

#### **Ban on Endosulfan**

1405. SHRI R.C. SINGH: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that about 60 countries in the world have banned Endosulfan;
- (b) whether it is also a fact that some countries, after re-assessing its risks, have also banned the above pesticide;
- (c) if so, whether any assessment has been made in the country about the risks and benefits of Endosulfan;
- (d) if so, the details thereof; and
- (e) the reasons for not banning Endosulfan?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI HARISH RAWAT):  
(a) Yes, Sir. As per information available, about 60 countries have banned use of the pesticide Endosulfan.

(b) Australia, Brazil and USA have decided to end use of Endosulfan by 2012, 2013 and 2016 respectively on the basis of re-assessment of its risks and benefits. In fifth meeting of Conference of Parties (COP) to Stockholm Convention held in Geneva, Switzerland from 25 to 29 April, 2011, it was decided to list Endosulfan in Annex A with specific exemptions under Article 4 of the Convention.

(c) to (e) Use of Endosulfan has been reviewed on several occasions in the past. A committee headed by Director General (DG), Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) was constituted to review Endosulfan from health perspective. Another committee headed by Agriculture Commissioner was constituted to review alternative pesticides to Endosulfan. Subsequently, in writ petition (civil No. 213 of 2011 "Democratic Youth Federation of India vs. Union of India and Others", Hon'ble Supreme Court passed an ad-interim order on 13.05.2011 banning production, sale and use of Endosulfan in the country till further orders and appointed a joint Committee headed by the DG, ICMR and the Agriculture Commissioner to conduct a scientific study on the question whether the use of Endosulfan would cause any serious health hazard to human beings and would cause environmental pollution. The Committee was also directed by the Court to suggest alternatives to Endosulfan. Accordingly, the Central Government issued instructions on 14.05.2011 to all State Governments/Union Territories to implement interim orders of the Court *in toto*, which are binding on all manufacturers.

#### **Compensation for farm loss**

1406. SHRI B.S. GNANADESIKAN: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government will come forward to make necessary changes in the National Crop Insurance Scheme to provide compensation by calculating individual farm loss instead of calculating the loss for the entire notified area and calculating average yield loss in that area;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI HARISH RAWAT):  
(a) to (c) Under yield based schemes of National Agricultural Insurance Scheme (NAIS) and Modified NAIS, claims are assessed on the basis of actual yield which is estimated through requisite number of Crop Cutting Experiments (CCEs). Conducting CCEs at individual farm level is not possible for States. However, individual based assessment of claims in respect of localized calamities of hailstorm and landslide have been included under newly launched Pilot Modified National Agricultural Insurance Scheme (MNAIS). Similarly, under Weather Based Crop Insurance Scheme (WBCIS), weather data can not be recorded for individual farm level.

**Utilization of funds for construction of RCOF**

1407. SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the funds utilised for construction of Research Centres of Organic Farming (RCOF) is much less than the funds released for the same;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor and whether the unutilised funds are handed back to Government; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI HARISH RAWAT):  
(a) Details of funds sanctioned for construction of buildings of Regional Centres of Organic Farming (RCOF) and funds utilized by Central Public Works Department during 2010-11 are given below:

RCOF	Amount sanctioned (Rs. Lakh)	Expenditure (Rs. Lakh)
Imphal	117.69	117.62
Nagpur	50.00	46.21
Bangalore	240.00	175.23

(b) Main reason of unutilized funds was slower pace of construction than expected. As funds are drawn against bills, unutilized funds remain with the Government.

(c) Does not arise.