

1	2	3
9.	Karnataka	44.34
10.	Kerala	86.13
11.	Madhya Pradesh	28.85
12.	Maharashtra	52.32
13.	Manipur	47.60
14.	Meghalaya	44.85
15.	Mizoram	78.60
16.	Nagaland	54.75
17.	Orissa	34.68
18.	Punjab	50.41
19.	Rajasthan	20.44
20.	Sikkim	46.69
21.	Tamil Nadu	51.33
22.	Tripura	49.65
23.	Uttar Pradesh	25.31
24.	West Bengal	46.56
<b>Union Territories</b>		
1.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	65.46
2.	Chandigarh	72.34
3.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	26.98
4.	Daman & Diu	59.40
5.	Delhi	66.99
6.	Lakshadweep	72.89
7.	Pondicherry	65.63

\*Excluding Jammu & Kashmir

#### **Clearance to Projects**

\*294 SHRI A. VENKATESH NAIK:

SHRI GIRIDHAR GAMANG:

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

(a) whether a large number of projects proposed to be implemented in Karnataka, Orissa and other States are pending for the forest/environmental clearance;

(b) if so, the period for which the projects particularly from Karnataka and Orissa are pending and the reasons therefor;

(c) the steps being taken to expedite clearance of these projects;

(d) whether the policy to entrust the State level bodies with clearing the project proposals has been framed so that the delay in according clearance to projects can be avoided; and

(e) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI SURESH PRABHU): (a) A total of 133 proposals are pending with the Central Government under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980, out of which 8 proposals pertain to Karnataka and 16 to Orissa. There are 81 proposals pending for environmental clearance with the Ministry out of which 7 pertain to Karnataka and 7 to Orissa.

(b) In respect of Karnataka and Orissa the proposals are mostly pending for the period between 1 month to 18 months. The main reason for pendency is unavailability of complete information in respect of the proposals and/or site inspection reports of the area involved.

(c) As and when complete details in respect of the proposals are received from the concerned State Government/Project proponent, these proposals are processed expeditiously for final decision.

(d) No, Sir.

(e) Does not arise.

#### **Mal-Functioning of IGNOU**

\*295. SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA:

SHRI BENI PRASAD VERMA:

Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether a substantial amount of funds allocated to the Indira Gandhi National Open University has been withheld recently;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor indicating the projects affected thereby;

(c) whether the outgoing Vice-Chancellor of the IGNOU has recently accused the Ministry of encroaching upon the autonomy of the University;

(d) if so, whether the Ministry have undertaken or asked the Central Vigilance Commission to inquire into the affairs of the University and its mal-functioning;

(e) if so, the details thereof;

(f) the details of the steps taken or proposed to be taken to restore the normalcy and autonomy in the University; and

(g) the losses suffered by the University during the last three years, year-wise?

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI): (a) and (b) Out of the plan