

EIGHTEENTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY
(1995-96)

(TENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF NON-CONVENTIONAL
ENERGY SOURCES

—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (1994-95)

**[Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the
8th Report of the Standing Committee on Energy (Tenth Lok Sabha)]**



Presented to Lok Sabha on 25th April, 1995
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 25th April, 1995

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 1995/Chaitra, 1917 (Saka)

C.E. No. 025

Price : Rs. 10.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY
BIBL. GOVT. PUBLICATIONS
1. No. PC 91765 (7)
• 26/4/95

Lc
322.3657R
N5.18;6

© 1995 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Edition) and printed by Akashdeep Printers, 20 Ansari Road,

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by the Government	3
CHAPTER III Recommendation/Observation which the Com- mittee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	12
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	13
CHAPTER V Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	14

APPENDICES

I. Extracts of Minutes of the First Sitting of the Standing Committee on Energy (1995-96) held on 17th April, 1995	15
II. Analysis of Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Eighth Report of Standing Committee on Energy (10th Lok Sabha)	17

**COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY (1995-96)**

CHAIRMAN

Shri Jaswant Singh

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. **Shri Bhawani Lal Verma**
3. **Shri Murli Deora**
4. **Shri Motilal Singh**
5. **Shri Khelsai Singh**
6. **Shri Khelan Ram Jangde**
7. **Shri Parasram Bhardwaj**
8. **Shri S. Thota Subba Rao**
9. **Shri K.P. Reddaiah Yadav**
10. **Shri Shiv Charan Mathur**
11. **Dr. Krupasindhu Bhoi**
12. **Shri Dalbir Singh**
13. **Shri Vilas Muttemwar**
14. **Shri P.C. Chacko**
15. **Shri Arjun Singh Yadav**
16. **Shri Virender Singh**
17. **Shri Laxminarain Tripathi**
18. **Prof. Rita Verma**
19. **Shri Shankersinh Vaghela**
20. **Shri Haradhan Roy**
21. **Shri Anil Basu**
22. **Shri Keshari Lal**
23. **Shri Rajesh Kumar**
24. **Shri Vijay Kumar Yadav**
25. **Dr. Venkateswara D. Rao**

26. Shri Chitta Basu
27. Shri Mohan Singh (Ferozpur)
28. Shrimati Dil Kumari Bhandari
29. Shrimati Lovely Anand
30. Shri B. Shankaranand

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri Parmeshwar Kumar Agarwalla
32. Shri M.M. Hashim
33. Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita
34. Shri Dipankar Mukherjee
35. Shri M. Rajasekara Murthy
36. Shrimati Ila Panda
37. Shri J.S. Raju
38. Shri T. Venkatram Reddy
39. Shri Rajni Ranjan Sahu
40. Shri Viren J. Shah
41. Dr. Naunihal Singh
42. Smt. Kamla Sinha

SECRETARIAT

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.N. Mishra | — <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Smt. Roli Srivastava | — <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri G.R. Juneja | — <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 4. Shri A. Louis Martin | — <i>Under Secretary</i> |

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Standing Committee on Energy having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this Eighteenth Report (Tenth Lok Sabha) on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 8th Report of the Standing Committee on Energy (Tenth Lok Sabha) on "Demands for Grants (1994-95) of the Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources".

2. The 8th Report of the Standing Committee on Energy was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1994. Replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the report were received on 8th April, 1994. The Standing Committee on Energy considered and adopted this report at their sitting held on 17th April, 1995.

3. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 8th Report of the Committee is given in Appendix-II.

NEW DELHI;
18th April, 1995
Chaitra 28, 1917 (Saka)

JASWANT SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Energy.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

The Report of the Committee deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Eighth Report (Tenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Energy on Demands for Grants (1994-95) of the Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources which was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1994.

2. Action Taken Notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 12 recommendations contained in the Report. These have been broadly categorised as follows:

- (i) *Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by the Government; Sl. Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 25 and 26.*
- (ii) *Recommendation/Observation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's reply; Sl. No. 23.*
- (iii) *Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee;*

-NIL-

- (iv) *Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited;*

-NIL-

3. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government on one of their recommendations:

Explanatory note in Performance Budget

Recommendation (Para Nos. 12 and 13)

4. The Committee expressed concern that the Ministry was demanding grant of two different amounts under two different sub-heads for the same item of expenditure. This was observed from the following which was a reproduction of sub-heads of the Demands for Grants of the Ministry:

(In thousands of rupees)

B.1(4)(3)(1)(1)—Biomass Gasifiers for stand alone applications	1,30,00
B.1(4)(3)(2)(1)—Biomass Gasifiers for stand alone applications	1,78,00

5. The same position was reflected in Ministry's Performance Budget as well. The Committee required an explanation from the Ministry in this regard.

6. The Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources in its reply stated that the first Budget sub-head *i.e.* B.1(4)(3)(1)(1) is for the ongoing/new R&D activities in the area of Biomass Gasifier whereas Budget sub-head B.1(4)(3)(2)(1) is for taking up the demonstration programme on commercially proven Biomass Gasifier technologies.

7. The Committee feel that showing two different sub-heads for the same item of expenditure gives a misleading picture. The Committee, therefore, desire that for proper appreciation of information contained in the Demands for Grants, a suitable explanatory note may be given in the Performance Budget in future.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No. 8)

Contrary to the Ministry's claim, the Committee find that the number of biogas plants sought to be installed in 1993-94 and 1994-95 is significantly less and the budgetary outlay considerably higher as compared to the year 1992-93. During 1992-93, 1.88 lakh plants were installed with an outlay of Rs. 56.87 crores. During 1993-94 and 1994-95, the number of plants proposed to be set up is only 1.75 lakh in each year and outlay involved is Rs. 65.2 crores and Rs. 63.7 crores respectively. The Committee will await a clarification from the Ministry in this regard.

Reply of the Government

During the year 1992-93 for an outlay of Rs. 57.20 crores, a target of only 1.35 biogas plants was fixed. This corresponds to per plant central financial assistance of about Rs. 4,200. The achievement for the year, however, has been 1.88 lakh plants which has resulted in accrual of liabilities to be settled during the subsequent years. During the year 1993-94, a target of 1.75 lakh biogas plants was fixed with a budgetary outlay of Rs. 65.2 crores. Physical target during 1993-94 was internally raised to 2.00 lakh by reducing and rationalising subsidies. Target for 1994-95 also has been fixed at 2.00 lakh. Thus, the central financial assistance on per plant basis for the years 1993-94 and 1994-95 works out to about Rs. 3,200.00 only.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-PSC
dated the 8th April, 1994]

Recommendation (Para No. 9)

The Committee also note that with regard to setting up of biogas plants during the year 1994-95. While the Expenditure Budget of the Government indicates a target of 2 lakh, the performance budget of the Ministry shows a lesser figure of Rs. 1.75 lakh. The Committee would like the Ministry to indicate the exact target envisaged for the year 1994-95.

Reply of the Government

Since the budget allocation for National Project on Biogas Development for the year 1994-95 has remained at the same level as that of year 1993-94 and it has been decided to maintain the same level of Central financial assistance during

the year 1994-95, the target of 2 lakh biogas plants for the year 1994-95 has been fixed.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C dated the 8th April, 1994]

Recommendation (Para No. 10)

The details regarding the number of CBP/IBP/NBP Plants set up/proposed to be set up and the budgetary outlay involved are as under:

(Rs. in lakhs)

	No. of Plants set up/proposed	Expenditure outlay
1992-93 (Actual)	189	88
1993-94 (Target)	50	50
1994-95 (Target)	200	300

Recommendation (Para No. 11)

It can be observed from the above, that the average cost of CBP/IBP/NBP plant proposed to be set up in 1994-95 has registered an increase of over 200% as compared to the cost in 1992-93. The average cost of a plant in 1992-93 works out to just Rs. 0.46 lakh whereas in 1994-95 the cost would be Rs. 1.5 lakh. Even granting allowance for price inflation and plant size variations the Committee feel that the expenses of the Government is unaccountably higher. The Committee expect that the Ministry will look into this aspect and explain satisfactorily the price differential.

Reply of the Government

The average Central financial assistance under Community/Institutional/Night Soil Biogas Plants programme has to be calculated on the basis of annual plan allocation and the annual target. The variation mentioned are based on the figure of achievement reported during a particular year. The plan allocations and targets for the years 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 are as follows:—

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Year	Target	Allocation
1.	1992-93	50	50.00
2.	1993-94	50	50.00
3.	1994-95	200	300.00

It may be seen that average Central financial assistance works out to Rs. 1.00 lakh in 1992-93 and 1993-94 whereas it is Rs. 1.50 lakh in 1994-95. The increase in 1994-95 is due to implementation of the new components of night soil based plants where we are meeting the full cost of gas generating system.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C dated the 8th April, 1994]

Recommendation (Para Nos. 12 & 13)

The Committee are concerned to note that the Ministry is demanding grant of two different amounts under two different sub-heads for the same item of expenditure. This may be observed from the following which is a reproduction of sub-heads of the Demands for Grants of the Ministry appearing at page 4:—

(In thousands of rupees)

B.1(4)(3)(1)(1)—Biomass Gasifiers for stand alone applications	1,30,00
B.1(4)(3)(2)(1)—Biomass Gasifiers for stand alone applications	1,78,00

The same position is reflected in Ministry's Performance Budget as well. The Committee will await an explanation from the Ministry in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The Demand for Grants for Biomass Gasifier Programme is under two Budget sub-heads as indicated below:—

(In thousands of rupees)

B.1(4)(3)(1)(1)—Biomass Gasifiers for stand alone applications	1,30,00
B.1(4)(3)(2)(1)—Biomass Gasifiers for stand alone applications	1,78,00

The first Budget sub-head i.e. B.1(4)(3)(1)(1) is for the ongoing/new R & D activities in the area of Biomass Gasifier whereas Budget sub-head B.1(4)(3)(2)(1) is for taking up the demonstration programme on commercially proven Biomass Gasifier technologies.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C dated the 8th April, 1994]

Comments of the Committee

Recommendation (Para No. 14)

It has been stated in the Performance Budget of the Ministry (Page 32) that to undertake R & D programme as Biomass production, conversion and utilisation the Budget allocation of Rs. 2.75 crores has been made for the year 1994-95. Demands for Grants of the Ministry however does not show this figure. The Committee hope that Ministry will clarify the position.

Reply of the Government

The budget allocation of Rs. 2.75 crores for the R & D Programme of Biomass production, conversion and utilisation is shown in following budget sub-heads of the Demands for Grants:—

At Page No. 4 of Demands for Grants

(In thousands of Rupees)

B.1(4)	Bio-Energy—Biomass	
B.1(4)(1)	R & D	Rs. 1,75,00
B.1(4)(2)	Energy Plantation	Rs. 75.00
B.1(4)(2)(1)	Demonstration and Technology utilisation of Biomass utilisation	Rs. 20,00
At page No. 6 of Demands for Grants		
B.1(5)	Other Expenditure	Rs. 5,00
Total		Rs. 2,75,00

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93—P&C dated the 8th April, 1994]

Recommendation (Para No. 15)

The budgetary provisions for some of the items of SPV programme during 1993-94 and 1994-95 are as under:

(Rs. in lakhs)

S.P.V. Programme	1993-94	1994-95
	B.E.	B.E.
Research & Development	150	100
P.V. Test Facility	50	35
Training, Repair and Maintenance	100	40

Recommendation (Para No. 16)

It can be observed from above that there is steep reduction in budgetary provisions of 1994-95 for R & D, P.V, Test facility, Training, Repair and Maintenance under SPV Programme. The Committee would like to know the reasons for lower budgetary allocations for these items of expenditure particularly for R & D.

Reply of the Government

(a) The Ministry is giving a new orientation to its R & D efforts, by ensuring goal oriented developmental efforts, preferably with industrial linkages. New initiatives have to be taken during 1994-95, for which the proposed funds should be adequate.

(b) The PV Test Facility is an on-going activity at the Solar Energy Centre. As the bulk of the infrastructural requirements have already been established at this facility, the proposed budgetary allocation should, therefore, be adequate for the year 1994-95.

(c) Since under the new policy of the Socially Oriented Scheme, emphasis is on the supply of complete SPV system to individual beneficiaries/users, it is expected that the beneficiaries/State agencies will be themselves responsible for the maintenance of the SPV systems, supplied to them under this scheme, after the suppliers warranty periods are over.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C dated the 8th April, 1994]

Recommendation (Para No. 16)

The Committee find though the budgetary provision under SPV programme for demonstration and technology utilisation for rural energy applications have been increased from Rs. 1000 lakh in 1993-94 to Rs. 1065 lakh in 1994-95, the physical targets for the year 1994-95 have been halved as compared to the previous year in the case of domestic lighting system and SPV power plants, also no target appears to have been set with respect to street lighting systems. The Committee expect that the Ministry will explain the position in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Under the Socially Oriented Scheme, MNES releases only 50% of its estimated share to the State agencies while sanctioning the projects. The balance share of MNES is released after the distribution/commissioning of the SPV systems.

During 1993-94, the MNES enhanced the original targets for sanctioning SPV systems under this scheme. The initial and enhanced targets are given below:—

SPV System	Original Target (Nos.)	Enhanced Target (Nos.)
Street Lighting System	400	2,000
Domestic Lighting System	1,000	12,500
Portable Lanterns	10,000	30,000
Power Plants	100 Villages (200 KWp)	200 Villages (600 KWp)
Other Systems	300	500

It was envisaged that additional funds would be provided for sanctioning systems as per the above enhanced targets. However, no additional funds could be mobilised for this purpose. The MNES nevertheless sanctioned/gave clearance for a total of 1,289 street lighting systems; 12,495 domestic lighting systems; 30,450 portable solar lanterns; and 70 small village level, SPV power plants, with an aggregate 223 KWp SPV capacity. Majority of these systems were sanctioned during 3rd and 4th quarters of the year 1993-94 and are currently under implementation. The initial 50% of MNES share has already been released to the State Implementing Agencies for these systems, as per policy of the scheme. Keeping in view, the available budgetary provision of Rs. 1065 lakhs for the Demonstration programme for 1994-95 and the estimated liability of about Rs. 8.50 crores for the systems currently under implementation, the balance funds under the programme are considered adequate to cover initial 50% release of the MNES share for the proposed targets for 1994-95.

It is, therefore, expected that the physical achievements during 1994-95 will be much higher than the targets proposed for the year, on account of the SPV systems which were sanctioned during 1993-94 and are currently under implementation.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C, dated, the 8th April, 1994.]

Recommendation (Para No. 21)

The Committee is of the view that progress with regard to small hydro-power is unsatisfactory. The capacity envisaged for 1994-95 is lower than the target of 35 MW fixed for the preceding year. If this trend continues, the Committee is not

reassured that the target of 200 MW set for the 8th Plan period would be achieved. The Committee expects that vigorous efforts will be made to accelerate the implementation of this programme.

Reply of the Government

The 8th Plan target of 200 MW includes 100 MW under MNES subsidy scheme (upto 3 MW) and 100 MW through IREDA supported projects (upto 15 MW). The targets for sanctioning of projects and actual achievements are given below:—

	Target				Achievement		
	Sanctioning		Sanctioning		Commissioning		
	MNES	IREDA	MNES	IREDA	MNES	IREDA	Other
1992-93	—	—	21.75	13.00	—	1.00	11.02
1993-94	20.00	15.00	26.35	20.00	2.15	12.00	3.20
1994-95	25.00	35.00	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

It will thus be seen that against the target of 200 MW for the 8th Plan, a total capacity of 81.1 MW has been sanctioned during the first two years of the Plan, and a total capacity of 29.37 MW has been commissioned.

During 1994-95, the sanctioning target of 25 MW is likely to be achieved by MNES, and projects of aggregate capacity of 20 MW under subsidy scheme are likely to be commissioned; in addition, about 20 MW capacity under IREDA/others is expected to be added.

According to reports received from various States, a capacity of about 93 MW had been installed upto March, 1992. This included 23 MW completed during the VII Plan and 6 MW during 1990-91 and 1991-92. Aggregate capacity of 29.37 MW has been added during the last two years, and the total installed capacity at the end of March, 1994 stands at about 122 MW (including a 12 MW project under IREDA).

The total capacity which is under implementation including projects under MNES subsidy, IREDA, assistance and State Government projects exceeds 200 MW. The Ministry is making vigorous efforts to have the main bottlenecks and constraints removed by the State Governments to enable accelerated implementation and timely completion of the projects. The problems relate mainly to the institutional arrangements; inadequate State Plan allocations and diversion of funds; delay in land allotment, environment, forestry and statutory

clearances. A data bank on the on-going projects as well as identified sites for new projects, is being maintained by the Ministry, and the implementation is being closely monitored. It is expected that the capacity of about 200 MW which was under implementation at the end of March, 1994 will get completed before the end of the 8th Plan period, assuming a gestation period of two to three years, and provided sufficient funds are made available under the Central and State Plans. The completion of projects sanctioned during the remaining three years of the Plan period may spill over to the 9th Plan.

The capacity envisaged to be sanctioned during 1994-95 is 60 MW, which includes 25 MW for MNES and 35 MW for IREDA. This is against a total of 35 MW envisaged for 1993-94.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C, dated the 8th April, 1994.]

Recommendation (Para No. 25)

The Committee note that as against the 8th Plan outlay of Rs. 3 crores for Magneto Hydro Dynamics Programme the allocation made during the first two years of the plan period adds upto only Rs. 1 crore and no budgetary provision has been made for this programme during the year 1994-95. The Committee would like to know whether the programme had yielded the desired results, if it has then why no provision has been made for this programme in the budget? Alternatively, if it has not yielded any results then why is it being retained at all. Either way this is not a satisfactory situation.

Reply of the Government

This R & D project was a collaborative effort between MNES, BHEL and BARC. The broad objectives of the Magneto Hydro Dynamics Programme to establish a pilot plant and to carry out experimentation have been completed. 17 Test Runs have been carried out on the plant and data have been collected. It is understood that the BHEL is carrying on the work relating to commercialisation of the main technology or the spin offs. BHEL has prepared a feasibility report for retrofitting the MHD plant to an existing thermal power station. The provisions made in the budget were to meet commitments in the project. No budget provision has been made for the year 1994-95 for this activity.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C, dated the 8th April, 1994.]

Recommendation (Para No. 26)

The Committee observe that under the major head 2810 (4)(3)(6) Ocean Energy has been allocated a sum of Rs. 10 lakhs only. Against this sum, no

mentioned the appraisal of the tidal project in the Kutch and undertaking of survey and investigation in the Sunderbans of the East and the Gulf of Cambay in the West. Ther Committee, however, observe that leave alone in the budgetary allocation, the Ministry have not even considered Ocean Thermal Power. The Committee would await an explanation of this omission from the Government. Simultaneously, the Committee would urge the Government to undertake this aspect of Non-Conventional Energy as a potentially major contributor in the total energy resources available.

Reply of the Government

Seas and Oceans are the vast sources of renewable energy. The commercially exploitable sources of Ocean Energy includes Tidal Energy, Ocean Thermal Energy Conservation and Wave Energy. A Potential of about 50,000 MW OTEC, 20,000 MW Wave Energy and 9,000 MW Tidal Energy has been estimated for power generation in India.

A Memorandum of Understanding for purchase of power from 100 MW OTEC Power Plant of Tamil Nadu coast has been signed between the Government of Tamil Nadu and M/s. Sea Solar Power, USA. The entire expenditure on commissioning and operation of the plant will be met by M/s. Sea Solar Power, USA. Another project proposal for 1 MW Floating Wave Power Vessel off Andaman & Nicobar coast has been received from M/s. Sea Power AB, Sweden. The entire cost for commissioning and operation of the Plant will be met by M/s. Sea Power AB, Sweden.

The subject of Tidal energy has been transferred to MNES from the Ministry of Power in December, 1993. MNES has supported the work on OTEC and Wave Energy at IIT, Madras and Calcutta Port Trust. It is also proposed to support the survey and investigation work on Wave Energy, Tidal Energy and OTEC in the Eastern and Western coasts. MNES is providing administrative support for various clearances/approvals from various Central Ministries/Departments for the above mentioned two project proposals under consideration.

Under the New Technology Division of the Ministry the Ocean Energy cell has been strengthened. A token provision of Rs. 10 lakhs has been made for the year 1994-95 for this activity. Additional budget support will be made available for the programme as and when there is a need with the growth of the activities.

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C,
dated the 8th April, 1994.]

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATION/OBSERVATION WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLY

Recommendation (Para No. 23)

The result of research and development efforts initiated and supported by MNES until now have shown promise to utilize Urban/Municipal and Industrial Waste for energy recovery through variety of technological/conversion routes. Some of the wastes viz. distillery effluents, paper industry wastes etc. have successfully come to pilot demonstration stage. With a view to exploiting the potential of these sources a separate division namely Urban/Municipal and Industrial Waste has been created in the Ministry.

The Committee are however surprised to note that no budgetary allocation has been made for this programme during the year 1994-95. The Committee would like to know how it is proposed to implement this programme in the absence of any budgetary allocation.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry has made a provision of Rs. 3.50 crores for the year 1994-95. This is reflected in the Demands for Grants as follows:—

	Page	Head	(In thousands of rupees)
Energy from Municipal Waste	4	B.1(4)(3)(1)(2)	125,00
National Bio-Energy Board Activities	5	B.1(4)(3)(2)(2)	92,00
Energy from Industrial Wastes	5	B.1(4)(3)(2)(3)	133,00
Total			350,00

[Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Letter No. 9/27/93-P&C, dated the 8th April, 1994.]

CHAPTER IV

**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH
REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY
THE COMMITTEE**

-NIL-

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH
FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED.

-NIL-

NEW DELHI;
18th April, 1995
Chaitra 28, 1917 (Saka)

JASWANT SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Energy (1995-96).

APPENDIX-I

EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE FIRST SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENERGY (1995-96) HELD ON MONDAY, THE 17TH APRIL, 1995

The Committee sat from 11.00 hrs. to 13.30 hrs.

PRESENT

1. Shri Shiv Charan Mathur — *In the Chair*
2. Smt. Lovely Anand
3. Shri Anil Basu
4. Smt. Dil Kumari Bhandari
5. Shri Dalbir Singh
6. Shri Keshari Lal
7. Shri Rajesh Kumar
8. Shri Venkateswara D. Rao
9. Shri K.P. Reddaiah Yadav
10. Shri Haradhan Roy
11. Shri Khelsai Singh
12. Shri Laxminarayan Tripathi
13. Shri Shankersinh Vaghela
14. Prof. Rita Verma
15. Shri Virender Singh
16. Shri Vijay Kumar Yadav
17. Shri Parmeshwar Kumar Agarwalla
18. Shri M.M. Hashim
19. Shri Bhubneswar Kalita
20. Shri Dipankar Mukherjee
21. Smt. Ila Panda
22. Shri J.S. Raju
23. Shri T. Venkatram Reddy
24. Shri Viren J. Shah

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri G.R. Juneja | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri A. Louis Martin | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Shiv Charan Mathur to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. ** ** ** **

4. ** ** ** **

5. Then the Committee considered and adopted the following draft action taken reports:—

(i) ** ** ** **

(ii) ** ** ** **

(iii) Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 8th Report of Standing Committee on Energy on "Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources – Demands for Grants (1994-95)".

(iv) ** ** ** **

The Committee also authorised the Chairman to finalise above mentioned reports and present the same to Parliament.

6. ** ** ** **

The Committee then adjourned.

** Paras 3, 4, 5 (i), 5 (ii), 5 (iv) and 6 of the Minutes relating to procedural matter, consideration of three other Action Taken Reports and Draft Reports on Demands for Grants of Ministry of Coal and Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources

APPENDIX II

(Vide Para 3 of Introduction)

Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the Recommendations contained in the Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Energy (Tenth Lok Sabha)

I.	Total No. of recommendations made	12
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government (<i>vide</i> recommendations at Sl. Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 25 and 26).	11
	Percentage of total	91.7
III.	Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies (<i>vide</i> recommendation at Sl. No. 23).	1
	Percentage of total	8.3
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	Nil
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	Nil