

MINUTES OF THE 1ST INTER MINISTERIAL COMMITTEE MEETING CONSTITUTED FOR RECOGNITION AND REVIEW OF PRE-SHIPMENT INSPECTION AGENCY UNDER APPENDIX 5 OF HBP (Vol.-I).

Date : 13.07.2012
Venue: : Room No.4, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi
Time : 2.30 p.m.

Members present:

- (i) Shri D.K. Singh, IAS, Addl.DGFT
- (ii) Shri B.D. Ghosh, Addl.Indl. Adviser, Min. Of Steel
- (iii) Shri G.K. Panda, Scientific Officer (E), AERB
- (iv) Dr. Saroj, Director, MOEF
- (v) Shri S.K. Jain, D.O., DIPPP
- (vi) Ms. Shubhra, Jt.DGFT
- (vii) Shri B.K. Sachdeva, Dy.DGFT
- (viii) Shri D.C. Katoch, FTDO

The Chairman welcomed the members of the Committee and informed that the Department has received applications subsequent to the modifications of eligibility criteria for recognition of Pre-Shipment Inspection Agencies (PSIA) notified vide Public Notice No.104 dated 23.3.2012. There are 11 applications for recognition as PSIA.

2. The representative of AERB informed that radiation survey meters play an important role in monitoring metal scrap. Similarly, once a radioactive source is discovered, the radiation spectrometers play an important role in identification of the source. From the various applications received in the office for qualification of pre-shipment inspection agencies, it is not possible to establish whether the declared equipment will serve the intended purpose. Therefore, all the applicants may be requested to fill in and forward a questionnaire to AERB which is part of the minutes, as early as possible for further consideration of the applications.

3. The Committee after due deliberations took following decision in each case. The information not available in file is to be sought from the applicants for further consideration of cases.

-
Case No.1

M/s.ELBI Consultancy (India) Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata
01/53/162/95/PSIA/AM13/E-5/IC

The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (i) Firm is not a member of any of the Organisations prescribed in Col. 3 of P.N. No.104 dated 23.3.2012.
 - (ii) The intended area of operation for issuance of certificate has been indicated as Kolkata and they have not given the address of branch office from where the Inspection of the imported consignment will be carried out by them.
 - (iii) Firm has shown experience in metal inspection, though they were not recognised as PSIA in the previous list notified at App. 5. It was decided to seek the details from the firm in this regard.
 - (iv) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.
-

Case No.2

M/s.Worldwide Inspection Services Pvt. Ltd., Delhi
01/53/162/161/AM13/W-2/IC

Case No.3

M/s.Worldwide Inspection Service-SARL, Sengal
West Africa [F.No.01/53/162/AM13/W-3/IC]

Case No.4

M/s.Worldwide Inspection Service-SARL, Cotonou, Benin [01/53/162/168/AM13/W-4/IC]

-
The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (1) The Committee noted that the firm has filed 3 applications for recognition as PSIA i.e. for (i) Delhi, (ii) Senegal West Africa and (iii) Cotonou, Benin. However, the information provided in these three applications such as Equipments, manpower etc. is the same. It was decided to seek explanation as to why 3 different companies have the same equipment and manpower. Are they different companies or one entity only?
- (2) They do not have the mandatory equipment i.e. Radio Nuclear Identifier.
- (3) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.

Case No.5

M/s.Cayley Aerospace Inc., USA
01/53/162/140/AM13/C-8/IC

The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (1) The Committee noted that the firm is not a member of any of the Organisation prescribed in Col. 3 of P.N. No.104 dated 23.3.2012.
- (2) They have only one manpower for the purpose of carry out inspection which may not be sufficient.
- (3) They have not furnished copy of annual report / Balance Sheet.
- (4) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.

Case No.6

M/s.Gattini & Co., Mumbai
01/53/162/138/AM13/G-6/IC

The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (1) The firm is not a member of any of the Organisation prescribed in Col. 3 of P.N. No.104 dated 23.3.2012.
- (2) They do not have the mandatory testing equipment for testing metal scrap.
- (3) The intended are of operation for issuance of certificate has been indicated as Mumbai and they have not given the address of branch office from where the Inspection of imported consignment will be carried out by them.
- (4) The firm has shown experience in metal inspection, though they were not recognised as PSIA. The Committee, therefore, decided to seek explanation.
- (5) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.

Case No.7

M/s.Alex Stewart (International) Corporation Ltd., Latvia [01/53/162/138/AM13/G-6/IC]

The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (1) The firm is the member of MRAI only. MRAI was requested to verify the credentials of the applicant. However, their report is awaited. The Committee, therefore, decided to seek the credentials from MRAI.
 - (2) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.
-

Case No.8 M/s.Superintendence Company of India (P) Ltd., Kolkata [01/53/276/PSIA/AM13/S-30/IC]

The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (1) The firm is not a member of any of the Organisation prescribed in Col. 3 of P.N. No.104 dated 23.3.2012.
 - (2) They do not have all the three mandatory testing equipment for testing metal scrap.
 - (3) The Committee decided to seek the details from the firm.
 - (4) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.
-

Case No.9 M/s.NQAQSR North America, USA 01/53/162/298/AM13/N-8/PSAI/IC

The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (1) MRAI was requested to verify the credentials of the applicant. However, their report is awaited.
 - (2) The representative of AERB informed that from the list of mandatory equipment furnished by the firm, it appears that item no. (ii) & (ii) of the applicant would not be able to detect presence of radioactive material.
 - (3) The firm has not furnished copies of annual report / balance sheet.
 - (4) The Committee decided to seek the credentials from ISRI/MRAI and explanation from the firm on the above.
 - (5) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.
-

Case No.10 M/s.A.G. Associates, Mumbai [01/53/8/302/AM13/A-22/PSIA/IC]

The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (1) The firm is not a member of any of the Organisation prescribed in Col. 3 of P.N. No.104 dated 23.3.2012.
- (2) They do not have any of the prescribed mandatory testing equipment for testing metal scrap.
- (3) The Committee decided to seek the details from the firm in this regard.
- (4) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.

Case No.11

M/s.Ravi Energie Pvt. Ltd,. Baroda 01/53/162/366/AM13/R-13/IC

The Committee considered the application and pointed out following deficiencies:-

- (1) IFIA, ISRI, BIR and MRAI was requested to verify the credentials of the applicant. However, their report is awaited. The Committee, therefore, decided to seek the credentials from IFIA, ISRI, BIR and MRAI.
 - (2) Information in the proforma, prescribed by AERB.
4. The Chairman concluded the discussions informing the participants that the next meeting will be held shortly on receipt of requisite information from the applicants.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to the Chair.

Dear Applicants,

You must be aware of the fact that radiation survey meters play an important role in monitoring metal scrap. Similarly, once a radioactive source is discovered, the radiation spectrometers play an important role in identification of the source. We had received applications from various agencies for qualification of pre-shipment inspection agencies. From the mentioned model of the radiation monitors we could not make out whether they will serve the intended purpose. For this reason we have prepared a questionnaire. You are requested to fill in and forward the same to us early as possible for further consideration of your application.

Hand held survey meter

Make (name & of manufacturer)	Serial No.	Last date of calibration	Whether the monitor is suitable in the energy range 60 keV to 1.33 MeV (flat energy response)	Whether the monitor is suitable to measure dose rate from 1 urem/hour	*Response time of the monitor (in seconds)	Provision for alarm (audio & visual) setting
			Yes/No		Yes/No	Yes/No

Model	Make (Name & address of manufacturer)	Serial No.	Provision of self calibration	Whether the equipment is suitable in the energy	Whether the monitor is suitable to measure dose rate	Real Time Spectrum display	Storage and transfer of spectra to a pc	Time taken to identify a Cs-137 source in the radiation level of I	Automatic identification of normally encountered radionuclides like Co60,Cs-	Provision for alarm (audio & visual) setting
-------	---------------------------------------	------------	-------------------------------	---	--	----------------------------	---	--	--	---

Portable Spectrometer

				range 40 keV 40 to 3.0 MeV	from 1 µrem/hour			µrem/hour(in seconds)	137,Ir192,NORM etc.	
			Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No		Yes/No	Yes/No

*Response time: It is the time taken by a radiation monitor to stabilize the meter reading (typically it should be of the order of 2-3 seconds for field instruments at the natural background radiation levels).

Note: For practical purpose (for gamma radiation with whole body exposure): $1\mu R=1\mu rem=0.01\mu Gy=0.01\mu Sv=10nSv$