

**HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH
REPORT**

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(1983-84)**

(SEVENTH LOK SABHA)

**DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF A
WEAPON SYSTEM**

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

**[Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the
Public Accounts Committee contained in their 113th
Report (Seventh Lok Sabha)]**



Presented in Lok Sabha on 25 11 83
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 12 12 83

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

August, 1983/Sravana, 1905 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 1.00

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS**

ANDHRA PRADESH

1. Andhra University General
Cooperative Stores Ltd.,
Waltair (Visakhapatnam)

BIHAR

2. M/s. Crown Book Depot,
Upper Bazar,
Ranchi (Bihar).

GUJARAT

3. Vijay Stores,
Station Road,
Anard.

MADHYA PRADESH

4. Modern Book House,
Shiv Vilas Palace,
Indore City.

MAHARASHTRA

5. M/s. Sunderdas Gianchand,
601, Girgaum Road,
near Princess Street,
Bombay-2.
6. The International Book House
(Private) Limited,
9, Ash Lane,
Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay-1.
7. The International Book Service,
Deccan Gymkhana,
Poona-4.
8. The Current Book House,
Maruti Lane, Raghunath
Dadaji Street,
Bombay-1.
9. M/s. Usha Book Depot,
585/A, Chira Bazar,
Khan House, Girgaum Road,
Bombay-2.

10. M & J Services, Publishers,
Representatives Accounts &
Law Book Sellers,
Bahri Road,
Bombay-15.

11. Popular Book Depot,
Dr. Bhadkamkar Road,
Bombay-400001.

MYSORE

12. M/s. Peoples Book House,
Opp. Jaganmohan Palace,
Mysore-1.

UTTAR PRADESH

13. Law Book Company,
Sardar Patel Marg,
Allahabad-1.
14. Law Publishers,
Sardar Patel Marg,
P.B. No. 77,
Allahabad-U.P.

WEST BENGAL

15. Granthaloka,
5/1 Ambica Mookherjee Road,
Belgharia,
24-Parganas.
16. W. Newman & Company Ltd ,
3, Old Court House Street,
Calcutta.
17. Mrs. Manimala, Buys & Sells,
128, Bow Bazar Street,
Calcutta-12.

DELHI

18. Jain Book Agency,
Connaught Place,
New Delhi.
19. M/s. Sat Narain & Sons,
3141, Mohd. Ali Bazar,
Mori Gate,
Delhi.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ...	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I — Report	1
CHAPTER II — Recommendations and Observations that have been accepted by Government. ...	5
CHAPTER III — Recommendations and Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the light of the replies received from Government.	11
CHAPTER IV — Recommendations and Observations replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration.	14
CHAPTER V — Recommendations and Observations in respect of which Government have fur- nished interim replies.	16
APPENDIX — Conclusions/Recommendations. ...	17

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(1983-84)

CHAIRMAN

Shri Sunil Maitra

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Chitta Basu
3. Smt. Vidyavati Chaturvedi
4. Shri C.T. Dhandapani
5. Shri G.L. Dogra
6. Shri Bhiku Ram Jain
7. Shri Satyanarayan Jatiya
8. Shri K. Lakkappa
9. Shri Mahavir Prasad
10. Shri Dhanik Lal Mandal
11. Shri Jamilur Rahman
12. Shri Uttam Rathod
13. Shri Harish Rawat
14. Shri G. Narsimha Reddy
15. Shri Ram Singh Yadav

Rajya Sabha

16. Dr. Sankata Prasad
17. Shri Syed Rahmat Ali
18. Smt. Pratibha Singh
19. Dr. (Smt.) Sathiavani Muthu
20. Dr. Harekrushna Mallick
21. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
22. Shri Kalyan Roy

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri T. R. Krishnamachari—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri H. S. Kohli—*Chief Financial Committee Officer*
3. Shri K. K. Sharma—*Senior Financial Committee Officer*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Hundred and Sixty-eighth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their Hundred and Thirteenth Report (Seventh Lok Sabha) on development and manufacture of a weapon system.

2. In their 113th Report, the Committee had dealt with a case in which due to the abandonment of the project for development of the mount around vehicle 'E' the order for ground equipment had to be curtailed by 28.5 per cent, resulting in a redundancy of materials to the extent of Rs. 17.20 lakhs. The Committee had considered it unfortunate that orders for ground equipment were placed on the undertaking even before successful development of a suitable mount. The Committee were earlier informed that for obviating the chances of such redundancy, a decision had been taken by the Ministry of Defence that no anticipatory orders for equipment would be placed on any agency unless evaluation and trials were successfully carried out and the product found suitable for induction into service. The Ministry of Defence have, however, now intimated that as this decision was leading to problems in indigenous development of equipment and creating difficulties in Research and Development efforts, it was reviewed in the Ministry at the highest level and it has since been decided not to impose a blanket ban on placement of anticipatory orders but in future specific orders of the Defence Secretary, Secretary (DP)/Secretary (R&D) would be obtained where necessary. While noting this change of decision, the Committee have emphasised that adequate precaution should be taken to guard against the material becoming redundant as a result of anticipatory orders, as has happened in the present case.

3. On 12 May, 1983 the following Action Taken Sub-Committee was appointed to scrutinize the replies received from Government in

(vi)

pursuance of the recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee in their earlier Reports:

1. Shri Sunil Maitra—*Chairman*
 2. Shri K. Lakkapa
 3. Shri G. L. Dogra
 4. Shri Ram Singh Yadav
 5. Shri Bhiku Ram Jain
 6. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
- } *Members*

4. The Action Taken Sub-Committee of the Public Accounts Committee (1983-84) considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 2 August, 1983. The Report was finally adopted by the Public Accounts Committee on 1st August, 1983

5. For reference facility and convenience, the recommendations and observations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report and have also been reproduced in a consolidated form in the Appendix to the Report.

7. The Committee placed on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in this matter by the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

NEW DELHI
11 August, 1983
20 Sravana, 1905 (S)


SUNIL MAITRA
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee

CHAPTER I

REPORT

1.1 The Report of the Committee deals with the action taken by Government on Committee's recommendations and observations in their 113th Report (Seventh Lok Sabha) on Paragraph 8 of the Report of Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1979-80, Union Government (Defence Services) on Development and manufacture of a weapon system.

1.2 The 113th Report which was presented to Lok Sabha on 30 April, 1982 contained 11 recommendations. Action Taken Notes have been received in respect of all the recommendations/observations and these have been broadly categorised as follows :

- (i) Recommendations and observations that have been accepted by Government :

Sl. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

- (ii) Recommendations and observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the light of the replies received from Government:

Sl. No. 10.

- (iii) Recommendations and observations replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:

Sl. No. 11.

- (iv) Recommendations and observations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies :

— Nil —

1.3. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by Government on some of their recommendations.

*Redundancy of materials due to abandonment of the project
(Sl. No. 10—Paragraph 1.70).*

1.4 Dealing with the redundancy of materials due to the abandonment of the project, the Committee had in Paragraph 1.70 of their 113th Report observed as follows :—

“The Committee find that due to the abandonment of the project for development of the mount around vehicle ‘E’ the order for ground equipment had to be curtailed by 28.5 per cent. As a result, there was a redundancy of materials to the extent of Rs. 17.20 lakhs. It is unfortunate that orders for ground equipment were placed on the undertaking even before successful development of a suitable mount for weapon ‘A’. The Committee have been informed that a policy decision has since been taken by the Ministry that no anticipatory orders will be placed on any agency unless evaluation and trials have been successfully carried out and the product has been found suitable for induction into service. The Committee trust that these instructions will be strictly followed in future. The Committee desire that the redundant material should be disposed of at the earliest to the best advantage of the State.”

1.5 In their action taken note dated 19 March, 1983 the Ministry of Defence stated as follows :

“The earlier policy decision that no anticipatory orders would be placed on any agency unless evaluation and trials had been successfully carried out and the product had been found suitable for introduction into service was leading to problems in indigenous development of equipment and creating difficulties in Research & Development efforts. The policy has, therefore, been reviewed in the Ministry at the highest level and it has since been decided not to have a blanket ban on the placement of anticipatory orders on development/production agencies as this would increase the time-cycle of development and make the Armed Forces dependent upon imported equipment for a longer period. The placement of anticipatory orders after enough confi-

defence has been gained in the development of weapons/equipment does cut down the lead-time in establishing free flow production. This Ministry's reconsidered view is, therefore, that every case should be considered on its merits and discretion used in the placement of anticipatory orders. Only in certain special cases would such orders be necessary. It has accordingly been decided not to impose a blanket ban on placement of anticipatory orders, but in future specific orders of the Defence Secretary/Secretary (DP)/Secretary (R & D) would be obtained where necessary. Instructions to this effect have been issued to all concerned. Necessary action is in hand to make alternative use of the maximum number of items and dispose of the remaining ones to the best advantage of the State."

1.6 Due to the abandonment of the project for development of the mount around vehicle 'E' the order for ground equipment had to be curtailed by 28.5 per cent, resulting in a redundancy of materials to the extent of Rs. 17.20 lakhs. The Committee had considered it unfortunate that orders for ground equipment were placed on the undertaking even before successful development of a suitable mount. The Committee were informed that for obviating the chances of such redundancy, a decision had been taken by the Ministry of Defence that no anticipatory orders for equipment would be placed on any agency unless evaluation and trials have been successfully carried out and the product found suitable for induction into service. The Ministry of Defence have, however, now intimated that as this decision was leading to problems in indigenous development of equipment and creating difficulties in Research and Development efforts, it was reviewed in the Ministry at the highest level and it has since been decided not to impose a blanket ban on placement of anticipatory orders but in future specific orders of the Defence Secretary/Secretary (DP)/Secretary (R&D) would be obtained where necessary. In view of the submission made by the Ministry that the earlier decision was leading to problems in indigenous development of equipment and creating difficulties in research and development efforts, Committee do not desire to comment on this change of decision. They, however, trust that adequate precaution will be taken to guard against the material becoming redundant as a result of anticipatory orders, as has happened in the present case.

1.7 As regards the disposal of the material since rendered surplus the Committee have been informed that necessary action is in hand to make alternative use of the maximum number of items and dispose of the remaining ones to the best advantage of the State. The Committee would like to be informed of the details regarding the action taken in this regard.

Service conditions and promotional avenues of Scientists under Defence Research Establishments.

1.8 In para 1.71 of their 113th Report, the Committee had, *inter alia*, recommended as follows :

“The Committee consider that in the interest of making the country self-sufficient in the field of defence hardware, it is essential that the service conditions and promotional avenues of the scientists are brought at par with those available to officers belonging to the other All India Services *viz.* the IAS, IPS *etc.* The Committee trust that the matter would be reviewed at the highest level so as to attract the best talent to man the Defence Research Establishments in the country.”

1.9 In their action taken note dated 15th December 1982, the Ministry of Defence have stated, “As regards the service conditions and promotional avenues, the Committee’s recommendation has been noted.”

1.10 The Committee are not happy at the vague reply of Government that the recommendation of the Committee has been noted. In their opinion, mere ‘noting’ is not enough. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation that the question of bringing the service conditions and promotional avenues of defence scientists at par with those available to officers belonging to other All India Services, *viz.* the IAS, IPS, *etc.* should be reviewed at the highest level so as to attract the best talent to man the Defence Research establishments in the country. The Committee would like to be informed of the specific steps taken by Government in this regard at an early date.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation

The Committee find that the designing and development of an anti-tank missile system was entrusted to a Defence Research and Development Laboratory, as a competence building project as early as in 1962. At the initiative of the user it was converted into a staff project and necessary sanction was accorded in January, 1964. No time schedule for its completion was fixed since it was a new field of technology for which adequate know-how and even the basic infrastructure did not then exist in the country. At the time of revision of the cost estimate in 1966, it was felt that it would be possible to complete the project in 1½ to 2 years. The Committee, however, regret to note that the DRDL could not develop or design the weapon system even over a period of ten years and the project had to be finally closed down in April, 1972, after incurring an expenditure of Rs. 28.72 lakhs (against the estimated cost of Rs 6 lakhs).

[S. No. 1 (Para 1.61) of Appendix to 113th Report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha)].

Action Taken

The Defence Research & Development Organisation will make continuous efforts to complete projects expeditiously by building up the necessary manpower and competence and infrastructural facilities consistent with the available resources.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O.I) dated 9-12-82]

Recommendation

The Committee observe that by January, 1969 it had become clear that the weapon under development was not suitable for induction in the army. The user trials showed that the reliability of the weapon

system actually achieved was 64 per cent at a range of 1500 yards as against 90 to 95 per cent reliability required at a range of 2000 yards. It was, however, decided to continue the work on the project" to enable the scientists in the DRDL to derive maximum benefit from this project in the areas of design, development, engineering trial techniques and evaluation methods of similar weapons". The representatives of the Ministry contented in the evidence before the Committee that the decision to take the project to its logical conclusion had enabled the country to go to the next step of developing a totally indigenous ground to air missile and also in developing new propulsion technology and guidance and control systems. Thus, the project had helped in competence building and in establishing a technological base in the country for the highly sophisticated field of missile technology.

[S. No. 2 (Para 1.62) of Appendix to 113th Report of PAC
(7th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

The observation of the Committee has been noted.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O.I) dated 9-12-82.]

Recommendation

The Committee find that an expenditure of Rs. 27.64 lakhs had been incurred on the project upto January 1969 and a further expenditure of Rs. 9.91 lakhs was incurred from February 1969 till closure of the project. Thus the total expenditure on the project comes to Rs. 37.55 lakhs out of which credit to the tune of Rs. 8.82 lakhs is stated to have been given on account of salvage items/assets utilised elsewhere on the closure of the project. Since the user trials had been completed by August, 1970, the Committee consider that there was not ostensible reason for delaying the formal closure of the project till April, 1972. Much of the extra expenditure of nearly 10 lakhs on the project could therefore have been saved had the project been formally closed in August 1970 itself.

[S. No. 3 (Para 1.63) of Appendix to 113th Report of PAC
(7th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

Projects allotted to the DRDO by Army HQrs. are now being monitored by them to see that these are closed after their main purpose has been served.

All endeavours will be made by DRDO in future to close the projects as soon as a decision in this regard has been taken.

[Ministry of Defence O. M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O.I) dated 9-12-82]

Recommendation

The Committee find that the delay in development of the weapon system necessitated import of certain quantities of two varieties of the weapon at a cost of nearly Rs. 4 crores. In addition, equipment costing Rs. 23.47 lakhs for mounting the weapon on a vehicle had also to be imported. Further, imports of mounts of a different design offered by another source were also made at a cost of Rs. 17.13 lakhs in October, 1972.

[S. No. 4 (Para 1.64) of Appendix to 113th Report of the PAC
(7th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

The observation of the Committee has been noted.

[Ministry of Defence O. M. No. 12(2)/82/D (O.I) dated 9-12-82]

Recommendation

The Committee find that in December, 1969 the Vehicle Research and Development Establishment (VRDE) was asked to develop a suitable mount for deploying the weapon system 'A' on Equipment 'D' with a view to improving the operational effectiveness of these tanks. During the user trials in January, 1971, it was observed that the mounting of weapon 'A' on these tanks did not permit full exploitation of the main armament of the tank and that the characteristics of the weapon 'A' and the armament system of the tank were incompatible. In addition, it was realised at this stage that the tanks after fitment of weapon 'A' no longer retained their offensive character and the proposal had, therefore, to be shelved. In reply to a pointed question, the

Committee have been informed that "it is correct to an extent that no other country in the world had mounted an anti-tank missile on a medium tank except France. It was hoped that the disadvantages arising out of the immobility of the tank for a short time would be more than off set by the longer range of the missile. Unfortunately, this did not come true". The Committee have been further informed that while the technical nature of the development of the mount was discussed with CRDE prior to assigning the project, the tactical aspects because of which the project was given up, were not discussed with the VRDE as these were not its concern. The Committee regret to observe that the fundamental question of compatibility of the two systems was not examined in all its aspects before assigning the work of development of a suitable mount to the VRDE. The very fact that a system did not obtain in any other country excepting one should have impelled the authorities to have first got the proposal examined thoroughly by a team of experts before assigning the same to the VRDE.

[S. No. 5 (Para 1.65) of Appendix to 113th Report of PAC
(7th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

The observation of the Committee has been noted. All aspects of a project will be fully examined before assigning the same to the R&D.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O.I) dated 9-12-82.]

Recommendation

In February, 1971, it was decided that the weapon system 'A' should be mounted on vehicle 'E' (PT 76 tanks) for some squadrons and on vehicle 'F' for others. The Committee find that the user-cum-technical trials to which the first mount was subjected in February, 1972 showed that the same was wanting in some respects. Further trials incorporating the modifications desired were carried out. During the trials carried out in 1974 it was found that the defects which were brought out earlier still persisted. It was decided not to proceed with the further development work as it was felt that even if the mount was developed successfully in another one or two years' time, it would equipment 'E' would not permit their full utilisation. The project was accor-

dingly dropped after spending Rs. 1.60 lakhs and losing another three years in the process.

[S. No. 6 (Para 1.66) of appendix to 113th Report of PAC
1981-82 (7th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

The conclusion of the Committee is a statement of fact and has been noted.

[Ministry of Defence O. M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O.I) dated 9-12-82]

Recommendation

In March, 1974, the development of the mount for weapon 'A' on vehicle 'G' was assigned to EME by the Army HQrs. The Committee find that an army workshop had developed a mount for weapon 'A' on this vehicle based on the mount imported in October, 1972. This mount was found suitable during trials carried out in August, 1974.

[S. No. 7 (Para 1.67) of Appendix to 113th Report of PAC (7th
Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

The observation of the Committee is a statement of fact and has been noted.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O.I) dated 9-12-82]

Recommendation

The Committee thus observe that after about five years of fruitless effort in designing and producing a suitable mount (which was urgently required in the context of the situation prevailing in 1971) through the VRDE, the problem was solved by the ingenuity of an army workshop.

[S. No. 8 (Para 1.68) of Appendix 113th Report of PAC (7th
Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

(a) As per the existing procedure a feasibility study is carried out, where considered necessary, before allotting projects to minimise the risks involved in research and development effort.

(b) It has been decided by the DRDO as a policy to off load simpler development jobs which could be undertaken by other agencies to enable them to concentrate on major development activities.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O. 1) dated 9-12-82]

Recommendation

From the foregoing, it would be clear that the technical feasibility of the proposal was not examined in depth by the Army HQrs. before assigning the project to VRDE. Had this been done, the process of trial and error, which ultimately resulted in nothing but waste of precious years, would have been cut short, it not altogether avoided. The Committee trust that proper lessons would be drawn by Government from their experience in this case.

[S. No. 9 (Para 1.69) of Appendix to 113th Report of PAC
(7th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

The recommendation of the Committee has been accepted. As mentioned against the conclusion of the Committee in Para 1.65, all aspects will be fully examined before assigning a project to the R&D.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O.I) dated 9-12-82]

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN THE LIGHT OF THE REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Recommendation

The Committee find that due to the abandonment of the project for development of the mount around vehicle 'N' the order for ground equipment had to be curtailed by 28.5 per cent. As a result, there was a redundancy of materials to the extent of Rs. 17.20 lakhs. It is unfortunate that orders for ground equipment were placed on the undertaking even before successful development of a suitable mount for weapon 'A'. The Committee have been informed that a policy decision has since been taken by the Ministry that no anticipatory orders will be placed on any agency unless evaluation and trials have been successfully carried out and the product has been found suitable for induction into service. The Committee trust that these instructions will be strictly followed in future. The Committee desire that the redundant material should be disposed of at the earliest to the best advantage of the State.

[S.No. 10 (Para 1.70) of Appendix to 113th Report of PAC
(7th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

The earlier policy decision that no anticipatory orders would be placed on any agency unless evaluation and trials had been successfully carried out and the product had been found suitable for introduction into service was leading to problems in indigenous development of equipment and creating difficulties in Research Development efforts. The policy has, therefore, been reviewed in the Ministry at the highest level and it has since been decided not to have a blanket ban on the placement of anticipatory orders on development/production agencies as this would increase the time-cycle of development and make the Armed Forces dependant upon imported equipment for a longer period. The placement of

anticipatory orders after enough confidence has been gained in the development of weapons/equipment does cut down the lead-time in establishing free flow production. This Ministry's reconsidered view is, therefore, that every case should be considered on its merits and discretion used in the placement of anticipatory orders. Only in certain special cases would such orders be necessary. It has accordingly been decided not to impose a blanket ban on placement of anticipatory orders, but in future specific orders of the Defence Secretary/Secretary(DP)/Secretary(R&D) would be obtained where necessary. Instructions to this effect have been issued to all concerned (ANNEXURE). Necessary action is in hand to make alternative use of the maximum number of items and dispose of the remaining ones to the best advantage of the State.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 12(2)/82/D(O.I) dated 14-3-83]

ANNEXURE

**Ministry of Defence
(Budget)**

SUBJECT :— *Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1979-80—Union Government (Defence Services)—Para 8—Development and manufacture of a Weapon System-- Remedial/corrective action on paras.*

The Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1979-80—Union Government (Defence Services) mentions a case where orders were Placed for certain ground equipment before successful development of a suitable mount for a particular weapon leading to a substantial curtailment of the requirement for the equipment and this resulted in redundancy of material. A view has been taken in the Report that had the order on the undertaking been placed after successful development of a suitable mount for the weapon, the redundancy could have been avoided. A copy of Para 8 of the Report of the C & AG of India for the year 1979-80—Union Government (Defence Services), is enclosed.

2. The observations made in para 8 are brought to the notice of all concerned with the request that these may be kept in view while placing orders on production agencies in future and specific orders of Defence Secretary/Secretary Defence Production/Secretary (R&D) obtained where necessary.

Sd/-

**(ASHIM CHATTERJI)
JOINT SECRETARY (P&D)**

All Joint Secretaries/Directors/Dy. Secretaries in the Ministry of Defence (including Department of Defence Production, Defence Supplies and Defence (R&D) and CCR and D.

[M of D.I.D. No. PC. II to F. 11(13)—81/D (budget), dt. 12-1-1983]

Copy to :—

- (i) Army Headquarters FP Dte.
- (ii) Naval Headquarters (Dte. of Naval Plans)
- (iii) Air Headquarters (FP Dte)

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS REPLIES TO WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND WHICH REQUIRE REITERATION

Recommendation

The Committee were informed during evidence that a macro level review of the working of Defence Research Establishment had been undertaken recently as a result of which large number of small projects have been given up. The Committee were assured that the entire long term perspective plan was now getting more and more integrated and that interaction between the users, production agencies and the DRDO was "as close to perfection as possible in a situation which is necessarily imperfect". The Committee have been further informed that more modern and sophisticated equipment and machinery is being provided to facilitate research and development effort. Defence Science Service Rules are also stated to have been modified considerably to provide better chances of promotion to the scientists. The Committee consider that the interest of making the country self-sufficient in the field of defence hardware, it is essential that the service conditions and promotional avenues of the scientists are brought on par with those available to officers belonging to the other All India Services viz. the IAS, IPS etc. The Committee trust that the matter would be reviewed at the highest level so as to attract the best talent to man the Defence Research Establishments in the country.

[S. No. 11(Para 1.71) of Appendix to 113th Report of PAC
(7th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken

As a result of a macro level review, the number of small projects was brought down from 868 to 660 during the period January 1975 to December 1981. Efforts on these lines will continue.

2. A close coordination is being maintained between the DRDO, the Users and the Production Agencies, through R&D Panels, Steering

Committee and Production Review Meetings, Specialists from Users/ Production Agencies apart from other Research Agencies/IATs are deputed on these Panels/Committees. The panels not only recommend the new projects for execution by various Laboratories but also monitor very closely their progress. The Production Agency is brought into the picture and is associated with the project at an appropriate time during the feasibility stage, thus helping to understand the intricacies of the technology involved in design/ development, as well as production planning.

3. As regards the service conditions and promotional avenues, the Committee's recommendations have been noted.

[Ministry of Defence O. M. No. 12(2)/82/D (O.I) dated 9-12-82]

CHAPTER V
RECOMMENDATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT
OF WHICH GOVERNMENT HAVE FURNISHED
INTERIM REPLIES

—NIL—

NEW DELHI ;
August 11, 1983

Sravana 20, 1905 (Saka)


SUNIL MAITRA
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

APPENDIX

Conclusions and Recommendations

Sl. No.	Para No.	Ministry concerned	Conclusion/Recommendation
1	2	3	4
1	1.6	Defence	<p>Due to the abandonment of the project for development of the mount around vehicle 'E' the order for ground equipment had to be curtailed by 28.5 per cent, resulting in a redundancy of materials to the extent of Rs. 17.20 lakhs. The Committee had considered it unfortunate that orders for ground equipment were placed on the undertaking even before successful development of a suitable mount. The Committee were informed that for obviating the chances of such redundancy, a decision had been taken by the Ministry of Defence that no anticipatory orders for equipment would be placed on any agency unless evaluation and trials have been successfully carried out and the product found suitable for induction into service. The Ministry of Defence have, however, now intimated that as this decision was leading to problems in indigenous development of equipment and creating difficulties in Research and Development efforts, it was reviewed in the Ministry at the highest level and it has since been decided not to</p>

1

2

3

4

impose a blanket ban on placement of anticipatory orders but in future specific orders of the Defence Secretary/Secretary (DP)/Secretary (R&D) would be obtained where necessary. In view of the submission made by the Ministry that the earlier decision was leading to problems in indigenous development of equipment and creating difficulties in research and development efforts, the Committee do not desire to comment on this change of decision. They, however, trust that adequate precaution will be taken to guard against the material becoming redundant as a result of anticipatory orders, as has happened in the present case.

1.7

Defence •

As regards the disposal of the material since rendered surplus the Committee have been informed that necessary action is in hand to make alternative use of the maximum number of items and dispose of the remaining ones to the best advantage of the State. The Committee would like to be informed of the details regarding the action taken in this regard.

1.10

Defence

The Committee are not happy at the vague reply of Government that the recommendation of the Committee has been noted. In their opinion, mere 'noting' is not enough. The

Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation that the question of bringing the service conditions and promotional avenues of defence scientists at par with those available to officers belonging to other All India Services, viz. the IAS, IPS, etc. should be reviewed at the highest level so as to attract the best talent to man the Defence Research establishments in the country. The Committee would like to be informed of the specific steps taken by Government in this regard at an early date.
