

**COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(2016-2017)**

(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)

FORTY- EIGHTH REPORT

**REVIEW OF PENDING ASSURANCES
PERTAINING TO THE
MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION**

Presented to Lok Sabha on 11/04/2017



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

April, 2017/Chaitra, 1939 (Saka)

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2016-2017)	Page (iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2015-2016)	iv
INTRODUCTION	v

REPORT

I. Introductory	1-5
II. Review of Pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Civil Aviation	6-23
III. Implementation Reports	23

APPENDICES

I. USQ No.4130 dated 16.12.2002 regarding 'Strategy for Traffic Development'.	24
II. SQ No.366 dated 17.04.2008 regarding 'Incidents of Theft at Metro Airports'	25-26
III. SQ No.443 dated 24.04.2008 regarding 'Committee on ATC Modernisation'	27-28
IV. USQ No.2990 dated 18.12.2008 regarding 'New Ground Handling Policy'	29
V. USQ No.2767 dated 23.07.2009 regarding 'Pune Airport'	30
VI. USQ No.1290 dated 04.03.2010 regarding 'Exemption of VVIPs from Frisking'	31
VII. SQ No.489 dated 07.09.2011 regarding 'Operational Failure in Delhi Airport'	32-33
VIII. USQ No.1509 dated 30.11.2011 regarding 'Naming of Airports'	34
IX. USQ No.3401 dated 14.12.2011 regarding 'Transfer of Airports'	35
X. USQ No.4472 dated 21.12.2011 regarding 'Transfer of Airstrips'	36

XI.	Extracts from Manual of Practice and Procedure in the Government of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, New Delhi	37-40
-----	---	-------

ANNEXURES

I .	Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 17 June, 2016.	41-48
II.	Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 06 April, 2017	49-50

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

Dr. Ramesh Pokhriyal "Nishank" - Chairperson

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
3. @ Vacant
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 | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. | Shri P.C. Tripathy | - | Director |
| 3. | Shri S. L. Singh | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 4. | Smt. Vineeta Sachdeva | - | Committee Officer |

* 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

@ Shri E. Ahamed passed away on 01 February 2017

**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 | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. | Shri J.M. Baisakh | - | Director |
| 3. | Shri S. L. Singh | - | Deputy Secretary |

* The Committee has been re-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- Eighth Report (16th Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (2015-2016) at their sitting held on 17 June, 2016 took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Civil Aviation regarding pending Assurances from the 11th of Session of 13th Lok Sabha to the 9th Session of the 15th Lok Sabha.

3. At their sitting held on 06 April, 2017 the Committee (2016-2017) considered and adopted their Forty- Eighth Report.

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

5. For facility of reference and convenience, the Observations and Recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters in the Report.

DR. RAMESH POKHRIYAL "NISHANK"

CHAIRPERSON

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

NEW DELHI;
07 April, 2017

17 Chaitra, 1939 (Saka)

REPORT

I. Introductory

The Committee on Government Assurances scrutinize the Assurances, promises, undertakings etc., given by the Ministers from time to time on the floor of the House and report the extent to which such Assurances, promises, undertakings have been implemented. Once an Assurance has been given on the floor of the House, the same is required to be implemented within a period of three months. The Ministries/Departments of Government of India are under obligation to seek extension of time required beyond the prescribed period for fulfillment of the Assurance. Where a Ministry/Department are unable to implement an Assurance, that Ministry/Department are bound to request the Committee for dropping it. The Committee consider such requests and approve dropping, in case, they are convinced that grounds cited are justified. The Committee also examine whether the implementation of Assurances has taken place within the minimum time necessary for the purpose and the extent to which the Assurances have been implemented.

2. The Committee on Government Assurances (2009-10) took a policy decision to call the representatives of the various Ministries/Departments of the Government of India, in a phased manner, to review the pending Assurances, examine the reasons for pendency and analyze operation of the system prescribed in the Ministries/Departments for dealing with Assurances. The Committee also decided to consider the quality of Assurances implemented by the Government.

3. The Committee on Government Assurances (2014-2015) decided to follow the well established and time tested procedure of calling the representatives of the Ministries/Departments of Government of India, in a phased manner and review the pending Assurances. The Committee took a step further and decided to call the representatives of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs also as all the Assurances are implemented through them.

4. In pursuance of the *ibid* decision, the Committee on Government Assurances (2015-2016) called the representatives of the Ministry of Civil Aviation and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and examined the following 10 pending Assurances (Appendices –I to X) pertaining to the Ministry at their sitting held on 17 June, 2016:-

S.No.	SQ/USQ No. dated	Subject
1.	USQ 4130 dated 16.12.2002	Strategy for Traffic Development (Appendix-I)
2.	SQ 366 dated 17.4.2008	Incidents of Theft at Metro Airports (Appendix-II)
3.	SQ 443 dated 24.4.2008	Committee on ATC Modernisation (Appendix-III)
4.	USQ 2990 dated 18.12.2008	New Ground Handling Policy (Appendix-IV)
5.	USQ 2767 dated 23.7.2009	Pune Airport (Appendix-V)
6.	USQ 1290 dated 4.3.2010	Exemption of VVIPs from Frisking (Appendix-VI)
7.	SQ 489 dated 7.9.2011	Operational Failure in Delhi Airport (Appendix-VII)
8.	USQ 1509 dated 30.11.2011	Naming of Airports (Appendix-VIII)
9.	USQ 3401 dated 14.12.2011	Transfer of Airports (Appendix-IX)
10.	USQ 4472 dated 21.12.2011	Transfer of Airstrips (Appendix-X)

5. The Extracts from Manual of Practice and Procedure in the Government of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs laying guidelines on the definition of an Assurance, the time limit for its fulfillment, dropping/deletion and extension, the procedure for fulfillment etc., besides maintenance of Register of Assurances and periodical reviews to minimize delays in implementation of the Assurances are reproduced at Appendix-XI.

6. During oral evidence, the Committee pointed out the delay in fulfilling the Assurances and desired to know whether the Ministry of Civil Aviation have evolved any mechanism of reviewing the Assurances from time to time at any level especially at the level of Minister and also whether the Ministry have been able to comply with the instructions of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in this regard. In his disposition before the Committee, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation stated as under:-

"First of all, I would like to thank the Committee and its esteemed Members for the reason that as and when such review meetings are held, it certainly gives a boost to our activities. Moreover, such meetings are helpful in eliminating lacuna, If any, in our efforts through your guidance".

7. He further added as under:-

"I want to assure the Hon'ble Committee that the Pending Assurances are as much important to us and we definitely take these very seriously. Our Joint Secretary who looks after the work of Parliamentary Affairs, review these Assurances on weekly basis Our Minister of State as well as Cabinet Minister also review Assurances as and when the need arises. As you have pointed out, sometimes, delay happens in fulfillment of Assurances due to lack of coordination. We will definitely try to improve upon that. Now we are going to make you aware of the problems faced by us in fulfillment of Assurances and seek your guidance."

8. Subsequently, 05 Assurances mentioned at Sl. No. 2, 4, 6 7, and 10 have since been fully implemented on 10.08.2016 while the Assurance mentioned at Sl. No. 1 was partly implemented on 21.08.2003.

Observations/Recommendations

9. **The Committee find that pending Assurances are reviewed at different hierarchical levels in the Administrative Ministries/ Departments of Government of India. Similar exercise is also undertaken by the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, who also undertake elaborative exercise to review such Assurances from time to time. Despite this structural mechanism, the Assurances remain pending for months and years together. Instances have been brought to notice of the Committee, where the Administrative Ministry have forwarded the Implementation Statement to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and the same has not been laid by the latter for one reason or the other. It is an acknowledged fact that the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs are required to follow procedural formalities before the Assurances are laid on the Table of House. Due to lack of understanding on the part of the Administrative Ministry and also the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, the Assurances remain pending at times. To obviate such a situation, the Committee desire that the Administrative Ministry, upon furnishing the Implementation Status, should also obtain the status of laying of such Assurances on the Table of the House from time to time. While undertaking review of pending Assurances, the Administrative Ministry concerned should also bring to the notice of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, the instances where they have furnished Implementation Report and which have not been laid on the Table of the House. Similarly, the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, on receipt of Implementation Statement, should acknowledge the receipt of the same and deficiencies, if any, in such statement be brought to the notice of the concerned Ministry within a period of 7 days. The Committee also urge that there ought to be better coordination between the**

Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and the Administrative Ministry so as to ensure that the pending Assurances, especially those where Implementation Reports have been forwarded, are laid on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

10. The Committee note that out of 10 Assurances taken up by them, five Assurances mentioned at Sl. Nos. 2,4,6, 7 and 10 have since been fully implemented after delays ranging from 5 to 8 years while the Assurance at Sl. 1 could only be partly implemented even after a lapse of 14 years. The remaining 4 Assurances mentioned at Sl Nos. 3,5,8 and 9 are pending for 8,7,5 and 5 years respectively. The Committee are dismayed to find the inordinate delays in fulfillment of the Assurances which are clearly indicative of the lackadaisical attitude of the Department in undertaking proper follow up action and absence of regular review meeting once an Assurance has been made. The Committee feel that because of such unreasonable delays in fulfillment of the Assurances by the Ministry, the purpose and relevance of the Assurances get lost. The scrutiny of the pending Assurances also exhibits that the mechanism and procedure followed by the Department for review of the implementation of Assurances, especially those involving other Ministries/Departments/Agencies are inadequate. The Committee desire that the Ministry of Civil Aviation should adopt a pro-active approach, make sustained efforts and enhance the level of coordination with other Ministries/Departments concerned including the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and stakeholders with periodic reviews at the highest level for timely/early implementation of all the pending Assurances as well as the Assurances to be made in future.

II. Review of Pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Civil Aviation.

11. In the succeeding paragraphs, the Committee deal with pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry.

A. Strategy for Traffic Development

12. In reply to USQ No.4130 dated 16.12.2002 regarding 'Strategy for Traffic Development'(Appendix-I), the Ministry stated that the information pertaining to scheme for development of strategy to project the traffic demand upto the year 2025 formulated by the UT Administration of Andaman and Nicobar Islands is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

13. In their Status Note dated 14.06.2016, the Ministry of Civil aviation apprised the position with regard to fulfillment of the Assurance as under:-

"The Implementation Report (IR) for fulfillment of the Assurance was sent on 17.07.2003 but the same was treated as only partly fulfilled by Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. Initially due to paucity of time this Ministry handled the Assurance/Question and then, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Shipping, Ministry of Road Transport and Planning Commission were approached to handle the Assurance as the matter pertains to them. But all these Ministries/Departments refused to accept the transfer of Assurance. Request for dropping of the Assurance was not accepted by the Committee on Government Assurance. Subsequently, a meeting was held on 26.06.2013 in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. As directed by Lok Sabha Secretariat the Assurance was transferred to the Planning Commission on 07.06.2013. However, the Planning Commission denied to accept the transfer by saying that there is no scheme awaiting clearance of the Planning Commission"

14. During oral evidence, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation deposed before the Committee stating the following status of fulfillment of the Assurance:-

"When we asked for the reply from the Planning Commission, they responded by saying that they don't have any pending clearances/approvals related to Andaman Nicobar. On the basis of the facts provided by the Planning Commission, we prepared an Implementation Report and furnished it to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. We sent it 3 years back."

15. On being point out that as Andaman and Nicobar Islands being an attractive tourist destination, the intention of the Member was to know the estimated traffic demand in the Union Territory by 2025, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation submitted as under:-

"In part (c) of the Question it was asked as to whether the Planning Commission has any pending project related to this subject. For this part also we provided the information after collecting it from the Planning Commission."

16. When the Committee enquired as to whether any Report has come in this regard, the Secretary deposed during evidence as under:

"We asked Andaman and Nicobar Island Administration if any report has come. Their final Report has not come yet"

17. The Committee then specifically enquired about the reasons for withholding the report by Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration. In reply, the Secretary stated as under:-

"UT Administration of Andaman and Nicobar Islands has not disclosed the reasons for withholding the report. I want to say that the transport matter on which the Union Territory has constituted a Committee does not relate to Aviation only. It includes aviation, inter-island transfer and Road transport. The Administration of

Union Territory comes under the Ministry of Home Affairs. As the Question was sent to us, we asked them for the information."

18. While agreeing to the fact that the Question does not exclusively pertain to the Ministry of Civil Aviation, the Committee further enquired about the Report of the Task Force. To this, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation replied as under:-

"The Task Force was not constituted on our behalf. It was constituted for the development of Island Territory by the UT Administration itself. We are not the nodal Ministry in this case. The Home Ministry is the nodal Ministry. As the Question was sent to us and the Home Ministry refused to accept it from us, we took the responsibility of answering it as it was to be replied in a time bound manner that is precisely three days."

19. Further asked whether any Implementation Report had been furnished in this regard, another representative of the Ministry of Civil Aviation supplemented during evidence as under:-

"Part Implementation report was sent. The Question went at various places including (the Ministry of) Surface transport. Basically the Territorial Administration was required to conduct a study on the traffic needs of the Island. We had very little time with us. At such times we give an Assurance that we'll give the information after collecting it from various Departments".

20. The Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation further corroborated as under:-

"When the question of transport needs comes then one part is looked after by Ministry of Civil Aviation, one part is looked after by Ministry of Shipping and the other part is looked after by the Ministry of Road Transport. The Planning Commission provide funds for the same. UTs come under the Ministry of Home Affairs."

21. When the Committee asked the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs for their comments, the representative of the Ministry submitted as under:-

"In 2013, the Part Implementation Report was laid on the Floor of the House. If a Question belongs to different Ministries then the nodal Ministry approaches the concerned Ministries and if they accept that the Question pertains to them, then it is transferred"

22. On being asked as to what should be done if any Ministry refuses to accept the Question, he further stated as under:-

"It should be transferred to the concerned Ministry."

23. To a pointed query on who will decide which Ministry/Department the Question belongs to when every Ministry is refusing to accept the Question, the Secretary deposed before the Committee as under:-

"My submission is that we are discussing a situation in which a question has landed at a wrong place. If in the Committee's opinion there is another Ministry which is best placed to handle that Assurance then it is better that the Committee direct that the Question be handled by them. I just want to say that the Question involves co-ordination. The Home Ministry would be the most competent authority to deal with the Question because it can ask the Administration of Andaman and Nicobar islands as it falls under it. A Question which was asked in 2002 has not been given a final report even in 2016. We will not be able to ask them in an authoritative way as they don't fall under us. Home Ministry can ask them authoritatively. Therefore a Department which can competitively follow up with the matter should be given the Question. It is a kind of guideline but the Committee is free whichever way you state, that Department will fulfill the responsibilities."

Observations/Recommendations

24. The Committee are disturbed to note that the Assurance given in reply to USQ No. 4130 dated 16.12.2002 regarding "Strategy for Traffic Development" which was Partly Implemented on 21.08.2003 is yet to be fully implemented even after a prolonged period of more than 14 years against the prescribed period of 3 months for the purpose. The Committee do not see any justification or plausible reason for this inordinate delay considering that fulfillment of the Assurance involved only collection of some basic information from about four/five Ministries/Departments and the union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands. The Committee have been informed that the Question primarily concerns with the traffic needs of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. Even though the reply was given by the Ministry of Civil Aviation under certain technical and compelling reasons, the Assurance is not exclusively the subject matter of that Ministry. Rather, it requires collection of information from the Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Shipping, Ministry of Road Transport and the erstwhile Planning Commission (now NITI Aayog). The Ministry of Civil Aviation have sought to transfer the Assurances to them but all of them have refused to accept it. In 2013, the Assurance was transferred to Planning Commission but the later Planning Commission declined to accept the transfer saying that there is no scheme awaiting their clearance. This raises serious coordination issues amongst these Ministries/Departments and the Planning Commission and their commitment towards fulfilling a Parliamentary obligation. The Committee concur with the Ministry of Civil Aviation that the Question does not exclusively belong to that Ministry. But at the same time, it was the Minister of Civil Aviation who gave the Assurance on the Floor of the House and hence it is incumbent upon them to collect the information from various Ministries/Departments and the Administration of Andaman and Nicobar Islands and fulfill the Assurance. Deplorably, however, none of the above Ministries/Departments are willing to accept their responsibility and the Assurance is vacillating from one Ministry/Department to the other. This could

have been avoided had these Ministries/Departments been a little more attentive to their duties, responsibilities and commitments towards Parliamentary matter. To avoid such unwarranted situations, the Committee feel that whenever there is impasse between two Ministries/Departments with regard to administrative jurisdiction of a particular Assurance, the Ministry/Department concerned should place the facts before this Committee for consideration and taking appropriate decision. As for the instant case, since the erstwhile Planning Commission has clarified that there is no such scheme under their consideration, the Committee desire that the Assurance be transferred to the Ministry of Home Affairs and they fulfill the same expeditiously.

B. Committee on ATC Modernisation

25. In reply to SQ No. 443, dated 24.04.2008 regarding 'Committee on ATC Modernisation' (Appendix-III), it was stated that the Committee headed by Shri Ajay Prasad on ATC modernisation has submitted its Report on 25.03.2008, which is under examination.

26. The Ministry of Civil Aviation in their Status Note dated 14.06.2016 apprised the position in this regard as under:-

"The Assurance pertains to Ajay Prasad Committee Report on Future Airport Navigation System (FANS) Master Plan. Some of the recommendations have been implemented and the implementation of the remaining recommendations are at various stages and may take several years depending on ICAO".

27. During oral evidence, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation informed the Committee of the following position with regard to the fulfillment of the Assurance as under:-

"When the Question was asked, the Report of the committee was under examination. The status today is that the Committee made a total of 48 recommendations falling in three categories; short term, medium term and long term. Out of these forty eight recommendations, twenty eight have been implemented by the Airports Authority of India (AAI), and three have not been accepted. There are seventeen recommendations which need the ICAO action. If you permit, I want to put before you that the management of Aviation service, its safety and security standards are regularized by International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), a United Nations body. As and when the technology develops and Aviation services get promoted, the ICAO revises the body safety and security standard which are accredited by all the nations. In Civil aviation requirements, the standards are decided by ICAO. So, unless ICAO decides as to what should be done, we cannot start implementing these recommendations unilaterally because all over the world the standards have to be uniform. That is the reason, why, those items which depend on ICAO's inputs, we have to per force keep them pending. As we would not be able to do anything on the above said 17 recommendations, my submission to Hon'ble Committee is that we should keep the Question here only."

28. Pointing out that the Assurance is based on the Report of the Committee and it will not be possible to drop the Assurance as the recommendations of the Committee have not yet been fully implemented, the Committee enquired as to why the Ministry are not co-ordinating constructively at international level to fulfill the Assurance. In response, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation submitted during evidence as under:-

"I just want to say that as all other nations of the world, our country is also a signatory to ICAO regulations. As and when changes are made by ICAO, all the countries need to implement such changes. No nation can set their own standards other than those set by the ICAO."

29. In this regard, the representative of the Ministry supplemented as under:-

"I want to bring to your kind notice that we have a road map upto 2019 and we'll complete it. We are bound to complete it. Aviation is international, we cannot isolate ourselves from the global standards and global practice. If we isolate ourselves then others would also remove us from their membership/practices and it will create a crisis for our Aviation industry. We have to follow the global standards whether these come as recommendations of the Committee or otherwise. We are making full efforts and it has been complete."

30. On being asked as to why the Ministry want to go up to 2019 to fulfill the Assurance, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation replied during evidence as under:-

"the intention of 2019 is that the 17 Assurances which are pending, we hope to get the provision by ICAO on these by this time. If ICAO doesn't make any rules on these, then we won't be able to isolate the Assurances. Assurance which were not related to ICAO have already been implemented but we'll face trouble in ICAO related subjects. We expect that ICAO regulations will arrive by 2019."

31. The Committee pointed out that the Assurance pertains to the year 2008 but is still under consideration and would remain so as the Ministry would work according to the recommendations of the Committee constituted on ATC modernization whose report has't come as yet. The Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation replied as under:-

"It was complete in 2010, we have already given the Implementation Report. It was acknowledged by the then Assurance Committee."

32. The Committee drew the attention of the Ministry to the fact that the Implementation Report was furnished three times which suggests that there must have been some deficiencies in the said Implementation Reports. The Committee accordingly enquired as to what was the reason for sending the Report three times and whether any meeting was held in this regard. The Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation replied as under:-

"There was some confusion in its version. In the usual table in which the IR is sent, reply should come in front of the Paragraph column. It had become upside down so that one to one correspondence could not be established. There was no factual mistake or limitation."

Observations/Recommendations

33. The Committee are concerned that the Assurance given in reply to SQ No. 443 dated 24.04.2008 regarding "Committee on ATC Modernization" could not be implemented even after a lapse of more than eight years against the prescribed period of 3 months for the purpose. The Committee have been informed that the Committee on Air Traffic Control (ATC) Modernization made a total of 48 recommendations. Out of these 48 recommendations, 28 have been fulfilled, three have not been accepted and seventeen recommendation which needed action by International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), a United Nations body, are pending. The Committee are further informed that ICAO regulations/provisions relating to these 17 are likely to arrive by 2019 and the implementation or otherwise of the recommendations would be considered in tune with the said regulations/provisions. Citing this reason, the Ministry have requested the Committee to treat the Assurance as fully implemented. Since the Assurance cannot be considered as fulfilled until and unless the 17 pending Recommendations are implemented or duly rejected on justifiable grounds, the Committee are not inclined to accede to the request of the Ministry to drop this

Assurance. The Committee also note that before requesting for dropping the Assurance as the last resort, the Ministry tried to lay the Implementation Report but had to furnish it three times due to certain shortcomings which could have been avoided with a little attention to details. Still worse, it took the Ministry five years to forward the said Implementation Report which was furnished to them in 2011 and the same is yet to be laid in the House. The Ministry certainly need to introspect their functioning to plug the loopholes/lapses. The Committee direct the Ministry to further review and pursue the matter vigorously and better co-ordinate with all concerned including ICAO at international level and diligently fulfill the Assurance. Meanwhile a part Implementation Report be filed and placed on the Table of the House.

C. Pune Airport

34. In reply to USQ No. 2767 dated 23.07.2009 regarding 'Pune Airport' (Appendix-V), it was stated that a proposal for setting up of new Greenfield Airport at Chakan near Pune in Maharashtra to be developed by Maharashtra Airport Development Company Ltd has been received from the Government of Maharashtra and the work relating to finalizations of site for the Airport is in progress after due consultation with various stakeholders.

35. In their Status Note dated 14.06.2016, the Ministry of Civil Aviation stated the position in this regard as under:-

"In 2006, Maharashtra Airport Development Company (MADC), the developer of Greenfield Airport at Pune under the Greenfield Airport Policy of Government of India had proposed a site for new Greenfield Airport at Chakan near Pune around 30 km North of existing Pune Airport. Due to non availability of land and operationally unavailable conditions, the site was shifted from Chakan to Rajgunager and further shifted to presently proposed site at Khed SEZ, which is around 30 km N-NE of existing Pune Airport. In April 2013, on request of MADC, AAI has carried out pre-feasibility study at Khed site for development of two parallel runways with simultaneous operations and indicated total land requirement with a tentative Master Plan to MADC. On 06.11.2013, the Secretary (Civil Aviation) took a meeting

for finalization of the site. Accordingly, MADC submitted a detailed proposal to GoM for finalization of the site and GoM on 25.02.2014 accorded in principal approval for the site at Khed and formed a Committee. The first meeting of the Committee to discuss the issue of land acquisition with Khed Economic Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd (KEIPL) and khed Developers Ltd. (KDL), who are presently holding the land, took place on 12.03.20014. In May 2014, due to high cost of land acquisition and cutting and filling required for leveling the Khed site, MADC has requested AAI to examine the feasibility of development of Greenfield Airport at Khed, with single runway. AAI has examined the proposal and forwarded the comments to MADC. Comments in the matter are awaited from MADC."

36. During oral evidence, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation apprised the Committee of the following position with regard to the fulfillment of the Assurance as under:-

"Pune is a very important city of our country. Presently, air operations in Pune happen from a Defence airfield. In a sense, they do a favour to us by giving space where we build our terminal building and run aircraft by using their runway facilities. If ever, we would need to expand the terminal building, we would be able to do it only if the Defence Ministry has the requisite land. The Defence Ministry does not have land there. If we want to give a good airport to Pune, we will not be able to provide it by using the Defence Ministry's runway. We have been having discussions with the Maharashtra Government during the previous seven eight years to provide a brand new runway and terminal building for Pune City. In an airport development model, the land is provided by the State Government free of cost. On that land, the Airport Authority at their expense builds the runways, terminal building and makes arrangement for security. The problem is that four times the land has been shown to us but unfortunately in each of the said places there is either a problem of adequate land or we have an obstacle survey wherein the runway or site is rendered useless due to a barrier coming in between the path/runway."

37. He further added as under:-

"Besides this, if we will not make an Airport with two runways, then it will get saturated in 20 years period. Therefore, we and Maharashtra State Government are trying to ensure that a two runway airport is build there. Unfortunately, we have not yet been given a land by the Maharashtra Government. The lands that have been shown are either not useful for our civil aviation procedure or not requisite for our purpose."

38. In this regard, the representative of Ministry of Civil Aviation supplemented as under:-

"Sir, at the existing airport and runway of Defence Ministry, there is also a condition that an airport which is to be made should be parallel to the existing runway."

39. The Committee desired to know whether any meeting has been held with the Additional Secretary or whether any discussion on this matter has taken place, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation replied as under:-

"Various meetings have been held. The Maharashtra Government itself has held meeting on the matter from time to time. It has been a matter of trouble for us and the GoM as we have not been able to expand the Airport and as a result the city has not been able to grow. Today it is becoming difficult to get the land. For this airport we want 2000 to 2500 acres of land. We are not able to get it near the city. Obviously, if the land would be at a two hours distance then nobody would go there. Therefore we want land at a 45 minutes or an hour distance from the city. The State Government is busy in this work only. Sir, it should be between outer limits to outer limits. It creates problem within the city."

40. When the Committee specifically enquired as to whether the Defence Ministry do not have any space for expansion of the existing Pune Airport, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation deposed during evidence as under:-

"No, we have seen it by talking."

41. Since expansion of Airport in a city like Pune would be inevitable in due course of time, the Committee asked the witnesses to state their opinion in the matter. The representative of the Ministry of Civil Aviation replied as under:-

"I want to tell that we are making full efforts in this regard. Basically, in cities, urbanization has become so much that everywhere houses have come up. Therefore, its difficult to get two-three thousand acres of vacant land at one place. Secondly, farmers are also clever and there is problem of compensation. Another problem is that there are many residents. If the area is agricultural or irrigated then also it becomes difficult to get the land. The Commissioner of Pune and others are trying to get the land. Basically, the problem is that the land seen by us during previous years are of no use. Until a new site is made available, it is not possible to build an Airport. Therefore, for the time being we'll have to negotiate with the existing Airport. We'll upgrade the existing Airport."

Observations/Recommendations

42. In yet another disquieting instance, the Committee note that the Assurance given in reply to USQ No. 2767 dated 23.07.2009 regarding 'Pune Airport' still remains to be fulfilled even after a lapse of more than 7 years despite the fact that the task involved is mere identification of the site for setting up of a new Greenfield Airport near Pune in Maharashtra. The Committee have been informed that in airport development model, land is provided by the State Government free of cost and on that land the Airport Authority at their expense build the runway, terminal building and makes

arrangement for security. In this case, the Ministry claimed that the proposed land has been shown to them 4 times but unfortunately each of the places has been of no use to them. Thus, the matter has been held up due to problems in land acquisition and the Ministry are exploring the option of upgrading the existing defence airport at Pune. In view of space constraints and security restrictions in the existing airport, the Committee feel that such an arrangement cannot be a permanent solution for the need of a full fledged airport in an important and rapidly growing city like Pune with all its future prospects. The Ministry, therefore, should not abandon the idea/proposal for development of a new Greenfield Airport in Pune. The current problem in land acquisition for the airport is apparently due to lack of understanding and coordination with the Government of Maharashtra and the same can be resolved with earnest and sustained efforts. The Committee would like the Ministry to take every possible step to identify and finalise an appropriate site for the new airport even at a place little far away from the city, complete the due procedure for implementing the Assurance and lay the requisite Implementation Report in the House at the earliest.

D. Naming of Airports.

43. In reply to USQ No. 1509 dated 30.11.2011 regarding 'Naming of Airports' (Annexure-VIII), it was stated that requests for renaming of two Airports namely Chandigarh and Raipur, received from State Government of Punjab and Chhattisgarh respectively, are under consideration.

44. In their Status Note, the Department of Civil Aviation explained the position with regard to fulfillment of the Assurance as under:-

"Raipur Airport has since been renamed as Swami Vivekananda Airport. As regards the draft Cabinet Note on renaming of Chandigarh Airport, the Cabinet in its meeting held on 02.06.2011 had postponed the decision on the proposal and desired that a written confirmation be obtained from the Punjab Government. Subsequently, a

revised Cabinet Note was submitted in September, 2012 based on the recommendations of the Punjab and Haryana Governments. However, PMO vide letter dated 17.10.2012 advised to take latest comments of Government of Punjab. Several efforts are made to arrive at a unanimous decision of both the State Governments in the matter with the Chief Ministers of both the States vide DO letter dated 18.03.2016 and 16.05.2016. However, a consensus view in the matter could not be reached so far.”

45. During the oral evidence, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation elaborated on the issue as under:-

"Raipur Airport was renamed as proposed. Assurance regarding Raipur Airport has been fulfilled. But Chandigarh Airport, as it belongs to both Haryana and Punjab requires proposals from both the States. There has been a controversy between the two States on this matter. Both the States have suggested different names whereas the name should be identical. In one way, the Minister of State has maintained an agreement between the two States and after an agreement a name has come after passing from the Haryana Assembly but it has yet to come from the Punjab Assembly. When it comes, then only it will become a subject of our work”.

46. When the Committee pointed out that Chandigarh is a Union Territory, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation submitted during evidence as under:-

"There are political sensitivities. Therefore, even though it is a Union Territory, one part of the Airport where the new terminal building is located, happens to be in Mohali which is in Punjab but the money for that has been given equally by Punjab and Haryana.”

Observations/Recommendations

47. The Committee find much to their consternation that the Assurance given in reply to USQ No. 1509 dated 30.11.2011 regarding 'Naming of Airports' which involves naming of Raipur and Chandigarh airports is yet to be fulfilled even after a lapse of more than five years. The Ministry could not offer any convincing explanation for this lapse either in their Status Note or in their deposition before the Committee during oral evidence. The Committee have been informed that Raipur airport has since been renamed as Swami Vivekananda Airport. Hence, the Assurance regarding Raipur Airport has been fulfilled. As regards Chandigarh airport, which belongs to both Punjab and Haryana, different names have been suggested/proposed by the two States and no unanimous decision could be reached resulting in inordinate delay in naming the airport. The Committee observe that except for maintaining that an agreement on the issue should be reached between the two States and writing letter to both the States in this regard, the Ministry have failed to take concrete steps to coordinate and hold further discussions with the two States and arrive at a solution. Expressing surprise at such lack of coordination between the two State Governments which are housed in the same Secretariat building as well as lack of initiative on the part of the Ministry of Civil Aviation, the Committee urge upon the Ministry to be more proactive and engage both the State Governments for forming a consensus and fulfill the Assurance at the earliest. The Committee further desire that the existing system of naming airports should be revisited and the same should be done in such a way that the names given to the airports of the country are mass appealing with local fervor and are able to portray the tourist attractions/cultural heritage of the State/region. The Committee also direct the Ministry to furnish a Part Implementation Report of the Assurance.

E. Transfer of Airports

48. In reply to USQ No. 3401 dated 14.12.2011 regarding 'Transfer of Airports' (Annexure-IX), it was stated that the lease agreements between the Airports Authority of India (AAI) and the State Government of Madhya Pradesh is under finalization. The Airports will be leased by AAI to the Government of Madhya Pradesh within three months of the finalization of the lease agreement.

49. In their Status Note dated 14.06.2016 the Ministry of Civil Aviation informed the position with regard to fulfillment of the Assurance as under:-

"The proposal has been considered and agreed to in principle by the Ministry subject to the condition that the land is used only for aeronautical purposes. The State Government has been approached for the consent and the same is received. Further action is in process."

50. During oral evidence, the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation elucidated the further developments in their efforts to fulfill the Assurance as under:-

"The three Airports of Madhya Pradesh Government i.e. Satna, Khandwa and Panna are a subject of loss to us also because no Aircraft goes there. Madhya Pradesh Government is asking us to give these Airports back to them. We told them that we would give these Airports back on the condition that the land is used only for aeronautical purposes. Earlier Madhya Pradesh Government did not agree with us. But now it has given its approval for Satna and Khandwa."

Observations/Recommendations

51. The Committee are concerned that the Assurance given in reply to USQ No. 3401 dated 14.12.2011 regarding 'Transfer of Airports' is yet to be fulfilled even after a lapse of more than five years. The Committee have been informed

that a condition was imposed on the Madhya Pradesh Government that all the three Airports to be transferred i.e. Satna, Khandwa and Panna Airports would be transferred to them subject to the condition that the land is used only for aeronautical purposes. The Government of Madhya Pradesh have since given its approval for Satna and Khandwa Airports. However, in respect of Panna Airport, the approval is awaited. The Committee urge upon the Ministry to pursue the matter even more vigorously with the Government of Madhya Pradesh at the highest level so as to reach an amicable agreement in the matter at the earliest. The Committee would also like the Ministry to lay urgently a Part Implementation Report of the Assurance.

III. Implementation Reports

52. As per the Statements of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, Implementation Reports in respect of the Assurances given in reply to the following SQs/USQs have since been laid on the Table of the House on the dates as mentioned against each.

Sl. No 1	*USQ No.4130 dated 16.12.2002 regarding 'Strategy for Traffic Development'	21.08.2003
Sl. No 2	SQ No.366 dated 17.04.2008 regarding Incidents of Theft at Metro Airports'	10.08.2016
Sl. No 4	USQ No.2990 dated 18.12.2008 regarding 'New Ground Handling Policy'	10.08.2016
Sl. No 6	USQ No.1290 dated 04.03.2010 regarding 'Exemption of VVIPs from frisking'	10.08.2016
Sl. No 7	SQ No.489 dated 07.09.2011 regarding Operational Failure in Delhi Airport'	10.08.2016
Sl. No 10	USQ No.4472 dated 21.12.2011 regarding 'Transfer of Airstrips'	10.08.2016

* Partly Implemented

DR. RAMESH POKHRIYAL "NISHANK"

CHAIRPERSON

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

NEW DELHI;
07 April, 2017

17 Chaitra, 1939 (Saka)

Appendix-XVII
(Vide para 5 of the Report)

Extracts from Manual of Practice & Procedure in the Government of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, New Delhi

Definition

8.1 During the course of reply given to a question or a discussion, if a Minister gives an undertaking which involves further action on the part of the Government in reporting back to the House, it is called an 'assurance'. Standard list of such expressions which normally constitute assurances and as approved by the Committees on Government Assurances of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, is given at [Annex 3](#). As assurances are required to be implemented within a specified time limit, care should be taken by all concerned while drafting replies to the questions to restrict the use of these expressions only to those occasions when it is clearly intended to give an assurance in these terms.

8.2 When an assurance is given by a Minister or when the Presiding Officer directs the Government to furnish information to the House, it is extracted by the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs from the relevant proceedings and communicated to the department concerned normally within 10 working days of the date on which it is given.

Deletion
from the list
of
assurances

8.3.1 If the administrative department has any objection to treating such a statement as an assurance or finds that it would not be in the public interest to fulfil it, it may write to the Lok/Rajya Sabha Secretariat direct with a copy to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs within a week of the receipt of such communication for getting it deleted from the list of assurances. Such action will require prior approval of the Minister.

8.3.2 Departments should make request for dropping of assurances immediately on receipt of statement of assurances from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and only in rare cases where they are fully convinced that the assurances could not be implemented under any circumstances and there is no option left with them but to make a request for dropping. Such requests should have the approval of their Minister and this fact should be indicated in their communication containing the request. If such a

	<p>request is made towards the end of the stipulated period of three months, then it should invariably be accompanied with a request for extension of time. The department should continue to seek extension of time till a decision of the Committee on Government Assurances is received by them. Copy of the above communications should be simultaneously endorsed to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs.</p>
<p>Time limit for fulfilling and assurance</p>	<p>8.4.1 An assurance given in either House is required to be fulfilled within a period of three months from the date of the assurance. This time limit has to be strictly observed.</p>
<p>Extension of time for fulfilling an assurance</p>	<p>8.4.2 If the department finds that it is not possible to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period of three months or within the period of extension already granted, it may seek further extension of time direct from the respective Committee on Government Assurances under intimation to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs as soon as the need for such extension becomes apparent, indicating the reasons for delay and the probable additional time required. Such a communication should be issued with the approval of the Minister.</p>
<p>Registers of assurances</p>	<p>8.5.1 The particulars of every assurance will be entered by the Parliament Unit of the department concerned in a register as at Annex 4 after which the assurance will be passed on to the concerned section.</p> <p>8.5.2 Even ahead of the receipt of communication from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, the section concerned should take prompt action to fulfil such assurances and keep a watch thereon in a register as at Annex 5.</p> <p>8.5.3 The registers referred to in paras 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 will be maintained separately for the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha assurances, entries therein being made session wise.</p>
<p>Role of Section Officer and Branch Officer</p>	<p>8.6.1 The Section Officer incharge of the concerned section will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) scrutinise the registers once a week; (b) ensure that necessary follow-up action is taken without any delay whatsoever; (c) submit the registers to the branch officer every fortnight if the House concerned is in session and

Procedure
for fulfilment
of an
assurance

once a month otherwise, drawing his special attention to assurances which are not likely to be implemented within the period of three months; and

(d) review of pending assurances should be undertaken periodically at the highest level in order to minimise the delay in implementing the assurances.

8.6.2 The branch officer will likewise keep his higher officer and Minister informed of the progress made in the implementation of assurances, drawing their special attention to the causes of delay.

8.7.1 Every effort should be made to fulfil the assurance within the prescribed period. In case only part of the information is available and collection of the remaining information would involve considerable time, an implementation report containing the available information should be supplied to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in part scrutinize of the assurance, within the prescribed time limit. However, efforts should continue to be made for expeditious collection of the remaining information for complete implementation of the assurance at the earliest.

8.7.2 Information to be supplied in partial or complete fulfilment of an assurance should be approved by the Minister concerned and 15 copies thereof (bilingual) in the prescribed proforma as at [Annex 6](#), together with its enclosures, along with one copy each in Hindi and English duly authenticated by the officer forwarding the implementation report, should be sent to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. If, however, the information being furnished is in response to an assurance given in reply to a question etc., asked for by more than one member, an additional copy of the completed proforma (both in Hindi and English) should be furnished in respect of each additional member. A copy of this communication should be endorsed to the Parliament Unit for completing column 7 of its register.

8.7.3 The implementation reports should be sent to the Ministry of the Parliamentary Affairs and not to the Lok/Rajya Sabha Secretariat. No advance copies of the implementation reports are to be endorsed to the Lok/Rajya Sabha Secretariat either.

Laying of the implementation report on the Table of the House

8.8 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, after a scrutiny of the implementation report, will arrange to lay it on the Table of the House concerned. A copy of the statement, as laid on the Table, will be forwarded by the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs to the member as well as the department concerned. The Parliament Unit of the department concerned and the concerned section will, on the basis of this statement, make a suitable entry in their registers.

Obligation to lay a paper on the Table of the House vis-à-vis assurance on the same subject

8.9 Where there is an obligation to lay any paper (rule/order/notification, etc.) on the Table of the House and for which an assurance has also been given, it will be laid on the Table, in the first instance, in fulfilment of the obligation, independent of the assurance given. After this is done, a report in formal implementation of the assurance indicating the date on which the paper was laid on the Table will be sent to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in the prescribed proforma ([Annex 6](#)) in the manner already described in para 8.7.2.

Committees on Government Assurances LSR 323,324 RSR 211-A

8.10 Each House of Parliament has a Committee on Government assurances nominated by the Speaker/Chairman. It scrutinized the implementation reports and the time taken in the scrutinized of Government assurances and focuses attention on the delays and other significant aspects, if any, pertaining to them. Instructions issued by the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs from time to time are to be followed strictly.

Reports of the Committees on Government Assurances Effect on assurances on dissolution of the Lok Sabha

8.11 The department will, in consultation with the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, scrutinize the reports of these two committees for remedial action wherever called for.

8.12 On dissolution of the Lok Sabha, all assurances, promises or undertakings pending implementation are scrutinized by the new Committee on Government assurances for selection of such of them as are of considerable public importance. The Committee then submits a report to the Lok Sabha with a specific recommendation regarding the assurances to be dropped or retained for implementation by the Government.

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 | - | Additonal Secretary |
| 2. | Shri T.S. Rangarajan | - | Director |

WITNESSES

MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION

1. Shri R.N. Choubey, Secretary (CA)
2. Shri Anil Srivastava, Joint Secretary

3. Shri Arun Kumar, Joint Secretary
4. Smt. Usha Padhee, Joint Secretary
5. Shri V.R. Hegde, Director
6. Shri Suyash Narain, Director

BUREAU OF CIVIL AVIATION SECURITY

1. Shri Kumar Rajesh Chandra, DG, BCAS

AIRPORT AUTHORITY OF INDIA

1. Shri S. Raheja, Chairman, AAI

XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXXX

MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

1. Shri A .Manoharan, Director
2. Shri Mukesh Kumar, Under Secretary

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and apprised them regarding the days's agenda.

2. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Civil Aviation regarding some of the pending Assurances from the 11th Session of 13th Lok Sabha to the 9th Session of 15th Lok Sabha. The Committee reviewed 10 Assurances (Annexure-III) of the Ministry on the following subjects:-

I. Strategy for Traffic Development

USQ No. 4130 dated 16.12.2002 regarding 'Strategy for Traffic Development' (S.No.1).

The Committee were informed that a Part Implementation Report based on the response of the Planning Commission stating that no clearance or approval of schemes pertaining to Andaman and Nicobar Islands was pending with them has already been

submitted in 2003 and the Ministry would like to proceed in the matter as per the instructions of the Committee. As regards the portion of the Assurance pertaining to projected traffic demand in 2025 in Andaman & Nicobar Islands, the Ministry stated that the matter not only involves the air traffic but road and inter island traffic also. Moreover, the Administration of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, being a Union Territory, comes under the Ministry of Home Affairs. Hence, the Assurance pertains to various Ministries including the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Ministry of Shipping, the Ministry of Civil Aviation, the Ministry of Transport and Highways, the Ministry of Tourism as well as Andaman Public Works Department (APWD). As none of the other Ministries is ready to accept it, the Assurance has been kept pending. The Committee were perturbed to find that even after 14 years, the Assurance is still pending. Pointing out that there should be a proper mechanism to deal with such type of Assurances involving various Ministries, the Committee directed that the Ministry Civil Aviation, being the nodal Ministry, should fulfill the Assurance in consultation with other Ministries concerned. The Committee further stated that if the Ministry consider that the Assurance involves other Ministries also, then they should have intimated the Secretariat which inturn would have made necessary arrangements to call them too for the purpose of fulfilling the Assurance.

II. Incidents of Theft at Metro Airports

SQ No. 366 dated 17.04.2008 regarding 'Incidents of Theft at Metro Airports' (S.No.2).

The Committee were informed that a Part Implementation Report was furnished in 2008 wherein 74 out of 138 cases of theft were disposed off after completing investigation. The Second Interim Report was furnished in June, 2016 wherein chargesheet has been filed in 136 out of 138 theft cases. The Ministry further stated that all the 138 theft cases have been finalised on the date of the meeting and the Ministry are now in a position to give their last Report. The Committee directed the Ministry to pursue the cases/matter and furnish the complete Implementation Report to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs for being laid on the Table of the House.

III. Committee on ATC Modernization

SQ No. 443 dated 24.04.2008 regarding 'Committee on ATC Modernization' (S.No.3).

The Committee were informed that the Assurance was pending as many of the recommendations of Ajay Prasad Committee on Air Traffic Control (ATC) modernisation needed action by the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), a United Nations body. Unless ICAO decides what should be done, the Ministry cannot start implementing the recommendations unilaterally. It was further informed that out of 48 recommendations of the said Committee constituted by the Ministry, 28 have been implemented, 3 have not been accepted and 17 need ICAO action. The Committee were dismayed to find that even after a lapse of 8 years, coordination was lacking at both national and International levels and asked the Ministry to review the matter. The Committee also apprised the Ministry that the Assurance will be considered implemented only when all the 17 pending recommendations are implemented. The Committee further desired that the Ministry should co-ordinate with the international level organizations in a time bound manner so that Assurance can be fulfilled in a definite timeframe.

IV. New Ground Handling Policy

USQ No. 2990 dated 18.12.2008 regarding 'New Ground Handling Policy' (S.No.4).

The Committee have been informed that Implementation Report was furnished in 2010. The Committee pointed out that some shortcomings must be there as the Implementation Report was again furnished on 19.10.2011 and 03.06.2016. The Ministry admitted certain errors in their Implementation report which necessitated corrective action and subsequent resubmission. The Committee expressed dissatisfaction that the Assurance was fulfilled in 2010 but the Implementation Report thereof could not be laid even after a delay of more than 6 years and directed the Ministry to review the matter.

V. Pune Airport

USQ No. 2767 dated 23.07.2009 regarding 'Pune Airport' (S.No.5).

The Committee were informed that presently air operations in Pune originates from a Defence airfield. As per norms, for airport development, the State Government is required to provide land free of cost. The Airport Authority provides funds and builds the runways, terminal buildings and make all security arrangements. The State Government of Maharashtra has not been able to provide/identify the land suitable for building the proposed airport at Pune. The Committee were further informed that the existing airport at Pune doesn't have enough space for expansion. Moreover, as it is a Defence airfield, which is a sensitive area, it has its own limitations. The Committee observed that there are three parties involved in the process i.e. the Ministry of Defence, Maharashtra Government and the Ministry of Civil Aviation. The Ministry stated that they have conducted various meetings with the State Government to solve the land problem. However, the required 2000-2500 acres of land have not still been identified. The Ministry further stated that till land is made available, the existing Airport would be upgraded to accommodate the growing traffic. The Committee pointed out that even if the Ministry have been facing problems in finding suitable land for the Airport, the expansion/upgradation of the existing Airport has to be accomplished somehow.

VI. Exemption of VVIPs from Frisking

USQ No. 1290 dated 04.03.2010 regarding 'Exemption of VVIPs from Frisking' (S.No.6).

The Committee were informed that frisking of VVIP in American plane is done under their security regulations. However planes which take off from Delhi such as Delta Air have exempted categories of VVIPs as they have a good rapport with the Indian Authorities. The Committee were further informed that there is no complaint in this regard as on date even though there had been some complaints in the past.

VII. Operational Failure in Delhi Airport

SQ No. 489 dated 07.09.2011(Smt. Ingrid Mcleod, MP) regarding 'Operation Failure in Delhi Airport' (S.No.7).

The Committee were informed that the Implementation Report has been forwarded to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in 2012. The Committee observed that from the point of view of security, such matters should not get delayed.

VIII. Naming of Airports/Airstrips

USQ No. 1509 dated 30.11.2011 regarding 'Naming of Airports' (S.No.8).

The Committee were informed that Raipur Airport has been renamed as recommended. But as regards Chandigarh airport, as it belongs to two States i.e. Punjab and Haryana, there has been a dispute. Both the Governments have not been able to arrive at an agreement. The Minister of State for Civil Aviation has been mediating in the matter. Whereas, the Haryana Government has submitted a name after negotiation, Punjab Government is yet to submit it. Until that time, the issue is not likely to get resolved. The Committee directed the Ministry to submit a Part Implementation Report.

IX. Transfer of Airports/Airstrips

(i) USQ No. 3401 dated 14.12.2011 regarding 'Transfer of Airports' (S.No.9)

(ii) USQ No. 4472 dated 21.12.2011 regarding 'Transfer of Airstrips' (S.No.10).

The Committee were informed that a condition was imposed on the Madhya Pradesh State Government that all the three airports/airstrips i.e. Satna, Khandwa and Panna would be transferred to them subject to the condition that the land is used only for aeronautical purposes. Madhya Pradesh Government has now agreed and has given its approval for Satna and Khandwa airports. The Committee directed Ministry to submit a Part Implementation Report. As regards Panna Airstrip, the approval is still awaited. The Committee desired that the people who get displaced as a result of establishment of an airport/airstrip should get proper compensation and employment and the Ministry should take steps to rehabilitate them. The Committee also desired that the Ministry should

review/analyze all the 54 pending Assurances and should try to submit as many Implementation Reports as possible before July, 2016.

3. The representatives of the Ministry of Civil Aviation thereafter withdrew.

(The witnesses withdrew)

4. A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES (2015-2016) LOK SABHA

**Statement of Pending Assurances of the Ministry of Civil Aviation
(From 11th Session of 13th Lok Sabha to 9th Session of 15th Lok Sabha)**

S.No.	SQ/USQ No. dated	Subject
1.	USQ 4130 dated 16.12.2002	Strategy for Traffic Development
2.	SQ 366 dated 17.4.2008 (Shri Ranen Barman, MP)	Incidents of Theft at Metro Airports
3.	SQ 443 dated 24.4.2008 (Smt. Sumitra Mahajan, MP)	Committee on ATC Modernisation
4.	USQ 2990 dated 18.12.2008	New Ground Handling Policy
5.	USQ 2767 dated 23.7.2009	Pune Airport
6.	USQ 1290 dated 4.3.2010	Exemption of VVIPs from Frisking
7.	SQ 489 dated 7.9.2011 (Smt. Ingrid Mcleod, MP)	Operational Failure in Delhi Airport
8.	USQ 1509 dated 30.11.2011	Naming of Airports
9.	USQ 3401 dated 14.12.2011	Transfer of Airports
10.	USQ 4472 dated 21.12.2011	Transfer of Airstrips