentional detours without losing the project.

Annexure – I: List of Attendees (Physical and Virtual)

Sr. No.	Company Name	Attendees	Email IDs
1.	Annamalai Hotels Pvt Ltd	Mr. V. Sivakumar Director, Annamalai Hotels Pvt Ltd	sivakumarv18@gmail.com
Shri V. Sivakumar attended in person and was present throughout the proceedings.			
2.	Sri Sasthaa Constructions	Mr. CT Narayanan Managing Director Sri Sasthaa Constructions	ceo@SSCons.in
Shri CT NARAYANAN attended the meeting in person and was physically present throughout the proceedings.			
3.	Turiya EV Charge Partners (EVCP) Private Limited	Refused to send authorized representative or any Board Member to attend the meeting.	
Shri Kalaiselvan came to attend the meeting without any written authorization from Turiya EVCP. MD Sashi Kumar CK informed that a formal email authorizing Mr. Narayanan from Sri Sasthaa Constructions to represent EVCP was being shared. However, it did not arrive until the following Tuesday despite several reminders. Shri Kalaiselvan was allowed to sit on the condition to get quick authorization via email and take notes of the proceedings, but no formal response, input, or document he submitted.			
4.	Laksaws Business and Property Consultants	Ms. Sathya Ramakrishnan Proprietor, Laksaws Business and Property Consultants	Laksawsobe@gmail.com
Ms. Sathya Ramakrishnan attended the meeting in person and was physically present throughout the proceedings.			
5.	Aksaratex	Mr. K. Kannan Managing Director Aksaratex Ms. Aruna Gunaseelan Business Associate Aksaratex	kannan@aksaratex.in aruna@aksaratex.in
Ms. Aruna Gunaseelan and Shri K. Kannan attended the meeting in person and were physically present throughout the proceedings.			
6.	Pinaka Innovation Private Limited	Ms. Sreepriya Kowshik Managing Director Pinaka Innovation Private Limited Working Group Member of NHEV National WGM on Networks	sreepriya@pinakainnovation.com
Ms. Sreepriya Kowshik attended the meeting in person and was physically present throughout the proceedings with a representative Mr. Rahul K.			

Sr. No.	Company Name	Attendees	Email IDs
7.	KS Globals	Mr. Krupasankar U Managing Director/CEO KS Globals Ms. Ramya Krishnaveni M CTO, KS Globals Mr. Sriram Chandrasekar CFO, KS Globals	krupasankar@ksglobals.com ramyakrish0799@gmail.com srirampard@gmail.com
Team KS Globals attended the meeting in person and was physically present throughout the proceedings.			
8.	PP Associates	Mr. Krishnan General Manager PP Associates	ppassociatescbe@gmail.com
Shri Krishnan attended the meeting in person and was physically present throughout the proceedings.			
9.	Lakshmi Electrical Control Systems Limited	Mr. Vishnu Prasad Associate Vice President Lakshmi Electrical Control Systems Limited, Working Group Member of NHEV National WGM on Energy. Mr. Pravin Kumar Mechanical Engineer Lakshmi Electrical Control Systems Limited Mr. R Parthiban Public Relations Head Lakshmi Electrical Control Systems Limited	vishnuprasad.vp@lecsindia.com Shankaran@lecsindia.com
Shri Vishnu Prasad joined the meeting virtually, while Shri Praveen and Shri Parthiban from his team attended in person.			

Annexure – II

List of deliberations for Clarity of partners regarding the delay till August 2025 as mentioned in Part-II

A timeline of Tamil Nadu state partners onboarding till August 2025 was run and revised on screen digitally and recounted by the Program Director orally for MoM and partners. Here is summary list for records along with other questions asked by partners

Points listed below as Discussed in PART - I

1. Urgency to conclude procurement & pricing for the TN portfolio by 31 Mar 2026.
2. Risk of losing pledged TN sites in the next FY year if deadlines are not met.
3. 3 years' delay is not acceptable; strict corrective action framework is needed.
4. All fee and allocation - related discussions must be documented formally.
5. Administrative communication protocol and official email requirements.
6. Review of past delays and missed milestones (Aug–Sept commitments) will happen.
7. Waiver of ₹2.95 crore given but implications resulted in rejection are unknown.
8. Tamil Nadu portfolio structure (6 highways, ~66 charging stations).
9. EVCP reason for the delay in issuance of the Provisional Letter of Award (LOA) is unknown.
10. Partner onboarding workflow and registration status need micromanagement.
11. NHEV Application fee and piloting fee structure were discussed for documentation.
12. Discussion on highway prioritization and took partners inputs for allocations.
13. Activation of Plan B / Backup execution framework to be developed.
14. Scope and value of central services (Technical, Commercial, Regulatory).
15. State-level coordination services and fee structure justification principles.
16. Audit of state agency fees require payee partner's consent and invoice.
17. Strict Caution & Restraints against misinformation should be issued.
18. Restriction on undocumented announcements is enforced on partner request.
19. Monthly compilation & Official Orders publication before review meet from March.
20. CAPEX clarity and revenue projections requirement were explained to partners.
21. On-screen land interest portal demonstration and workflow.
22. Partner highway allocation matrix was explained for transparency.
23. National Working Group structure (individual vs company participation).
24. Role of EVCP under Terms of Reference (TOR) was played on screen.
25. Extension of waivers and conditional approvals were discussed.
26. Safety net mechanism to build procurement backup in case of failure again.
27. Next review meeting timeline in week of 28th March 2026 is tentatively fixed.
28. Description of EVCP services are to be provided by EVCP within 10 days with invoices.
29. Screening & Elevation Framework from LoR to LoA was explained by program director.
30. The Tech Trial – III success was expected to accelerate procurement closure was explained.