

46

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES (2016-2017)

SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA

FORTY-SIXTH REPORT

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING
OF ASSURANCES
(NOT ACCEDED TO)

(Presented to Lok Sabha on 15 December, 2016)



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December, 2016/Agrahayana, 1938 (Saka)

FORTY-SIXTH REPORT

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(2016-2017)

(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING
OF ASSURANCES
(NOT ACCEDED TO)

(Presented to Lok Sabha on 15 December, 2016)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI
December, 2016/Agrahayana, 1938 (Saka)

CGA No. 296

Price: ₹ 112.00

© 2016 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fifteenth Edition) and Printed by the General Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110 002.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2016-2017)	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2015-2016)	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)
REPORT	1

APPENDICES I TO XV

Requests for Dropping of Assurances (Not Acceded to)

I. SQ No. 81 dated 04.03.2013 regarding 'VVIP Helicopters Deal'	3
SQ No. 554 dated 06.05.2013 regarding 'VVIP Helicopters Deal'	8
USQ No. 154 dated 05.08.2013 regarding 'VVIP Helicopters Deal'	9
USQ No. 2668 dated 26.08.2013 regarding 'VIP Helicopters Deal'	10
II. USQ No. 3828 dated 17.12.2012 regarding 'Irregularities in NH Projects'	12
USQ No. 1959 dated 19.08.2013 regarding 'Quality of Roads'	17
III. SQ No. 384 dated 19.12.2014 regarding 'Naval Vessels'	21
IV. *SQ No. 24 dated 08.07.2014 (Supplementary by Shri Arjun Meghwal, M.P.) regarding 'Mega Food Parks'	26
V. USQ No. 543 dated 26.02.2015 regarding 'Pranahita Chevella'	44
VI. USQ No. 598 dated 25.02.2010 regarding 'Expert Committee'	47
VII. USQ No. 1842 dated 22.07.2014 regarding 'Empowerment of Transgender Community'	52
VIII. USQ No. 2988 dated 10.02.2014 regarding 'Production of GM Crop'	54

*Implementation Reports laid on the Table of the House on 10.08.2016

(ii)

	PAGE
IX. USQ No. 1450 dated 29.07.2015 regarding 'Recycling Plastic Waste'	56
X. USQ No. 2396 dated 28.03.2012 regarding 'National Broadband Plan'	58
XI. USQ No. 3652 dated 15.12.2014 regarding 'Environmental Clearances for Mining Projects'	65
XII. USQ No. 3224 dated 13.12.2012 regarding 'Sale of Power by DVC' .	67
XIII. USQ No. 645 dated 26.11.2012 regarding 'Coast Guard Airport'	69
XIV. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 17 June, 2016.	72
XV. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 14 December, 2016.	79

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES*
(2016-2017)

Dr. Ramesh Pokhriyal “Nishank” — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
3. Shri E. Ahamed
4. Shri Anto Antony
5. Shri Tariq Anwar
6. Prof. (Dr.) Sugata Bose
7. Shri Naranbhai Bhikhabhai Kachhadiya
8. Shri Bahadur Singh Koli
9. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
10. Shri A.T. Nana Patil
11. Shri C.R. Patil
12. Shri Sunil Kumar Singh
13. Shri Taslimuddin
14. Shri K.C. Venugopal
15. Shri S.R. Vijay Kumar

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri R.S. Kambo | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri J.M. Baisakh | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 3. Shri S.L. Singh | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |

*The Committee has been re-constituted *w.e.f.* 01 September, 2016 *vide* Para No. 4075 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 05 September, 2016.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES*
(2015-2016)

Dr. Ramesh Pokhriyal “Nishank” — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
3. Shri E. Ahamed
4. Shri Anto Antony
5. Shri Tariq Anwar
6. Prof. (Dr.) Sugata Bose
7. Shri Naranbhai Bhikhabhai Kachhadiya
8. Shri Bahadur Singh Koli
9. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
10. Shri A.T. Nana Patil
11. Shri C.R. Patil
12. Shri Sunil Kumar Singh
13. Shri Taslimuddin
14. Shri K.C. Venugopal
15. Shri S.R. Vijay Kumar

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri R.S. Kambo | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri J.M. Baisakh | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 3. Shri S.L. Singh | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |

* The Committee has been constituted w.e.f. 01 September, 2015 vide Para No. 2348 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 31 August, 2015.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Committee on Government Assurances (2016-2017), having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Forty-Sixth Report (16th Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (2015-16) at their sitting held on 17 June, 2016 considered Memoranda Nos. 122 to 151 containing requests received from the various Ministries/ Departments for dropping of pending Assurances and decided to pursue 13 Assurances.

3. At their sitting held on 14 December, 2016 the Committee (2016-17) considered and adopted their Forty-Sixth Report.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this Report.

NEW DELHI;
14 December, 2016

23 Agrahayana, 1938 (Saka)

DR. RAMESH POKHRIYAL “NISHANK”
Chairperson,
Committee on Government Assurances.

REPORT

While replying to Questions in the House or during discussions on Bills, Resolutions, Motions, etc., Ministers sometimes give Assurances, undertakings or promises either to consider a matter, take action or furnish information to the House at some later date. An Assurance is required to be implemented by the Ministry concerned within a period of three months. In case, the Ministry finds it difficult in implementing the Assurances on one ground or the other, it is required to request the Committee on Government Assurances to drop the Assurances and such requests are considered by the Committee on merits and decisions taken to drop an Assurance or otherwise.

2. The Committee on Government Assurances (2015-2016) considered the following requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping of Assurances at their sitting held on 17 June, 2016:—

Sl. No.	SQ/USQ No. & Date	Ministry	Subject
1	2	3	4
1.	SQ No. 81 dated 04.03.2013	Defence (Department of Defence)	VVIP Helicopters Deal
	SQ No. 554 dated 06.05.2013		VVIP Helicopters Deal
	USQ No. 154 dated 05.08.2013		VVIP Helicopters Deal
	USQ No. 2668 dated 26.08.2013		VIP Helicopter Deal (Appendix-I)
2.	USQ No. 3828 dated 17.12.2012	Road Transport and Highways	Irregularities in NH Projects
	USQ No. 1959 dated 19.08.2013		Quality of Roads (Appendix-II)
3.	SQ No. 384 dated 19.12.2014	Defence (Department of Defence Production)	Naval Vessels (Appendix-III)
4.*	SQ No. 24 (Supplementary by Shri Arjun Meghwal, M.P.) dated 08.07.2014	Food Processing Industries	Mega Food Parks (Appendix-IV)
5.*	USQ No. 543 dated 26.02.2015	Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation	Pranahita Chevella (Appendix-V)

1	2	3	4
6.	USQ No. 598 dated 25.02.2010	Railways	Expert Committee (Appendix-VI)
7.	USQ No. 1842 dated 22.07.2014	Social Justice and Empowerment	Empowerment of Transgender Community (Appendix-VII)
8.	USQ No. 2988 dated 10.02.2014	Environment, Forest and Climate Change	Production of GM Crop (Appendix-VIII)
9.*	USQ No. 1450 dated 29.07.2015	Science and Technology (Department of Scientific & Industrial Research)	Recycling Plastic Waste (Appendix-IX)
10.	USQ No. 2396 dated 28.03.2012	Communications & Information Technology (Department of Telecommunications)	National Broadband Plan (Appendix-X)
11.	USQ No. 3652 dated 15.12.2014	Steel	Environmental Clearances for Mining Projects (Appendix-XI)
12.	USQ No. 3224 dated 13.12.2012	Power	Sale of Power by DVC (Appendix-XII)
13.	USQ No. 645 dated 26.11.2012	Defence (Department of Defence)	Coast Guard Airport (Appendix-XIII)

* Implementation Reports have since been laid on the Table of the House.

3. The details of the Assurances arising out of the replies and the reason(s) advanced by the Ministries/Departments for dropping of the Assurances are given in Appendices-I to XIII.

4. The Minutes of the sitting of the Committee dated 17 June, 2016 are given in Appendix-XIV.

5. After having considered the requests of the Ministries/Departments, the Committee are not convinced with the reasons furnished for dropping the Assurances. The Committee desire that the Government should take note of the Observations of the Committee, as contained in Appendix-II to Appendix-XIV and take appropriate action, for the implementation of the Assurances expeditiously.

NEW DELHI;
14 December, 2016
23 Agrahayana, 1938 (Saka)

DR. RAMESH POKHRIYAL "NISHANK"
Chairperson,
Committee on Government Assurances.

APPENDIX I

MEMORANDUM NO. 122

Subject: Request for dropping of Assurances given in replies to:—

- (i) Starred Question No. 81 dated 04 March, 2013 regarding "VVIP Helicopters Deal" (Annexure-I).
- (ii) Starred Question No. 554 dated 06 May, 2013 regarding "VVIP Helicopters Deal" (Annexure-II).
- (iii) Unstarred Question No. 154 dated 05 August, 2013 regarding "VVIP Helicopters Deal" (Annexure-III).
- (iv) Unstarred Question No. 2668 dated 26 August, 2013 regarding "VIP Helicopter Deal" (Annexure-IV).

The above mentioned questions were asked by various M.Ps. to the Minister of Defence (Department of Defence). The contents of the questions along with the replies of the Minister are as given in Annexures (I to IV).

2. The replies to the questions were treated as Assurances and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Defence within three months of the date of the reply but the Assurances are yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Defence *vide* O.M. No. 7(7)/US(SK)/D(Air-I)/2013 dated 05 January, 2016 have requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds:—

“That the Assurance essentially pertains to investigation by CBI into VVIP helicopters case, which has international dimensions. CBI has issued Letters Rogatory (LRs) to eight (08) countries, namely, Italy, Tunisia, Mauritius, UAE, UK, Switzerland, Singapore and British Virgin Island. The execution of these LRs is still pending. The LRs is dependent upon Judicial Authorities of these countries. The completion of CBI investigation is likely to take considerable period of time. It is, therefore, not possible to indicate any definite time-frame by which CBI will be able to complete the investigation. Under the circumstances, Hon'ble Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha Secretariat is requested to kindly consider dropping of the Assurance.”

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Minister of Defence, have requested to drop the above assurances.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated 15.06.2016

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 81
ANSWERED ON 4.3.2013

VVIP Helicopters Deal

*81. SHRIASADUDDIN OWAISI:
SHRIUDAY SINGH:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether India has signed a deal with M/s. Agusta Westland, UK to buy a dozen helicopters for the use of VVIPs at a cost of Rs. 3546 crore;

(b) if so, the details thereof including the number of helicopters so far received by India;

(c) whether reports of alleged bribery charges in the said deal have come to the notice of the Government and if so, the details thereof;

(d) whether the Government has ordered a CBI inquiry into the case and if so, the details thereof including the number of persons involved in this deal along with the action taken/initiated against such persons so far; and

(e) the extent to which this case is likely to affect the other defence deals in the pipeline?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI A.K. ANTONY): (a) to (e) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (e) OF LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 81 FOR ANSWER ON 4.3.2013

The Ministry of Defence (MoD) signed a contract with M/s. Agusta Westland, U.K. on February 8, 2010 for procurement of 12 VVIP/VIP helicopters at a total cost of Euro 556.26 million as replacement for the ageing Mi-8 fleet in the Air HQ Communication Squadron, which is tasked with VIP transportation. The procurement case was completed in accordance with the established procurement procedure in a transparent manner with all stages of procurement being followed meticulously. Three helicopters, delivered by the vendor, have so far been accepted after completion of Joint Receipt Inspection.

Media reports about alleged wrong doing and unethical conduct by M/s. Finmeccanica, parent company of M/s. Agusta Westland, U.K. in connection with the purchase of the 12 VVIP helicopters and initiation of preliminary investigations against the company started surfacing since February 2012. Ever since then, Ministry of Defence has pursued the matter with the Embassy in Rome to get credible information regarding the status of investigation and authenticity of the documents/records being cited in various media reports. Given the independence of the Italian Judiciary from the Executive and the preliminary investigations being covered by 'Secrecy' clause under the Italian law, no concrete information was forthcoming. The matter was also taken up, through the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) with the U.K. Government in view of the alleged involvement of a British consultant and the fact that the contract had been signed with M/s. Agusta Westland, U.K. The UK side informed MEA that they have not launched any investigation and are awaiting the results of the Italian investigation in order to ascertain whether any further action needs to be taken. M/s. Agusta Westland, U.K. in the meantime, repeatedly denied any wrongdoing on their part in the contract for purchase of the 12 VVIP Helicopters.

It would be observed from the position indicated above that subsequent to media reports relating to alleged payment of kickbacks/bribes by M/s. Finmeccanica, MoD had taken prompt action on newspaper reports with a view to seek factual information from the concerned authorities. However, since no concrete information to substantiate the allegations was forthcoming, no formal enquiry was then ordered.

On the report of the arrests of the Finmeccanica Chief, Mr. Orsi who was earlier Chief Executive of M/s. Agusta Westland and Mr. Bruno Spagnoloni, Chief Executive of Agusta Westland Spa, MoD immediately asked the CBI on February 12, 2013 to conduct an inquiry into the matter. The CBI, after a visit of its team to Italy and on further examination of the documents available, has registered a Preliminary Enquiry (PE) on February 25, 2013 in this matter against eleven persons including five Indians and four firms which include two Indian firms.

Besides referring the matter to CBI, MoD on February 13, 2013 requested our Embassy in Rome for further factual report pertaining to arrest, nature of charges framed and any other relevant details, which in turn, took up the matter with the Judge for the preliminary investigation in Busto Arsizio. The Embassy on February 15, 2013 has forwarded the response of the Judge which states that 'the investigations are at a preliminary stage during which, as per Article 329 of the Code of Penal Procedure, all information are covered by secrecy'. It was also added in the response of the Judge that when the 'Secrecy' obligations are over his Office would be glad to examine a new request from India.

Meanwhile, CBI investigation is progressing in India. In view of the present stage of investigation in this case, it would be early to opine on the extent to which this case is likely to affect other Defence deals in the pipeline.

(Q. 81)

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI (HYDERABAD): Madam Speaker, I am convinced about the strong stance of the hon. Defence Minister. During his tenure he has blacklisted six companies. ... *(Not recorded)* But the problem of corruption in defence deals is still persisting. ... *(Interruptions)* From my experience being a member of the Standing Committee on Defence, I am convinced that the bigger problem is our overdependence on defence imports. ... *(Interruptions)*

अध्यक्ष महोदया: आप ऐसा क्यों कर रहे हैं? माननीय सदस्य को आप सवाल पूछने दीजिए।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI (HYDERABAD): We have the dubious distinction of being the largest importer of defence equipment. ... *(Interruptions)* My suggestion to the hon. Minister is, the defence requirements are met by Ordnance Factory Board, Tatas, Birlas, Mahindras, Reliance, etc. ... *(Interruptions)*

अध्यक्ष महोदया: आप सवाल पूछने दीजिए। आपकी पार्टी के सदस्य ने भी सवाल पूछना है।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI (HYDERABAD): Will the hon. Minister agree with my suggestion that we should have more plans for indigenization? ... *(Interruptions)* You must have a vision for indigenization and then only can we control this bigger malice of corruption. ... *(Interruptions)*

1103 hours

(At this stage, Shri Sk. Saidul Haque, Shri P. Lingam, Shri O.S. Manian and some other hon. Members came and stood near the Table.)

... *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI A.K. ANTONY): Madam, I fully agree with the hon. Member. ... *(Interruptions)* The ultimate solution to the scourge of corruption in defence deals is indigenization. ... *(Interruptions)* Because of the operational necessity of the Services, on the request that they need the most modern equipment to meet the operational necessity, Government moves to import any high value equipment from foreign sources. ... *(Interruptions)* But now Government is giving topmost priority to indigenization. ... *(Interruptions)* Within a few months we are going to change the defence procurement procedure again. ... *(Interruptions)* In that, we will give more priority to indigenization so that Indian public sector and private sector can play a major role in producing state-of-the-art equipment for the Indian forces. ... *(Interruptions)*

1104 hours

(At this stage, Shri Kalyan Banerjee and some other hon. Members came and stood near the Table.)

... *(Interruptions)*

MADAM SPEAKER: Please go back to your seats. Let us proceed with the Question Hour.

... (Interruptions)

MADAM SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned to meet again at 12 noon.

1105 hours

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Twelve of the Clock.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 554
TO BE ANSWERED ON 6.5.2013

VVIP Helicopters Deal

*554. SHRI J.M. AARON RASHID:
SHRI HARISHCHANDRACHAVAN:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government has received first set of documents from Italy regarding the alleged irregularities in the Agusta Westland Helicopter deal;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether the Central Bureau of Investigation has issued look-out notices for some former chiefs of the Indian Air Force in connection with the said deal;

(d) if so, the details thereof; and

(e) the present status of investigation into the said deal and the steps taken/proposed to be taken by the Government to expedite the investigation?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI A.K. ANTONY): (a) to (e) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (e) OF LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 554 FOR ANSWER ON 6.5.2013

The Government has received an initial set of documents from Italy pertaining to the alleged irregularities in the Agusta Westland deal which include, *inter alia*, copy of the search and seizure order issued by the Judge for the preliminary investigation in Busto Arsizio, Italy, copies of certain Contracts entered by M/s. Agusta Westland Spa, Italy, a shareholder of M/s. Agusta Westland International Ltd. UK, with various entities in Tunisia and India. The Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) has issued Look-Out Notices against a number of individuals in India including a former Chief of Indian Air Force in connection with the said case. The matter is still under investigation and the Ministry is following it up with the CBI for expediting investigation.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 154
ANSWERED ON 5.8.2013

VVIP Helicopters Deal

154. SHRIMATI ASHWAMEDH DEVI:
SHRIBHUDEO CHOUDHARY:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the CBI has sealed several accounts of the relatives of a former Chief of the Indian Air Force in the VVIP helicopters procurement deal;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) the amount of kickbacks allegedly deposited in these accounts so far along with the details thereof; and

(d) the time by which the inquiry is likely to be completed?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI A.K. ANTONY): (a) & (b) Subsequent to registration of Case No. RC 2172013A0003 on 12th March, 2013 against Air Chief Marshal (Retd.), S.P. Tyagi and Others, CBI had frozen several bank accounts of the relatives of Air Chief Marshal (Retd.), S.P. Tyagi, former Chief of Indian Air Force. However, subsequently all the bank accounts have been de-frozen as per a Court order, imposing certain conditions on the bank account holders.

(c) Investigation is still in progress on this aspect.

(d) Since the CBI investigations are still going on which includes the process of collecting evidence from abroad through Letter Rogatories, no definite time-limit can be set at this stage for conclusion of the investigations.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2668
ANSWERED ON 26.8.2013

VIP Helicopters Deal

2668. DR. M. THAMBIDURAI:
SHRI PRALHAD JOSHI:
SHRI VIRENDER KASHYAP:
SHRI ARJUN MEGHWAL:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Government had made certain changes in the tender on the technical requirements for procurement of 12 Agusta Westland 101 helicopters for VVIP use;
- (b) if so, the details thereof along with the reasons therefor;
- (c) the details of the present status of the deal;
- (d) whether the Government has initiated any inquiry into the alleged irregularities in the said deal;
- (e) if so, the details thereof along with the present status of the investigation; and
- (f) the steps taken/proposed to be taken by the Government to expedite the investigation and punish the guilty?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI A.K. ANTONY): (a) & (b) After issuance of Request For Proposal (RFP) for the procurement of 12 VVIP/VIP Helicopters, certain changes, with the approval of the competent authority in terms of Defence Procurement Procedure-2006, have been made in technical requirements on the basis of the recommendation of the stakeholders to meet the requisite standards of operational safety and security.

(c) to (f) The contract for procurement of 12 VVIP/VIP helicopters was signed with M/s. Agusta Westland, U.K. on 8th February, 2010. Three helicopters have so far been supplied by the vendor. In view of allegations of irregularities in this procurement, Ministry of Defence has entrusted enquiry into the matter to CBI. The CBI, on

conclusion of preliminary enquiry, registered a regular case on 12th March, 2013 against 13 persons and 6 firms. The CBI investigation is in progress. Further operation of the Contract has been put on hold.

APPENDIX II
MEMORANDUM NO. 123

Subject: Request for dropping of assurances given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3828 dated 17.12.2012 regarding "Irregularities in NH Projects & Unstarred Question No. 1959 dated 19.08.2013 regarding "Quality of Roads".

On 17 December, 2012 S/Shri Neeraj Shekhar, Yashvir Singh, G.M. Siddeshwara, Bal Kumar Patel and E.G. Sugavanam, M.Ps. addressed a Unstarred Question No. 3828 & on 19 August, 2013 S/Shri Ramesh Rathod, Dilipkumar Mansukhlal Gandhi and Rajendra Agrawal, M.Ps. addressed a Unstarred Question No. 1959 to the Minister of Road Transport and Highways. The text of the questions alongwith the replies of the Minister are as given in Appendix-I & II.

2. The replies to the questions were treated as assurances by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Road Transport & Highways within three months from the date of the reply but the assurances are yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Road Transport and Highways *vide* O.M. No. H-11016/127/12-P&M dated 22.05.2015 & O.M. No. H-11016/129/2013-P&M dated 22.05.2015 have requested to drop the assurances given in replies on the following grounds:—

"That action on the cases which are under investigation as was furnished in the Annexure in reply to the above questions shall depend on the outcome of the investigation and it is contemplated that appropriate action against the concerned contractor/officer, if found guilty, will be taken as per the contract agreement and extant service rules subject to outcome of such investigation. Further, no time frame for such investigations can be specified.

In view of the above, the Committee on Government Assurances may be requested not to treat the details furnished at Sl. No. 6 of Annexure-I referred in reply to parts (a) to (c) of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 3828 answered on 17.12.2012 regarding "Irregularities in NH Projects" and the details furnished the annexure referred to in reply to part (a) of the Lok Sabha USQ No. 1959 for 19.08.2013 regarding "Quality of Road" as assurances so as to drop the above assurances from the list of pending assurances."

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Minister of State for Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, have requested to drop the above assurances.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;

Dated : 15.06.2016

APPENDIX I

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3828

ANSWERED ON 17.12.2012

Irregularities in NH Projects

3828. SHRINEERAJ SHEKHAR:
SHRI YASHVIR SINGH:
SHRI G.M. SIDDESWARA:
SHRI BAL KUMAR PATEL :
SHRI E.G. SUGAVANAM:

Will the Minister of ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government has received complaints regarding irregularities in National Highway Projects under implementation in the various States of the country;

(b) if so, the details thereof, State-wise during the last three years and the current year along with the action taken against the companies/officials involved in these irregularities;

(c) the details of prescribed time-frame, if any, for dealing with complaints of irregularities/corruption along with the State-wise details of the complaints whereupon no action has been taken so far along with the reasons therefor;

(d) whether the Government has blacklisted a number of companies during the period and if so, the details thereof; and

(e) whether the Government has lifted the ban imposed on some of these companies and if so, the reasons therefor?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS (SHRI SARVEY SATHYANARAYANA) : (a) to (c) Cases of irregularities in National Highway (NH) projects under implementation, whenever received, are examined and action is taken in accordance with the provisions of the contract agreements and the service rules. The State-wise details of cases of irregularities under investigation and also the cases of irregularity where action has been completed along with action taken against the companies/officials involved in these irregularities during the last three years and the current year are at Annexure-I. Action on the cases

under investigation shall depend on the outcome of the investigations. There is no time frame for such investigations.

(d) and (e) The State-wise details of companies black listed/debarred, companies on which ban was lifted and the reasons thereof during the last three years and the current year are at Annexure-II.

ANNEXURE I

ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (A) TO (C) OF LOK SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3828 FOR ANSWER ON 17.12.2012
ASKED BY SHRI NEERAJ SHEKHAR AND OTHERS
REGARDING IRREGULARITIES IN
NH PROJECTS

The State-wise details of cases of irregularities under investigation and also the cases of irregularity where action has been completed along with action taken against the companies/officials involved in these irregularities during last three years and the current year

Sl. No.	State	No. of cases of irregularities	Details of action taken against where investigations have been completed
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2	—
2.	Bihar	2	One case is with CBI.
3.	Chhattisgarh	3	In two cases companies have been blacklisted. In the 3rd cases agreement has been terminated.
4.	Gujarat	1	The company has been banned for business in Gujarat for 3 years.
5.	Haryana	4	—
6.	Karnataka	4	In one case investigation is completed and further compliance is awaited.
7.	Maharashtra	2	In one case matter referred to CVC, for its advice for Departmental action against officers.
8.	Odisha	2	—
9.	Punjab	1	—
10.	Rajasthan	4	—
11.	Tamil Nadu	2	In one case recovery against contractor/ concessionaire imposed. In the 2nd case warning was issued to the concerned officer.

ANNEXURE II

ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (D) AND (E) OF LOK SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3828 FOR ANSWER ON 17.12.2012 ASKED
BY SHRINEERAJ SHEKHAR AND OTHERS REGARDING
IRREGULARITIES IN NH PROJECTS

**The State-wise details of companies black listed/debarred, companies on which ban
was lifted and the reason thereof during last three
years and the current year**

Sl. No.	State	No. of companies black listed/debarred	No. of companies on which ban was lifted	Reasons for removing the ban
1.	Bihar	5	1	Black listing lifted but suspended for six months.
2.	Chhattisgarh	2	Nil	NA
3.	Gujarat	1	Nil	NA
4.	Madhya Pradesh	-	1	As per review of State Government of Madhya Pradesh.
5.	Maharashtra	1	1	As per orders on Hon'ble High Court of Mumbai.
6.	National Highways Authority of India (NHAI)	11	6	(i) In one case based on the recommendation of review Committee the ban was reduced to three months. (ii) In three cases as per orders of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. (iii) In one case the ban was lifted by the review Committee on hearing the case. (iv) In one case ban was lifted on personal hearing and clarifications provided by the Consultant.

APPENDIX II

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 1959

ANSWERED ON 19.08.2013

Quality of Roads

1959. SHRI RAMESH RATHOD:

SHRI DILIP KUMAR MANSUKHLAL GANDHI:

SHRI RAJENDRA AGRAWAL:

Will the Minister of ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) the details of the complaints received by the Government regarding the quality of construction work of roads/National Highway roads in the country during the last three years and the current year, State/UT-wise including Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh along with the action taken thereon;

(b) whether the Government has evolved any mechanism to inspect the quality of construction of roads/NH roads in the country;

(c) if so, the details thereof along with the findings of the inspection carried out during the period; and

(d) the steps taken or being taken by the Government to ensure quality of construction of National Highways?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS (SHRI SARVEY SATHYANARAYANA): (a) The Ministry is primarily responsible for development and maintenance of National Highways (NHs). Development and maintenance of other type of roads is entrusted with the concerned State Governments and other executing agencies. Complaints regarding quality of construction work on NH, whenever received, are examined and action taken as per extant policy and in accordance with the provisions of the contract agreements. The State/Union Territory (UT)-wise details of the complaints regarding the quality of construction work of NHs in the country including Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh during the last three years and the current year along with the action taken thereon are annexed. Action on the cases under investigation shall depend on the outcome of the investigation. There is no time frame for such investigations.

(b) to (d) All NH projects are constructed as per quality standards specified in Indian Roads Congress (IRC)/Ministry of Road Transport & Highways specifications. Supervision/ Independent Consultants are appointed for closely monitoring the quality of construction through regular checks and tests. Besides, quality of construction is also closely monitored by field officers executing the project and Regional Officers (ROs) of the Ministry including Officers from headquarters.

Further, Bottom of Form Vigilance Division of National Highways Authority of India (NHAI) conducts surprise checks to examine the quality of material used in road construction. Such checks are conducted at construction sites without prior information to the field officers as well as contractors and the samples of materials collected are tested independently.

ANNEXURE

ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (A) OF LOK SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 1959 FOR ANSWER ON 19.08.2013
ASKED BY SHRI RAMESH RATHOD, SHRI DILIP KUMAR
MANSUKHLAL GANDHI AND SHRI RAJENDRA
AGRAWAL REGARDING QUALITY OF ROADS

**The State/Union Territory (UT)-wise details of the complaints regarding the
quality of construction work of NHs in the country including
Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh during the last three
years and the current year along with the action
taken thereon**

Sl. No.	State/ UT	NH No.	Name of work	Action Taken
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	7	4-lane NH road from Islampur to Kadthal	Under Investigation.
2.	Andhra Pradesh	7	Road in Ananatpur district	Under Investigation.
3.	Assam	31 & 54	Guwahati-Nalbari section and Lanka Daboka section	Under Investigation.
4.	Bihar	80	Mokama-Munger Project	Under Investigation.
5.	Bihar	2	Six laning from Varanasi to Aurangabad	Material tested at IIT BHU and found conforming to the project specification.
6.	Bihar	77	2 lane with paved shoulder from Muzaffarpur to Sonbarsa	Material tested from NIT, Patna and found to be in accordance with specifications.
7.	Bihar	NH-28A	2 laning with paved shoulder from Piprakothi to Raxaul setion	Material tested from NIT, Patna and found to be in accordance with specifications.
8.	Gujarat	NH-8E	Somnath-Bhavnagar road	Agency banned and work started at the risk and cost of agency.
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	44	Samba-Kunjwani-Narwal section	Wrok of protection/rehabilitation likely to be completed by Sep., 2013.
10.	Jharkhand	80	Km. 191 to 281.501	Under Investigation.
11.	Karnataka	4	Bangalore-Kolar-Mulabagal section	Deficiency rectified by the concessionaire and verified by Independent Engineer.
12.	Karnataka	17,48 & 13	New Mangalore Port	Contractor instructed to improve finishing which is in progress.
13.	Madhya Pradesh	25	Jhansi-Shivpuri section	Defect repaired by contractor at his cost.

1	2	3	4	5
14.	Odisha	5	NH bypass from Sunakhala to Chilika through Balugaon town	Under Investigation.
15.	Rajasthan	76	Service road in district Baran.	Under Investigation.
16.	Delhi/ Haryana	2	Service Road from Badarpur to Sarita Vihar	Recommendations made for testing, recovery as well as rectification/ replacement of the various component of the works.
17.	Uttar Pradesh	24	Work in three towns Jangbadurganj, Maigalganj and Moholi	
18.	Uttar Pradesh	93	Agra-Aligarh section	Under Investigation.

APPENDIX III

MEMORANDUM NO. 124

Subject: Request for dropping of assurance given in reply to Supplementary to Starred Question No. 384 dated 19.12.2014 by Shri Narasimham Thota M.P., regarding "Naval Vessels".

On 19 December, 2014 Shri Narasimham Thota, MP & Shri Sisir Kumar Adhikari, M.P., addressed a Starred Question No. 384 to the Minister of Defence. The text of the question along with the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. During discussion Shri Narasimham Thota, M.P. raised the following Supplementary Question:—

“I would like to know if there is any proposal to give orders for building submarines at Hindustan Shipyard, Visakhapatnam.”

3. In reply the Minister of Defence (Shri Manohar Parrikar) Stated as follows:—

“The aspect mentioned by the Member is correct. Hindustan Shipyard does have a problem. It is a taken over shipyard from the Ministry of Shipping and it is a loss incurring company. Currently the financial and HR restructuring of the company is under process.”

4. The reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Defence within three months from the date of the reply but the assurance is yet to be implemented.

5. The Ministry of Defence *vide* O.M. No. 2(3)/15/PQ/384/DPO (NS-G) dated 05 March, 2015 have requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds:—

“That the reply given by Raksha Mantri does not constitute an assurance though it is true that Hindustan Shipyard Limited (HSL) is going through financial crisis and a proposal for financial and HR restructuring is under consideration. The Committee on Government assurances, Lok Sabha is, therefore, requested that the reply given to supplementary of Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 384 dated 19.12.2014 may not be treated as an Assurance and the same may kindly be deleted from the list of pending assurances.”

6. In view of the above, the Ministry with the approval of Minister of Defence, have requested to drop the above assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 384
ANSWERED ON 19.12.2014

Naval Vessels

*384. SHRI NARASIMHAM THOTA:
SHRI SISIR KUMAR ADHIKARI:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether public and private shipyards have adequate capabilities to build naval vessels including warships and submarines of various categories;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the other steps being taken or proposed to be taken by the Government to acquire self sufficiency in the construction of naval vessels indigenously;
- (d) whether the Government has assessed the potential of exporting naval vessels, warships and submarines to other countries; and
- (e) if so, the proactive action taken by the Government in this regard?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI MANOHAR PARRIKAR): (a) to (e) A Statement laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (A) TO (E) OF LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 384 FOR ANSWER ON 19.12.2014

(a) & (b) Indian shipyards, both in the public and private sectors, have adequate capabilities to build various categories of naval vessels including Warships and Submarines. Mazgaon Dock Limited (MDL), Garden Reach Shipbuilders and Engineers (GRSE) and Cochin Shipyards Limited (CSL) are engaged in building large vessels, submarines and aircraft carrier. Other Defence Shipyards and private shipyards also have capability in building various categories of vessels including Patrol Vessels, Tugs, Barges, Tankers, Survey Vessels etc.

(c) The modernisation programme of the Indian Navy is focussed on indigenous warship construction and is largely driven by Indian Shipyards and industry. The steps taken by the Government to make the country self sufficient in the field of indigenous construction of naval vessels are placed at **Appendix-I**.

(d) & (e) Defence Public Sector Shipyards have potential of exporting naval vessels, and warships. The export orders received by Defence Public Sector Shipyards are as under:—

- (i) Goa Shipyard Limited has orders for export of eleven (11) Fast Interceptor Boats and two (02) Fast Patrol Vessels to Mauritius and two (02) Offshore Patrol Vessels to Sri Lanka.
- (ii) Garden Reach Shipbuilders and Engineers (GRSE) has order for export of one Offshore Patrol Vessel to Mauritius.

APPENDIX-I REFERRED IN THE REPLY GIVEN IN THE STATEMENT IN PART(C) OF LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 384 FOR ANSWER ON 19.12.2014

STEPS TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT TO MAKE THE COUNTRY SELF SUFFICIENT IN THE FIELD OF INDIGENOUS CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS INDIGENOUSLY:

1. The Defence Production Policy promulgated in 2011, aims at achieving substantive self-reliance in the design, development and production of equipment, weapon systems, platforms required for defence as early as possible; creating conditions conducive for the private industry to take an active role in this endeavour; enhancing potential of SMEs in indigenisation and broadening the defence R&D base of the country.

2. In pursuance of the Defence Production Policy, 2011 the Government has taken the following major steps to promote the participation of private sector in the indigenous production of defence equipment:—

- (i) National Institute for Research and Development in Defence Shipbuilding (NIRDESH), a society registered under the Society Act 1860 has been set up for R&D relating to warships, submarines and other related platforms in order to strengthen indigenous defence production capabilities.
- (ii) Modernisation plans have been initiated in all the defence public sector shipyards to enhance capacity and capability for indigenous shipbuilding.
- (iii) Preference to 'Buy (Indian)', 'Buy & Make (Indian)' & 'Make' categories of acquisition over 'Buy & Make' and 'Buy (Global)' categories thereby giving preference to Indian Industry in procurement.
- (iv) The procedure for 'Buy & Make (Indian)' category has been further simplified in order to make the category more attractive for Indian Defence Industry.
- (v) Indian private sector industry has also been allowed to receive 'Maintenance Transfer of Technology (MTot)' in 'Buy (Global)' cases.
- (vi) FDI policy in Defence sector has been reviewed and as per the new policy, composite foreign investment upto 49% has been allowed through FIPB route and beyond 49% with the approval of the Cabinet Committee on Security (CCS).
- (vii) Defence products list for the purpose of industrial licensing has been revised and most of the components/parts /raw materials, have been taken out from the revised list from purview of industrial licensing.

- (viii) Defence Exports Strategy has been formulated and is put in public domain. The Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for issuing NOC for export of military stores has been simplified and process for issuing NOC has been made online.

(Q. 384)

SHRI THOTA NARASIMHAM (KAKINADA): Madam Speaker, India's overall shipbuilding industry comprises 27 shipyards of which six are in Central public sector, two are under State Governments, and 19 in the private sector. However, not all of these shipyards are involved in naval shipbuilding. Of the six shipyards in the Central public sector, four are under the administrative control of the Ministry of Defence and are known as Defence PSU shipyards. Although these four shipyards are primarily responsible for constructing naval ships, some other yards both in the public and private sectors are also involved in naval ship building. Madam, I want to know from the hon. Defence Minister through you, how the shipbuilding industry wants to improve its efficiency.

In Andhra Pradesh, the Hindustan Shipyard at Visakhapatnam is in a financial crisis due to lack of order. I would like to know if there is any proposal to give orders for building submarines at Hindustan Shipyard, Visakhapatnam.

SHRI MANOHAR PARRIKAR: Madam Speaker, the aspect mentioned by the Member is correct. Hindustan Shipyard does have a problem. It is a taken over shipyard from the Ministry of Shipping and it is a loss incurring company. Currently the financial and HR restructuring of the company is under process. They already have orders worth Rs. 3,256 crore. Their production, however, was only of Rs. 453 crore for financial year 2013-14 as against a target of Rs. 750 crore. But they are facing financial crisis. There is no problem with the orders. We can offload more orders. But I think there are certain issues which need to be sorted out like efficiency, production capability and overheads. In one particular tender I was observing that their quote is around Rs. 1,000 crore whereas the L1 by a private sector company was about Rs. 450 crore.

So you can understand the quantum of overheads which have piled up. I have already had one briefing with it. I assure the hon. Member that very soon I will go into the restructuring of Hindustan Shipyard Limited to make it more efficient as well as to reduce the overheads. What is happening is that overhead of existing staff is being loaded on whatever quote they make. I think that is not the correct way of calculating them. They should actually calculate for that. The rest can be separately worked out. But more orders are being considered for LPD project that is Landing Platform Dock and two special operational vessels, one submarine under Project P-75 (1). These are future projects but in the meantime I am also working out whether some works of GRE, Garden Reach can be offloaded on them so that they have work. I am aware of the financial crisis they are facing. I am looking into it so that there is no real crisis developing.

HON. SPEAKER: The Member can now ask the second supplementary question.

SHRI THOTA NARASIMHAM (KAKINADA): Madam, my second supplementary question is, what are the steps being taken by the Government for research and development in specialized areas like submarine warfare and allied weapon systems?

SHRI MANOHAR PARRIKAR: The Government has already worked out complete capacity assessment of various shipyards also. I would also like to share with the House that in certain projects we have reached quite a substantial indigenous content; for example, in P-17 project we are around 61 per cent; in P-15A we are around 60 per cent; in P-28 corvette project we are 90 per cent, in P-15B destroyer of higher class project 75 per cent and in P-75 Scorpene submarine we are 21 per cent. We are trying to increase the indigenous content and DRDO including the Metallurgical Lab, Hyderabad is actively participating with the Navy and naval shipyards in upgrading both the capacity and the capability.

SHRI SISIR KUMAR ADHIKARI (KANTHI): Not present.

श्री सुल्तान अहमद (उलुबेरिया): माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, मंत्री जी ने स्टेटमेंट में कहा है कि इंडीजिनस नैवल वैसल बनाते हैं और सिर्फ मारीशस, श्रीलंका को पेट्रोल वैसल्स, ऑफ शोर एंड फास्ट पेट्रोल दिए जा रहे हैं। सरकार ने 49 परसेंट एफडीआई एलाऊ किया है। एफडीआई आया है या नहीं, मैं इसके बारे में प्रश्न।

APPENDIX IV

MEMORANDUM NO. 126

Subject: Request for dropping of assurance given in reply to Supplementary to Starred Question No. 24 dated 08 July, 2014 by Shri Arjun Meghwal, MP regarding "Mega Food Parks".

On 08 July, 2014 Shri Arjun Meghwal, M.P. addressed a Starred Question No. 24 to the Minister of Food Processing Industries. The text of the question along with the reply of the Minister is given in the Annexure.

2. During discussion Shri Arjun Meghwal, M.P. raised the following Supplementary Question:—

“The Scheme is very good but 30 proposals were received, 13 were sanctioned, 13 were rejected as the scheme has a cluster based approach. I would like to ask the Hon'ble Minister whether there is a proposal to simplify the conditions imposed. We are hearing about the food parks for 10 years but it is not so that much food Parks have been sanctioned in the 10 years. Now, with the new Government, it is expected from the Hon'ble Minister and also it is question whether there is a proposal for its simplification or not?”

3. In reply, the Minister of Food processing Industries (Shrimati Harsimrat Kaur Badal) stated as follows:—

“Hon'ble Minister *inter-alia* stated that the matter is being considered and whatever improvement is likely to be made therein, efforts would be made to carry them out.”

4. The above reply was treated as an assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Food Processing Industries within three months from the date of the reply but the assurance is yet to be implemented.

5. The Minister of Food processing Industries *vide* O.M. No. F.No. H-1/2014-Mega Food Park dated 10 October, 2014 have requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds:—

“That to make the implementation of these projects smoother, the scheme of Mega Food parks has been modified on 10.02.2014 by relaxing certain conditions experienced as bottlenecks in the implementation of the scheme.

In the revised scheme, condition of incorporation of Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), the implementing agency of Mega Food Park, with at least three entrepreneurs/business units, with the entrepreneurs being independent of each other and business units with no common Directors has been removed. Now, the Anchor Investor in the SPV holding majority stake, with or without other

promoters of SPV, will be required to set up at least one food processing unit in the park with an investment of not less than Rs. 10 crore.

Further, State Government/State Government entities and cooperatives applying for the projects under the scheme will not be required to form a separate SPV and set up processing units(s) in the park. Restriction of maximum of 26 per cent of equity in the SPV shall not apply to State Government/State Government entities/ Cooperatives.

Need of any further modification in the scheme may be ascertained after assessing the impact of these modifications recently made which is likely to take time. An evaluation of the scheme has been awarded to Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER), New Delhi on 13.08.2014. They are likely to complete the evaluation of the scheme within four months. Evaluation of Schemes is a continuous process and the statement of Hon'ble Minister can in no way be constructed as an assurance. In view of the position explained above, the statement of the Hon'ble Minister may not be treated as an Assurance and may be dropped."

6. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of the Hon'ble Minister of Food Processing Industries, have requested to drop the above assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES
LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 24
ANSWERED ON 08.07.2014

Mega Food Parks

*24. SHRI ARJUN RAM MEGHWAL:

Will the Minister FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES be pleased to state:

(a) the objectives and the guidelines for establishing Mega Food Parks in the country and the extent to which these objectives have been achieved;

(b) whether the Government has received several proposals from the States for setting up mega food parks in various parts of the country during the last three years and the current year;

(c) if so, the details thereof, State-wise including Rajasthan; and

(d) the action taken by the Government thereon including the funds allocated/ released for the purpose during the above period project/State-wise?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (SMT. HARSIMRAT KAUR BADAL): (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) to (d) OF LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 24 FOR ANSWER ON 8TH JULY, 2014 REGARDING MEGAFOOD PARKS

(a) The primary objective of Mega Food Parks Scheme is to create modern infrastructure facilities for the food processing along the value chain from the farm to the market with a cluster based approach based on a hub and spokes model. It includes creation of infrastructure for primary processing and storage near the farm at Primary Processing Centres (PPCs) and Collection Centres (CCs) and common facilities and enabling infrastructure like roads, electricity, water, ETP facilities etc. at Central Processing Centre (CPC). These PPCs and CCs act as aggregation and storage points to feed raw material to the processing units located in the CPC.

(b) and (c) Yes, Madam. Details of the proposals for setting up Megal Food Parks received from various States in the country including Rajasthan during the last three years and the current year are at Annexure-I*

*Not enclosed.

(d) 30 Mega Food Park projects have been accorded in-principle approval by the Ministry after evaluation of the proposals, received during the last three years and the current year, as per the scheme guidelines. Out of these 30 projects, 13 projects have been accorded final approval and are at various stages of implementation. 13 projects have been cancelled due to their failure to meet the conditions of final approval as per the scheme guidelines. Details of implementation of these 30 projects including the funds allocated/released for the purpose during the last three years and the current year are as at Annexure-II.*

*Not enclosed.

ANNEXURE I

ANNEXURE REFERRED IN REPLY TO PARTS (b) AND (c) OF THE LOK SABHA
STARRED QUESTION NO. 24 FOR ANSWER ON 08TH JULY, 2014
REGARDING MEGA FOOD PARKS

State-wise details of the proposals received for setting up Mega Food Parks
during the last three years and the current year including Rajasthan

List of EoIs/Proposals received under Phase II of implementation

Sl.No.	Name of the Applicant	Project Location
1	2	3
Bihar		
1.	Keventer Food Park Infra Ltd.	Kahelgaon, District Bhagalpur
2.	Ruchi Infrastructure Limited	Durgawati, Bhabua
3.	JVL Mega Food Park Private Limited	Basahi, Rohtas
4.	Bihar Mega Processed Food Park Private Ltd.	Araria
5.	Pristine Logistics & Infra projects Pvt. Ltd.	Khagaria
Madhya Pradesh		
1.	Ruchi Soya Limited	Maheswar, Khargone
2.	Jabalpur Mega Food Park Private Ltd.	Khairi, Jabalpur
3.	Vashisht Holding Limited SPV-Madhya Pradesh Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Rodya, Taluka Bhikangaon, District Khargone.
4.	Central India Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Kodhasabri, District Chhindwara
5.	Sanwaria Mega Food Park Limited	Kiratpur Village, Taluka Itarsi, Hopshangabad
6.	Madhya Pradesh Mega Processed Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Bilawali, Tehsil/District Dewas
7.	Chhindwara Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Chhindwara
Tripura		
1.	Sikaria Infra Projects Private Limited	Near Agartala
2.	Tube Glass Containers Limited SPV- Tripureswari Mega Food Parks Ltd., not formed yet	Uttar Champapura, West Tripura

1	2	3
Haryana		
1.	Haryana Herbal and Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Bakana, Kurukshetra
2.	Star One Realtors Pvt. Ltd.	Nuh, District Mewat
3.	Haryana Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Shakarpuri, Tehsil Ferozpur Jhirka, Mewat District
Gujarat		
1.	Jaffe Food Industries Private Limited	Bakrol Village, Ahmedabad Distt.
2.	Santoshi Masala Private Limited	Anand
3.	Fanidhar Mega Food Pvt. Ltd.	Viramgam, Ahmedabad
4.	Shri LTC Export India Private Limited SPV-Kutch Mega Food Park, not formed yet	Village Mouje Ratadiya, Taluka Mumdra, District Kutch
5.	Mahakali Mega Food Park	Village Kayat, Junishedhavi Navishedhavi of Kadi District Mehsana
6.	Anil Limited SPV-Anil Mega Food Park Pvt., not formed yet	Village Paladi, Taluka Savli, District Vadodara
7.	Winfra Green Projects Pvt. Ltd.	Vareth, Taluka Mandvi, Surat
8.	Gujarat Mega Processed Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Savli, Vadodara
9.	Vibrant Mega Food Park	Janakhali, Taluka Mandvi, Surat
Rajasthan		
1.	Rajasthan Mega Food Parks Limited	Nairaina, District Jaipur
2.	ARL Infratech Limited	Bhilwara District
3.	Marwar Agro Mega Food Parks Private Limited	Dooni, Gandhigram, District Tonk
Jammu and Kashmir		
1.	Simplex Projects Limited	Shadipora, Srinagar
2.	Kashmir Agri Fresh Food Park	Lassipora, District Pulwama, Kashmir
Kerala		
1.	Kerala State Civil Supply Corporation Limited	Konil, Pathanamthitta District
2.	Malabar Mega Food Park Limited	Kinaloor, Kozhikode District
3.	National Integrated Maga Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Palakkad

1	2	3
Odisha		
1.	Centre of Entrepreneurship Development, Regional College of Management	Badchana, Cuttack
2.	MITS Mega Food Park Ltd.	Rayagada
3.	Orissa Mega Agro Food Park Ltd.	Banki
Chhattisgarh		
1.	Ramky Infrastructure Limited	Banjari/Bagaudh of Tehsil Kurudh in district Dhamtari
2.	Sahara Integrated Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Badori, Taluka Rajpur, district Surguja
3.	Chhattisgarh Agro Mega Food Parks Pvt. Ltd.	Naya Raipur
List of EoIs/Proposals received under Phase III of implementation		
Andhra Pradesh		
1.	Godavari Mega Aqua Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Tadepalligudem, District West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh
2.	Orange Bio Industrial Infrastructure Technologies Pvt. Ltd. (ORBIT)	Raghunadhpally Village and Mandal of Warangal district, Andhra Pradesh
3.	Annapura Integrated Agri Park	Chintalapadu, Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh
4.	Satyavedu Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Palagunta, Taluka Satyavedu, District. Chittoor, Andhra Pradesh
5.	Smart Agro Industries Corporation Pvt. Ltd.	Village Lakkampally, Nandipet Mandal, District Nizamabad, Andhra Pradesh
6.	Continental Mega Food Park Ltd.	Village Thimmapur & Kothur, District Mehboob Nagar, Andhra Pradesh
7.	Carbon Neutrals Energy Pvt. Ltd.	Zaheerabad, Medak, Andhra Pradesh
Assam		
1.	Kamrup Eco Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Belguri, District Kamrup, Assam
Bihar		
1.	JVL Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Jorabarpur, District Rohtas, Bihar

1	2	3
2.	Pristine Logistics & Infra Projects Pvt. Ltd.	Block Mansi, District-Khagaria, Bihar
3.	Champan Agri Park Pvt. Ltd.	Bariya, District East Champaran, Bihar
4.	Mums Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Chaugain, Taluka Dumrawn, District Buxar, Bihar
Chhattisgarh		
1.	Sindhu Farms Pvt. Ltd.	Village Bemta, Sarora, District Raipur
2.	Chhattisgarh Agro Mega Food Park Ltd.	Village Kharora, Distt. Raipur
3.	Utsav Organic Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Villages Dhansuli & Khatiya, Tilda Tehsil, District Raipur
Delhi		
1.	Pavitra Bhumi Pvt. Ltd.	GT Karnal Road, District North West, Delhi
2.	Vyanjan Vihar Pvt. Ltd.	Not provided in the EoI.
Goa		
1.	Polar Fresh Pvt. Ltd.	Village Sigaon, District South Goa, Goa
Gujarat		
1.	Adani Ports and SEZ Ltd.	Mundra, District Kutch, Gujarat
2.	Vraj Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Dholi, Taluka Dholuka, District Ahmedabad, Gujarat
3.	Rainbow Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Suraj, Taluka Kadi, District Mahasana, Gujarat
4.	Vibrant KKP Food and Agro Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Jankhala, Taluka: Mandavi, District Surat, Gujarat
5.	Fanidhar Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Munderda, near Mehsana, District Mehsana, Gujarat
6.	Gujarat Agro Infrastructure Mega Food Park	Taluka Mangrol, District: Surat, Gujarat
Haryana		
1.	Soma New Towns (P) Ltd.	Village Natar, Sirsa
2.	Continental Warehousing Corporation (NhavaSeva) Limited	Village Jattipur, Distt. Panipat
3.	Star One Realtors Pvt. Ltd.	Village Tajpur, District Mewat, Haryana
4.	Indian Railways Catering and Tourism Corporation Ltd.	Ganaur Town, Sonipat District, Haryana

1	2	3
Himachal Pradesh		
1.	Poliyan Mega Food Park	Village Poliyan, District Una, Himachal Pradesh
2.	Himachal Integrated Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Dulehar, District Una, Himachal Pradesh
3.	HIM Mega Food Park	Kangra District, Himachal Pradesh
4.	Grewal Associates Pvt. Ltd.	Not given, Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir		
1.	Simplex Projects Limited	Lassipora in Pulwama Distt. of J&K
2.	Greens Food Park India Pvt. Ltd.	Lassipora in Pulwama Distt. of J&K
3.	Kashmir Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Lassipora in Pulwama Distt. of J&K
4.	J&K Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Lassipora in Pulwama Distt. of J&K
Karnataka		
1.	Favorich Infra Pvt. Ltd.	Gram Panchayat Kalinganahalli, District Mandya, Karnataka
Kerala		
1.	Malabar Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Kuzhur, Irinjalakuda taluk of Thrissur Distt., Kerala
Mizoram		
1.	Mizoram Mega Food Park	Khamaran, Distt. Aizwal, Mizoram
Madhya Pradesh		
1.	Trident Corporation Ltd.,	Village Berkhedi & Khapakhurd, Taluka Budhani, District Sehore, Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra		
1.	Dewap Mega Food Park	District: Parbhani, Maharashtra
2.	Amravati Integrated Mega Food Park	Shirpur, Amravati District, Maharashtra
3.	Garden Pick Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Utran, Jalgaon, Maharashtra
4.	Sindhudurg Integrated Coastal Food Park	Taluka Gavan, District Sindhudurg, Maharashtra
5.	Maharashtra Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Naigaon Sanghvi, District Satara, Maharashtra
6.	Suyojit Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Wadgaon Pingla, Taluka Sinnar, District Nasik, Maharashtra

1	2	3
7.	Satara Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Degaon, District Satara, Maharashtra
8.	Majalgaon Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Majalgaon, District Beed, Maharashtra
9.	SK Agro Foodtech Pvt. Ltd.	Village: Kaledhol, District Satara, Maharashtra
10.	Toronto Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Talasari, District Thane, Maharashtra
Odisha		
1.	Huma Coastal Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Mouza Raniboro, Tehsil Khallikote, District: Ganjam, Odisha
Puducherry		
1.	Goenka Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	Village Abhishekpakkam, District Puducherry
Punjab		
1.	Worldwide Food Park Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	Village Hamira, District Kapurthala, Punjab
2.	Saastha Mega Food Park Ltd.	Rail Majra, Distt. Nawanshahar, Punjab
Rajasthan		
1.	Green Tech Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village-Rupangarh, District Ajmer, Rajasthan
2.	Rajasthan Mega Food Park Ltd.	Village Narayana, Sambhar Tehsil, Rajasthan
Sikkim		
1.	M3 Food Paradise Pvt. Ltd.	Saramsa Village, East District, Sikkim
2.	Himalayan Organic Mega Food Park Ltd.	Melli, Distt. South Sikkim, Sikkim
Uttar Pradesh		
1.	UP Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Aurangpur, Pargana Dankaur, District Gautam Budh Nagar, NCR
Uttarakhand		
1.	Himalayan Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Village Mauha Kheraganj, Kashipur, District Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand
West Bengal		
1.	Concast Exim Ltd.	Amta, Howrah, West Bengal
2.	Dankuni Projects Ltd.	Dankuni, District Hooghly, West Bengal
3.	Bengal Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Rajganj village, District Jalpaiguri, West Bengal

ANNEXURE II

ANNEXURE REFERRED IN REPLY TO PART (D) OF THE LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 24 FOR ANSWER ON 08TH JULY,
2014 REGARDING MEGA FOOD PARKS

Status of Implementation of 30 Mega Food Park Projects approved during the last three years and the current year project/State-wise including Rajasthan (as on 30.06.2014)

Sl. No.	Name	State	Project cost	Date of In-principle approval	Date of Final Approval	(Rs. in crore)	
						Amount of grant approved	Amount of grant released
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	M/s Godavari Mega Aqua Park Pvt. Ltd., West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh	Andhra Pradesh	119.12	21.09.2012	16.12.2013	50.00	0.00
2.	M/s Smart Agro Industries Corporation Pvt. Ltd.	Andhra Pradesh	116.44	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval has been accorded.		
3.	M/s Keventer Food Park Infra Ltd., Bhagalpur, Bihar	Bihar	153.96	29.04.2011	30.11.2011	50.00 Cancelled in IMAC on 30.06.2014	5.00
4.	M/s Pristine Logistics & Infra Projects Pvt. Ltd., Khagaria, Bihar	Bihar	142.98	21.09.2012	Final approval has been accorded in IMAC meeting on 30.06.2014		

5.	M/s JVL Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Bihar	114.22	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval has been accorded.	
6.	M/s Indus Best Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd., Raipur, Chhattisgarh	Chhattisgarh	124.91	06.09.2012	04.06.2014	50.00 0.00
7.	M/s Raipur Mega Food Park Ltd., Raipur, Chhattisgarh	Chhattisgarh	129.65	21.09.2012	04.06.2014	50.00 0.00
8.	M/s Anil Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd., Vadodara, Gujarat	Gujarat	141.70	29.04.2011	13.01.2012	50.00 5.00 Cancelled due to withdrawal of the SPV from the Project
9.	Gujarat Agro Infrastructure Mega Food Park, Surat, Gujarat	Gujarat	108.30	21.09.2012	22.05.2014	50.00 0.00
10.	M/s Fanidhar Mega Food Park Ltd.	Gujarat	117.80	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval has been accorded.	
11.	M/s Soma New Towns (P) Ltd., Sirsa, Haryana	Haryana	147.08	21.09.2012	"In-principle" approval accorded to the project has been cancelled <i>vide</i> notice dated 25.06.2013	
12.	Continental Warehousing Corporation (Nhavaseva) Limited	Haryana	249.92	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval accorded to the project has been cancelled in IMAC meeting dated 30.06.2014	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13.	Himachal Integrated Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Himachal Pradesh	81.45	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval accorded to the project has been cancelled in IMAC meeting dated 30.06.2014		
14.	M/s Poliyam Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd., Una, Himachal Pradesh	Himachal Pradesh	97.63	21.09.2012	Final approval has been accorded in IMAC meeting dated 30.06.2014		
15.	M/s RPK Greens Food Park Pvt. Ltd., Pulwama, Jammu & Kashmir	Jammu & Kashmir	81.02	21.09.2012	19.02.2014	50.00	0.00
16.	M/s. Indus Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd. Madhya Pradesh	Madhya Pradesh	127.70	10.10.2011	27.08.2012	50.00	30.00
17.	M/s Maharashtra Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Maharashtra	135.00	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval accorded to the project has been cancelled in IMAC meeting dated 30.06.2014		
18.	M/s Amravati Integrated Mega Food Park	Maharashtra	133.08	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval accorded to the project has been cancelled in IMAC meeting dated 30.06.2014		
19.	M/s Suyojit Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd.	Maharashtra	142.95	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval accorded to the project has been cancelled in IMAC meeting dated 30.06.2014		
20.	M/s Satara Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd., Satara	Maharashtra	132.26	21.09.2012	Final approval has been accorded in IMAC meeting dated 30.06.2014		

21.	M/s Zoram Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd. (earlier M/s Mizoram Mega Food Park)	Mizoram	71.91	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval has been accorded.
22.	M/s Huma Coastal Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd., Ganjam, Odisha	Odisha	117.05	21.09.2012	"In-principle" approval has been cancelled <i>vide</i> notice dated 30.03.2014.
23.	M/s MITS Mega Food Park Ltd., Rayagada, Odisha	Odisha	80.17	29.04.2011	16.04.2012 50.00 5.00
24.	M/s Chakranemi Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., Abhishekhpakka	Puducherry	149.89	06.09.2012	"In-principle" approval has been cancelled <i>vide</i> notice dated 29.05.2014
25.	M/s Greentech Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd. Ajmer, Rajasthan	Rajasthan	113.11	21.09.2012	19.02.2014 50.00 0.00
26.	M/s Kanchenjunga Mega Food Park Ltd., South Sikkim, Sikkim	Sikkim	80.37	21.09.2012	"In-principle" approval has been cancelled <i>vide</i> notice dated 19.02.2014
27.	M/s Sikaria Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd., Agartala, Tripura	Tripura	87.45	29.04.2011	30.11.2011 50.00 20.79

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
28.	Uttar Pradesh Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd	Uttar Pradesh	113.95	19.12.2013	"In-principle" approval accorded to the project has been cancelled in IMAC meeting dated 30.06.2014		
29.	M/s Himalayan Food Park Pvt. Ltd., Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand	Uttarakhand	124.52	21.09.2012	23.01.2014	50.00	0.00
30.	M/s Bengal Mega Food Park Pvt. Ltd. Jalpaiguri, West Bengal	West Bengal	113.9	21.09.2012	"In-principle" approval accorded to the project has been cancelled <i>vide</i> notice dated 19.02.2014		

(प्रश्न 24)

श्री अर्जुन राम मेघवाल (बीकानेर): अध्यक्ष जी, मेरा प्रश्न मेगा फूड पार्क की स्कीम से सम्बन्धित है। जो मंत्री जी ने जवाब दिया है, उसके अनुसार इनको पूरे 30 प्रपोजल तीन साल में प्राप्त हुए हैं और उन 30 प्रपोजल्स में से 13 प्रोजेक्ट्स इन्होंने सैंक्शन किये हैं और 13 प्रोजेक्ट्स ही इन्होंने रिजेक्ट किये हैं।

मैं बीकानेर संसदीय क्षेत्र से आता हूँ और वहाँ पर जो भुजिया होती है, पूरे देश में जो बीकानेरी भुजिया के नाम से प्रसिद्ध है, उसमें एक एग्रीकल्चर प्रोडक्शन मोठ है। उस मोठ के कारण वह बहुत फेमस हुई। क्लाइमेट भी उसमें एक है। इन 30 प्रपोजल्स में बीकानेर का जो प्रपोजल है, उसका इसमें उल्लेख नहीं है। उसका कारण क्या रहा, क्यों नहीं उल्लेख है? मैं जहाँ तक समझ पा रहा हूँ, मेगा फूड पार्क में एक एस.पी.वी. नामक कंडीशन है। यह स्कीम बहुत अच्छी है, लेकिन 30 प्रपोजल्स प्राप्त हुए, 13 मंजूर हुए, 13 रिजेक्ट हुए, क्योंकि, इस स्कीम में क्लस्टर बेस्ड एप्रोच है। मेरा मंत्री जी से यह सवाल है कि जो कंडीशन्स लगाई गई हैं, उन कंडीशन्स को ठीक करके सरलीकरण करने का विचार है क्या? ये फूड पार्क हम दस सालों से सुनते आ रहे हैं, लेकिन 10 सालों में कोई ज्यादा फूड पार्कस् मंजूर हुए हैं, ऐसा नहीं है। अब नई सरकार आई है तो मंत्री जी से अपेक्षा और प्रश्न है कि इसमें सरलीकरण करने का विचार है या नहीं?

खाद्य प्रसंस्करण उद्योग मंत्री (श्रीमती हरसिमरत कौर बादल): मैडम, यह बिल्कुल सही है कि पिछले दस सालों में, जितने तीन सालों में खास तौर से मेगा-फूड पार्कस् सैंक्शन हुए हैं, उनमें से जितने लगने चाहिए, वे पूरे नहीं लग सके, लेकिन इसके बहुत से अन्य कारण हैं। सबसे बड़ा कारण यह है कि स्कीम में दिखते हैं कि 50 एकड़ जमीन की जरूरत होती है, 50 एकड़ जमीन एक जगह में लेना बहुत मुश्किल होता है, उसमें समय लगता है। उसके बाद उस जमीन के लिए सी.एल.यू. स्टेट गवर्नमेंट से लेने में बहुत टाइम लग जाता है और सी.एल.यू. लेने के बाद जो आगे उस मेगा फूड पार्क में आइडिया है कि छोटे-छोटे और यूनिट्स लगें, जिससे छोटे किसानों को भी फायदा हो तो यह आगे जब सब-लीज करना होता है तो जब सारी लैंड लीज पर ली जाती है तो सब-लीज का क्लार्ज़ नहीं होता। कई सारे ऐसे कारण हैं, जिनको देखा जा रहा है और उसमें जो सुधार किया जा सकता है, वह सुधार करने की कोशिश की जायेगी।

जहाँ तक एस.पी.वी. की इन्होंने बात की है। इसमें तीन-चार स्टेजेज होती हैं, सबसे पहले एक एक्सप्रेसशन ऑफ इंटरैस्ट आता है, जब सरकार मैगा फूड पार्कस् सैंक्शन करती है तो एडवरटाइजमेंट देती है, मंत्रालय एक्सप्रेसशन ऑफ इंटरैस्ट इन्वाइट करता है कि कौन लगाना चाहता है। लोग अपने आप एप्लाइ करते हैं। वे जब एप्लाइ करते हैं तो एक कमेटी उसको चैक करती हैं, चैक करने के बाद एक और टैक्नीकल कमेटी उसे देखती है। उसके बाद तीसरी कमेटी देखती है और यह सब देखने के बाद वे सैंक्शन होते हैं। सबसे पहली स्टेज होती है कि यह एस.पी.वी. की जो एक कंडीशन होती है, जिसमें आपके पास जमीन होनी चाहिए, सी.एल.यू. होना चाहिए, फाइनेंशियल आपका सारा अरेंजमेंट होना चाहिए, तब जाकर आपको सैंक्शन मिलती है। इसलिए यह एस.पी.वी. (स्पेशल परपज व्हीकल) है, ताकि लोग ग्रांट लेकर काम कर सकें। इसके मेन क्राइटीरिया में जमीन हो, पैसा हो, सारा कुछ टाइड-अप हो, उसके बाद ही एप्रूवल मिलती है।

जैसा ऑनरेबिल मैम्बर ने कहा कि यहाँ बीकानेर में भुजिया का है तो मैं उम्मीद करती हूँ कि वहाँ से जब नये प्रोजेक्ट्स सैंक्शन किए जाएंगे तो उसमें वे जरूर एप्लाइ करें, मैं इसको देख रही हूँ कि कारण क्या है

कि सारे जितना इसको पोपुलर होना चाहिए, क्योंकि सारे नहीं लग रहे हैं और स्कीम्स में बदलाव जो कर सकते हैं, जिस करके यह स्कीम आगे बढ़ सके, वह जरूर किया जायेगा।

श्री अर्जुन राम मेघवाल (बीकानेर): मैं मंत्री जी का धन्यवाद करना चाहता हूँ कि बीकानेरी भुजिया के लिए ये सैद्धान्तिक स्वीकृति अभी सदन में दे रही हैं। मेरा आपके माध्यम से दूसरा सप्लीमेंटरी प्रश्न है कि जो ये एस.पी.वी. (स्पेशल परपज व्हीकल) है और उसके साथ जुड़ा हुआ स्टेक होल्डर है, जितने प्रोजेक्ट्स मंजूर भी हुए हैं तो मेरी जानकारी जो है, उसके मुताबिक मैं कह रहा हूँ कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट, एस.पी.वी. और स्टेक होल्डर्स, इन तीनों के बीच में कोआर्डिनेशन नहीं है।

एसपीवी वाले जब मेगा फूड पार्क प्रोजेक्ट मंजूर करके ले जाते हैं, उसके बाद स्टेट गवर्नमेंट से भी संबंध अच्छे नहीं रखते हैं और जो स्टेक होल्डर्स होते हैं, उनकी भी कई ऐसी शिकायतें आती हैं कि एसपीवी वाला हमारा शोषण कर रहा है। स्टेट गवर्नमेंट, एसपीवी और स्टेक होल्डर्स इन तीनों के बीच में कोई कोआर्डिनेशन बैठाकर, अगर स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को ही एसपीवी बना दें या कुछ कंडीशन में सरलीकरण कर दें तो यह स्कीम ज्यादा लाभान्वित हो सकती है। मेरा आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से यह प्रश्न है।

श्रीमती हरसिमरत कौर बादल: मंत्रालय की तरफ से एक लोकल ऑफिसर स्टेट लेवल पर एप्वाइंट किया जाता है, जो इसको आगे देखते हैं। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि जैसे स्कीम पहले थी, उसमें यह प्रॉब्लम जरूर आती थी। इन्हीं देखते हुए कई चेंजेज किये गये हैं, अभी नये मेगा फूड पार्क जो किये जायेंगे, जिसमें एक बड़ा चेंज यह किया गया है कि पहले जो कोऑपरेटिव और स्टेट एजेंसीज थीं, उनको भी यह स्कीम फिट नहीं आती थी। अब उनके लिए एसपीवी की जरूरत नहीं होगी, जिससे डॉयरेक्टली कोऑपरेटिव और स्टेट एजेंसीज भी कर सकती हैं और यह जो नोमिनेट किया जाता है, स्टेट लेवल पर जो ऑफिसर होता है, अक्सर वे कमिश्नर होते हैं, डिप्टी कलेक्टर्स होते हैं तो वे इस सारे को मानीटर करते हैं और उन्हीं का यह काम होता है। ये जो स्टेट के साथ प्रॉब्लम्स आती हैं, इसीलिए उनको उस कमेटी में डाला जाता है ताकि वे स्टेट लेवल पर फॉलोअप कर सकें।

श्री ज्योतिरादित्य माधवराव सिंधिया (गुना): महोदया, हमारे देश में फूड प्रोसेसिंग के क्षेत्र में क्षमता बहुत है। आज भारत दूध के क्षेत्र में नम्बर वन उत्पादक है, फ्रूट एंड वेजिटेबल के क्षेत्र में नम्बर दो और फूड ग्रेन्स के क्षेत्र में नम्बर तीन, लेकिन हमारी वेस्टेज करीब 40 प्रतिशत है। यह जो मेगा फूड पार्क स्कीम है, मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि मंत्री जी को और उन्होंने उल्लेख भी किया है कि कठिनाइयाँ हैं और यह वास्तविकता है जो मंत्री जी ने कहा, लेकिन कठिनाइयों का समाधान करने के लिए मंत्रालय और मंत्री जी की क्या सोच है? इसी के साथ जो एक प्रस्ताव रखा गया था कि जो कैपिटल कॉस्ट है, उसे पचास करोड़ से बढ़ाकर सौ करोड़ रखा जाए, उस पर सरकार की क्या सोच है और कितने लोगों को इसके आधार पर भविष्य में रोजगार मिल पाएगा? कृपया इस बारे में हमें सूचित करें। ...*(व्यवधान)*

श्रीमती हरसिमरत कौर बादल: जो यह मेगा फूड पार्क की स्कीम है, जैसा इन्होंने वेस्टेज के बारे में कहा, पोस्ट हार्वेस्टिंग इंजीनियरिंग और टेक्नॉलाजी की एक स्टडी सिफेट ने की है, उसमें उन्होंने बताया है कि जो पेरिशेबल फ्रूट्स एंड वेजिटेबल्स होते हैं, उसमें तकरीबन 6.8 से लेकर 18 परसेंट तक वेस्टेज होते हैं, जिसमें सबसे ज्यादा मात्रा फ्रूट और वेजिटेबल में होती है। एक कारण यह है कि फ्रूट प्रोसेसिंग में फ्रूट्स एंड वेजिटेबल्स की प्रोसेसिंग सबसे कम है, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है, मिल्क की ज्यादा है, दूसरी चीजों की ज्यादा है। खास तौर से हमारे देश में लोगों को फ्रेश फ्रूट्स और फ्रेश वेजिटेबल्स की आदत है, प्रोसेस्ड फ्रूट्स की अभी इतनी आदत नहीं है। इस मेगा फूड पार्क का एक यही उद्देश्य था कि वेस्टेज को घटाने के

लिए ये मेगा फूड पार्क बनाये जाएं। हब एंड स्पोक एक मॉडल होता है, जहां पर एक बड़ा प्रोसेसिंग सेंटर होता है और फॉर्म लेबल पर कलेक्शन सेंटर्स होते हैं, उसके पास प्राइमरी प्रोसेसिंग सेंटर्स होते हैं, फिर ये सेंट्रल प्रोसेसिंग सेंटर्स पर आते हैं। यह हब एंड स्पोक मॉडल इसीलिए है ताकि उसकी कवरेज चारों तरफ से हो सके, इसीलिए मेगा फूड पार्क को इनविजन किया गया था। जैसा पहले बताया कि इसकी जैसी सक्सेस रेट होनी चाहिए, वह नहीं है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट से मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि यह सपोर्ट मिलेगा, वे चेंजेज लाने के लिए जिससे यह स्कीम आगे बढ़ सके।

As far as the hon. Member's suggestion that the amount of subsidy should be raised from Rs. 50 crore to Rs. 100 crore is concerned, I would like to say that, unfortunately the financial status has not been left in such a condition that we would do things that we would love to do. So, soon as the funds situation is put on the right track, I am sure we will look into that. Meanwhile, other alternatives or options are being weighed.

श्री दुष्यंत चौटाला (हिसार): महोदया, अभी मंत्री जी ने बताया कि नये फूड प्रोसेसिंग प्लांट्स देश के अंदर और खोले जाएंगे। मैं इतना ही पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या हरियाणा प्रदेश में और हिसार लोक सभा क्षेत्र में भी कोई प्लांट सेटअप करने की कोई उम्मीद केन्द्र सरकार रखती है?

श्रीमती हरसिमरत कौर बादल: नए मेगा फूड पार्क के लिए अभी भी स्कीम 31 जुलाई तक ओपेन है। लोग अपना एक्सप्रेसन ऑफ इंटेरेस्ट (ईओआई) भेज सकते हैं। शायद, इसको एक्सटेंड करने के बारे में सोचा जा सकता है। यह अभी भी अवेलेबल है।

SHRIMATI KAVITHA KALVAKUNTALA (NIZAMABAD): Madam, in Nandipet mandal in my constituency, around 380 acres have already been acquired from the farmers but the Food Park never started in the past seven years. I just want to understand the reason behind it. I think the final approval is still pending. Will the final approval happen? If not, will the land be given back to the farmers?

SHRIMATI HARSIMRAT KAUR BADAL: Like I said earlier, there are various stages in it. Once those norms are met, then the approvals are given. So, if the final approval is still pending, it means that either funds have not been tied up or the land is not there in that unit of 50 acres. As soon as all the options are cleared, the grant is released.

माननीय अध्यक्ष: सभी प्रश्नों के उत्तर अच्छी तरह से आ गए हैं।

APPENDIX V

MEMORANDUM NO. 130

Subject: Request for dropping of assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 543 dated 26.02.2015, regarding "Pranahita Chevella".

On 26 February, 2015 Shri B. Vinod Kumar, M.P. address an Unstarred Question No. 543 to the Minister of Water Resources, River Development & Ganga Rejuvenation, The text of the question alongwith the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Water Resources within three months from the date of the reply but the assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Water Resources *vide* O.M. No. P-11011/01/2015-SPR-1 dated 27-07-2015, have requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds:—

"That the statutory clearances from M/o Environment, Forest & Climate Change and M/o Tribal Affairs are also awaited which are to be submitted by the Project Authorities. The Detailed Project Report (DPR) of Pranahita Chevella Project prepared by State Government has many design deficiencies which has been intimated to State Government. One of them which talks about creation of integrated storage for Pumped Water from Pranahita Chevella Project, is to be Planned and for that planning entire DPR preparation will be required which is time consuming process and will further require the preparation of Environment impact Assessment and Environment Management Plan for those storages which will be conceived for Pranahita Chevella pumped water at different locations. After carrying out these steps, the Detailed Project Report of the entire Project will have to be re-written along with seeking TOR for Environment Impact Assessment and Environment Management Plan. This activity is time consuming and beyond control of M/o Water Resources, River Development & Ganga Rejuvenation as other Ministries are also involved. Therefore it is requested that the above Assurance may be deleted from list of pending assurance relating to Ministry of Water Resources, River Development & Ganga Rejuvenation."

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of the Ministry of Water Resources, River Development & Ganga Rejuvenation have requested to drop the above assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES, RIVER DEVELOPMENT AND
GANGA REJUVENATION
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 543
ANSWERED ON 26.02.2015

Pranahita Chevella

543. SHRI VINOD B. KUMAR:

Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES , RIVER DEVELOPMENT AND GANGA REJUVENATION be pleased to state:

- (a) the details of the guidelines/criteria laid down for declaring a project as national project;
- (b) whether the Government has a proposal for according the status of national project to Pranahita Chevella project in Telangana State;
- (c) if so, whether any deliberations/meetings have been convened in this regard; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof ?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR WATER RESOURCES, RIVER DEVELOPMENT AND GANGA REJUVENATION (PROF. SANWAR LAL JAT): (a) New projects could be considered for inclusion as national Projects if they fulfill the following selection criteria

- (i) International projects where usage of water in India is required by a treaty or where planning and early completion of the project is necessary in the interest of the country.
- (ii) Inter-State projects which are dragging on due to non-resolution of inter-state issues relating to sharing of costs, rehabilitation, aspects of power production etc. including river interlinking projects.
- (iii) Intra-State projects with additional potential of more than 2,00,000 ha with no dispute regarding sharing of water and where hydrology is established.
- (iv) Extension, renovation and modernization projects envisaging restoration of lost potential of 2 lakh or more subject to certain conditions.

(b) to (d) The project is under appraisal in Central Water Commission. The statutory clearances from Ministry of Environment & Forest and Ministry of Tribal Affairs are also awaited, which are to be submitted by the project authorities. The project could be considered for the Status of National Project only when the project as submitted by the State Government is techno economically viable and fulfills the criteria as laid down in the Guidelines for National Projects subject to all other statutory clearances from respective Ministries/Departments.

APPENDIX VI

MEMORANDUM NO. 134

Subject: Request for dropping of assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 598 dated 25.02.2010, regarding "Expert Committee".

On 25 February, 2010 Shri Baijayant Jay Panda and Shri Nityananda Pradhan, M.Ps. addressed an Unstarred Question No. 598 to the Minister of Railways. The text of the question alongwith the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the question was treated as an Assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Railways within three months from the date of the reply but the assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Railways *vide* O.M. No. 2010/W-2/ECOR/PQL/08 dated 14.09.2015, have requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds:—

"That four projects out of seven on which Assurance had been made, have already been completed & commissioned and three projects on which also Assurances had been made, are at an advanced stage of completion as per details given below:—

Project completed

S.No.	Name of Project	Present Status
New Line		
1.	Lanjigarh Road-Junagarh (56km).	Completed & commissioned
Gauge Conversion		
2.	Naupada-Gunupur (90km).	Completed & commissioned
Doubling		
1.	Sambalpur-Rengali (22.7).	Completed & commissioned
2.	Bimlagarh-Dumitra (18.3km).	Completed & commissioned
<i>Projects in Progress</i>		
Doubling		
3.	Jharsuguda-Rengali (25.6km).	95% work completed
4.	Cuttack-Barang (12km).	95% work completed
5.	Khurda Road-Barang 3rd line (35km).	88% work completed

It is informed that all the three projects mentioned above, which are in progress, have been accorded very high priority now and adequate funds have been provided for their early completion. However, as the works are being executed very near to the

running lines, these projects may take about 1 or 2 years to complete. In view of the position brought out above, it may not be appropriate to keep the above Assurance pending for long. Lok Sabha Secretariat (CGA) is, therefore, requested to drop the above Assurance."

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of the Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways, have requested to drop the above Assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;

Dated: 15.6.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 598
ANSWERED ON 25.02.2010

Expert Committee

598. SHRI BAIJAYANT JAY PANDA:
SHRINITYANANDA PRADHAN:

Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

- (a) whether an Expert Committee has been set up by the Railways to oversee completion of rail projects;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether the Committee has finalized strict time-line for completion of these projects;
- (d) if so, the details thereof; and
- (e) the status of various rail projects (*viz.* new lines, doubling, gauge conversions etc.) on the East Coast Railway?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI K. H. MUNIYAPPA): (a) to (d) Objectives of the Expert Committee set up by Ministry of Railways include reviewing progress of ongoing activities undertaken by the Railways. The Committee has held a number of meetings and a review of the progress of ongoing projects has been taken up.

(e) A Statement is attached.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (E) OF UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 598 BY S/SHRI BAIJAYANT JAY PANDA AND NITYANANDA PRADHAN TO BE ANSWERED IN LOK SABHA ON 25.02.2010 REGARDING EXPERT COMMITTEE

(Rs. in crore)

S. No.	Name of the Project	Latest Anticipated Cost	Actual Expenditure incurred up to 31/03/2009	Budget Outlay provided during 2009-10	Present Status
1	2	3	4	5	6
NEW LINE					
1.	Lanjigarh Road-	170.00	85.31	30.00	In the first phase, work for Lanjigarh-

1	2	3	4	5	6
	Junagarh (56 kms)				Bhawanipatna (31 Kms) has been taken up, where earthwork and bridgework are in progress. The work is likely to be completed in 2010-11.
2.	Khurda Road Bolangir (289 kms)	700.00	77.74	28.07	On this project, earthwork and bridgework have been taken up in Phase I from Kurda Road to Begunia (36 Kms).
3.	Haridaspur-Paradeep (82 Kms)	594.34	136.63	0.00	The work is being executed by Rail Vikas Nigam Limited (RVNL) through a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV). 1146.39 out of 1653.69 acres of land has been acquired. Earthwork and minor bridgework have been taken up. Work on major bridges over rivers Luna and Mahanadi has also been taken up.
4.	Angul-Sukinda Road (98.7 kms)	344.00	599	75	The work is to be executed by RVNL through the formation of an SPV. Final Location survey (FLS) has been completed. 470.3 out of 619.23 hectares of land has been acquired.
5.	Talcher-Bimlagarh (154 kms)	810.78	27.98	10.00	FLS has been completed. Land acquisition has been taken up. Earthwork, bridge works taken up.
GAUGE CONVERSION					
1.	Naupada-Gunupur (90 Kms)	168.88	149.08	14.00	Earthwork, bridgework, ballasting and track-linking are in progress. The project is likely to be completed during 2009-10.
DOUBLING					
1.	Rajathgarh-Barang (20 kms)	242.87	166.36	75.00	The work is being executed by RVNL through Asian Development Bank (ADB) funding. Earthwork and bridgework including the bridge over river Mahanadi have been taken up. The work is likely to be completed during 2010-11.
2.	Sambalpur-Rengali (22.7 kms)	106.54	83.41	10.00	Sambalpur to Sarla, Sasan to Sarla Completed. Sasan to Rengali is likely to be completed in 2010-11.
3.	Jharsuguda-Rengali (25.6 kms)	150	30.45	35.00	Earthwork and bridgework have been taken up. The project is likely to be completed during 2010-11.
4.	Cuttack-Barang (12 kms)	178.98	104.75	55.00	The work is being executed by RVNL through ADB funding. Earthwork and bridgework, etc. including Kuakhai Bridge have

1	2	3	4	5	6
					been taken up. The project is likely to be completed during 2010-11.
5.	Khurda Road-Barang 3rd line (35 Kms)	207.00	72.14	65.00	The work is being executed by RVNL through ADB funding. Earthwork and bridgework, etc. have been taken up. The project is likely to be completed in March, 2011.
6.	Sambalpur-Titlagarh (182 kms)	474.25	3.3	3.0	The work is being executed by RVNL through ADB funding. FLS has been completed. Necessary planning has been taken up.
7.	Raipur-Titlagarh (203 kms)	614.35	0.00	3.20	The work is being executed by RVNL through ADB funding. Necessary planning has been taken up.
8.	Bimlagarh-Dumitra (18.3 kms)	73.77	0.16	50.00	Detailed Estimate has been sanctioned. Tendering for works has been taken up. The project is likely to be completed during 2010-11.
9.	Banspani-Joruli (9 kms)	76.22	-	4.00	Detailed Estimate has been . sanctioned Tendering for works has been taken up.
10.	Vizianagram-Kottavala sa-3rd line. (34.7 km)	194.89	9.24	35.00	Earthwork, bridge work taken up.
11.	Kottavala sa-Simhachalam North 4th Line (16.69 km)	94.73	19.51	32.00	Earthwork, bridge work taken up.
12.	Banspani-Daitari-Tomka-Jakapura (180 km)	1142.6	0	1.0	New work included in 2009-10. Work has been entrusted to RVNL for execution. Land acquisition taken up.

The ongoing projects will be completed in the coming years as per the availability of resources.

APPENDIX VII

MEMORANDUM NO. 141

Subject: Request for dropping of Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1842 dated 22.07.2014, regarding "Empowerment of Transgender Community".

On 22 July, 2014 Shri Baijayant Jay Panda, M.P. addressed an Unstarred Question No. 1842 to the Minister of Social Justice and Empowerment. The text of the question alongwith the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the question was treated as an Assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment within three months from the date of the reply but the Assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment *vide* O.M. No. P.13011/5(3)/2014-DP-III dated 18th June, 2015 requested to drop the Assurance on the following grounds:—

"That in reply to the above Question, it was *inter alia* informed by this Ministry that 'on 15th April, 2014 the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a Writ Petition (Civil) No. 400/2012 filed by National Legal Services Authority (NLSA) has delivered its judgement on the issues of Transgender person, directing the Central and State Governments to take various steps for the welfare of the transgender community and also to examine the recommendations of the Experts Committee based on the legal declaration made in the above said judgement'. The Ministry is of view that this is a factual information and does not constitute an Assurance. In similar reply given in Unstarred Question No. 583 on 27.11.2014 to Rajya Sabha, it was informed that 'the Government has taken a decision to formulate a National Policy on transgender Persons'. The matter was taken up earlier with Rajya Sabha Secretariat and it has been deleted from the list of Assurances *vide* Rajya Sabha Office Memorandum No. RS. 1/233/99/2014-Com. III dated 05.05.2015. In view of the foregoing, it is requested that reply of the Ministry in Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1842 given on 22.07.2014 may not be treated as an Assurance and the same may be deleted from the list of Assurances pending against the Ministry."

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Minister of State for Social Justice and Empowerment, have requested to drop the above Assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 1842
ANSWERED ON 22.07.2014

Empowerment of Transgender Community

1842. SHRI BAIJAYANT "JAY" PANDA:

Will the Minister of SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Government proposes to formulate an integrated national policy for the empowerment of the transgender community; and
- (b) if so, the details thereof and the steps taken so far in this regard?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT (SHRI SUDARSHAN BHAGAT): (a) & (b) An Expert Committee was constituted *vide* Order dated 22nd October, 2013 in the Ministry to make an indepth study of the problems being faced by the Transgender Community and suggest suitable measures to ameliorate their problems. The Committee has submitted its report on 27th January, 2014.

On 15th April, 2014, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a Writ Petition (Civil) No. 400/2012 filed by National Legal Services Authority (NLSA) has delivered its judgment on the issues of Transgender Persons, directing the Central and State Governments to take various steps for the welfare of the transgender community and also to examine the recommendations of the Expert Committee based on the legal declaration made in the above said judgment.

APPENDIX VIII

MEMORANDUM NO. 142

Subject: Request for dropping of Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2988 dated 10 February, 2014, regarding "Production of GM Crop".

On 10 February, 2014 Shri Ananth Kumar, M.P. addressed an Unstarred Question No. 2988 to the Minister of Environment, Forests and Climate Change. The text of the question alongwith the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the Question was treated as an Assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change within three months from the date of the reply but the Assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change *vide* O.M. No. C.12011/07/2014-CS. III dated 15 October, 2015 requested to drop the Assurance on the following grounds:—

"That the issue pertaining to aforesaid Assurance is presently sub-judice and pending before Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for final decision. The said issue is pending before the Court for a considerable time. It is also pertinent that any decision in respect of the aforementioned assurance is possible only, once the matter is finally decided by Court and no specific time frame can be given to fulfill the same.

It is therefore, requested that in order to save precious time of Parliament on an issue wherein no specific time frame can be given for fulfillment in view of the pendency of matter before Supreme Court, the matter may not be considered as Assurance and Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha is requested to drop the Assurance.

It is also pertinent that the request of this Ministry in the similar two other Assurances on the same subject pending with the Rajya Sabha Committee on Government Assurances were acceded to and said Assurances were dropped in view of the fact that the matter is sub-judice."

4. In view of the above the Ministry, with the approval of the Minister of State for Environment, Forests and Climate Change, have requested to drop the above Assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2988
ANSWERED ON 10.02.2014

Production of GM Crop

2988. SHRI ANANTH KUMAR:

Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Government has any proposal to lift the moratorium on production and sale of Bt. Brinjal a Genetically Modified (GM) crop in the country;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether the Government has held any consultation or proposes to consult the stakeholders and State Governments in this regard;
- (d) if so, the details thereof; and
- (e) the steps taken/being taken by the Government in this regard?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (DR. M. VEERAPPAMOILY):

(a) to (e) The Government imposed a moratorium on 09.02.2010 on commercialization of Bt. Brinjal event EE-I a genetically modified crop in the country till such time independent scientific studies establish that Bt. Brinjal is safe for the environment and human health. As a follow up to the moratorium, a meeting of the Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC) to consult with experts and scientists on the safety of Bt. Brinjal was held on April 27, 2011. While several of the experts recommended limited release of Bt. Brinjal seeds to evaluate its performance under strict supervision, some experts suggested additional biosafety studies with respect to long term impacts on biodiversity and human health before limited release is permitted. In the absence of consensus a final view is yet to emerge.

APPENDIX IX

MEMORANDUM NO. 143

Subject: Request for dropping of Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1450 dated 29.07.2015, regarding "Recycling Plastic Waste".

On 29 July, 2015, Shri Konda Vishweshwar Reddy, M.P. addressed an Unstarred Question No. 1450 to the Minister of Science and Technology (Department of Scientific and Industrial Research). The text of the Question along with the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the Question was treated as an Assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Science and Technology (Department of Scientific and Industrial Research) within three months from the date of the reply but the Assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Science and Technology *vide* O.Ms. 26-1(34)/2015-PU dated 05.11.2015 and 30.11.2015, requested to drop the Assurance on the following grounds:—

"That while the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs has treated the CSIR response to the aforesaid Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1450 as Assurance at the instance of Lok Sabha Secretariat, CSIR in its response to the Question had only described the effort of its constituent CSIR-IIP being put to commercialize the technology developed. The Technology under reference is for converting plastic waste into petroleum products. CSIR-IIP is under discussion with Indian Railways and emphasizing that they adopt and implement this technology. It will not be out of place to mention that a time-line cannot be assigned to such an effort. The Hon'ble Committee on Government Assurances Lok Sabha, is therefore, requested that the response of CSIR may not be treated as Assurance and be dropped, as CSIR technology under reference lies in the ambit of a third party."

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Minister of Science and Technology, have requested to drop the above Assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;

Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 1450
ANSWERED ON 29.07.2015

Recycling Plastic Waste

1450. SHRI KONDA VISHWESHWAR REDDY:

Will the Minister of SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY be pleased to state:

(a) the present status of the project, developed by the Indian Institute of Petroleum (IIP), Dehradun and sponsored by the Gas Authority of India Ltd. (GAIL), that aims at converting of plastic waste into petroleum products;

(b) whether there is a project in place to collect and recycle municipal plastic waste for the above purpose; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND EARTH SCIENCES (SHRI Y.S. CHOWDARY): (a) A facile technology for converting plastic waste to petroleum products has already been developed jointly by CSIR-Indian Institute of Petroleum (CSIR-IIP), Dehradun and Gas Authority of India Ltd. (GAIL) at the laboratory scale and revalidated at the bench scale. Based on this technology, setting up of 1 Tonne per day unit to convert plastic collected from the municipal solid waste is under advance stage of implementation. CSIR-IIP has received more than 50 inquiries from prospective clients regarding the technology. Further, Indian Railways has shown interest in converting their in-house generated waste plastic to diesel to run their locomotives. CSIR-IIP is under discussion with Indian Railways to implement three projects on conversion of plastic waste to petroleum products.

(b) & (c) As mentioned above, the project is under advance stage of implementation.

APPENDIX X

MEMORANDUM NO. 148

Subject: Request for dropping of Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2396 dated 28.03.2012, regarding "National Broadband Plan".

On 28 March, 2012 Shri Rao Saheb Danve Patil, Shri M.K. Raghavan, Shri Hansraj G. Ahir, Shri Radhe Mohan Singh, Shri Varun Gandhi, Shri Harishchandra Chavan, Shri Ram Singh Kaswan, Shri R. Thamaraiselvan, Shri Suresh Kumar Shetkar and Dr. Kirit Premjibhai Solanki M.Ps. addressed an Unstarred Question No. 2396 to the Minister of Communication and Information Technology (Department of Telecommunications). The text of the question alongwith the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the question was treated as an Assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology (Department of Telecommunications) within three months from the date of reply but the Assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Communications and Information Technology (Department of Telecommunications) *vide* O.M. No. 8/09/2012-Policy-I dated 1st December, 2015 requested to drop the Assurance on the following grounds:—

"That the National Optical Fibre Network (NOFN) project was planned, in 2011 to connect all Gram Panchayats (approx. 2.5 Lakh), in the Country through Optical Fibre Cable (OFC) utilizing existing fibers of PSUs *viz.* Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (BSNL), Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL) and RailTel to bridge the connectivity gap between Gram Panchayats (GPs) and Blocks for providing broadband connectivity by all categories of service providers on non-discriminatory basis. The project was approved by Government on 25.10.2011. The project is being funded by USOF and is being executed by a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) namely Bharat Broadband Network Limited (BBNL), which has been incorporated on 25.02.2012. NOFN was targeted to be implemented by December, 2016.

Given the pace of implementation of National Optical Fibre Network (NOFN), Government of India constituted an Expert Committee on 14th January, 2015 to review the strategy and approach towards speedy implementation of NOFN project. One of the mandates of this Committee was to come up with solutions that could ensure project completion by December, 2016. The Committee gave considerable thought to this issue and was of the opinion that adherence to the timeline of December, 2016 either in the existing framework or the revised framework suggested by the Committee, may not be feasible. The Committee submitted its report on 31st March, 2015 wherein a revised timeline upto December, 2017 has, *inter alia*, been indicated.

Based on the report of the Committee on NOFN, the implementation strategy, approach, technology etc. of the project are under examination in consultation with stakeholders. It is, therefore, expected that the completion of the project to cover all Gram Panchayats will take considerable time.

In view of the above, it is requested that the Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha Secretariat may consider dropping of the Parliament Assurances given in respect of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2396 answered on 28.03.2012."

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Minister of Communications & Information Technology, have requested to drop the above Assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;

Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2396
ANSWERED ON 28.3. 2012

National Broadband Plan

2396. SHRI RAO SAHEB DANVE PATIL:
SHRI M.K. RAGHAVAN:
SHRI HANSRAJ G. AHIR:
SHRI RADHE MOHAN SINGH:
SHRI VARUN GANDHI:
SHRI HARISHCHANDRACHAVAN:
SHRI RAM SINGH KASWAN:
SHRI R. THAMARAISELVAN:
SHRI SURESH KUMAR SHETKAR:
DR. KIRIT PREM JIBHAI SOLANKI:

Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Government has prepared and finalized the National Broadband Plan;
- (b) if so, the details and the salient features thereof along with the action taken by the Government in this regard so far;
- (c) whether the Government has provided/proposes to provide high speed broadband facilities in rural areas;
- (d) if so, the details thereof and the number of villages/panchayats covered under the scheme so far, State-wise;
- (e) whether the slow pace of internet broadband coverage has adversely affected the economic and social development and thereby Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the country; and
- (f) if so, the details thereof and the action taken by the Government to increase broadband penetration in the country?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI MILIND DEORA): (a) to (d) Department of Telecommunications had received the recommendation made by Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI) dated 8th December, 2010 on 'National Broadband Plan'. The Government has already approved the Scheme for creation of National Optical Fibre Network (NOFN) on 25th October, 2011, for providing Broadband connectivity to 2.5 lakh village Panchayats. The objective of this scheme is to extend the existing optical fibre network to Panchayats by utilizing the Universal Services Obligation Fund (USOF). The project is proposed to be completed in 2 years.

In addition, USOF has launched a Rural Wireline Broadband Scheme to increase broadband penetration in rural and remote areas. Under this scheme BSNL will provide 8,88,832 wire-line Broadband connections to individual users and Government Institutions over a period of 5-years in this scheme. As on February, 2012, a total of 3,54,595 broadband connections have been provided. The telecom circle-wise details is given in **Annexure I**.

Further Government under Bharat Nirman-II has a target of covering 2.5 lakh Gram Panchayats in 2012. State-wise broadband coverage of village Panchayats is, given in **Annexure-II**.

The Government in draft revised National Telecom Policy, 2011, has *inter-alia* proposed to revise the existing Broadband download speed of 256 Kbps to 512 Kbps and subsequently to 2 Mbps by 2015 and higher speeds of at least 100 Mbps thereafter. However, no final decision has been taken in the matter so far.

(e) & (f) Studies have shown that increase in the penetration of Internet/Broadband has a positive impact on the growth of Gross Domestic Product.

In addition to this following initiatives have been taken by the Government to increase the broadband penetration:—

- (i) Allotment of Spectrum for 3G and BWA services will facilitate proliferation of broadband through mobile handsets and wireless technologies.
- (ii) Permitting Sharing of infrastructure amongst the Service providers.
- (iii) The Indian Telegraph Rules have been amended, and stream IV has been added under the title "Provision of broadband connectivity to villages in a phased manner" to bring provisioning of broadband connectivity to the rural areas under the purview of the USOF.
- (iv) USOF schemes for supporting shared infrastructure for mobile services in rural and remote areas are under implementation. These towers will also be used to provide Broadband connectivity in the newly covered Block/Taluka headquarters.
- (v) A Rural Wire-line Broadband Scheme has been launched under USOF to increase broadband penetration in rural and remote areas. Under this scheme BSNL will provide 8, 88,832 wire-line Broadband connections to individual users and Government Institutions over a period of 5 years in this scheme.

*ANNEXURE I***Broadband connections provided by BSNL under USOF plans up to
February, 2012**

Telecom Circle	Total USOF Connections
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	325
Andhra Pradesh	48,707
Assam	1,750
Bihar	3,024
Chhattisgarh	1,669
Chennai Telecom Distt.	5,418
Gujarat	21,480
Haryana	11,395
Himachal Pradesh	7,379
Jammu and Kashmir	1,291
Jharkhand	1,647
Karnataka	23,377
Kerala	78,532
Madhya Pradesh	4,231
Maharashtra	28,387
North East-I	835
North East-II	365
Orissa	6,165
Punjab	40,098
Rajasthan	16,410
Tamil Nadu	25,602
Uttar Pradesh (East)	7,730
Uttar Pradesh (West)	4,135
Uttarakhand	1,707
West Bengal	12,936
Total	3,54,595

ANNEXURE II

**State of Broadband Coverage of Village Panchayats under Bharat Nirman-II upto
31.12.2012**

Sl. No.	State/UTs	Total Number of VPs	Cumulative Achievement
1	2	3	4
1.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	67	56
2.	Andhra Pradesh	21862	14034
3.	Assam	3943	2062
4.	Bihar	8460	7788
5.	Chhattisgarh	9837	2150
6.	Gujarat (including Dadra and Nagar Haveli & Daman and Diu)	14439	7599
7.	Haryana	6234	5651
8.	Himachal Pradesh	3241	1862
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	4146	1308
10.	Jharkhand	4559	4460
11.	Karnataka	5657	3779
12.	Kerala	999	997
13.	Lakshadweep	10	5
14.	Madhya Pradesh	23022	4171
15.	Maharashtra (including Goa)	28078	10294
16.	Tripura	1040	
17.	Mizoram**	768	1190
18.	Meghalaya**	1463	
19.	Arunachal Pradesh	1756	
20.	Manipur	3011	1410
21.	Nagaland**	1110	
22.	Orissa	6233	2372
23.	Punjab	12809	11100
24.	Chandigarh	17	16

1	2	3	4
25.	Rajasthan	9200	2946
26	Tamil Nadu	12617	9308
27	Puducherry	98	98
28	Uttar Pradesh	52125	43003
29	Uttarakhand	7546	2474
30	West Bengal	3354	2475
31	Sikkim	163	66
Total		247864	142674

** Equivalent Rural Local Bodies.

APPENDIX XI

MEMORANDUM NO. 149

Subject: Request for dropping of Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3652 dated 15.12.2014, regarding "Environmental Clearances for Mining Projects".

On 15 December, 2014 Shrimati Meenakashi Lekhi, M.P. addressed an Unstarred Question No. 3652 to the Minister of Steel. The text of the Question along with the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the Question was treated as an Assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Steel within three months from the date of the reply but the Assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Steel *vide* O.M. No. 2(10)/2015-RM-I dated 22 July, 2015, have requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds:—

“That in reply to parts (b) and (c) of the above mentioned Lok Sabha Unstarred Question, it was *inter alia* stated that discussions in this regard are underway with the concerned State Governments, which has been treated as Assurance. Since the intention of this Ministry was not to give an Assurance and the formation of Steel SPVs for setting up of Steel Plants in the States of Chhattisgarh, Karnataka, Odisha and Jharkhand are a long drawn process to achieve ambitious target of 300 MTPA Steel production by 2025-26 and SMZ is also a concept to be pursued in the long term, therefore the Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha Secretariat is requested that the reply given to Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 3652 dated 15.12.2015 may not be treated as an Assurance and the same may be dropped from the list of pending Assurances.”

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of the Minister of State in the Ministry of Steel have requested to drop the above Assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF STEEL
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3652
ANSWERED ON 15.12.2014

Environmental Clearances for Mining Projects

3652. SHRIMATI MEENAKASHI LEKHI:

Will the Minister of STEEL be pleased to state:

(a) the number of iron and manganese mining projects which are awaiting environmental clearances presently in the country;

(b) the status of the Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) and Special Mining Zones (SMZs) which the Government sought to introduce to attract investment in steel sector; and

(c) the steps taken by the Government for expeditious environmental clearance and implementation of SPVs and SMZs plans to promote growth in steel sector?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI VISHNU DEO SAI): (a) There are 13 cases of iron and manganese mining projects which are awaiting environmental clearances as per Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, as on 01.11.2014.

(b) and (c) The concept of Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) for development of Steel Plants in the country involves agreement of the iron ore rich State Governments for providing land and infrastructure facilities along with iron ore supply to SPV. Discussions in this regard are underway with the concerned State Governments. Similarly, in order to have speedy development of resources like iron ore & coal in the country, a concept of Special Mining Zone (SMZ) is being deliberated upon to facilitate procedural requirements for exploitation of minerals without unnecessary restrictions.

APPENDIX XII

MEMORANDUM NO. 150

Subject: Request for dropping of Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3224 dated 13.12.2012, regarding "Sale of Power by DVC".

On 13 December, 2012 Shri Kuldeep Bishnoi, M.P. addressed an Unstarred Question No. 3224 to the Minister of Power. The text of the question along with the reply of the Minister are as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the question was treated as an Assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Power within three months from the date of the reply but the Assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Power *vide* O.M. NO. 12/17/2012-DVC dated 02 June, 2015, have requested to drop the Assurance on the following grounds:—

“That DVC informed that no reply has been received from Bihar State Power Holding Co. Ltd. (BSPHCL) earlier known as Bihar State Electricity Board (BSEB) on the proposal of allocation of power. Moreover, BSPHCL has surrendered 100 MW Power supplied to Bihar from 2nd July, 2013. BSES also expressed its inability to take the power from DVC *vide* letter dated 17.07.2013. This issue is, therefore, closed.

In so far as recovery of dues from JSEB is concerned, total dues of DVC as on 28.02.2015 is Rs. 8865 crore (Principal: Rs. 4968 Crore and DPS Rs. 3897 crore).

After continuous persuasion by the Ministry to rationalize the issue, a meeting was held between the Government of Jharkhand and DVC on 30.12.2014. During the meeting a roadmap has been prepared with the consent of Government of Jharkhand and DVC. Accordingly, since January, 2015, JSEB (presently JUVNL) has been paying their monthly power supply bills along with additional payment of Rs. 100 crore towards payment of old dues as per commitment. Therefore, there is no need now to invoke the provision of Tripartite Agreement. Accordingly, this issue is also closed.

Keeping in view the fact that final decision has been taken on both the pending issues, the Committee on Government Assurances (Lok Sabha) is requested to drop the Assurance."

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Minister of State for Power, have requested to drop the above Assurance.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF POWER
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3224
ANSWERED ON 13.12.2012

Sale of Power by DVC

3224. SHRI KULDEEP BISHNOI:

Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) declined recently to sell power to Bihar at Rs. 4.50 per unit while it is selling 500 MW at a cheaper rate presently;
- (b) if so, the reasons therefor; and
- (c) the steps taken by the Government to streamline the functioning of the DVC?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE (INDEPENDENT CHARGE) OF THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRI JYOTIRADITYA M. SCINDIA) : (a) & (b) No, Madam. Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) is supplying 100 MW power to Bihar State Electricity Board (BSEB) since 4th September, 2012 @ Rupees 3.98 power unit as per Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC) norms.

A proposal has also been sent by DVC to BSEB for supplying additional 1225 MW power to Bihar.

(c) The following measures have been taken by the Government of India for improvement in the functioning of DVC.

(i) The Damodar Valley Corporation (Amendment) Act, 2011 has been published on 9th January, 2012 in the Gazette of India and the Corporation has been broad based by increasing the number of Corporation members for improving the overall functioning of the Corporation.

(ii) Recovery of dues of Rupees 2353 crore from JSEB as reconciled till March, 2012 by devolution of the Central plan share of Jharkhand State in terms of the Tripartite Agreement (TPA) of the securitization scheme 2002 of Government of India is under process.

(iii) Government of India has issued guarantee for Rupees 4400 crore in year 2011-12 for the issuance of Bonds, DVC has already raised this amount. Ministry of Finance has agreed to provide guarantee for Rupees 2600 crore for the year 2012-13.

APPENDIX XIII

MEMORANDUM NO. 151

Subject: Request for dropping of Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 645 dated 26.11.2012, regarding “Coast Guard Airport.”

On 26 November, 2012 Shri Hamdullah Sayeed, M.P. addressed an Unstarred Question No. 645 to the Minister of Defence. The text of the question along with the reply of the Minister is as given in the Annexure.

2. The reply to the question was treated as Assurance by the Committee and required to be implemented by the Ministry of Defence within three months from the date of the reply but the Assurance is yet to be implemented.

3. The Ministry of Defence *vide* O.M. No. 3(1)2013-D(CG) dated 29th January, 2016 requested to drop the Assurances on the following grounds:—

“That earlier, Airports Authority of India (AAI) had plans to construct an air strip and allied infrastructure at Minicoy and the Coast Guard was required to develop a limited set up for undertaking flying operations and MoD had accorded approval in principle for setting up a Coast Guard Air Enclave at Minicoy Island.

However, the AAI has informed that they have inspected the Minicoy Island, Lakshadweep and it was found feasible to develop an air strip for small aircraft having seating capacity 6/8 in fair weather condition. Lakshadweep Administration had further not shown any interest to develop the air strip for an airport. AAI has no future plan to develop an Airport at Minicoy Island for civil operation. M/s Civil Aviation was requested to clarify whether there was any proposal of AAI to set up Civil Airport at Minicoy (either approved by Ministry of Civil Aviation or unapproved).

M/o Civil Aviation *vide* OM dated 27.11.2015 has stated that an AAI CHQ team inspected the Minicoy Island in March 1999 and established that *prima facie* it is feasible for construction of mini air strip of dimensions 700mx60m with runway of dimensions 500mx 23m in the north-south direction. Thereafter the Lakshadweep Administration was also requested to ensure that the required land is made available and obstructions (trees) are removed as identified by AAI team. The Lakshadweep Administration was also requested in April 1999 to provide a map of the Island including the air strip and windrose diagram for the last 10 years to finalise orientation of the air strip. The requisite information has not been provided by the Lakshadweep administration so far. Further, AAI had informed that it does not have any proposal for construction of Airport at Minicoy as there is no demand from airlines to operate scheduled services to that Island.

Indian Coast Guard have proposed to develop a small air strip including construction of runway and associated infrastructure to facilitate Coast Guard fixed wing aircraft operations and in the absence of an air strip, ICG air operations from Minicoy will be restricted to helicopter operations by constructing helipad. Accordingly, the sanction for acquisition of 82,500 sqmtrs. land for establishing Indian Coast Guard Air Enclave/Helipad at Minicoy. Island was accorded by this Ministry on 15.05.2015. In this regard, Coast Guard Headquarter has stated that the 82,500 sqmtrs. (20 Acres) land sanctioned on 15-05-2015 being private is subject to New Land Act. The timeline for acquisition of the said land may not be fixed at this stage and it may take 4-5 years for establishing Coast Guard Air Enclave at Minicoy Island for rotary wing aircraft *i.e.* Twin Engine Heavy Helicopters (TEHH).

It is unlikely to fulfil the Assurance in the instant case for the reason mentioned at para-3 and 4 on pre-page. Therefore, Lok Sabha Secretariat is requested to take up the matter with the Committee on Government Assurances for withdrawing the assurance in the instant case."

4. In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Minister of Defence, have requested to drop the Assurances.

The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;

Dated: 15.06.2016

ANNEXURE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 645
ANSWERED ON 26.11.2012

Coast Guard Airport

645. SHRI HAMDULLAH SAYEED:

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there is a proposal to set up a Coast Guard Airport in Lakshadweep Islands;
- (b) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor; and
- (c) the stipulated time period for completion of the airport?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI A.K. ANTONY): (a) to (c) Government has approved the setting up of Coast Guard Air Enclave at Minicoy on 30th September, 2010. 20 acres of land has been identified for the said purpose and the proposal for acquisition of the land is in progress. The Airport will be operationalised in due course after obtaining necessary clearances/approvals.

APPENDIX XIV
MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(2015-16)
(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)
TWELFTH SITTING
(17.06.2016)

The Committee sat from 1030 Hrs. to 1330 Hrs. in Committee Room "G-74", Parliament Library Building, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Ramesh Pokhriyal 'Nishank' — *Chairperson*

Members

2. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
3. Shri Anto Antony
4. Shri Bahadur Singh Koli
5. Shri C.R. Patil
6. Shri Taslimuddin
7. Shri K.C. Venugopal
8. Shri S.R. Vijay Kumar

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri R.S. Kambo | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri T.S. Rangarajan | — | <i>Director</i> |

****	****	****	****
****	****	****	****

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and apprised them regarding the day's agenda. Thereafter, the Committee took up 30 Memoranda (Memorandum Nos. 122 to 151) containing requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping of pending Assurances. After considering a few Memoranda, the Committee authorized the Hon'ble Chairperson to decide the dropping or otherwise of the Assurances contained in the remaining Memoranda. Thereafter, the Hon'ble Chairperson decided to drop 17 Assurances as per details given in Annexure-I* and to pursue the remaining 13 Assurances as per details given in Annexure-II, for implementation by the Ministry/Department concerned.

****	****	****	****
------	------	------	------

The Committee then adjourned.

*Not enclosed.

ANNEXURE II

Statement showing Assurances by the not dropped Committee on Government Assurances at their sitting held on 17.06.2016

Sl. No.	Memo No.	Question	Ministry/ Department	Subject	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	122	SQ No. 81 dated 04.03.2013 SQ No. 554 dated 06.05.2013 USQ No. 154 dated 05.08.2013 USQ No. 2668 dated 26.08.2013	Defence (Department of Defence)	VVIP Helicopters Deal VVIP Helicopters Deal VVIP Helicopters Deal VVIP Helicopters Deal	The Ministry have requested to drop the Assurances on the ground that these essentially pertain to investigation by CBI into allegations of irregularities in procurement of VVIP helicopters case which has international dimensions. They have stated that as the completion of CBI investigation is likely to take considerable period of time, it will not be possible for them to indicate any definite time frame for completion of the investigation. The Committee understand that such matters take much time but at the same time Committee feel the need to ensure accountability the matter in so that the country's overall interest is protected and the case does not affect other defence deals in the pipeline. Moreover, Assurances cannot be dropped just because CBI investigation into the matter would take a considerable time. The Committee desire that the Ministry must vigorously pursue the matter with the CBI for expediting the investigation. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the initiatives taken by the Ministry and the CBI as well as the progress made in the matter.
2.	123	USQ No. 3828 dated 17.12.2012 USQ No. 1959 dated 19.08.2013	Road Transport and Highways	Irregularities in NH Projects Quality of Roads	The Committee feel that there should be a prescribed time frame for dealing with complaints of irregularities/corruption in National Highway projects under implementation in the country. Further, the Ministry cannot wash their hands of by merely providing information that the matter is under investigation or that there is no time frame for investigation. Moreover, the Ministry cannot question the wisdom of the Committee to treat which statement as Assurance or otherwise. The

1	2	3	4	5	6
					Committee desire that the Ministry must vigorously pursue the matter and expendite the fulfillment of the Assurances. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the initiatives taken and the progress made in the matter.
3.	124	SQ No. 384 dated 19.12.2014	Defence	Naval Vessels	The Ministry have requested for dropping the Assurance on the grounds that the reply by the Minister does not constitute an Assurance. The Ministry cannot question the wisdom of the Committee to treat which statement as Assurance or otherwise. The Committee feel that once an Assurance has been given, it is incumbent upon the Ministry to fulfil it. In the instant case, the Ministry is required to undertake financial and human resource restructuring of Hindustan Shipyard Limited as assured. The Committee desire that the Ministry must also apprise the Committee of the latest developments in the matter. Till that time the Assurance will be treated as pending.
4.	126	Sq No. 24 (Supp. by Shri Arjun Meghwal, M.P.) dated 08.07.2014	Food Processing Industries	Mega Food Parks	The Committee appreciated that the Ministry have released certain conditions experienced as bottle necks in the implementation of Mega Food Parks Scheme. The Committee, however, find that these relaxations essentially confined to conditions regarding formation of Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), the implementing agency of Mega Food Park and other issues are left untouched. As a matter of fact, an evaluation of the scheme had been awarded to Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER), New Delhi. This proves that much still needs to be done to simplify the rules and regulations as well as conditions and procedures governing the Mega Food Parks Scheme so as to improve its implementation especially in view of the lack of success in the endeavour so far. The Committee desire the Ministry to pursue the matter earnestly and fulfil the Assurance at the earliest.
5.	130	USQ No. 543 dated 26.02.2015	Water Resources, River Development and	Pranahita Chevella	The Committee are of the view that the Assurance cannot be dropped merely on the ground that the matter of DPR preparation will take time and that other Ministries are also involved in the matter and the activity

			Ganga Rejuvenation		is time consuming. The contention of the Ministry is far from convincing since once an Assurance is given, it is incumbent upon the Ministry to fulfil it with proper planning and co-ordination with all the Ministries/ Department/agencies concerned. The Committee desire that the Ministry of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation should pursue the matter vigorously with other Ministries/Departments concerned and the State Government of Telangana and fulfil the Assurance at the earliest.
6.	134	USQ No. 598 dated 25.02.2010	Railways	Expert Committee	The Committee appreciate that out of the 7 projects, 4 have been completed/commissioned and high priority has been accorded and funds have been provided for completion of the remaining 3 projects under progress but, at the same time that cannot be construed as fulfillment of the Assurance. Moreover, an Assurance cannot be dropped merely because it might take about 1 or 2 more years to complete the projects undertaken. The Committee desire that the Ministry must actively pursue the matter and expedite the fulfillment of the Assurance. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the initiatives taken and the progress made in the matter.
7.	141	USQ No. 1842 dated 22.07.2014	Social Justice and Empowerment	Empowerment of Transgender Community	The Ministry have contended that no Assurance was given on the issue as the reply given to the Question, according to them, was only a factual position. The Committee reject outright this contention of the Ministry as it is their prerogative to treat a particular reply as an Assurance and the Ministry cannot question the wisdom of the Committee as to what constitutes an Assurance. The Committee feel that the matter should be pursued vigorously till its logical conclusion. The Committee would like to be apprised of the initiatives taken and the progress made in the matter.
8.	142	USQ No. 2988 dated 10.02.2014	Environment, Forest and Climate Change	Production of GM Crop	The Ministry have requested the Committee to drop the Assurance on the ground that matter is subjudice and no specific time frame can be given for its outcome and finality. The Committee feel that the

1	2	3	4	5	6
					<p>matter of allowing production of GM Crop is of crucial importance and considering food safety and security issues and needs to be pursued vigorously to bring to its logical conclusion. The Ministry are also required to apprise the Committee and Parliament of the final outcome of the matter along with the directives of the Supreme Court in this regard. The Committee would like to be apprised of the initiatives taken and the progress made in the matter.</p>
9.	143	USQ No. 1450 dated 29.07.2015	Science and Technology	Recycling Plastic Waste	<p>The Committee feel that the Ministry cannot wash their hands of by stating that the technology under reference lies in the ambit of a third party. Moreover, the Ministry cannot question the wisdom of the Committee to treat which statement as Assurance or otherwise. The Assurance is also of crucial importance for ensuring better management of hazardous plastic waste and reducing outflow of precious foreign exchange on import of petroleum products. While not accepting the contention of the Ministry that no timeline cannot be assigned to such an effort, the Committee desire that the matter should be pursued vigorously with the Ministry of Railways and the Assurance implemented at the earliest.</p>
10.	148	USQ No. 2396 dated 28.03.2012	Communications and Information Technology	National Broadband Plan	<p>The Committee feel that the NOFN project is of utmost importance and a matter of national significance as the slow pace of internet broadband coverage specially in rural areas has created digital divide and has adversely affected the economic and social development and thereby GDP growth of the country. The Committee are dismayed to note that apparently the Ministry are adopting a lackadaisical attitude in the matter when they ought to have implemented the project with alacrity and determination in the larger interest of the country. Moreover, an Assurance cannot be dropped merely because its implementation would take considerable time. The Committee urge the Ministry to shed this approach and pursue the matter vigorously by making concerted and co-ordinated efforts and fulfil the Assurance at the earliest. The Committee would like to be apprised of initiatives taken and progress made in this regard.</p>

11.	149	USQ No. 3652 dated 15.12.2014	Steel	Environmental Clearances for Mining Projects	The Committee observe that providing information that the discussions are underway with the State Governments concerned for formation of SPVs in steel sector as a reply to Lok Sabha Question is very much an Assurance. Moreover, the Ministry cannot question the wisdom of the Committee to treat a particular statement as Assurance or otherwise. The Committee understand that such matters take time but the Ministry need to do some concrete action to finalise a clear time line for formation of the SPVs. The Committee urge the Ministry to take urgent action in the matter with alacrity and specific timeline and pursue the matter with the State Governments concerned and implement the Assurance at the earliest.
12.	150	USQ No. 3224 dated 13.12.2012	Power	Sale of Power by DVC	The Committee feel that although the issue of supply of power to BFPH CL (earlier known as BSEB) is closed as it has expressed its inability to take power from DVC, the Ministry need to recover the huge outstanding dues amounting to Rs. 2,353 crore (as reconciled till March 2012) from the Government of Jharkhand. The roadmap prepared on 30.12.2014 entails additional payment of Rs. 100 crore only towards payment of old dues and hence it cannot be considered as a substitute for the process of recovery of the dues under the Tripartite Agreement. Even if a new alternative arrangement is made, the Ministry cannot waived off the said huge outstanding dues. The Committee desire that the Ministry should pursue the matter vigorously with the State Government of Jharkhand so as to recover the outstanding dues and fulfill the Assurance at the earliest.
13.	151	USQ No. 645 dated 26.11.2012	Defence	Coast Guard Airport	The Committee feel that an Assurance cannot be dropped merely on the ground that its implementation would take a considerable length of time. Lakshadweep Islands are strategically important for the country and have lots of potential for development of tourism but have not been provided with proper air connectivity so far. In particular, there is no airstrip/air base at such strategic island as Minicoy which does not auger well for the country's coastal security and development of coastal tourism.

1	2	3	4	5	6
					<p>The Committee feel that the matter should be pursued vigorously as it plays a crucial role in development of the Island's economy through tourism and enhancing the country's defence preparedness. The Committee, therefore, urge Ministry to do some concrete action to take up the matter with the Ministry of Home Affairs and Lakshadweep Administration so as to finalise a clear time limit for starting and completing the work and implement the Assurance at the earliest.</p>

APPENDIX XV

MINUTES

THIRD SITTING

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES (2016-2017) HELD ON 14 DECEMBER, 2016 IN
CHAIRPERSON CHAMBER'S ROOM NO. 133,
PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE,
NEW DELHI

The Committee sat from 1015 hours to 1050 hours on Wednesday, 14 December, 2016.

PRESENT

Dr. Ramesh Pokhriyal 'Nishank' — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
3. Prof. Saugata Bose
4. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
5. Shri C.R. Patil
6. Shri Sunil Kumar Singh

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri R.S. Kambo | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri S.L. Singh | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and apprised them regarding the day's agenda. Thereafter, the Committee considered and adopted the following seven (07) draft Reports without any amendment:—

- (i) Draft 41st Report regarding review of pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of New and Renewable Energy.
- (ii) Draft 42nd Report regarding review of pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.
- (iii) Draft 43rd Report regarding review of pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Department of Health and Family Welfare).
- (iv) Draft 44th Report regarding review of pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Defence (Department of Defence).

- (v) Draft 45th Report regarding requests for dropping of Assurances (acceded to).
- (vi) Draft 46th Report regarding requests for dropping of Assurances (not acceded to).
- (vii) Draft 47th Report regarding review of pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Law and Justice (Legislative Department).

2. The Committee also authorized the Chairperson to present the Reports during the current session of the Lok Sabha.

The Committee then adjourned.

"All Parliamentary Publications including DRSC Reports are available on sale at the Sales Counter, Reception, Parliament House (Tel. Nos. 23034726, 23034495, 23034496). Agents appointed by Lok Sabha Secretariat and Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi (Tel. Nos. 24367260, 24365610) and their outlets. The said information is available on website 'www.parliamentofindia.nic.in'.

The Souvenir items with logo of Parliament are also available at Sales Counter, Reception, Parliament House, New Delhi. The Souvenir items with Parliament Museum logo are available for sale at Souvenir Shop (Tel. No. 23035323), Parliament Museum, Parliament Library Building, New Delhi. List of these items are available on the website mentioned above."
