

(d) the reasons why despite Supreme Court's order, there are many cases of Aadhaar-based exclusion in the country?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI DANVE RAOSAHEB DADARAO): (a) to (d) A few reports have of late appeared in the media citing non-linking of Aadhaar with Ration Cards as one of the reasons for the difficulties faced by the beneficiaries under NFSA in getting their entitled quota of foodgrains. In this regard, the State Governments have informed that the allegations made in the media reports of deaths due to starvation have not been substantiated.

Further, provisions of the Notification issued under the Section-7 of the Aadhaar Act 2016, *vide* SO No. 371[E] dated 08/02/2017 [as amended from time to time] by the Department, all eligible beneficiaries entitled to receive subsidized foodgrains, under the National Food Security Act, 2013 [NFSA], who do not possess Aadhaar number or, are not yet enrolled for Aadhaar, but are desirous of availing the subsidized foodgrains, are required to make an application for Aadhaar enrolment by 30/09/2019, and also linking of Aadhaar with Ration Cards/Beneficiaries ensure correct identification of beneficiaries and their rightful delivery of subsidized foodgrains under NFSA.

This Department has issued instructions to all States/UTs *vide* letter dated 24.10.2017 that no beneficiary/household shall be deleted from the list of eligible beneficiaries/households only on the ground of not possessing an Aadhaar number, and shall also not be denied from subsidized foodgrains or cash transfer of food subsidy under NFSA due to failure of biometric/Aadhaar authentication because of network/connectivity/linking issues/poor biometric of the beneficiary or other technical reasons. This Department has again issued instructions to all States/UTs *vide* letter dated 08/11/2018 that owing to failure of biometric/Aadhaar authentication, no genuine beneficiary shall be denied from foodgrains entitled under NFSA.

Rottening of foodgrains

†2306. DR. KIRODI LAL MEENA: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

- (a) the details of the foodgrains storage capacity in the country, State-wise;
- (b) the details of the wheat rotted due to the shortage of godowns, during last three years, State-wise; and

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(c) the details of quantity of the foodgrains getting rotten in the godowns of the Food Corporation of India (FCI) along with the reasons therefor, State-wise?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI DANVE RAOSAHEB DADARAO): (a) to (c) The total storage capacity available with Food Corporation of India (FCI), Central Warehousing Corporation (CWC) and the State Agencies (both owned and hired capacity), is 862.45 LMT (as on 31.05.2019) comprising 739.76 LMT in covered godowns and 122.69 LMT in Cover and Plinth (CAP) storage. The State-wise details are given in the Statement-I (*See below*).

No wheat stocks have been damaged in FCI due to shortage of godowns during 2016-17 to 2018-19.

The foodgrains are stored scientifically with various preservation measures like fumigation and treatment with pesticides. In spite of taking necessary care and precautions, small quantities of foodgrains may become non-issuable due to various reasons like natural calamities, damages in transit, negligence of officials etc., for which action is invariably taken.

The State-wise details accrual of damaged foodgrains in FCI during the last 3 years and the current year is given in the Statement-II.

Statement-I

Total storage capacity available with Food Corporation of India (FCI) and the State Agencies (both owned and hired capacity) for storage of Central Pool Stock of foodgrains (as on 31.05.2019)

Sl. No.	State	Capacity (in LMT)
1	2	3
1.	Bihar	22.51
2.	Jharkhand	5.45
3.	Odisha	13.48
4.	West Bengal	19.24
5.	Assam	3.98

1	2	3
6.	Arunachal Pradesh	0.30
7.	Meghalaya	0.22
8.	Mizoram	0.67
9.	Tripura	0.99
10.	Manipur	0.49
11.	Nagaland	0.49
12.	Delhi	3.67
13.	Haryana	115.28
14.	Himachal Pradesh	0.53
15.	Jammu and Kashmir	2.43
16.	Punjab	233.99
17.	Rajasthan	29.60
18.	Uttar Pradesh	66.58
19.	Uttarakhand	2.94
20.	Andhra Pradesh	24.69
21.	Telangana	30.15
22.	Kerala	7.62
23.	Karnataka	12.78
24.	Tamil Nadu	31.36
25.	Gujarat	10.87
26.	Maharashtra	38.53
27.	Goa	0.00
28.	Madhya Pradesh	157.80
29.	Chhattisgarh	25.81
TOTAL		862.45

Statement-II

*Region-wise foodgrains stock accrued as non-issuable (damaged) in FCI
from 2016-17 to 2019-20 (as on 31.05.2019)*

Sl. No.	States/UTs	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 (as on 31.05.2019)
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Bihar	0	1617	3568	0
2.	Jharkhand	0	45	31	0
3.	Odisha	1	0	2	0
4.	West Bengal	0	0	12	0
5.	Assam	205	328	868	0
6.	NEF*	105	92	58	19
7.	Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	0	0
8.	Nagaland	3	0	0	0
9.	Manipur	0	0	0	0
10.	Delhi	12	14	2	0
11.	Haryana	0	0	0	0
12.	Himachal Pradesh	0	0	0	0
13.	Jammu and Kashmir	0	0	0	0
14.	Punjab	8	211	318	2
15.	Rajasthan	125	1	0	0
16.	Uttar Pradesh	48	243	116	8
17.	Uttarakhand	0	0	0	0
18.	Andhra Pradesh	6	0	0	0
19.	Kerala	88	2	113	0

1	2	3	4	5	6
20.	Karnataka	13	75	53	0
21.	Tamil Nadu	66	16	6	0
22.	Gujarat	119	6	19	0
23.	Maharashtra	7963	15	35	3
24.	Madhya Pradesh	0	0	5	0
25.	Chhattisgarh	12	0	7	0
TOTAL		8774	2665	5213	32

*NEF includes Tripura, Meghalaya and Mizoram.

Authenticity of online marketing

2307. SHRIMATI SHANTA CHHETRI: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government is aware that online market places provide comparison services of products but do not disclose the main parameters determining how offers resulting from a search query are ranked and the authenticity of product reviews;

(b) if so, whether Government has taken measures to protect the consumers' right to know who is actually selling the product or service and be provided with clear information prior to a purchase; and

(c) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI DANVE RAOSAHEB DADARAO): (a) Comparison services of products, ranking of offers resulting from search query and product reviews on online marketplaces are within the domain of the companies.

(b) and (c) In the case of online purchases, the rights of the consumers for making informed choices are protected through Legal Metrology Rules in the case of pre-packaged commodities by mandating the online marketplaces to ensure declaration of maximum retail price, name and address of the manufacturer, net quantity, common or generic name of the commodity, expiry date of the product on offer.