

- (b) if so, the extent of this increase and the reasons therefor;
- (c) whether it is also a fact that Government had decided to sell a huge quantity of wheat in the open market to arrest this increase in prices;
- (d) if so, the quantities of wheat sold by Government in the open market from July, 2012 to November, 2012 along with the prices at which they were sold; and
- (e) the impact of this move on the selling prices of wheat?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (PROF. K.V. THOMAS): (a) and (b) The Wholesale Price Index (WPI) for wheat which was at 5.97% for the month of April, 2012, started rising from May, 2012 onwards except for month of July and was 19.78% for the month of October, 2012. The wholesale and retail prices of wheat as reported from the three major metros (Delhi, Mumbai, and Chennai) also showed an upward trend from April, 2012 to November, 2012. During this period, the wholesale prices were in the range of Rs. 1280-2600 per quintal and retail prices between Rs. 16-28 per kg.

The rise in the prices of wheat are due to supply-demand dynamics and distribution logistics.

(c) to (e) During July, 2012 to November, 2012, Government has allocated 95 lakh tonnes of wheat under Open Market Sale Scheme (OMSS), for tender sale to bulk consumers and sale to small private traders for the period upto February, 2013, with an objective to offload surplus stocks and to control price rise of wheat in open market. The reserve price for sale of wheat was fixed on 3.7.2012 at Rs. 1170/- per quintal. This was moved to Rs. 1285/- per quintal on 27.7.2012. It was revised on 30.8.2012 to Rs. 1285/- per quintal plus local levies and from 15.11.2012 freight was also added to this reserve price.

The increase in availability of wheat is likely to have a favourable impact on the market price of wheat.

#### **Implementation of TPDS**

†2507. SHRI RAGHUNANDAN SHARMA: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

- (a) whether various reports/assessments have shown that implementation of the

---

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

Targeted Public Distribution System (TPDS) in various States/regions is below satisfactory level and its targets have not been achieved completely;

- (b) if so, the details thereof and Government's reaction thereto;
- (c) the number of cases of corruption, pilferage, bogus cards etc. reported during each of the last three years;
- (d) the details of remedial steps taken in the matter; and
- (e) the steps taken by Government for strengthening the above scheme in various States?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (PROF. K.V. THOMAS): (a) and (b) This Department has been getting the functioning of Targeted Public Distribution System (TPDS) evaluated from different agencies from time to time. Such evaluation studies have revealed certain shortcomings/deficiencies in the functioning of TPDS, such as inclusion/exclusion errors, leakages/diversion of foodgrains, etc. The reports received are sent to the States/Union Territories (UTs) concerned for taking necessary remedial measures to remove the deficiencies noticed in the functioning of TPDS. The last evaluation study was undertaken through Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) (2007-11) in 14 States/UTs, for which survey was conducted by IIPA during 2007-08. Details of inclusion/exclusion errors and leakages/diversion of foodgrains mentioned in the report are given in the Statement-I and II respectively (See below).

However, in an independent study conducted recently by a group of research scholars and student volunteers, including Mr. Jean Dreze, Reetika Khera and others (2011), it has been stated that there has been an impressive revival of PDS across the country during the recent years. The group have based their findings on a study made in 106 randomly-selected villages, spread over two districts each in 9 States. Based on the survey made in May-June 2011, the researchers have brought out that there have been major initiatives in the recent past to improve PDS and these efforts are showing results. It has been also mentioned that the days when up to half of the PDS grain was diverted to the open market are gone. The study further points out that the average purchase of PDS grain by beneficiaries as a proportion of their full quota in the 9 States stood at 84%.

(c) to (e) There have been complaints regarding irregularities in implementation of TPDS including instances of corruption, leakages/diversion of foodgrains, prevalence of bogus/ineligible ration cards, etc. in some States/regions in the country. A Statement indicating number of such complaints received during each of the last three years is given in the Statement-III (*See* below). As and when complaints are received by the Government from individuals and organisations as well as through press reports, these are referred to the State Governments/UT Administrations concerned for inquiry and appropriate action.

In consultation with the State/UT Governments, a Nine-Point Action Plan was evolved in 2006, which *inter-alia* includes continuous review of Below Poverty Line (BPL)/Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) lists, and to eliminate bogus/ineligible ration cards, etc. A Statement giving details of the bogus/ineligible ration cards deleted by States/UTs during the last three years is given in the Statement-IV (*See* below).

Strengthening and streamlining of TPDS is a continuous process. Government has regularly reviewed and has issued instructions to States/UTs to strengthen functioning of TPDS by improving monitoring mechanism and vigilance, increased transparency in functioning of TPDS, adoption of revised Model Citizen's Charter, use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) tools and improving the efficiency of Fair Price Shop operations.

#### ***Statement-I***

*Consolidated figures of wrongful inclusion and exclusion of households indicated in IIPA (Phase-I) concurrent evaluation of TPDS study report*

| Name of State     | % of wrongful inclusion of households in BPL cards | % of wrongful exclusion of BPL households from holding BPL cards |
|-------------------|--|--|
| 1                 | 2  | 3  |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 67.3   | 31.3   |
| Manipur           | 73.8   | 20.2   |
| Nagaland          | 19.9   | 10.4   |

| 1           | 2    | 3    |
|-------------|------|------|
| Odisha      | 16.5 | 20.0 |
| Tripura     | 66.9 | 10.6 |
| West Bengal | 8.70 | 9.71 |

*Inclusion/Exclusion Errors in the IIPA (Phase-II) concurrent  
evaluation of TPDS study report*

| Name of State     | Inclusion errors in<br>percentage | Exclusion errors in<br>percentage |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Tamil Nadu        | 76.8                              | *                                 |
| Punjab            | 68.9                              | 16.5                              |
| Haryana           | 69.9                              | 13.5                              |
| Chandigarh        | 30.2                              | 38.6**                            |
| Andhra Pradesh    | 18.0                              | 9.0                               |
| Himachal Pradesh  | 26.1                              | 10.7                              |
| Jammu and Kashmir | 44.3                              | 10.3                              |
| Karnataka         | 37.6                              | 34.5                              |

*Note:* Inclusion error is based on percentage of BPL and AAY cardholders above poverty line, as obtained from the sample and projected to the total number of cardholders in each category. This is based only on income criteria using Planning Commission poverty line and should be read with caution. The high percentages are also because of the low poverty line. Exclusion error indicates the percentage of APL cardholders, who are below poverty line.

\* Tamil Nadu has universal PDS

\*\* In Chandigarh, nearly 3.7% of the poor households remain excluded because of failure to identify them.

**Statement-II**

*Consolidated figures of leakage/diversion of foodgrains  
(rice and wheat) indicated in IIPA and TPDS*

**I. Consolidated figures of leakages of foodgrains (rice and wheat) indicated in IIPA (Phase-1) Report in respect of States, namely Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Nagaland, Odisha, Tripura and West Bengal.**

| Sl.No. | State             | Leakage as Percentage of offtake |
|--------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1.     | Arunachal Pradesh | 14.88                            |
| 2.     | Manipur           | 27.00                            |
| 3.     | Nagaland          | 49.49                            |
| 4.     | Odisha            | 6.86                             |
| 5.     | Tripura           | 3.24                             |
| 6.     | West Bengal       | 26.84                            |

**II. Consolidated figures of diversion/leakages of foodgrains (rice and wheat) allocated under TPDS as indicated in IIPA (Phase-II) Report in respect of States/UT of Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Chandigarh.**

| Sl. No. | State/UT          | Percentage of diversion/leakage of foodgrains (Rice and Wheat) allocated under TPDS to AAY and BPL beneficiaries |
|---------|-------------------|--|
| 1.      | Haryana           | 8.69   |
| 2.      | Punjab            | Nil*   |
| 3.      | Chandigarh        | 13.6   |
| 4.      | Tamil Nadu        | 13.64  |
| 5.      | Andhra Pradesh    | Nil*   |
| 6.      | Himachal Pradesh  | 5.6  |
| 7.      | Jammu and Kashmir | 4.1  |
| 8.      | Karnataka         | Nil*   |

\*Nil percentage of diversion/leakage does not take into account diversion from one category to another category of beneficiaries (AAY/BPL/APL).

**Statement-III**

*Number of complaints on TPDS received in the department from individuals, Organisations and through media reports etc. from 2009 to 2011*

| Sl. No. | State/UT          | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
|---------|-------------------|------|------|------|
| 1       | 2                 | 3    | 4    | 5    |
| 1.      | Andhra Pradesh    | —    | 3    | 1    |
| 2.      | Arunachal Pradesh | —    | 2    | 2    |
| 3.      | Assam             | 6    | 1    | 1    |
| 4.      | Bihar             | 16   | 13   | 6    |
| 5.      | Chhattisgarh      | 4    | 5    | 1    |
| 6.      | Delhi             | 29   | 37   | 16   |
| 7.      | Goa               | —    | 1    | —    |
| 8.      | Gujarat           | 4    | 3    | 2    |
| 9.      | Haryana           | 5    | 24   | 7    |
| 10.     | Himachal Pradesh  | —    | —    | 4    |
| 11.     | Jammu and Kashmir | 1    | 3    | —    |
| 12.     | Jharkhand         | 6    | 5    | 3    |
| 13.     | Karnataka         | 6    | 2    | 1    |
| 14.     | Kerala            | 1    | 3    | 1    |
| 15.     | Madhya Pradesh    | 9    | 13   | 9    |
| 16.     | Maharashtra       | 12   | 5    | 8    |
| 17.     | Manipur           | —    | —    | 1    |
| 18.     | Meghalaya         | —    | —    | 1    |
| 19.     | Mizoram           | —    | —    | —    |
| 20.     | Nagaland          | 1    | 1    | —    |
| 21.     | Odisha            | 1    | 3    | 2    |

| 1      | 2             | 3   | 4   | 5   |
|--------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|
| 22.    | Punjab        | 1   | 2   | —   |
| 23.    | Rajasthan     | 7   | 6   | 6   |
| 24.    | Sikkim        | 3   | 2   | —   |
| 25.    | Tamil Nadu    | 6   | 2   | 3   |
| 26.    | Uttarakhand   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| 27.    | Uttar Pradesh | 46  | 33  | 68  |
| 28.    | West Bengal   | 4   | 2   | —   |
| 29.    | Chandigarh    | —   | 2   | —   |
| 30.    | Puducherry    | —   | —   | —   |
| TOTAL: |               | 169 | 174 | 144 |

***Statement-IV***

*Number of bogus/ineligible rations cards deleted by the State/UT Governments during the year 2009, 2010 and 2011*

| Sl. No. | State/UT          | 2009   | 2010    | 2011  |
|---------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| 1       | 2                 | 3      | 4       | 5     |
| 1.      | Andhra Pradesh    | 0      | 1681000 | —     |
| 2.      | Arunachal Pradesh | 3005   | 1028    | —     |
| 3.      | Assam             | 2936   | 43786   | 0     |
| 4.      | Bihar             | 151166 | 8813    | —     |
| 5.      | Chhattisgarh      | 240573 | 248924  | 97000 |
| 6.      | Delhi             | 58000  | 0       | —     |
| 7.      | Gujarat           | 540443 | 368469  | —     |
| 8.      | Haryana           | 236    | 2753    | —     |
| 9.      | Himachal Pradesh  | 203    | 762     | 762   |
| 10.     | Jammu and Kashmir | 0      | 0       | 0     |

| 1      | 2              | 3       | 4       | 5       |
|--------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|
| 11.    | Jharkhand      | 65000   | 0       | —       |
| 12.    | Karnataka      | 218488  | 817331  | 1450178 |
| 13.    | Kerala         | 114     | 0       | —       |
| 14.    | Madhya Pradesh | 0       | 0       | —       |
| 15.    | Maharashtra    | 0       | 1275482 | 1186385 |
| 16.    | Meghalaya      | 0       | 0       | —       |
| 17.    | Mizoram        | 831     | 0       | —       |
| 18.    | Odisha         | 101635  | 155183  | 0       |
| 19.    | Rajasthan      | 3092    | 0       | —       |
| 20.    | Sikkim         | 0       | 0       | —       |
| 21.    | Tamil Nadu     | 106678  | 2015    | —       |
| 22.    | Uttar Pradesh  | 51736   | 50797   | 19040   |
| 23.    | Uttarakhand    | 0       | 0       | —       |
| 24.    | West Bengal    | 675036  | 0       | —       |
| 25.    | Chandigarh     | 0       | 0       | —       |
| 26.    | Lakshadweep    | 300     | 0       | —       |
| 27.    | Puducherry     | 16      | 0       | —       |
| TOTAL: |                | 2219488 | 4656343 | 2753365 |

#### Poor protection of foodgrains

2508. DR. BHARATKUMAR RAUT: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government is aware of the fact that thousands of tonnes of foodgrains are being rotten in its granaries in various parts of the country, as it was kept with poor protection for too long;

(b) the details of foodgrains being kept in open under tarpaulins cover, which is not a good weather-proof material, State-wise;

(c) the details of foodgrains spoiled during the last rainy season, State-wise;