

CEC Meeting Date	Theme
16.01.2012	<b>Mining Tenement System (MTS)</b>
	<p>Chairman desired that the proposed system should be put on the Ministry's portal. Additional Secretary (Mines) suggested that the pre-grant stage of mining leases should also be incorporated in the process. Director, Government of Karnataka pointed out that forest records were not available which made it difficult to demarcate boundaries. Commissioner, Government of Gujarat emphasized the need to structure in vehicle tracking system in the MTS. Principal Secretary, Government of Goa requested for ensuring that there was no duplication in the systems developed by the State Governments. Chairman clarified that MTS would largely be a Central system enabling a minimum common core functions /processes, with each State having facility for customization of the MTS for some of its specific needs.</p> <p>Considering the fact that the To-be processes for MTS had been prepared after studying the existing systems in four States, it was decided that:</p> <p>(a) all the important mineral producing State Governments should furnish their comments within 15 days on the draft To-be processes which would be circulated by the Ministry.</p> <p>(b) Committee to be set up in IBM with inclusion of all important mineral producing States and the first meeting to be held by the 16th February 2012.</p> <p>(c) Nodal officers to be appointed by the State Governments for execution of this project.</p> <p>(Action: M/o Mines, All State Governments and IBM)</p>
27.03.2012	<p>3.1 Representative from M/s Ernst &amp; Young gave a brief update on the progress of the MTS project, and stated that in spite of mailing the 'To-Be' and 'FRS' Report to important mineral producing States, several States were yet to respond. It was agreed that M/s Ernst &amp; Young may proceed with preparation of DPR without any further delay, and if any comments were received in the meantime, the same may be accommodated to the extent possible. (Action: M/s Ernst &amp; Young)</p> <p>3.2 On a specific query from the State Governments on linking of existing systems or systems being developed in the States, it was clarified by the Ministry that the MTS is not conceptualized as a parallel system, and that all the existing legacy data at State level would be suitably linked into the MTS by the vendor who would be developing the MTS. However, in order to do so the State Governments should immediately communicate details on the systems already in use or those being developed, along with the hardware already available with the State Government to M/s Ernst &amp; Young through their concerned nodal officers listed in Annexure II in the questionnaire circulated by M/s Ernst &amp; Young. (Action: All State Governments)</p>
28.06.2012	<p>M/s Ernst and Young, consultants for development of Mining Tenements System (MTS), informed that the Detailed Project Report and draft MoU had been given to the IBM. It was clarified that the MoU had been structured to allow the State Governments engagement in data sharing and Systems operationalisation, keeping in view the existing capabilities of the State Governments. It was pointed out that while the process of developing MTS was being undertaken, parallelly there was a need to initiate action on geo-referencing of the mineralized areas. It was decided that:</p>

	<p>(a) The draft MoU would be circulated to all the important mineral producing States.</p> <p>(b) The Steering Committee would be empowered to finalize the financial arrangement for funding the cost of development of MTS.</p> <p>(c) The likely margin of error in the GIS component would be defined and standardized.</p> <p>(d) All existing holders of Mining leases would be directed to complete the geo-referencing of their lease area, while areas held under mining lease and relinquished by the lease holders in the past would be identified for geo-referencing by the State Governments.</p> <p>(e) All the areas held under Reconnaissance Permits and Prospecting Licence would be geo-referenced on GIS maps at a scale of 1:25000.</p> <p>(Action: IBM and all State Governments)</p>
21.09.2012	<p>5.1 The representative from IBM gave a short presentation on the status of progress made in the MTS project. It was further apprised to all the participants that a meeting had been held under the chairpersonship of Additional Secretary (Mines) on 20.9.2012 with the nodal officers of the State Governments and the concerned officers of IBM, where the draft Detailed Project Report was discussed. Some of the important recommendations that emerged in the meeting on 20.9.2012 on the way forward for the MTS project, are given below:</p> <p>(i) The project is being contemplated as a Central Sector Scheme. It was recommended that the Scheme may include a provision for technical manpower support to the States, and hardware/equipment support to needy States.</p> <p>(ii) GIS maps should be authenticated by the States through Space/ Remote Sensing Agency/ Departments as already being done by some States.</p> <p>(iii) Survey of India maps digitized by NIC should be used as base map.</p> <p>(iv) Concurrent implementation of the project at the Centre/IBM, States and GSI should be undertaken.</p> <p>(v) The project would be envisioned for a period of seven years, with implementation period of 2 years followed by stabilization period of 5 years.</p> <p>5.2 The DPR along with above modifications was endorsed by the CEC, and was recommended for approval by the Core Committee. It was also agreed that the draft MoU be executed between the State Governments and the IBM expeditiously.</p> <p>(Action: All State Governments and IBM)</p>
15.01.2013	<p>The Committee was informed that the Detailed Project Report (DPR) of MTS had been approved by the Core Committee in its meeting held on 31.10.2012. M/s Ernst &amp; Young Pvt. Ltd. had been requested to prepare Expression of Interest (EOI) and Request for Proposal (RFP) as per approved DPR. The MoU to be signed between the State Governments and IBM has been finalized. State Governments were requested to sign the MoU with IBM by the end of January, 2013 so as to enable further appropriate action in the matter.</p>
	<b>Illegal Mining</b>
16.01.2012	<p>The Committee undertook State-wise review of the action taken to curb illegal mining. Chairman reiterated the need for regular monitoring by the Task Force at the State and District Levels with proper coordination with the Forest authorities at the State</p>

	<p>level. It was informed by the representative from the Ministry of Railways that after the procedure for checking the rake wise transit permits had been introduced, there had been a drop in the loading capacity (up to 48% in Odisha, up to 38% in Karnataka and up to 8% in Jharkhand), due to restrictions on vehicle movement, limited working hours of State DMGs, and manual stamping processes. It was also stated that while the Committee of Secretaries (CoS) had taken a decision to ensure rake wise transit permit check for iron ore, State Governments were seeking similar systems from the Railways for all minerals, which was administratively not feasible for the Railways. Representative of the Ministry of Steel pointed out that the Sponge Iron units were facing severe raw material shortage due to restrictions on movement of ore from Odisha. Further, it was informed that the e-auction system in Karnataka was facing problems in Karnataka due to restrictions on transportation, whereby after mineral was loaded into the rake, separate forest permits were required to be furnished for dispatch. After discussion on the subject it was decided that:</p> <p>(a) Representatives from the Ministry of Railways, the Government of Karnataka and the Government of Odisha would consult and prepare a position paper indicating the modifications that may be necessary in the CoS decision, within 15 days. (Action: M/o Railways, State Govts. of Karnataka and Odisha)</p> <p>(b) The Ministry of Mines would write to the Government of Karnataka to review the need for separate permits by DMG and the Forest departments, and if these permits could be integrated. (Action: M/o Mines)</p> <p>(c) Representative from the Ministry of Shipping stated that directions had been given to all the Major ports to insist on verification of transit passes by DMG, and in case of non-major ports the Ministry had requested all State Governments to issue suitable directions to such ports. Representative from the Department of Revenue stated that the process for harmonization of the 13 grades of iron ore with the HS Codes was under finalization. Chairman stated that in view of the ongoing consideration in the Government to introduce effective monitoring of export of iron ore in the country, there was a need to assess whether the data on mineral export captured by the Customs on I/E codes could be used by the IBM to check the source of minerals. It was also decided that the State Government of Odisha would give a report on the possibility of linking Import / Export Code with the transit pass generation system developed by Odisha. (Action: Government of Odisha/IBM)</p>
27.03.2012	<p>8.1 While reviewing the status of various steps taken by various State Governments to curb illegal mining, representative from the Ministry of Railways pointed out that due to uncertainties in clearing of trucks for rake loading, especially in Odisha, the freight indents had decreased significantly in the eastern sector. It was further requested that Odisha Government should immediately introduce 24 hour truck weighing capacities, even if manual weigh bridges are being used, so that the freight movement can be planned optimally. (Action: Government of Odisha)</p> <p>8.2 Representative from the State Government of Karnataka stated that post Supreme Court interim directions for conducting e-auctions for iron ore in Karnataka and allocating a portion of the sale proceeds to Development Fund, the State Government had accumulated sizeable funds. It was further stated that the State Government was considering increasing the total ore transported by rail in the State to 70% of total production in order to reduce load on the roads. To this effect, the State Government would be</p>

	<p>keen to fund any project to increase rail connectivity in the State, for which it has even identified certain routes. Representative from State Government of Odisha also stated that the Government of Odisha was also keen on such projects using State funds. Representative from the Railways stated that while Third party models and PPP models was proposed by the Railways to develop mega-handling capacities through a separate Logistics Corporation to be identified, the Railways would separately examine this issue with the both the State Governments to evolve a workable model in the light of the CoS decision. Secretary (M) desired that representatives from Railways and both the State Governments of Karnataka and Odisha should hold a meeting and submit a paper on this.</p> <p>(Action: Ministry of railways and Governments of Karnataka and Odisha)</p> <p>8.3 Representative from Railways pointed out that several State Governments were seeking that the system of rake-wise counter-checking of the transit passes through State DGM introduced for iron ore should be extended to other minerals like granite, sand etc. It was further stated that bringing all the minerals under this system would not be feasible administratively. It was also stated that the models for e-connectivity being considered in linking the transit passes to rake challans was a departure from the CoS decision, and it was suggested that it would be appropriate to approach the CoS on this issue. Secretary (M) directed that Railways may send a comprehensive proposal in the matter so that the same can be then taken up with the CoS.</p> <p>(Action: Ministry of Railways)</p> <p>8.4 Representative from the State Government of Odisha was reminded to send all the necessary information sought by the Justice MB Shah Commission of Inquiry, as lying pending, at the earliest to the Commission of Inquiry without delay.</p> <p>(Action: State Government of Odisha)</p> <p>8.5 Representative from the Government of Karnataka pointed out that the data on export of iron ore, furnished by the Customs did not tally with the port data on material moved out through ships. Representative from Customs pointed out that the Customs data should be taken as correct, since export duty is paid on every tonne of ore exported. It was agreed that the State Government may first take this issue in the State Coordination-cum-Empowered Committee meeting, and if the issue is not resolved, may refer to the CCEC.</p>
28.06.2012	<p>The Committee then took up state-wise review of Action taken to curb illegal mining. It was pointed out by the representative of the Ministry of Steel that the State Government of Odisha was imposing restrictions on movement of iron ore to domestic steel plants situated out of Odisha, especially in Karnataka. Representative from the Railways pointed out that there was an under-utilization of the rake capacity due to delays in issue of transit passes, limited operational timings of weight bridges, etc. Representative from the State Government of Odisha informed that while the ore movement to the ports had been streamlined, the State Government was working closely with the Railways to streamline the Transit pass issue system in the State with the Railway systems. The Committee held that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. All the State Governments should regulate mineral movement through ensuring that transit passes are issued only for mineral transactions between registered persons under Rule 45 of the MCDR, 1988.</li> <li>b. All State Governments to create a mechanism for ensuring that the monthly returns on mineral transactions are scrutinized and data analyzed.</li> </ol>

	(Action: All State Governments)
21.09.2012	<p>2.1 Action taken by the State Governments for curbing illegal mining was reviewed. It was observed that quarterly report on number of cases of illegal mining detected and action taken by the State Governments till June 2012 had been given only by Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal. Chairman requested the remaining State Governments to submit the returns immediately, and directed that the IBM should monitor this closely.</p> <p>(Action: All State Governments and IBM)</p> <p>2.2 During discussions, it was pointed out by the representative from Railways that due to restrictive practices by the State Government of Odisha, the rake movement in the eastern sector has fallen by 50%, implying that the rakes are idle, causing loss to the Government. It was clarified by the representative from the State Government of Odisha that ore movement has been affected due to truckers strike and stopping of issue of transit passes to mechanized mines which were not complying with the Orissa Minerals (prevention of theft, smuggling, &amp; illegal mining and regulation of possession, storage, trading and transportation) Rules, 2007. It was further informed that the situation has now been resolved and it was assured that the ore movement would be restored to normalcy soon.</p> <p>(Action: Government of Odisha)</p> <p>2.3 The representative from Railways stated that the Railways had held discussions with the State Government of Odisha and Karnataka on paperless check mechanism on the ore transported through Railways. A trial run of the system had been undertaken and the Railways were proposing to shortly send a paper to the Ministry of Mines. In this context, representative from State Government of Karnataka and Railways pointed out that while clearance from Mines department was covered under the proposed system, the checks by the Forest Department would still remain outside the system. A concern was raised by the representative of State Governments of Chattisgarh, Jharkhand, Odisha and Madhya Pradesh that such checks by Forest Department are ongoing since the Forest Department continues to classify ore as a forest produce. It was decided that the Ministry would take up this issue with the MoEF and State Government of Karnataka.</p> <p>(Action: Ministry of Mines)</p>
15.01.2013	It was observed with concern that only Gujarat and Rajasthan has sent their latest Quarterly report on illegal mining Chairman observed that stringent action should be taken against each and every case of illegal mining in order to ensure that the exploitation of natural resources subserves public interest
14.05.2013	Secretary (Mines) appreciated the efforts made by Rajasthan, where a police force of 450 staff headed by an Additional D.G. exclusively for preventing illegal mining was in position. He said that the various initiatives taken by the Ministry viz. implementation of Rule 45, the proposed Mining Tenement System, amendment in Rule 37 and Rule 15 would greatly help in curbing incidence of illegal mining.
	<b>Expediting Environment and Forest Clearances</b>
16.01.2012	14.1 As decided in the previous CEC meetings, all State Governments had to send a list of cases awaiting forest clearance to the MOEF, so that they could be expeditiously followed up. It was noted that the Governments of Chhattisgarh, Gujarat and

	<p>Rajasthan had sent their lists to the Ministry of Mines, which were forwarded to the MoEF. All other State Governments were requested to send their respective lists to the MoEF directly, under intimation to the Ministry of Mines, at the earliest. (Action: All State Governments/MoEF)</p> <p>14.2 It was informed that the Working Group constituted under the chairmanship of Additional Secretary (mines) to evolve software solution for monitoring the pendency of FCA applications at the State Government level, had already held a series of meetings and arrived at conclusions on all aspects of the software. The representative from the MoEF informed that the said software had been operationalised from 2nd January, 2012. The software had different categories of applications submitted by various agencies for forest clearances, mining being one of them. He also informed that the MoEF had issued detailed guidelines on the working of the software, and training programmes in the regional offices for the State functionaries had also commenced. He also stated that the nodal officers would populate the data in the software, which was expected to be completed by March, 2012. Additional Secretary (Mines) emphasized that all applications needed to be first registered by the nodal officers, and then sent to the State Forest Officer.</p> <p>He said that the guidelines on the subject and the list of nodal officers could be sent to the Ministry of Mines, for circulation among the State Mining and Geology Departments. (Action: MoEF)</p> <p>14.3 On the question of generation of a unique ID, the MoEF representative clarified that the system would generate a unique ID No. for each application on the basis of the LOI issued by the State Government. Chairman stressed that all applications should be accepted and registered at the Nodal Officer level so that the system captured them immediately, and its status was available to the users online. (Action: MoEF)</p> <p>14.4 Chairman desired to know whether applications for wildlife clearance could be integrated with the system, and whether the system could generate a single UID No. for both forest as well as wildlife clearances. He desired that this could be given a thought by the Forest Department in consultation with the Wildlife Division. (Action: MoEF)</p>
27.03.2012	<p>14.1 As decided in the previous CEC meetings, all State Governments had to send a list of cases awaiting forest clearance to the MOEF, so that they could be expeditiously followed up. It was noted that the Governments of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Gujarat and Rajasthan had sent their lists to the Ministry of Mines, which were forwarded to the MoEF. All other State Governments were requested to send their respective lists to the MoEF directly, under intimation to the Ministry of Mines, without further delay. (Action: All State Governments/MoEF)</p> <p>14.2 Additional Secretary (Mines) mentioned that the Coal and Mines Planning and Development Institute (CMPDI) had submitted an interim report on the impact of boreholes on the wildlife and fauna &amp; flora. Further progress in that regard needed to be ascertained. He also said that as mentioned in the previous meeting of the CEC, the software for monitoring the pendency of FCA applications had become operational in January, 2012. However, further steps in terms of issuance of guidelines on the subject, training of the MoEF personnel, and circulation of list of Nodal Officers, could not be ascertained, since there was no</p>

	representation of the MoEF in the meeting. Additional Secretary (Mines) hoped that the MoEF had done the needful in this respect. The status of these aspects would, however, be sought from the MoEF separately.
21.09.2012	<p>13.1 As decided in the previous CEC meetings, all State Governments had to send a list of cases awaiting forest clearance to the MOEF, so that they could be expeditiously followed up. It was noted that the Governments of Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Jharkhand and Rajasthan had sent their lists to the Ministry of Mines, which were forwarded to the MoEF. All other State Governments were requested to send their respective lists to the MoEF directly, under intimation to the Ministry of Mines, without any further delay, so that the matter could be followed up with the MoEF. (Action: All State Governments/MoEF)</p> <p>13.2 The MoEF had informed in the CEC meeting held on 16.1.2012 that the software for monitoring the pendency of FCA applications at the State Government level had been operationalised in January, 2012. The MoEF had also informed that it had issued detailed guidelines on the working of the software, and training programmes in the regional offices for the State functionaries had also been conducted. The MoEF had also informed that the nodal officers would populate the data in the software, which was to be completed by March, 2012. The MoEF was to issue guidelines on the subject; organise training programmes for the MoEF personnel; and circulate list of the Nodal Officers.</p> <p>13.3 No representative from the MoEF attended the CEC meeting on 21.9.2012. It was decided that the position on the afore-said points would be ascertained from the MoEF. (Action: All State Governments/MoEF)</p>
	<b>Mining Plans</b>
16.01.2012	<p>Representative of the Department of Atomic Energy suggested that mining plans for beach sand minerals like monazite should be approved by both the DAE as well as the IBM. COM, IBM stated that since the IBM was not technically competent to comment on existence of beach sand minerals, the DAE should continue to approve the mining plans for these minerals. It was desired that a proposal covering all aspects of the matter may be submitted in this regard by the IBM. (Action: IBM)</p>
27.03.2012	<p>7.1 JS (MR) apprised all the State Governments on the directions of the Supreme Court dated 27.2.2012 in the matter of auction of extraction rights for minor minerals, especially on the need to obtain environmental clearance for areas less than 5 hectare also. He also stated that the IBM had prepared a model guideline on Mining Framework of minor minerals/cluster mining/ Reclamation and Rehabilitation on the basis of guidelines suggested in the recommendation in the Report of the Group set up in the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF). Representatives of the State Governments stated that they were generally in agreement with the guidelines of the MoEF and IBM. However the Supreme Court's direction making it mandatory for obtaining environmental clearance of the MoEF for all minor mineral mining for area less than 5 hectares would not be feasible, as the small miners do not have the competency nor capability to obtain such clearances. It was also apprehended that with such tight regulations, most of the small miners would be unable to obtain environmental clearances and cases of illegal mining of minor minerals would increase. The State Governments stated that it was being considered by them to file a review petition with the</p>

	<p>Supreme Court to grant them additional time to ensure compliance. On a suggestion from the Ministry, the State Governments agreed broadly to seek adequate empowerment under the EIA notification for enabling grant of environmental clearance at District level itself for such small mines for minor minerals.</p> <p>7.2 Secretary (M) desired that all the State Governments may send their comments in the matter to the Ministry, along with the request for delegation of powers to the District level under the EIA notification, so that the same may be taken up with the MoEF at the earliest. (Action: All State Governments)</p>
28.06.2012	<p>The action taken by the various State Governments on the Supreme Court order dated 27th February 2012, in the SLP(C) No 19628-19629 of 2009 and in SLP(C) Nos. 729-731/2011, 21833/2009, 12498-499/2010, SLP(C)CC..16157 &amp;CC18235/2011, in the matter of mining of minor minerals, was reviewed. It was pointed out by the State Governments that while the time-limits for environmental clearance in the EIA notification was 105 days, environmental clearance normally took 2-3 years, and this delay might lead to increase in instances of illegal mining. It was stated by the representative from Andhra Pradesh that mineral rights for minor minerals were being auctioned by their State Government only after obtaining environmental clearance for the entire cluster. The Chairman suggested that similar model could be tried by other State Governments also, while the matter is taken up with the Ministry of Environment and Forests. After discussions, it was decided that:</p> <p>(a) State Government of Odisha would send a comprehensive proposal for streamlining the system of obtaining Environmental Clearances to the Ministry of Mines, which would be then taken up with the Ministry of Environment and Forests. (Action: Government of Odisha)</p> <p>(b) In the meantime, all the State Governments should immediately amend their Minor Mineral Rules to incorporate the model guidelines prepared by the IBM. (Action: All State Governments)</p>
21.09.2012	<p>It was apprised that the IBM has redrafted its existing norms and guidelines for preparation of Mining Plans with a view to reduce discretions and facilitate transparency. These guidelines are available on the website of the IBM, and comments have been invited. It was requested that the State Governments should immediately sent their comments by the 30th September 2012 in order to facilitate the IBM to finalize the same. (Action: State Governments)</p>
15.01.2013	<p>11.4 The representative of the IBM pointed out that as per Rule 22(4A) of MCR 1960, State Governments have been empowered to approve mining plans of 29 minerals listed therein. It was stated that despite such a provision the mining plans of all major minerals from State of Chhattisgarh were being submitted to IBM for approval resulting in extra burden for their officers. The representative of the State Government attributed this to the shortage of trained officers in the State Government. Chairman observed that the State Government should take immediate steps for performing the - activity assigned to it. Chairman desired that the State Government train its officers for performance of the job assigned to them as per provision of MCR 1960, within six to eight months. IBM may not be in a position to continue to perform the work beyond 30th September, 2013.</p>
	<b>Royalty</b>
16.01.2012	<p>It was informed that the IBM had circulated a Questionnaire to all the States seeking comments on the rates for Royalty and Dead</p>

	<p>rent. Since this information was necessary to the Study Group to review rates of royalty and dead rent, and complete the exercise in a timely manner, it was requested that State Governments may send their feedback by 30th January 2012 to the IBM. (Action: All State Governments)</p>
27.03.2012	<p>12.1 JS (MR) pointed out that the Ministry had recently been made aware that the State Government of Odisha, through a circular dated 7.9.2010, had started demanding a flat royalty charged at maximum value of royalty payable on the highest grade of iron ore on lower grades of iron ore also in total violation of Rule 64 of the MCR, 1960. The representative from Ministry of Steel stated that this issue has come to their notice and such demand from the Odisha Government was impacting the Steel industry that had set up beneficiation and pelletization plant for low grade ores, and such a measure was a strong disincentive for development of capacities for utilization of low grade ores in the country. Secretary (M) directed that the State Government of Odisha should stop the operations of the circular and immediately send a clarification in the matter to the Ministry. (Action: Government of Odisha)</p> <p>12.2 All the representatives of the State Governments were informed that the IBM had sought inputs on revision of royalty rates through a questionnaire (which is also available on the website of IBM). It was requested that the information should be sent immediately to the IBM in order to avoid delay in completing the process of reviewing the rates of royalty rates and dead rent. (Action: All State Governments) 12.3 Representative from the State Government of Tamilnadu stated that tonnage based royalty rates was preferable over ad valorem rates, especially for beach sand minerals where PMV reported was distorted due to intermediaries involved in export of ore. IBM was requested to look into the matter through the Monitoring Committee set up for the purpose at the earliest in consultation with the State Government of Tamilnadu. (Action: IBM)</p>
28.06.2012	<p>8.1 It was apprised by the Ministry that a draft Report on rates on royalty had been circulated to all the members of the Study Group. It was requested that all the State Governments, who are the members of Study Group should immediately furnish their comments to the IBM. (Action: All State Governments)</p> <p>8.2 Taking into account the concerns of the Government of Odisha on the calculation of average sale price by the IBM for iron ore, the Committee directed that IBM should immediately start displaying the prices of top ten mineral producers for iron ore on the website, apart from sharing the data with the State Government. (Action: IBM)</p> <p>8.3 Ministry of Mines pointed out that the Industry Associations had brought to the notice of the Government that the State Government of Odisha was assessing and levying royalty on higher value of either iron ore lump or processed form of lump on the iron ore Fines generated during processing of ore vide State Government circular No5905/SM-AUD-SM-17/2010 dated 7.9.2010. It was clarified to the State Government that this practice was not in consonance with Rule 64B of the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 and should be immediately withdrawn to avoid litigations. Chairman requested the State Government of Odisha to immediately withdraw the said circular, since it is in violation of the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960. (Action: Government of Odisha)</p>
21.09.2012	<p>The representative of the Government of Odisha stated that the comments of the State Government on assessing and levying</p>

	<p>royalty on higher value of iron ore lump/processed form of lump/ iron ore fines generated during processing of ore has been sent to the Ministry recently. It was clarified by the IBM that such classification would create administrative problem as the number of classification would increase in each grade of ore. It was decided that this issue may be discussed in detail by the State Government in the Monitoring Committee meeting of the IBM at the earliest.</p> <p>(Action: IBM)</p>
	<p><b>Strategic Plan for the Ministry of Mines</b></p>
16.01.2012	<p>M/s Mckinsey India Ltd gave a presentation on the Strategy Plan for Indian Mining Sector, prepared for the Ministry of Mines. Director, Government of Karnataka emphasized the need to interlink the data generated by all exploration agencies. Secretary, Government of Odisha stated that there was a need to delineate between bulk and non-bulk minerals, whereby mining lease for bulk minerals should be given only by auction. It was further stated that there was a need for tighter monitoring of RP and PL data filing requirements, single-window clearance systems, Regional level planning, and a clear definition of the role of the IBM and the State Government in regulation of the sector. It was decided that all State Governments would furnish their comments by the 31st January 2012.</p>
27.03.2012	<p>It was apprised by JS (MR) that a Strategy Paper for Ministry of Mines for unlocking the potential of the Mining sector has been uploaded on the website of the Ministry. It was stated that the primary objective of sharing the Strategic Paper with the State Governments was to ensure common goals and strategy for development of mining sector. Accordingly it was agreed that all the State Governments would prepare a State level Strategy Paper for their Department, which should invariably include plan for modernization of Departments of Mining and Geology, with fund requirements for implementation. (Action: All State Governments)</p>
21.09.2012	<p>1.1 The State Governments were requested to review/prepare their respective mineral policies in terms of the Strategic Plan document for the mining sector, and send a copy to the Ministry of Mines. (Action: State Governments)</p> <p>1.2 The State Governments were also requested to review the strengthening of the State Directorates of Mining and Geology. Representatives from the State Governments of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan stated that they were facing shortage of manpower, which is restricting them from modernizing their Directorate of Mining and Geology. Representative from State Government of Andhra Pradesh informed the CEC that their Government has prepared a model organization structure for the State Mining and Geology Directorate. Chairman desired that the model organization structure developed by State Government of Andhra Pradesh could be used by all the States for reviewing the organization strengths and structures of Directorates. He requested State Government of Andhra Pradesh to forward a copy of model organization to all the State Governments under intimation to the Ministry. (Action: Government of Andhra Pradesh)</p>
	<p><b>Other Special Issues Discussed</b></p>
21.09.2012	<p><b>Declassification of 'earth' as a minor mineral</b> The Ministry informed all the participants that NHAH had requested that „earth“ when used for filling</p>

	<p>purposes and for building embankments for roads should not be considered as a minor mineral, since obtaining environmental clearance in terms of Supreme Court order was impacting all its projects. The State Governments were of the view that such declassification was not acceptable, and it was requested that instead of taking it out of the minor mineral list, the matter should be taken up with the Ministry of Environment and Forests for delegation of powers to grant environment clearance for such activity at the District level with separate set of guidelines.</p>
18.06.2010	<p>11. Proper utilization of Periphery Development Funds contributed by mining companies to the State Government</p> <p>11.1 Special Secretary (Mines) stressed on the need for utilization of Periphery Development Fund contributed by the mining companies to the State Government. He reiterated that all State Governments need to put in place a well defined policy on the subject which would bring a sense of 'no loss' to the local community. Government of Andhra Pradesh was advised to intimate the mechanism to utilize 20% Periphery Development Fund in tribal areas consequent to SAMATHA judgment. The State Governments were advised to intimate the status of action taken by them. (Action: Ministry of Mines/ All the State Governments)</p>
	<p>Proper utilization of Periphery Development Funds contributed by mining companies to the State Government.</p> <p>10.1 JS (MR) emphasized the need for proper utilization of periphery development funds allocated by mining companies to the State Governments/Development Committees. It was recalled that the Government of Andhra Pradesh was requested vide letter No.4/4/2006-M.VI dated 25.9.2009 to intimate the mechanism to utilize the 20% periphery development fund in tribal areas consequent to Samatha judgment. JS (MR) stated that any guidelines by the Ministry would have to be in the light of the Court judgments on the subject.</p>
15.01.2013	<p>While appreciating that some State Governments have framed Rules under Section 15 of the MMDR Act, 1957, they were also impressed upon the need to report compliance to directions issued by the Apex Court on 27.2.2012 in the Deepak Kumar case. Continuing deliberations on this matter it was appreciated that the Government of Rajasthan has reported compliance by amending their Minor Mineral Concession Rules. Other States were also requested to take similar action urgently. Representative of MoEF stated that the opinion of the Department of Legal Affairs, M/o Law and Justice was being sought on whether the reporting compliance by the State of Rajasthan was sufficient for the State to obviate the need for obtaining Environment Clearance for mining projects in areas less than 5 hectares in the case of Deepak Kumar. It was agreed that action by the State Governments and MoEF may be taken in parallel.</p>
15.01.2013	<p>3. Secretary (Mines) informed the participants that the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Coal and</p>

	<p>Mines, which was examining the MMDR Bill, had given its recommendations on 7 th May, 2013. The observations and recommendations of the Standing Committee would be studied by the Ministry. The Bill would have to be examined in the light of the Standing Committee’s recommendations. After obtaining Cabinet’s approval, it would again go to Parliament. He informed that a core group of 5 members had been constituted under the chairpersonship of Special Secretary (Mines) to look into the provisions of the Bill and related aspects. He said that the Bill was in public domain, and if the State Governments had any inputs or comments on any aspect, they must send them to the Ministry within two weeks.</p>
14.05.2013	<p><b>Boundary Pillars</b>  The representative of Gujarat suggested that boundary marks, pillars and GPS coordinates should be linked with mining lease, which would be helpful in curbing illegal mining to a large extent. The Karnataka representative said that the pillars should be coloured in yellow so that they were clearly visible from satellite. There was general agreement that the gap between 2 pillars, in case the boundary was in straight line, should be 50 metres. On the issue of permissible limits of error, Shri R. Sahai, Controller of Mines, IBM suggested that margin of error could be as prescribed in the Metalliferous Mines Regulations, 1961. Secretary (Mines) agreed to the suggestions and desired that there should be standardized guidelines on the subject. While issuing the guidelines, it should be ensured that there is absolute clarity in the communication, and proper referencing of the earlier guidelines has been done, in order to avoid any confusion. He also said that the legal position, wherever applicable, should be followed scrupulously by the State Governments and IBM.</p>
14.05.2013	<p><b>MMDR Bill, 2011 – Maximum Lease Area</b>  Secretary (Mines) informed the participants that the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Coal and Mines, which was examining the MMDR Bill, had given its recommendations on 7th May, 2013. The observations and recommendations of the Standing Committee would be studied by the Ministry. The Bill would have to be examined in the light of the Standing Committee’s recommendations. After obtaining Cabinet’s approval, it would again go to Parliament. He informed that a core group of 5 members had been constituted under the chairpersonship of Special Secretary (Mines) to look into the provisions of the Bill and related aspects. He said that the Bill was in public domain, and if the State Governments had any inputs or comments on any aspect, they must send them to the Ministry within two weeks.  It was informed that the Ministry had received an audit observation from the C&amp;AG with a query as to whether the Ministry has considered restricting the maximum area up to which relaxation can be granted for mining lease under section 6(1)(b) of the MMDR Act, 1957. A note on the subject was circulated in the meeting, which was considered by the CEC. It was noticed that such requests have</p>

	<p>been, by and large, entertained for certain specific minerals viz. limestone and gypsum, as their occurrences are in levels of 2 to 4 metres requiring large areas, precious stones, gold and associated minerals where the occurrence is small and needs to be located over expanse of a large area. The CEC noted that the MMDR Bill, 2011, which was introduced in Lok Sabha on 12.12.2011, had been examined by the Standing Committee of Coal &amp; Steel, and the Committee had offered no comment on the maximum limit in a State of 500 sq.km for PL and 100 sq.km for ML, as proposed in the MMDR Bill. This could be considered as the upper ceiling for mineral concessions while considering relaxation of area under Section 6(1)(a) and 6(1)(b) of MM(D&amp;R) Act, 1957, till the new Act comes into force.</p>
--	---