

7

**STANDING COMMITTEE
ON ENERGY
(1996-97)**

ELEVENTH LOK SABHA

**NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAMME
—AN EVALUATION**

DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

*[Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in the
34th Report of the Standing Committee on Energy (Tenth Lok Sabha)]*

SEVENTH REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

February, 1997 / Magha, 1918 (Saka)

3.3657R

7;4

SEVENTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENERGY
(1996-97)

(ELEVENTH LOK SABHA)

NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAMME
- AN EVALUATION

DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

*[Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained
in the 34th Report of the Standing Committee on Energy
(Tenth Lok Sabha)]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on _____

Laid in Rajya Sabha on ~~_____~~ 04 MAR 1997



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

February, 1997/Magha, 1918 (Saka)

C.E. No. 065

Price : Rs. 10.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY
Central Govt. Publications
Acc. No. RC 965 70 (15)
Date... 4/3/97

LOK SABHA

CC
328.3657R
N6.7:4

© 1997 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eighth Edition) and Printed by National Printers, 20/3, West Patel Nagar, New Delhi-110008.

**CORRIGENDA
TO
THE SEVENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE
ON ENERGY (1996-97)**

Page	Para/ Column	Line	For	Read
1	2(ii)	2	Government't	Government's
2	5	2	nucelar	nuclear
3	7	9	Neclear	Nuclear
4	12	1	Committee'	Committee's
9	Heading	2	DO NOT PURSUE	DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE

CHAPTER V	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	12
------------------	---	-----------

APPENDICES

I.	Extracts of Minutes of the Ninth sitting of Standing Committee on Energy (1996-97) held on 18th December, 1996	14
II.	Analysis of Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Energy (Tenth Lok Sabha)	16

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	iii
INTRODUCTION	v
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by the Government	5
CHAPTER III Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	9
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	10
CHAPTER V Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	12

APPENDICES

- I. Extracts of Minutes of the Ninth sitting of
Standing Committee on Energy (1996-97) held on
18th December, 1996 14
- II. Analysis of Action Taken by the Government on
the recommendations contained in the Thirty-fourth
Report of the Standing Committee on Energy
(Tenth Lok Sabha) 16

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENERGY
(1996-97)

Shri Jagmohan — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Karia Munda
3. Shri Lalit Oraon
4. Prof. (Smt.) Rita Verma
5. Shri Gyan Singh
6. Prof. Om Pal Singh Nidar
7. Shri Ravindra Kumar Pandey
8. Shri Muni Lal
9. Shri Manoj Kumar Sinha
10. Shri Sriram Chauhan
11. Shri Sriballav Panigrahi
12. Shri G. Venkatswamy
13. Shri Tariq Anwar
14. Shri Parasram Bhardwaj
15. Shri A. K. Panja
16. Shri Prithviraj D. Chavan
17. Shri Iswar Prasanna Hazarika
18. Shri Sandipan Thorat
19. Shri P. Kodanda Ramaiah
20. Shri Ram Kirpal Yadav
21. Shri Anil Basu
22. Shri Haradhan Roy
23. Shri P.R.S. Venkatesan
24. Shri V. Ganesan
25. Shri N. Ramakrishna Reddy
26. Shri Gawali Pundlikrao Ramji
27. Shri Anand Mohan
28. Shri Prem Singh Chandumajra
29. Shri Chitta Basu
30. Shri Ramendra Kumar

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri Madhavsinh Solanki
32. Shri M. Rajasekara Murthy
33. Shri S. M. Krishna
34. Shri Ramji Lal
35. Shri Ved Prakash Goyal
36. Shri Lakhiram Agarwal
37. Shri Prem Chand Gupta
38. Shri Dipankar Mukherjee
39. Shri Vizol
40. Shri Gaya Singh
41. Smt. Basanti Sarma
42. Shri Rajendra Prasad Mody
43. Shri V. P. Duraisamy
44. Shri Rajnath Singh 'Surya'

SECRETARIAT

1. Smt. Roli Srivastava — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri G. R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri A. S. Chera — *Under Secretary*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Standing Committee on Energy having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this Seventh Report (Eleventh Lok Sabha) on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 34th Report of the Standing Committee on Energy (Tenth Lok Sabha) on "Nuclear Power Programme – An Evaluation".

2. The Thirty-Fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Energy (Tenth Lok Sabha) was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd December, 1995. Replies of the Government to the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 8th July, 1996. The Standing Committee on Energy (Eleventh Lok Sabha) considered and adopted this report at their sitting held on 18th December, 1996.

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

NEW DELHI;
February 6, 1997
Magha 17, 1918 (Saka)

JAGMOHAN,
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 Thirty-Fourth Report (Tenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Energy on "Nuclear Power Programme – An Evaluation" which was presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd December, 1995.

2. Action Taken Notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 7 recommendations contained in the Report. These have been categorised as follows :-

- (i) Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by the Government : Sl. Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.
- (ii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies : Nil.
- (iii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee : Sl. No. 2.
- (iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited : Sl. No. 1.

3. The Committee require that final reply in respect of the recommendation for which only interim reply has been given by the Government ought to be furnished to the Committee at the earliest.

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

10,000 MW Nuclear Power Programme

Recommendation Sl. No. 1, Part-B

4. The Committee observed that a programme was drawn by the Government in 1984 to achieve 10,000 MW nuclear power by the year 2000 A.D. by addition of twelve 220 MW and ten 500 MW units in accordance with which financial sanction totalling about Rs. 1511 crores was accorded by the Government in 1986 and 1991, for advance procurement of critical long delivery equipments. The Committee were greatly disappointed to note that the programme

was pruned in 1990 to a revised target of 5700 MW by the turn of the century. That even this was further scaled down and a capacity of just 3320 MW was expected to be achieved by the extended time frame of 2004, was a matter that the Committee viewed with great disquiet. The Committee felt that it was obvious from these successive downward revisions that unacceptable *ad-hocism* has ruled the Nuclear Power Programme of the Government. It was evident that no serious thought appeared to have been given to Financial Planning before launching the programme. What the Committee felt even more worrisome was that the synergetic consequences of cutting down this programme appeared to have not been sufficiently recognised.

5. The Department have stated in their reply that in line with the proposals made in the Nuclear Power Profile for achieving 10,000 MW installed nuclear power capacity, an outlay of Rs. 15,125 crores (Rs. 4998 crores budgetary support and Rs. 10,127 crores as Internal and Extra Budgetary Resources) was proposed for the VIII Plan. The Department have stated that it was proposed to commence work on 4 x 220 MWe units at Kaiga (Kaiga-3 to 6), 2 x 500 MWe units at Tarapur (TAPP-3 & 4) and 2 x 500 MWe Units at Rajasthan (RAPP-5 to 6) of which, administrative and financial sanction for 2 x 500 MWe Units at Tarapur (TAPP-3 & 4) had already been issued during 1991 and preliminary site infrastructure had been developed. However, the approved outlay during VIII Plan being only Rs. 4261 crores comprising a budgetary support of Rs. 761 crores and Internal Extra Budgetary Resources of Rs. 3500, the Department have stated that this was grossly insufficient for commencing work on the new Projects proposed to be taken up. Consequently, the Department have stated that it was decided to continue the ongoing projects at RAPP-3 & 4 and Kaiga-1 & 2 in addition to completing Kakrapar which was in advanced stage of completion and defer commencement of construction at TAPP-3 & 4 and obtaining administrative/financial sanction for Kaiga-3 to 6 and RAPP-5 & 6. The Department have also stated that the reduction of budgetary support was due to severe resource constraint.

6. The reply of the Department merely mentions the insufficiency of the approved Eighth Plan outlay as the reason for the inability to take up the Projects planned under the 10,000 MW Nuclear Power Programme. The concern expressed by the Committee about the financial planning not being given sufficient thought before launching the programme and insufficient recognition of the synergetic consequences of scaling down the Programme are not adequately addressed to in the reply. The Committee had observed that prior to curtailing the '10,000 MW Programme' financial sanction to the tune of Rs. 1511 crores had been accorded as per the envisaged requirements of the Programme. The Committee expect a detailed reply on its concern.

*Advance Procurement Action***Recommendation Sl. No. 2, Part B**

7. The Committee observed with grave disquiet that critical long delivery items, procured in advance, at a cost of Rs. 1366 crores, remained unutilised consequent upon the pruning of the Country's Nuclear Power Programme. The Committee found it shocking to note that a considerable proportion (almost 50%) of expenditure on this count had actually been incurred out of borrowings and this had an in-built and an escalating interest burden, which, as of March, 95 stood at Rs. 262 crores. The Committee were informed that though efforts have been made to divert/dispose off the items only scrap value could now be salvaged, as these equipments were specific to Nuclear Power Plants. And, this was not all: Purchase orders which were in the pipeline, as commitments were estimated to cost another Rs. 950 crores. The Committee simply could not accept such irresponsible handling of a programme of such critical and strategic importance to the country. Observing that a minimum of Rs. 2300 crores, plus continuing and mounting interest burden have been lost by the country, the Committee recommended a more detailed and urgent investigation of this whole matter with a view to affixing responsibilities.

8. The Department of Atomic Energy in their reply have stated that when it was known that the requisite resources were not available for commencement of work on the new Projects as originally proposed, mid-course corrective action to the extent possible was taken. Accordingly, re-phasing/re-scheduling of the 10,000 MWe Nuclear Power Programme was done. The Department have also stated that a review of the advance procurement action in progress has also been undertaken and the following steps have been taken for coming out of the difficult situation :-

- (1) Equipments which have already been received are being safely stored for preservation for eventual use when the projects are actually taken up.
- (2) Cancellation/short-closing of orders is being done to the maximum extent, with minimum loss.
- (3) Disposal of items which have already been procured and which could be disposed of is also being considered.

9. The Committee had recommended a detailed investigation of the matter of advance procurement of critical and long delivery items for the Nuclear Power Programme which resulted in a huge loss to the country-estimated to be about Rs. 2300 crores, plus continuing and mounting interest burden. Instead of addressing this issue, the Department have sought to convey the steps undertaken to overcome the situation,

viz. preservation/disposal of items procured and cancellation/short-closing of orders in the pipeline. Considering that the Department had earlier stated that only scrap value of the items procured at great expense can be salvaged and the magnitude of the loss caused to the country, the Committee reiterate that the whole matter should be investigated in detail with a view to affixing responsibilities.

Planning for the Nuclear Power Sector

Recommendation Sl. No. 4, Part-B

10. The Committee had been informed by DAE that Public and Private Sector Industries participating in the programme, had invested heavily, commensurate with the envisaged plan, to create/develop nuclear shops, technical skills and indigenous technology needed for the manufacture of such components. Observing that curtailment of the programme would result in gross under-utilisation, also consequent diversion of the facilities and skilled manpower, the Committee expressed agreement with the view expressed by an expert (Shri N. Srinivasan) that 'in the absence of a committed continuous programme, the technology built under heavy odds over four decades will be irretrievably lost.' The Committee considered it their duty to report this in unambiguous terms to the Parliament.

11. The Department have stated in their reply that apart from the efforts made for securing maximum plan allocation during the IXth Plan Period for the nuclear power sector, efforts are also being made for getting requisite priority for the nuclear power sector in the long term energy scenario in the country. For this purpose, the Department have stated that they are already participating in the deliberations of the Energy Policy Committee constituted by the Planning Commission last year for finalising the long term energy perspective plan for the country. The Department have further stated that efforts are being made to maintain the interest of the indigenous industry developed for the specialised jobs for the nuclear power sector. It has also been informed that once additional allocation is made in the IXth Plan, it will be possible to revive the indigenous efforts/technology needed for the manufacture of components.

12. The Committee's views on Nuclear Power as an answer to the Country's energy requirements have been expressed time and again. The Committee, while urging that the Nuclear Power Sector should be accorded its rightful place in the long term energy planning for the country, reiterate that the needed support should be extended to the Department so that the national capacity in this critical area is not undermined.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation Serial No. 3, Part B

Another fallout of scaling down the Nuclear Power Programme is that infrastructural facilities for uranium mining, fuel fabrication, fuel reprocessing, radioactive waste management and heavy water production etc. developed at great cost and effort will now remain either under-utilised, or totally un utilised. The costs of these cannot be computed.

Reply of the Government

As a result of the re-phasing/re-scheduling of the Nuclear Power Programme, changes have also been necessitated in the programme in other related sectors such as uranium mining, fuel fabrication, etc. A review of the projects sanctioned has already been done and the new plants proposed to be set up for fuel fabrication are being implemented with reduced capacity to start with and in-built provision has been made for augmentation of the production capacity at a later stage by adding only the equipment and machinery. Proposal to set up new Uranium Mill/Mine at Turamdih has been dropped. Development of the Uranium Mine at Domiasiat has also been re-scheduled.

[Department of Atomic Energy : O.M. No. 1/2 (2)/96-Budget dated 5.8.1996]

Recommendation Serial No. 4, Part B

The Committee have been informed by DAE that Public and Private Sector Industries participating in the programme, have invested heavily, commensurate with the envisaged plan to create/develop nuclear shops, technical skills and indigenous technology needed for the manufacture of such components. Curtailment of the programme will thus result in gross under-utilisation, also consequent diversion of the facilities and skilled manpower. It has been pointed out that unless immediate actions are taken for continuing with the projects, revival at the later date would be difficult due to dissipation of technology and exodus of trained manpower. The Committee agree with the view expressed by an expert (Shri N. Srinivasan) that 'in the absence of a committed continuous

programme, the technology built under heavy odds over four decades will be irretrievably lost.' The Committee consider it their duty to report this in unambiguous terms to the Parliament.

Reply of the Government

Apart from the efforts made for securing maximum plan allocation during the IXth Plan Period for the nuclear power sector, efforts are also being made for getting requisite priority for the nuclear power sector in the long term energy scenario in the country. For this purpose, the Department is already participating in the deliberations of the Energy Policy Committee constituted by the Planning Commission last year for finalising the long term energy perspective plan for the country. In respect of orders already placed with the indigenous manufacturers, efforts have been made to maintain the interest of the indigenous industry developed for the specialised jobs for the nuclear power sector. Once additional allocation is made in the IXth Plan, it will be possible to revive the indigenous efforts/technology needed for the manufacture of components.

[Department of Atomic Energy : O.M. No. 1/2 (2)/96-Budget dated 5.8.1996]

Comments of the Committee

Please See Paragraph 12 of Chapter I of the Report

Recommendation Serial No. 5, Part B

The Committee note that an outlay of Rs. 14,400 crores was proposed for the Eighth Five Year Plan Period. Against this the approved outlay was only Rs. 4119 crores, with a budgetary support of a mere Rs. 619 crores. The Committee have been informed that the resource generating capacity of the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Limited (NPCIL) is small; generating any sizeable surplus for funding Nuclear Power Projects extremely doubtful, and mobilising significant borrowings difficult. Another constraint of NPCIL is that it has no access to overseas funding. In the circumstances, the neglect of the Nuclear Power Programme by the Government can simply not be condoned. The Committee have grave doubts that it would be possible to achieve even the greatly truncated capacity of 3320 MW by 2004. The Committee therefore, urge the Government to review its policy in its entirety, and to provide the required funding the DAE, urgently.

Reply of the Government

Taking into account the present status of the programme, it is expected that the ongoing Projects at Kaiga (1 & 2) and Rajasthan (RAPP-3 & 4) will be completed during 1998-99. Accordingly, the installed power capacity expected by the turn of the century is 2620 MWe. Even though budgetary support of only Rs. 671 crores was contemplated in the VIII Plan for the NPCIL, actual support is expected to be Rs. 1412 crores during this period. Measures are being taken to improve the generation of internal resources of the Nuclear Power Corporation to undertake installation of additional capacity. Revised norms for fixing tariff for power supplied by the Nuclear Power Stations have been notified and the revision of the present tariff is being undertaken. The possibility of raising resources from the market by issue of debt instruments which have long maturity is also being explored. Efforts are also being made to enhance the budgetary support to the Corporation.

[Department of Atomic Energy : O.M. No. 1/2 (2)/96-Budget dated 5.8.1996]

Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Part B)

The Committee observe that if our indigenously developed technology is not implemented, the country will suffer a grave and near irreparable damage. The Committee emphasise that fossil fuels including coal are finite and for energy independence, it is essential to harness nuclear power. Also, for strategic and technical reasons, there is a need to develop a diversified energy resource base, for electricity generation. By neglecting the field of nuclear power the Government is guilty of having compromised the goal of energy independence for the country.

Reply of the Government

The possibility of assigning a greater share for nuclear power in the long term energy perspective of the country is under consideration.

[Department of Atomic Energy : O.M. No. 1/2 (2)/96-Budget dated 5.8.1996]

Recommendation (Serial No. 7, Part B)

Having examined the far reaching consequences of curtailment of Nuclear Power Programme prepared by DAE in 1984 and the need to develop diversified energy resource for strategic and technical reasons, the Committee

feel strongly that the Government must re-examine and modify its policy in respect of Nuclear Power Programme of the country, and adopt a committed programme, with committed, enhanced funding.

Reply of the Government

The possibility of enhanced funding for nuclear power programme is being explored.

[Department of Atomic Energy : O.M. No. 1/2 (2)/96-Budget dated 5.8.1996]

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

- NIL -

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation (Serial No. 2, Part B)

The Committee observe with grave disquiet that critical long delivery items, procured in advance, at a cost of Rs. 1366 crores, remain unutilised consequent upon the pruning of the country's Nuclear Power Programme. It is shocking to note that a considerable proportion (almost 50%) of expenditure on this count has actually been incurred out of borrowings. This has an in-built and an escalating interest burden, which, as of March, 95 stood at Rs. 262 crores. Though efforts have been made to divert/dispose of the items, it has been stated that only scrap value can now be salvaged, as these equipments are specific to Nuclear Power Plants. And, this is not all : Purchase orders which are in the pipeline, as commitments, are estimated to cost another Rs. 950 crores. The Committee simply cannot accept such irresponsible handling of a programme of such critical and strategic importance to the country. The Committee recommend a more detailed and urgent investigation of this whole matter with a view to affixing responsibilities. A minimum of Rs. 2300 crores, plus continuing and mounting interest burden have been lost by the country.

Reply of the Government

When it was known that the requisite resources were not available for commencement of work on the new Projects as originally proposed, mid-course corrective action to the extent possible was taken. Accordingly, re-phasing/re-scheduling of the 10,000 MWe Nuclear Power Programme was done. A review of the advance procurement action already in progress has also been undertaken and the following steps have been taken for coming out of the difficult situation :—

- (1) Equipments which have already been received are being safely stored for preservation for eventual use when the projects are actually taken up.

- (2) Cancellation/short-closing of orders is being done to the maximum extent, with minimum loss.
- (3) Disposal of items which have already been procured and which could be disposed of is also being considered.

[Department of Atomic Energy : O.M. No. 1/2 (2)/96-Budget dated 5.8.1996]

Comments of the Committee

(Please See Paragraph 9 of Chapter I of the Report)

CHAPTER V

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

Recommendation (Serial No. 1, Part B)

A programme was drawn by the Government in 1984 to achieve 10,000 MW nuclear power by the year 2000 A.D. by addition of twelve 220 MW and ten 500 MW units. It is observed that accordingly financial sanction totalling about Rs. 1511 crores was accorded by the Government in 1986 and 1991, for advance procurement of critical long delivery equipments. This was in line with the programme of achieving a target of 10,000 MW by 2000 A.D. The Committee are greatly disappointed to note that this was pruned in 1990 to a revised target of 5700 MW by the turn of the century. That even this was further scaled down and a capacity of just 3320 MW is now expected to be achieved by the extended time frame of 2004, is a matter that the Committee view with great disquiet. It is obvious from these successive downward revisions that unacceptable ad-hocism has ruled the Nuclear Power Programme of the Government. It is evident that no serious thought appears to have been given to Financial Planning before launching the programme. What is even more worrisome is that the synergetic consequences of cutting down this programme, appear to have not been sufficiently recognised. That this curtailment of the Nuclear Power Programme is accompanied by very grave consequences is brought out in the succeeding paragraphs.

Reply of the Government

In line with the proposals made in the Nuclear Power profile for achieving 10,000 MWe installed nuclear power capacity, an outlay of Rs. 15,125 crores (Rs. 4998 crores budgetary support and Rs. 10,127 crores as Internal and Extra Budgetary Resources) was proposed for the VIII Plan. It was proposed to commence work on 4 x 220 MWe Units at Kaiga (Kaiga-3 to 6), 2 x 500 MWe Units at Tarapur (TAPP-3 & 4) and 2 x 500 MWe Units at Rajasthan (RAPP-5 to 6). Of the above, administrative and financial sanction for 2 x 500 MWe Units at Tarapur (TAPP-3 & 4) had already been issued during 1991 and preliminary site infrastructure has been developed. However, the approved outlay during VIII Plan was only Rs. 4261 crores comprising a budgetary

support of Rs. 761 crores and Internal Extra Budgetary Resources of Rs. 3500 crores. This was grossly insufficient for commencing work on the new Projects proposed to be taken up. It was, therefore, decided to continue the ongoing projects at RAPP-3 & 4 and Kaiga - 1 & 2 in addition to completing Kakrapar which was in advanced stage of completion. The advance procurement sanctioned earlier had to be continued as orders had already been placed. However, commencement of construction at TAPP-3 & 4 was deferred. Similarly, action for obtaining administrative/financial sanction for Kaiga-3 to 6 and RAPP- 5 & 6 was also deferred. The reduction of budgetary support and consequently plan outlay was due to severe resource constraint.

[Department of Atomic Energy : O.M. No. 1/2 (2)/96–Budget dated 5.8.1996]

Comments of the Committee

(Please See Paragraph 6 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;
February 6, 1997
Magha 17, 1918 (Saka)

JAGMOHAN,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Energy.

APPENDIX I

EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE NINTH SITTING OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENERGY HELD ON 18TH DECEMBER, 1996.

The Committee sat from 1630 to 1700 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Jagmohan—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Lalit Oraon
3. Prof. (Smt.) Rita Verma
4. Prof. Om Pal Singh Nidar
5. Shri Muni Lal
6. Shri Manoj Kumar Sinha
7. Shri Sriram Chauhan
8. Shri Ishwar Prasanna Hazarika
9. Shri Sandipan Thorat
10. Shri P. Kodanda Ramaiah
11. Shri Haradhan Roy
12. Shri Ramendra Kumar
13. Shri Ramji Lal
14. Shri Ved Prakash Goyal
15. Shri Dipankar Mukherjee
16. Smt. Basanti Sarma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G. R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri A. S. Chera — *Under Secretary*

2. 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 34th Report of the Standing Committee on Energy (1995-96) (Tenth Lok Sabha) on "Nuclear Power Programme – An Evaluation". | | |
| (iv) | ** | ** | ** |
| (v) | ** | ** | ** |

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

The Committee then adjourned.

** Paras 2 (i), (ii), (iv) and (v) of the minutes relating to consideration and adoption of 4 other draft reports have not been included.

APPENDIX II

(Vide Para 3 of Introduction)

ANALYSIS OF ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE THIRTY – FOURTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENERGY (TENTH LOK SABHA)

I.	Total No. of recommendations made	7
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government (vide recommendations at SI. No. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7)	5
	Percentage of total	71.42%
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	Nil
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee (vide recommendation at SI. No. 2)	1
	Percentage of total	14.29%
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited (vide recommendation at SI. No. 1)	1
	Percentage of total	14.29%