Decisions of Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change with respect to import and export of hazardous waste under the Hazardous Waste (Management, Handling & Trans-boundary Movement) Rules, 2008 as approved by the Competent Authority on the basis of Decision of the 65th meeting of Expert Committee held on 27th-28th January 2016 for appraisal of such applications.

On the basis of agenda-wise detailed deliberation, following are the Decisions of the Expert Committee:

**AGENDA ITEM 2.1: IMPORT OF ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ASSEMBLIES (EEAs), ETC.**

**2.1.1 M/s Agilent Technologies India Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore (F. No. 23-55/2011-HSMD):**

**Decision:** The Committee was informed that earlier also they had been given permission to import 650 refurbished spare parts out of which they have already exported 530 defective parts. Now, the applicant is proposing to import 2000 refurbished spare parts and has given an undertaking that equal no. of defective parts will be re-exported within a period of 2 years. The Ministry therefore recommended the import.

**2.1.2 M/s Bruker India Scientific Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore (F. No. 23-165/2015-HSMD):**

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the consignment has already been imported and is meant for charging of high value super critical magnet for NMR. The applicant is first time importer and as per CEC the life of the equipment is one year old and residual life is about 15 years. The Ministry therefore recommended the import.

**2.1.3 M/s Secure Meters Limited, Udaipur (F. No. 23-28/2012-HSMD):**

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the equipment being imported is an assembly line consisting of 4 units and is of 2011 make. As per CEC the equipment is fully functional. The Ministry therefore recommended the import.

**2.1.4 M/s Philips India Ltd., Pune (F. No. 23-207/2014-HSMD):**

**Decision:** The Committee was informed that the three models of equipment are being imported for carrying out investigation of the defects and prepare a report to be sent to the manufacturing unit. They will be re-exported within four months from the date of permission from MOEFCC. The Ministry therefore recommended the import.

**M/s Philips India Ltd. Bangalore, Gurgaon:**

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the item is of 2014 make and refurbished by the OEM. The Ministry therefore recommended the import of Mobile C Arm.

**2.1.5 M/s SH Electronics India Pvt. Ltd., Kancheepuram, TN (F. No. 23-171/2015-HSMD):**
**Decision:** The justification for importing used cables for connecting power supply to machines is not clear from the document supplied by the applicant. The Committee also noted that the item has already been imported. The Committee therefore suggested that the applicant may be called for presentation.

### 2.1.6 M/s Oberthur Technologies India Pvt. Ltd., Noida (F. No. 23-94/2015-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the equipment being imported is a machine capable of transferring and printing personal data on the cards. The residual life of the machine is 15 years as per CEC. The Ministry therefore recommended the import of the module and the personalized card machine, one no. each.

### 2.1.7 M/s Greenscape Eco Management Pvt. Ltd., Alwar, Rajasthan (F. No. 23-3/2016-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee was informed that the proposed import is of EEEs of different types (used computer, Mobile Phones, Electronic equipment, circuit Board and miscellaneous Electronic Waste) for repair and for re-export of the repaired equipment along with the defective parts and the rejects including non-electronic components. The Ministry therefore recommended the import of 550 MT of used EEEs as per the break-up given in the application subject to the condition that after repair all the repaired items along with the defective parts and other rejects from dismantling including non-electronic parts/ scrap will be re-exported within a period of one year from the date of issue of permission.

### 2.1.8 M/s Acer India (Pvt) Ltd., Bangalore (F. No. 23-28/2011-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the items being imported are repaired/refurbished parts/components for warranty replacement of defective parts/components. As reported by the applicant the defective parts/components are exported for repair/refurbishment. The Ministry therefore recommended the import of 60,926 nos. of used EEAs for repair purpose.

### 2.1.9 M/s Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, New Delhi (F. No. 23-122/2013-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Ministry recommended the import of 108 nos. of used electronic goods for testing in Delhi Metro trains subject to the condition that the same will be re-exported within 2 years.

### 2.1.10 M/s Communications Test Design India Pvt. Ltd.(CTDI), Gurgaon(F. No. 23-45/2012-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the reason given by the applicant for not importing the items against the permission given by the MOEF&CC in 2012 earlier is that the project was not ready for carrying out the repair work. Since the items have now been imported and the question of the validity of the earlier import permission has been raised by Customs, the Committee felt that the status of the project should now be known. In view of this the Committee suggested that the applicant may be called for presentation.
2.1.11 M/s Barco Electronic Systems Pvt. Ltd., Noida (F. No. 23-155/2012-HSMD):

Decision: The Committee noted that the items being imported are parts of Indian make machines which are coming for repair and for re-export after repair. The Ministry therefore recommended the import of 5500 nos. of electronic goods/parts subject to the condition that all repaired and un-repaired EEE will be re-exported within three months.

2.1.12 M/s Moog Controls India Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore (F. No. 23-172/2015-HSMD):

Decision: The Ministry recommended the import of 6 nos. of used Electrical & electronic items (Motor parts) from USA and one from Japan for repair and return within 3 months.


Decision: The Ministry recommended the import of 278 no. of electronic boards subject to the condition that same will be re-exported within 11 months.


Decision: The Committee noted that the principal company which awarded the project has now written that the project is extended for a minimum period of another two years. The Ministry therefore recommended the requested extension.

2.1.15 M/s Keysight Technologies, Bangalore (F. No. 23-150/2014-HSMD):

Decision: The Committee noted that the Company got NOC for import of items out of which only a few have been imported against 4 applications. Infact against 2 NOC they have not imported anything, this shows that the company has been getting NOC without proper estimation of the requirement. The Company has now applied for extension of earlier NOCs. The Ministry therefore decided not to recommend extension.

2.1.16 M/s Semi-Conductor Laboratory, Dept. of Space, Mohali, Punjab (F. No. 23-174/2015-HSMD):

Decision: The Committee noted the strategic use of refurbished motor by the laboratory of Department of Space, the Ministry therefore recommended the import of refurbished Motor, AC 8PRA#1, Model : MSM042A5F from Israel.

2.1.17 M/s Centum Electronics Limited, Bangalore (F. No. 23-190/2015-HSMD):

Decision: The Committee was informed that these PCBs were supplied by the applicant to EEEs produced by manufacturers abroad such as GE, ABB, AEG etc. The Defective PCBs are now being imported for carrying out repair and after repair will be re-exported within a period of 6 months from the date of permission. The Ministry therefore recommended the import of 3000 electronic PCBs.
2.1.18 M/s Cochlear Medical Device Company India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (F. No. 5-25/2015-HSMD):

**Decision:** Since the applicant did not turn up for the presentation, the matter was deferred by the Committee.

2.1.19 M/s Wesley Surgical, Hyderabad (23-4/2016HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the used medical equipment meant for laparoscopy has already been imported without prior permission of this Ministry. The year of manufacture is not known. The inspection report of the Chartered Engineer states that the item can be used after servicing and is not refurbished or reconditioned. There are no spare parts also along with the equipment. In view of this the Ministry did not recommend the import.

2.1.20 M/s Father Muller Hospital, Mangalore (F. No. 23-5/2016-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the equipment is 2009 make, however the equipment has been refurbished by Original Equipment Manufacturer and the CEC has indicated the residual life of 15-20 years. The Ministry therefore recommended the import.

2.1.21 M/s Hollister Medical India Pvt. Ltd., Bawal, Haryana (F. No. 23-231/2012-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the items are being imported from another unit of the company situated in Ireland and as per CEC the residual life is 10-15 years without any major overhaul. The Ministry therefore recommended the import.

2.1.22 M/s MP Medical Equipment & Supplies, Ahemdabad (F. No. 23-10/2016-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the medical equipment has already been imported and are for critical care purpose. The year of manufacture is not clearly indicated and has been estimated by Chartered Engineer (CE) to be 2007-2008. The residual life as per CE is 5 years and none of the items have not been refurbished. Moreover the equipment have neither been tested for functionality by the CE and nor have been supplied by the OEM. In view of the above the Ministry recommended the rejection of the application and as per the Hazardous Waste (Management, Handling and Trans-boundary Movement), Rules 2008 the items should be re-exported.

2.1.23 M/s Quest Diagnostics Pvt. Ltd., Gurgaon (F. No. 23-115/2015-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Ministry recommended that the applicant should be called for presentation.

2.1.24 M/s Ericsson India Pvt. Ltd., Gurgaon (F. No. 23-81/2011-HSMD):

**Decision:** The Committee noted that the item is being imported for repair and will be re-exported back within 6 months. The Ministry therefore recommended the import of one old TRU test set (functional test system for transceiver units).
2.1.25 M/s Anite Telecoms India Pvt Ltd., Bangalore (F.No. 23-180/2015- HSMD):

Decision: The Committee was informed that the items have been imported from their principals in UK, are meant for calibration and will be re-exported within 6 months. The representative stated that they were not aware of the procedure of obtaining prior permission for import. Since, this is the first time import by the applicant and it will be re-exported within 6 months, the Committee recommended the import.

2.1.26 M/s SeS Environmental Services Pvt. Ltd., Gurgaon:

Decision: The Committee noted that the year of manufacture of all the cards has been indicated by the CEC as 2006-2012 and the residual life as 90% of the average life. The Committee recommended the import of 3150 Telecom Base Station (BTS) cards.

2.1.27 M/s ADS Diagnostic Ltd., New Delhi (F. No. 23-274/2014-HSMD):

Decision: The Committee reconsidered the matter and recommended that the applicant should first approach AERB for their clearance, being radiation related equipment.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2.2.: IMPORT OF BATTERY/LEAD SCRAP/TITANIUM SCRAP, ETC.


Decision: The Committee noted that the unit has been visited earlier and was also granted NOC previously in October 2015 based on the CTO capacity at that time. Now, the applicant has provided consent from the SPCB for enhanced capacity of 40,000 MTA. The Ministry therefore recommended import of additional 13,000 MT of RAINS & ROPE.

2.2.2 M/s Powertrek Industries, Guntur, A.P.:

Decision: The applicant was granted permission earlier. The Ministry now recommended import of ISRI Code: Radio, Rakes, Relays, Rents, Ropes, Rails and Racks for the two units as given below:

i. Unit I- 3000 MT of the above;

ii. Unit-II- 6000 MT of the above.

2.2.3 M/s Sameer Industries, Indore, M.P.( F.No. 23-261/2012):

Decision: The Committee considered the application based on the documents supplied by the applicant. Before taking any view in this matter, the Ministry recommended the site visit by Expert Member, Shri. K.P. Nyati.
AGENDA NO.2.3: IMPORT OF PET BOTTLE SCRAP/PLASTIC SCRAP/LDPE/POLYURETHANE FOAM SCRAP:

2.3.1 M/s Shree Bhavani Engineering Works, Navi Mumbai (F. No. 5-10/2015-HSMD):

Decision: The applicant was granted NOC earlier for import of 400 MT of virgin plastic waste (LLDP/LDPE/PP/Polystyrene) based on earlier consented capacity. In view of the enhanced capacity of 9600 MTA consented by SPCB the Ministry recommended import of additional 2800 MT of virgin plastic waste (LLDP/LDPE/PP/Polystyrene).

2.3.2. M/s Hamjani Plastic Industries, Ahmedabad (F. No. 23-197/2015-HSMD):

Decision: The Committee saw the video and was satisfied with the facilities installed for converting waste plastic into sheets. However being a first timer the Ministry recommended site visit by CPCB before considering the application for import.

2.3.3 M/s Hitouch Plastics, Gujarat (F. No. 17-1/2016-HSMD):

Decision: Being the first timer the Ministry recommended a site visit by CPCB.

2.3.4 M/s Seven star Polytex Pvt. Ltd., Indore, M.P. (F. No. 23-194/2015-HSMD):

Decision: The site was visited by Expert Member Shri K.P. Nyati and Dr. Abhay Saxena of Madhya Pradesh Pollution Control Board. Based on the site visit report, the Ministry recommended the import of 5000 MT PET bottle scrap and PET lumps.

AGENDA NO.2.4: IMPORT OF RUBBER SCRAP ETC.

2.4.1 M/s Fishfa Rubbers Ltd., Rajkot (F. No. 23-80/2014-HSMD):

Decision: From the application and the records available with the Ministry, M/s Fishfa Rubber ltd. have 2 reclaim rubber manufacturing units. However, the Form 7 & 8 indicates that application pertains to Unit I having monthly capacity of 1250 MT. While the Committee noted that the applicant was granted NOC earlier perhaps for both the units the Ministry now recommended import of 6000 MT of used rubber tyre scrap/tube scrap for Unit-I only.

2.4.2 M/s A.P. Rubber Industries, Haridwar (F. No. 23-91/2014-HSMD):

Decision: Taking into consideration the capacity of the plant for making crumb rubber, the Ministry recommended import of additional 1200 MT of waste rubber tyres for recycling/reprocessing purpose.
2.4.3. M/s Radiant Udyog (P) Ltd., Nagpur (F. No. 5-24/2013-HSMD):

Decision: While going through the report of operation submitted by the applicant, a few points needed clarification, however during the presentation by the applicant’s representative who stated was not the technical person the points could not be clarified. The Committee therefore reiterated the need for site visit.

2.4.4. M/s Eastman Reclamations, Jalandhar (F. No. 5-8/2012-HSMD):

Decision: The Ministry recommended the inclusion of tube scrap in the NOC.

2.4.5. M/s Tinna Rubber and Infrastructure Ltd., New Delhi (5-22/2010)-HSMD:

Decision: The applicant’s combined application for their crumb rubber plant located at Gunddipunddi, Tamilnadu, Wada-Maharashtra, Haldia- West Bengal and Panipat- Haryana was considered by the Committee. The combined consented capacity is 94,000 MTA of crumb rubber. The fact was considered that the applicant has imported 17,500 MT based on NOCs issued by this Ministry during the financial year 2015-2016. The Present application pertains to the permission for import of only 5000 MT of old/used rubber tyres with multiple cuts. The Ministry therefore recommended the import and at the same time decided to recommend site visits of all the four aforesaid plants by CPCB and/or sub-committee of this Committee.

2.4.6. M/s Om Shree Rubber, RamnagaraDistt., Karnataka (F. No. 23-155/2015-HSMD):

Decision: Subsequent to the submission of the site visit report by CPCB the Committee noted that the unit was not operational at the time of site visit and certain improvements have been suggested by CPCB team which needs to be implemented. The application will be considered only after submission of the evidence of having implemented the improvements as suggested by CPCB.

2.4.7. M/s Surya Rubber Industries, A.P. (F. No. 23-86/2015-HSMD):

Decision: Subsequent to the submission of the site visit report by CPCB the Committee noted that the unit was not operational at the time of site visit and certain improvements have been suggested by CPCB team which need to be implemented. The application will be considered only after submission of the evidence of having implemented the improvements as suggested by CPCB.


Decision: Subsequent to the submission of the site visit report by CPCB, the Committee considered the case and decided to recommend import of 20,000 MT of scrap rubber tyre with multiple cuts and scrap tubes.
AGENDA NO.2.5: IMPORT OF OIL.

2.5.1 M/s APJ Refineries Pvt. Ltd., Palakkad, Kerala (F. No. 23-112/2015-HSMD):

Decision: The Ministry recommended a site visit by CPCB before considering the case for import of used oil.

2.5.2 M/s New Lubri Sales Pvt. Ltd., Alwar, Rajasthan:

Decision: The Ministry recommended a site visit by sub-committee of this Committee before considering the case for import of used oil.

2.5.3 M/s Global Natural Petro Industries, Jhajjar, Haryana (F. No. 23-44/2015-HSMD):

Decision: Based on the presentation by the applicant before the Committee, the Ministry recommended site visit by sub-committee of this Committee in view of the proximity of the site to Delhi.

AGENDA NO.2.6: IMPORT OF GRAPHITE ELECTRODE SCRAP

2.6.1 M/s S.K. Carbon Ltd., Haryana (F. No. 5-29/2015-HSMD):

Decision: The Committee noted that the proposal is for import of used graphite electrode from the steel industry and the analysis report does not show any hazardous constituents. The proposed processing is only physical and mechanical and no hazardous waste gets generated. The Ministry therefore recommended the import.

AGENDA NO.3: IMPORT OF ZINC ASH, ZINC SKIMMING, ZINC FLUCKS

3.1.1 M/s Shivam Alums & Chemicals, Bharuch, Gujarat (F. No. 23-184/2015-HSMD):

Decision: Being the first time importer, the Ministry recommended site visit by CPCB.

AGENDA NO.4: IMPORT OF FERRO MANGANESE SLAG

4.1.1 M/s Modern India Con-Cast Ltd., Kolkata (F. No. 5-12/2012-HSMD):

Decision: Now that the applicant has provided the details of earlier import and imported materials usage in their Haldia plant, the Ministry recommended the import of 13,000 MT of ferro-manganese slag.