

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

1. The third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 was held on 26th September, 2017. The list of participants attending the meeting is placed as **Annexure**.
2. Shri Bipul Pathak, Member Secretary of the Committee welcomed the participants of the Committee and placed the comments before them for discussion, which were received from IBM, Cement Manufacturers' Association, Geological Survey of India, Indian Council of Forestry Research and Education, FICCI, CII, Govt. of Chhattisgarh, Pellet Manufacturers' Association of India, JSW Steel, Govt. of Telangana, Ministry of Steel, Govt. of Odisha, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, MEAI, Mines Mineral & people, HLN Goa, Railway Board, NACRI, NITI Aayog, Goa Foundation, Indian Bureau of Mines (CME).
3. Thereafter, Dr K. Rajeswara Rao, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Mines and Chairman of the Committee welcomed the representatives of various Ministries, State Governments, Industry Associations, PSUs, representatives from Civil Societies, technical institutions and the stakeholders to the third meeting to finalize the National Mineral Policy as per the directions of the Honorable Supreme Court. He thanked all the stakeholders for sending their notes/comments/suggestions on various aspects. He mentioned that NMP 2008 is very comprehensive document which has helped in development of the mining sector in a significant manner; and in this context mentioned that amendment to NMP 2008 has to be undertaken visualizing the existing situation, the emerging concerns regarding this sector, the requirements of the mineral sector in the coming years while being mindful of the fact that the mineral sector has several stakeholders with diverging interests. With this perspective he requested the stakeholders to give suggestions in a very constructive manner. He informed that the final meeting of the Committee will be held on 13th October where the first draft of the National Mineral Policy will be discussed. The Chairman concluded his opening remarks by saying that the Committee has an enabling environment to prepare a responsible policy to the society, community and also the nation.
4. Chairman introduced Dr Vinay Kumar, Director, Anthropological Survey of India who was requested to attend the meeting to have his valuable comments as the organization he represents is a very important and highly respected professional organization dealing with anthropological issues and also the NGOs. The Chairman emphasized that the comments of Ministry of Tribal Welfare and Ministry of Panchayati Raj be obtained and examined carefully.
5. Dr Vinay Kumar, Director, Anthropological Survey of India mentioned that he will be sending his comments after reading the comments which were put up for discussion from the point of view of the organization. He stated that whenever we discuss anything dealing with the minerals we should be mindful of the fact that the area from where minerals come are predominantly areas inhabited by communities which are known as tribal communities. In this context Director ASI emphasized that we should refrain from using the term 'indigenous communities' because this is a disputed term as this raises a contentious issue of determining who is indigenous and who is an outsider. He added that this has been the point of view of the Government of India, and the point of view of a

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

large number of anthropologists who have worked on these communities who are of the considered opinion that term 'indigenous communities' is more applicable in the context of America or Australia where you can certainly determine the "indigeneity" of populations. He said that here we are dealing with the communities which are known as tribal communities and added that there are 705 scheduled tribe communities according to the recent statistics which constitutes 8.6% of the total population of the country.

6. He shared his experience of being a professor of social anthropology at the University of Delhi. He proceeded to place two perspectives. The first perspective is that many of these communities are occupying the areas which are mineral rich areas which maybe because of historical accidents or because of the history of their migrations; and that these communities were not aware of the richness of the areas. He said that a very prominent Anthropologist Marshall D. Sahlins mentioned that these communities had been squatting on mineral rich areas; and that they had no understanding of the richness of minerals. They might have had some inkling that the areas are mineral rich maybe based on empirical evidence of the quality of water and soil and their experience and understanding of different situations. He said that these communities became aware of the area and the fact that they were living in a rich area, when the colonizers started entering their areas and when they were displaced. Once they become aware of the fact that they are squatting on the mineral rich areas, they started emphasizing their rights over the area. He further said that in the whole debate dealing with the minerals, forest, land and other resources there has always been the question of rights right from the time the colonial powers came. There always been a question of determining these rights and the conflict between what is private, what is public, what is of their own, what is of the larger world. He said that anthropologists are very well aware of these conflicts. With the increasing awareness about the richness of their areas the more vigilant they have become asserting their rights through large number of movements in different parts of the world.

7. Dr Vinay Kumar further mentioned that the second point of view relates to the legal aspect. How do we deal with this kind of a situation - with the claims of these people. There are several ways of doing that. One is that we recognize them as "authors of that area" in the sense the royalty should go to them. The second is people's knowledge. He said that we should not forget the idea of community. The benefits should go to the communities. He gave examples from the United States of America where the communities are being compensated for what they have been doing and it is very important that we take up the idea of community who constitutes the community. He added that no communities are homogenous. The communities have various debatable moot issues pertaining to different perspectives, contested perspectives on reality. One should not forget the gender aspect, the aspect of age and the aspect of social stratification. He said that if any anthropological concept content has to come is the policy document then it is imperative that it should deal with the people's voices and also how the community is going to be benefited. He further said that we should not forget the people, the rights of the people and their voices. He assured to submit his comments after reading the comments put up for discussion.

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

8. Dr Claude Alvares, President, Goa Foundation spoke next. He informed that they would send their detailed comments on para 7.10 i.e. Mineral Development & Protection of Environment. He emphasized that the context for these discussions is the parameters laid down by the Supreme Court in the Odisha judgment – on the issues of ‘sustainable development’ and ‘intergenerational equity’; and any meaningful discussion should include these concepts. He supplemented the suggestions made by the Director, ASI that we need to have a framework which includes the concerns of the people and communities. He emphasized that the Committee has been handed an historical mandate in the sense what this Committee does with this report is going to govern the country’s mining in the next 10 years or more. He said that civil societies are generally perceived as organizations people opposed to mining and clarified that this perspective is incorrect. Mining has to be regulated in a certain way and the policy should lay down the parameters in which mining has to be done. He recounted the experience of mining in Goa, which is suspended every now and then because some rules have been violated or some procedures have not been followed and also gave the examples of Bellary and Odisha. He said that mining should be conducted in a sustainable manner and the Policy should lay down the parameters which should not be compromised while mining. The Policy document should not only assure the mining industries but also the environmental groups, the groups that represent the tribal communities and so many other groups – so that they don’t have to keep going to the Courts repeatedly to deal with their problems. He emphasized that the Committee should work for a policy framework which will prevent these types of distortions and obstacles coming in the way of undertaking sustainable mining. He mentioned the efforts made by Goa Foundation in understanding the concept of ‘intergenerational equity’ as to whether it represented three generations or seven generations or generations even beyond –in reading literature on this field, interactions with institutions like the World bank, IMF, CAG, Reserve Bank of India and the discussions with a large number of associated persons. He added that human civilization existed for more than 5000-10000 years and realizing this, they came up with the latest solutions all over the world and found that more than 55 countries are involved in sequestering these resources from mining in order to deal with the issue of intergenerational equity and debt sequester them through the mechanism of permanent fund. He suggested that whatever we get from the sale of resources, we should sequester them in a permanent fund, so that when resources are totally depleted and come down to zero, then at least we still have the capital kept aside in another form for the future generation. That this is the background to the idea of the permanent fund which has been accepted by Supreme Court in the case of Goa where already more than 250 crore rupees has been deposited in the Goa Iron Ore Permanent Fund which will be available for future generations and that these funds will only grow as more mining is done. Dr Claude Alvares invited his colleague from Goa Foundation to explain this before the committee.

9. Shri Rahul Basu on behalf of Goa Foundation mentioned about the basic set of 5 principles. The First Principle is that minerals are owned by the state as a trustee on behalf of the people and especially for future generations. This is a legal principle called Public Trust Doctrine – States are not owner of the minerals but it actually part of the commons. Second Principle is that none of us have created minerals, we have inherited them, just like with family-gold or any other inheritance, we do not have the right to

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

consume it, we have to make sure that our children inherit them. We are only custodians today; our children have to receive the minerals because it's inheritance now. This is the principle of intergenerational equity, the idea is what we inherit are our options, as long as we ensure that the next generation has at least the same amount of inheritance, then there is equity created. Third Principle is that if we mine, we are effectively selling our family gold because at the end of mining, we no longer have the mineral. Presuming we have got the value of the gold, we must ensure zero loss value which can be estimated easily, it's called economic rent, we must ensure that the economic rent tends to zero loss. Fourth Principle is that everything we receive we must save in this new asset. Now if it is an individual, we can save in land but at the national level, there's not in that much land to purchase. What most countries have done like Botswana, Chile, Norway are the example; they have taken the money from the mineral sale of their family gold and put it into essentially in a big Mutual Fund and ensure that to the extent of inflation you put money back, so that the corpus keeps increasing. Fifth Principle is to ensure income beyond the real income from the fund. He said that we all own the mineral, we all own the fund and we all own the income being generated by the fund and just give it equally to everybody.

10. Shri Basu further stated that there is nothing fairer or more equal especially in the context of article 39B of the Constitution which talks of common good. Applying the principle of common good to minerals there is a certain implication for the way we draft the policy and if the policy is really not drafted in that way, that is not fully compatible with these some of the things which needs to be changed. He also mentioned that the two key things in MMDR Act are mineral conservation and mineral development. Mineral Conservation, he said, is to be understood in the context of conserving minerals because once minerals are extracted it is gone - we want mineral conservation to be redefined as the conservation of the value of the minerals. He said that minerals are owned by the entire society, all of that value must remain as part of the commons. Mineral Development happens when you extract minerals. In Goa overburden is found mixed with a number of minerals which need to be segregated for use like beneficiation. We are basically converting valuable material into junk by mixing up bentonite, red oxide and make it into mud - this is valuable stuff, we cannot create overburden. We cannot create minerals so mineral development must include zero waste mining - every single bit of value must be extracted for the minerals because we cannot create, we cannot be so wasteful with it. He further mentioned that when we talk about royalty, there are at least three different conceptions of royalty - income or revenue for the government, tax which is not the same as income or revenue, economic service provider and the fourth which is what Goa Foundation believes - it is none of the three as in no case is it income of the government because when you sell the family gold it is not income - it is sale of a asset. Mineral receipts must be treated as a capital receipt not as the revenue receipt in the books and because it's a trust asset and the public trust account the money must go into the public trust account of the State just like is happening with the National Investment Fund when the Government of India is divesting from assets the money is put into the Public Trust Account and then in to the National Investment Fund, then by extension the role of Ministry of Mines should not be focused on how much mineral can be extracted - it should be how much of the value of the minerals has been protected.

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

11. Member Secretary responded to the papers submitted by the Goa Foundation there are few concepts which are quite conceptual in nature they also address some of the issues and we would include them in the policy as guiding principle. He requested Goa Foundation to draft a paragraph on intergenerational equity for inclusion in the Policy documents which could be discussed in the next meeting. After that Member Secretary requested Shri S R Hiremath to give his point of views.

12. Shri Hiremath, Founder President, Samaj Parivartana Samudaya started his comments by giving a background to the cause being espoused by them and why they decided to move the Honorable Supreme Court. He requested the Committee to read the judgment delivered the three judge forest bench of the Honorable Supreme Court of India which is a landmark judgment dated 18th April 2013. He said that the ground realities were just astonishing - it was reckless and irresponsible mining which has adversely affected the people living in the area. Few miners basically stole the mineral wealth of this country throwing not only the laws of the land to the winds but the very Constitution. He said that Government of Karnataka in 2007 asked Justice Santosh Hegde, Retd. Judge of the Supreme Court, who was the then Lokayukta of the State, to investigate this illegal mining and conduct an enquiry and submit a report. The report was a very comprehensive report. Part 1 was submitted in 2008 and the next one came while the Supreme Court case was going on that was in 2011. He said that the three judge bench had to invoke powers under article 142 of the Constitution and had to use extraordinary powers to cancel the mining licenses of 51 C Category mines. He mentioned that Mr. Anil Agarwal from Centre for Science and Environment who produced an excellent report which he urged the members to go. The report is titled 'Rich Lands, Poor People - Is Sustainable Mining Possible' and he quoted a para from this report for the Committee to ponder over and incorporate it in the review of this policy: *'governments in India love to talk about poverty but usually serve the interest of the contractor and the companies the trouble is that mineral exploitation can easily destroy the natural resource base of the Poor forest and biodiversity in particular unless there is a strong governance of these resources which involve the local people instead of alienating them'*. He said that nature can never be managed well unless people closest to it are involved in its management and healthy relationship is established between society, culture and nature; and India has a long history of diversified, decentralized community control systems which will have to be involved in the new challenging situations. He said that just as the government is giving the industry role in the development of the country the pros and cons have to be debated very seriously. The natural resources *Jal, Jungle, Zameen, Khanij, Beejare* integrated and closely related to the livelihood of the vast majority of our people. It is important to consider how to involve them in the decision making process for their own survival, for their culture and their values - they are bound to understand the importance of the environment that plays in their lives. He said that from 1979 he has been working in the villages. He said that local people are far wiser, they understand the importance of natural resources, they understand the working of Mother Nature and these great assets for their very survival and they will be able to manage it better. He said that the members should read judgments like the Samantha judgment and provisions of the PESA Act. He said that

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

that the government should rule with the consent of the governed as it is a very widely accepted concept worldwide.

13. Member Secretary responded to that in compliance of Hon'ble Supreme Court Orders this Committee has been constituted and all participants have been invited. He appreciated the views put up by Shri S R Hiremath and requested him to frame a policy paragraph for the Policy document.
14. Shri Hiremath further mentioned the common good principle enshrined in Article 39 should be kept in mind and that we need to learn from our experiences and move forward in the direction that should serve the people of this country.
15. Dr K R Rao, Chairman thanked Goa Foundation, Samaj Parivatana Samudaya for their inputs. He said that the review of NMP is being done in very transparent and consultative manner that is why all the interested stakeholders are being invited and comments/views are being taken from them. He clarified that draft policy will be kept in the Ministry's website for comments to be given not only by State Government/Ministries and Associations but also for the individuals/activists and whoever is interested in the mining sector. After that he invited representative from ICFRE for put their views before the Committee.
16. Representative from ICFRE mentioned that they have covered the importance of forest conservation and rehabilitation, environmental management including the abandoned area and said that they will go through the comments already given by different organizations and provide more inputs in this regard. She said that ICFRE recommends undertaking studies on carrying capacity before providing mining concessions.
17. Representative from NITI Aayog shared his experience of being a forest officer for 20 years. He said the existing policy takes care of many aspects including conservation of tribal people etc. He mentioned that the National Mineral Policy 2008 is the finest document. He said that whatever happened in Goa or Jharkhand was a failure of Governance as the mining departments could not enforce the law properly. He again mentioned that the new points which have been raised by Goa Foundation like intergenerational equity are really very interesting and need to be incorporated. He expressed his concern about happened after the MMDR Act was amended. The overall growth of the mineral sector is really getting hampered. The issues affecting the growth of the mineral sector require to be attended seriously- otherwise our country is going to be affected adversely in economic terms. The contribution of the mining sector in GDP has reduced from 2.4% to 1.3%. Being a big country with a huge population we require harnessing the mineral resource to provide a strong employment base to the people. However, we need to undertake exploitation in a proper manner considering the conservation aspects, environment aspects and forest aspects. He emphasized that exploration which is to be given through auction need to be changed. When the NMP 2008 talks about seamless transition from RL to PL to ML that should be there. We requireexploiting our mineral resources so that country can grow. He mentioned his experience in Jharkhand BCCL where they have done a fantastic job in rehabilitation and

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

recounted his contribution to rehabilitation of more than 4000 to 5000 hectares of mined areas. He said that we take care of environmental aspects. With regard to mineral sector, he said that to encourage exploration there should be seamless transition of RP to PL to ML so that really we can explore all mineral resources. He said that the forest department and ICFRE's views on forest area and eco fragile area should be taken care of. So once an area is declared as 'in-violate' by the Forest Departments, no exploration / prospecting should be allowed in this area to avoid inconveniences to companies who are allowed to do RL or PL but when they come for Mining Lease they are stopped since it is an eco-sensitive or eco-fragile area – this unpleasantness should not be allowed as it is not the right approach towards companies who are putting their hard earned money in exploration. He suggested that the Forest Departments should declare the area as eco sensitive or eco-fragile beforehand. He suggested that regarding clearances there should be a single window system. The forest department and environment departments have introduced online system but it still requires improvisation. Some timeline should be there. Objections should be raised in one go so that the private companies are not harassed by raising objections a number of times. After that Dr K R Rao, Chairman invited the representative from Goa to put their view before the Committee as they were attending the first time.

18. Shri Prasanna Acharya, Addl. Secretary, Govt. of Goa assured that detailed comments will be sent later after getting the approval from the Government of Goa. He supplemented the Goa Foundation's views on intergenerational equity but he added that the focus should be on sustainability first - if we don't sustain ourselves there's no question of intergenerational equity. So the first goal and objective should be that we survive first – the needs of the present generation are taken care of and subsequently we can definitely take care of the intergenerational equity. He said that the government faced various difficulties like there was an SLP order which was passed in favor of the leaseholders where Goa has had concessions granted by Portuguese Government because of which there was an issue with regards whether they are to be treated in perpetuity or after the Abolition Act of 1987 are to be treated at par with other leases granted on the MMDR Act. High Court upheld the validity of Abolition Act. However, the lease holders managed to get an order from Supreme Court wherein it allowed them to carry on mining operations till they decide on the SLP. Unfortunately, it remains pending without a decision and mining was being carried on. He complimented Goa Foundation for the PILs filed by them, for doing a great job for the protection of environment. He said that we need to compliment such organizations for their serious concerns about protection of environment. He said that they have taken their guidance on intergenerational equity. He mentioned that Goa is in mining operations since 1950. Initially it was done manually and subsequently after 1955 it became mechanically and overall they are around 60-65 years into mining and we're going to exhaust our mineral resources. The collections made in GIOPF are kept in fixed deposits and we shall not touch whatever is the collection made under GIOPF the reason being that once we exhaust our resources in Goa, we won't be left with any major mineral with us - the concept of intergenerational equity wherever possible we have always borrowed. He said that valuable suggestions from the concerned citizens need to be taken into account for protection of environment. The role of the government should be to ensure sustainable mining. He said that he is glad that for the

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

first time public opinion is translating into law. After that Dr K R Rao, Chairman invited FIMI to give their comments.

19. Shri R. K. Sharma, President, FIMI started his first comments by clarifying on the words 'indigenous' and 'tribal' - he said that in India we don't use word indigenous and we always use tribal because indigenous is a word more appropriate with countries like Canada and US. Second, he stated that we should incorporate a separate para for the safeguarding the interest of the tribal people in the new policy. Member Secretary supplemented his concern and assured to include it as a new para. Third, on sustainability he mentioned that 74% of the mining leases covering 9% of the area is from 0 to 50 Hectares and 84% of the mining leases covering 16% of the area is from 0 to 100 Hectares. So our mining leases should be sustainable first. He mentioned that Govt. of Rajasthan gave 30000 leases, out of which 27000 were of 1 Hectare, 3000 were 2-5 Hectares - when leases themselves are not sustainable how the mining can be sustainable. Dr K R Rao, Chairman mentioned that issues regarding welfare of the tribal people and sustainability were also discussed with the new Assistant Secretaries and assured to incorporate the same and to expand on sustainability in the new policy.
20. Shri Naresh Kumar, DIG, MoEF&CC mentioned that he has not gone through this document yet and supplemented the concerns expressed by NITI Aayog. He said that we should not plunder our resources - we should do sustainable mining and in this forest department is always with the mining sector or coal sector, if only we emphasize on sustainable mining. Second issue he mentioned was that minerals are mostly located in thick forest areas, national park, sanctuary or other reserve forest areas - we have to clearly demarcate the areas in which mining can be done and once it is decided then we should not touch the other areas - the policy should address this so that mineable areas are demarcated for mining forest clearance can be given. However, he cautioned that we should conserve areas demarcated as in-violate areas - it should not be a situation where today we mine here, next year we mine there and after 20 years we will mine everywhere.
21. Dr K R Rao, Chairman asked Niti Ayog to give comments on in-violate areas. Member Secretary again mentioned that there is a deadline given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court which we all have to follow and requested all the representatives to send their view/suggestion by 6th of October in a para-wise format so that the first draft of the new policy could be prepared by 13th of October. He further mentioned that as we have to keep the policy for public consultation for one month, we will have to prepare with the final document by the end of October.
22. Shri Karunakar representative of FICCI supplemented the comments of NITI Aayog regarding the survey and exploration. To attract huge investment required to explore new deposits using latest technology in addition to NMET funds, private investment should also be encouraged by incentivizing exploration. Policy should bring in methods to provide surety for the exploration company to progress towards mining lease. Member Secretary desired to discuss the issue in detail by the Committee and incorporated in the policy document if found appropriate.

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

23. Member Secretary requested all the members to send their comment on intergenerational equity so that it can be incorporated in the new mineral policy document. He mentioned that the expertise of Goa Foundation can be used for formulating a paragraph for inclusion in the policy document.
24. Odisha Government has sent their written comments on NMP 2008. The additional suggestion from Odisha were discussed during the meeting. The policy should have a built-in mechanism/institutional mechanism to monitor the implementation of the policy either at state level or at the regional level. After the MMDR Act 2015, the exploration is de-incentivized, as at present only the blocks which are explored to the level of G3 or G2 are auctioned. Prospecting can be incentivized either by providing ROFR to the private companies undertaking prospecting or by compensating them by defraying the expenditure incurred by them.
25. Representative from Ministry of Steel mentioned that intergenerational equity should be understood from the perspective of reusability of minerals. She reiterated the need for faster statutory clearances, as at present 33 clearances are needed before the mines become operational. Member Secretary mentioned that M/o Steel's comments are reasonable and requested them to send their comments in a para-wise format.
26. Shri B R V Susheel Kumar, DMG, Telangana stated that the Andhra Pradesh was the only state which enacted a legislation which provided for grant of mining lease and prospecting licence in the tribal areas to individual tribals or the societies or PSUs. As on 2011 the statistics in this regard shows that out of 175 mining leases / prospecting licenses granted in tribal areas, only 6-7 were granted to APMDC (a PSU) and all other leases were granted to tribal societies or the individuals. The problem raised was the inability of the tribals to raise fund for mining and the solution to this problem is finance them through banks. Shri Susheel Kumar opined that if this package is not in place then the tribals living in mineral rich areas will not able to avail the provisions of the legislation enacted for them. Therefore, he said, investments, technologies and equipment should be made available to them for carrying out the mining operations. Shri Susheel Kumar further said that in a similar manner when bauxite deposits were reserved for APMDC they employed 200 tribals and they are being paid and being given technical training. He said that the policy should have measures to facilitate transfer of benefits of mining to tribals living in the area. He further informed that MOEFCC clearances should be in a single window system. As per the NMP 2008 the grant for mineral concession is in a time bound manner. He suggested that the EC / FC should be issued in a time bound manner.
27. Shri Roopwant Singh, Commissioner, D/o Geology and Mining, Gujarat said that their comments which range from mineral conservation and development to strengthening of compliance regime. He said that over the past years they have been in the process of evolving mineral specific policy for certain minerals like construction related minerals and industry related minerals which have large OGP area in Gujarat but could not capitalize that. He mentioned that during the evolving of those policies, the few things

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

that emerged were that the mineral policy should focus not only on mineral exploration but also on auction support, market research, and support by giving industry status. Finally, it should lead to infrastructure support towards promoting trading. Further, he suggested that rather than having a 10 year policy, we should have five year policies - the goals of which should be directed towards productivity, resource availability and strengthening the compliance regime as it is seen in leading nations like Canada and Australia. He mentioned his experience of the visit to Australia as part of delegation from Ministry. They spend huge amount on exploration, have high compliance level on environmental aspects; and even though they have an allotment regime, their mining is very efficient and extremely compliant. He submitted that the policy should promote efficient and compliant mining and assured to send comments.

28. Representative from Andhra Pradesh Government informed that they have submitted the comments. In addition to written comments a few more aspects were raised by him during the meeting. The current policy which ensures transparency in grant of leases provided through e-auction of major minerals should be extended to minor minerals also. To curb illegal mining monitoring by the state governments should be strengthened. He mentioned that since states are having insufficient funds, NMET funds should be allocated to the state governments. Member secretary responded to that as the state governments are getting the royalties in full, the state governments should allocate a part of that money to strengthen state machinery to curb illegal activities. Further, he said that Mining Surveillance system using GIS in generating triggers on illegal mining and the training to use the system is also being provided. The last aspect which the Andhra Pradesh representative mentioned was the delay in environmental aspect which is a concern to the mining industry, which should be addressed by MOEFCC.
29. Representative of FICCI suggested including goals to vision statement mentioned in policy document in terms of quantitative parameter like percentage of GDP or some other parameters which are pre-determined. Further, he mentioned about the pricing parity of the ores. He gave example that aluminum, copper, zinc and gold which all are based on London Metal Exchange wherein other indexers are iron ores, bauxite, manganese which all are Market determined. If the government could provide for an ideal reference pricing perspective or some kind of indices which will determine overall market industry as such. Member Secretary asked for details on this point. FICCI representative mentioned about the cluster centric approach for small deposit. One way to put it forward is in case certain entities who have better EC or larger EC, they can come together to have economies of scale. Member Secretary mentioned that Ministry has received many comments on small deposits and these will be discussed to be incorporated them in the policy.
30. Shri Ranjan Sahai, Controller General, IBM mentioned that most of the issues which have been discussed pertain to the major minerals but if we see the mining industry, by large the minor minerals have got a very important role right now and there is a great need to add a separate para in the policy regarding minor mineral. For that purpose, the issues like intergenerational equity, sustainable development and the vision for curbing and checking illegal mining in respect of major minerals should also be included with reference to minor mineral in a separate para.

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

31. Representative from Tamilnadu Government asked for inclusion of issues of regulatory mechanism for beach sand minerals in the policy; and added that value addition, import etc. shall also be included under the ambit of 23C of MMDR Act. Exporting of any kind of material should be based on a certificate for mineral being legally mined and with a valid transport permit which the Custom authorities should check.
32. Dr K R Rao, Chairman asked DMG, Telangana to draft a separate para drawing from his experience with respect to the initiative of APMDC for tribal welfare, which could be incorporated in the new policy document so that there could be policy enabling framework for economic and technical empowerment of tribal in exploring and exploitation of the minerals in their geographic area.
33. Dr K R Rao, Chairman again mentioned that the policy will be kept in the public domain for around 4 weeks for comments/suggestions from the tribals, tribal communities, civil societies, the public at large and government organizations.

The meeting ended with thanks to the Chair.

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

ANNEXURE

List of participants who attended the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review NMP 2008 held on 26.09.2017

1.	Dr. K Rajeswara Rao, Additional Secretary	Ministry of Mines
2.	Shri Bipul Pathak, Joint Secretary	-do-
3.	Ms. Veena Kumari. D, Director	-do-
4.	Shri P. Vinay Kumar, Under Secretary	-do-
5.	Shri Roopwant Singh, Commissioner	CGM, Gujarat
6.	Shri R. Palaniswamy, Commissioner	D/o Steel & Mines, Tamilnadu
7.	Shri Ranjan Sahai, Controller General	Indian Bureau of Mines
8.	Shri S. K. Popli, Special Secretary	D/o Steel & Mines, Odisha
9.	Shri Prasanna A. Acharya, Addl Secy. &	Govt. of Goa
10.	Shri V S Gaur, Joint Secretary	NITI Aayog
11.	Ms Promodita Sathish, Economic Adviser	M/o Steel
12.	Shri Vinay Kumar Srivastava, Director	Anthropological Survey of India
13.	Ms. Alarmelmangai. D, Director Geology &	Govt. of Chhattisgarh
14.	Shri Naresh Kumar, DIG F	MoEF&CC
15.	Shri J S Bindra	M/o Coal
16.	Dr. Sujeet Nayan, ASA	Archeological Survey of India
17.	Shri B R V Susheel Kumar, Director	D/o Mines & Geology, Telangana
18.	Shri S I Minz, Director	D/o Mines & Geology, Jharkhand
19.	Dr. P.K. Jain, Chief Mineral Economist	IBM, Nagpur
20.	Shri R. Saravanabhavan, Senior Research	NITI Aayog
21.	Shri Suresh Narayan Meshram, ADG	GSI, Nagpur
22.	Shri D. Nagaraju, Joint Director	DMG, Andhra Pradesh
23.	Dr. V Jeeva, Scientist F	ICFRE
24.	Shri S. Sudarsanam, Deputy Director	DMG, Tamilnadu
25.	Shri R. K. Nalwaya, Additional Director	Department of Mines, Govt of
26.	Shri R K Sinha, CG (Retd.)	Indian Bureau of Mines
27.	Shri Pushpender Gaur, Deputy Controller of	Indian Bureau of Mines, Delhi
28.	Shri Priyadarshi Sidhanta, Advisor	CII
29.	Shri Manish Mishra	Tata Steel, CII
30.	Shri R. K. Sharma, Secretary General	FIMI
31.	Shri G Karunakar	FICCI
32.	Shri Kumar Ankit	-do-
33.	Shri Gouranaga Sen, Senior Business Analyst	Vedanta , FICCI
34.	Shri Shantanu Dubey	FICCI
35.	Ms Leena Vereukar	-do-
36.	Ashutosh Guru	-do-

Minutes of the third meeting of the Committee constituted to review the National Mineral Policy 2008 held on 26.09.2017

37.	Shri Rajeev Moudgil	MESCO Steel, ASSOCHAM
38.	Shri Sherry V Thomas	ASSOCHAM
39.	Shri A K Kothari	MEAI
40.	Shri Deepak Gupta	-do-
41.	Shri M. Mahadevan	GM (RP & S), NMDC Ltd
42.	Shri Claude Alvares, President	Goa Foundation
43.	Shri Rahul Basu	-do-
44.	Ms Sumana Nandi	-do-
45.	Shri S R Hiremath, President	Samaj Parivartana Samudaya
46.	Shri A K Gahlot	WAPCOS
47.	Shri Mahendra Singh, Legal Consultant	-do-