236 Written Answers to [RAJYA S.	-	S
(6) Chairman Railways Board	· Member	

(6) Chairman, Railways Board : Member

(7) CEO, NITI Aayog : Member

(8) CEO, NICDIT : Member

Secretary

(c) and (d) Details with respect to projects that have been evaluated, sanctioned, approved and completed are as under:-

No. of projects evaluated and sanctioned	No. of projects approved by Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA)	No. of projects completed
13	10	Six projects have been completed/ nearing completion under Delhi Mumbai Industrial Corridor (DMIC)

Keeping rubber outside the purview of RCEP

1338. SHRIMATI WANSUK SYIEM: Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there has been a widespread protest against India compromising on its domestic interest over the RCEP agreement currently under negotiations;
- (b) whether a similar pressure was exerted on India over the ASEAN agreement by major rubber producers Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam and Malaysia to bring rubber under the purview of ASEAN agreement, with India not succumbing to pressure tactics; and
- (c) whether the considered opinion of the relevant commodity board, Rubber Board, is that rubber be kept outside the purview of the RCEP?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL):
(a) to (c) During the 3rd RCEP Leaders Summit which was held on 4 November, 2019 in Bangkok; India stated that the current structure of the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) did not fully reflect the RCEP Guiding Principles or address the outstanding issues and concerns of India, in the light of which India did not join the consensus. Under the existing India-ASEAN Trade in Goods Agreement

Unstarred Questions

(IATIGA), natural rubber has been excluded by India in its goods offer to the ASEAN countries. The Government held stakeholders' consultations including with commodity boards like Rubber Board. All these inputs are considered in the negotiations for a balanced and mutually beneficial outcomes while protecting and addressing domestic sensitivities.

Payment of compensation by 'APEDA' to grape exporters

1339. SHRI AMAR SHANKAR SABLE: Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

- whether the Aurangabad High Court in their decision dated 30.9.2016 on Writ Petitions No. 1979/11 and 1314/11 had decided for payment of compensation by Agriculture and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority (APEDA) to the grape exporters of Marathwada for the losses incurred by them due to rejection of their consignments in Europe in 2010;
 - if so, the details thereof;
- the action initiated so far by Government for payment of compensation; and
- (d) the reasons for inordinate delay in payment of compensation to affected grape exporters of Marathwada?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL): (a) and (b) The Bombay High Court (Aurangabad Bench), in its judgement dated 30.09.2016 on Writ Petitions No. 1979/11 and 1314/11, had directed the Government to consider the grievance of petitioners and try to redress it as may be permissible.

- (c) As per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, the matter was considered in the Department of Commerce, in consultation with the other stakeholders and it was decided that it would not be possible to agree to the request of payment of compensation to the grape exporters.
 - (d) Does not arise in view of (c) above.

India-ASEAN FTA

1340. SHRI ELAMARAM KAREEM: Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state: