

(b) As per existing policy on meat export, the exporter is required to certify that the items have been obtained/sourced from an APEDA registered integrated abattoir or from APEDA registered meat processing plant; and that the raw material have been sourced exclusively from APEDA registered integrated abattoir/abattoir. There are only 49 integrated abattoirs/abattoirs/meat processing plants registered with APEDA wherefrom the meat product can be exported.

(c) Reviewing its policy on meat export is a regular feature. As per the existing Government of India's Meat Export Policy, the export of beef (meat of cow, oxen and calf) is prohibited and is not permitted to be exported. Only buffalo which are not fit for milch and breeding purposes are allowed to be slaughtered for exports. However, as per the distribution of legislative powers between Union of India and States, preservation of cattle is the matter on which the State legislatures have the exclusive powers to legislate. It is, therefore, for the State Governments to enact such legislations.

#### **Assistance to Gujarat for development of salt industries**

2649. SHRI MANSUKH L. MANDAVIYA : Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of Gujarat has proposed for grant of 50 per cent assistance from the Central Government in the projects for development of salt industry and welfare activities for the nomadic tribes agarias; and

(b) if so, what decision has been taken by the Central Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN) : (a) The Central Government had received a general reference from the Government of Gujarat in February 2012 suggesting that the Central Government may contribute 50% of the amount in the projects approved by the State Government for better welfare activities and development in salt producing areas.

(b) In the absence of any concrete and specific proposal, no decision could be taken. The State Government has been informed.

#### **Formulation of Modified Price Stabilisation Fund**

2650. DR. K. V.P. RAMACHANDRA RAO: Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a Modified Price Stabilisation Fund (MPSF) Scheme is being formulated by Government, if so, the details thereof;

(b) whether the scheme has been finalised, and what is the impact of the new scheme; and

(c) by when it is likely to be implemented?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN) : (a) Yes, Sir. The Price Stabilisation Fund (PSF) Scheme has been reviewed by various Committee set up by the Government from time to time, namely, Dr. Pranab Sen Committee, Rangachary Task Force and High Powered Sub-Committee. On the recommendation of these Committees, particularly High Powered Sub-Committee, a Modified Price Stabilisation Fund (MPSF) Scheme is being formulated.

(b) and (c) The restructured and Modified Price Stabilisation Fund Scheme, addressing the identified bottlenecks of the ongoing Scheme and making it more beneficiary friendly, is under consideration of the Government.

#### **Review of performance of AEZs**

2651. DR. K.V.P. RAMACHANDRARAO : Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) the State-wise and location-wise details of the Agri Export Zones (AEZs) set up in different parts of the country particularly in Andhra Pradesh;

(b) whether the performance of AEZs has been reviewed, if so, the details thereof; and

(c) what are the new proposals to set up AEZs?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN) : (a) The details of 60 Agri Export Zones (AEZs) notified in different part of the country, state -wise and location-wise including Andhra Pradesh is given in Statement. (*See below*)

(b) and (c) A peer evaluation of the existing AEZs was carried out in 2005 to assess the performance of AEZs. Some of the important findings of the peer evaluation include i) Lack of ownership by Government Authority and their Agencies, ii) Lack of awareness about the scheme and its conceptual framework among stakeholders including State Government field establishments, iii) Lack of project orientation in the conceptual design of AEZ, iv) Lack of coordination/monitoring system in AEZs, v) Non materialization of adequate public investment from Central and State Governments, vi) indiscreet proliferation of AEZs etc. On the basis of the recommendations of the Peer Group in 2005, it was decided not to consider notification of new AEZs unless there were strong compelling reasons.