

42

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
(2011-12)**

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

Ministry of Planning

**THE NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION AUTHORITY OF INDIA
BILL, 2010**

FORTY-SECOND REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December, 2011/ Agrahyana, 1933 (Saka)

FORTY-SECOND REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
(2011-2012)
(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

Ministry of Planning

**THE NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION AUTHORITY OF
INDIA BILL, 2010**

Presented to Lok Sabha on 13 December, 2011

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 13 December, 2011



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

December, 2011/ Agrahyana, 1933 (Saka)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Composition of the Committee	(iii)
Introduction	(iv)

REPORT

A. Introduction	1
B. Objectives and Salient Features of the Bill	2
C. Evolution of the UIDAI	3
D. Issuance of aadhaar numbers pending passing the Bill by Parliament	5
E. UID scheme	7
F. Global Experience	9
G. Existing Identity forms vs need for aadhaar number	10
H. Identity and Eligibility	11
I. Aadhaar Number and National Population Register (NPR)	12
J. Coordination between the agencies involved in the UID scheme	13
K. Civil Liberties Perspective	16
L. Financial Implications	17
M. Technology	20
N. National Security vs the UID scheme	21

Part-II

Observations/Recommendations of the Committee	28
---	----

APPENDICES

I. Dissent notes submitted by S/Shri Prem Das Rai, MP, Manicka Tagore, MP, Raashid Alvi, MP and Magunta Sreenivasulu Reddy	36
II. Minutes of the sittings of the Committee held on 11 February, 2011, 29 June, 2011, 29 July, 2011 and 8 December, 2011.....	40
III. The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010.....	49

COMPOSITION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE – 2011-2012

Shri Yashwant Sinha - Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Shivkumar Udasi Chanabasappa
3. Shri Jayant Chaudhary
4. Shri Harishchandra Deoram Chavan
5. Shri Bhakta Charan Das
6. Shri Gurudas Dasgupta
7. Shri Nishikant Dubey
8. Shri Chandrakant Khaire
9. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
10. Shri Anjan Kumar Yadav M.
11. Shri Prem Das Rai
12. Dr. Kavuru Sambasiva Rao
13. Shri Rayapati S. Rao
14. Shri Magunta Sreenivasulu Reddy
15. Shri Sarvey Sathyanarayana
16. Shri G.M. Siddeswara
17. Shri N. Dharam Singh
18. Shri Yashvir Singh
19. Shri Manicka Tagore
20. Shri R. Thamaraiselvan
21. Dr. M. Thambidurai

RAJYA SABHA

22. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
23. Shri Raashid Alvi
24. Shri Vijay Jawaharlal Darda
25. Shri Piyush Goyal
26. Shri Moinul Hassan
27. Shri Satish Chandra Misra
28. Shri Mahendra Mohan
29. Dr. Mahendra Prasad
30. Dr. K.V.P. Ramachandra Rao
31. Shri Yogendra P. Trivedi

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|------------------|
| 1. | Shri A.K. Singh | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. | Shri R.K. Jain | - | Director |
| 3. | Shri Ramkumar Suryanarayanan | - | Deputy Secretary |

(iii)

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance, having been authorized by the Committee, present this Forty-Second Report on “The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010”.

2. The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010 introduced in Rajya Sabha on 3 December, 2010 was referred to the Committee on 10 December, 2010 for examination and report thereon, by the Speaker, Lok Sabha under Rule 331E of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee obtained background note, detailed note and written information on various provisions contained in the aforesaid Bill from the Ministry of Planning.

4. Written suggestions / views / memoranda on the provisions of the Bill were received from various institutions / experts / individuals.

5. The Committee took briefing / oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Planning and the Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI) at their sitting held on 11 February, 2011.

6. At the sitting held on 29 June, 2011, the Committee heard the views of the representatives of (i) the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), and (ii) the Indian Banks Association (IBA), and Dr. Reetika Khera, Visitor, Delhi School of Economics, New Delhi. The Committee also heard the views of the representatives of the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII), and experts namely, Dr. Usha Ramanathan, Independent Law Researcher, New Delhi, Dr. R. Ramakumar, Associate Professor, the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai and Shri Gopal Krishna, Member, Citizen Forum for Liberties, New Delhi at the sitting held on 29 July, 2011.

7. The Committee, at their sitting held on 8 December, 2011 considered and adopted this Report.

8. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Ministry of Planning and the Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI) for furnishing the requisite material and information which were desired in connection with the examination of the Bill. The Committee would also thank all the institutions and experts for their valuable suggestions on the Bill.

9. For facility of reference, the observations/recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report.

**New Delhi;
9 December, 2011
20 Aghrayana, 1933(Saka)**

**YASHWANT SINHA,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Finance**

REPORT

PART - I

A. Introduction

1. With a view to ensure that the benefits of centrally sponsored schemes reaches to right person and not misused, the Central Government had decided to issue unique identification numbers to all residents in India and to certain other persons. The scheme of unique identification involves collection of demographic and biometric information from individuals for the purpose of issuing of unique identification numbers to such individuals. The Central Government, for the purpose of issuing unique identification numbers, constituted the Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI) on 28th January, 2009, being executive in nature, which is at present functioning under the Planning Commission.

2. It has been observed and assessed by the Government that the issue of unique identification numbers may involve certain issues, such as (a) security and confidentiality of information, imposition of obligation of disclosure of information so collected in certain cases, (b) impersonation by certain individuals at the time of enrolment for issue of unique identification numbers, (c) unauthorised access to the Central Identities Data Repository (CIDR), (d) manipulation of biometric information, (e) investigation of certain acts constituting offence, and (f) unauthorised disclosure of the information collected for the purpose of issue of unique identification numbers, which should be addressed by law and attract penalties.

3. In view of the foregoing paragraph, the Government has felt it necessary to make the said Authority as a statutory authority for carrying out the functions of issuing unique identification numbers to the residents in India and to certain other persons in an effective manner. It is, therefore, proposed to enact the National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010 to provide for the establishment of the National Identification Authority of India (NIDAI) for the purpose of issuing identification numbers (which has been referred to as aadhaar number) to individuals residing in India and to certain other classes of individuals and manner of authentication of such individuals to facilitate access

to benefits and services to which they are entitled and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

B. Objectives and Salient Features of the Bill

4. The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010, introduced in Rajya Sabha on 3rd December, 2010, *inter alia*, seeks to provide—

(a) for issue of aadhaar numbers to every resident by the Authority on providing his demographic and biometric information to it in such manner as may be specified by regulations;

(b) for authentication of the aadhaar number of an aadhaar number holder in relation to his demographic and biometric information subject to such conditions and on payment of such fees as may be specified by regulations;

(c) for establishment of the National Identification Authority of India consisting of a Chairperson and two part-time Members;

(d) that the Authority to exercise powers and discharge functions which, *inter alia*, include—

(i) specifying the demographic and biometric information for enrolment for an aadhaar number and the processes for collection and verification thereof;

(ii) collecting demographic and biometric information from any individual seeking an aadhaar number in such manner as may be specified by regulations;

(iii) maintaining and updating the information of individuals in the CIDR in such manner as may be specified by regulations;

(iv) specify the usage and applicability of the aadhaar number for delivery of various benefits and services as may be provided by regulations;

(e) that the Authority shall not require any individual to give information pertaining to his race, religion, caste, tribe, ethnicity, language, income or health;

(f) that the Authority may engage one or more entities to establish and maintain the CIDR and to perform any other functions as may be specified by regulations;

(g) for constitution of the Identity Review Committee consisting of three members (one of whom shall be the chairperson) to ascertain the extent and pattern of usage of the aadhaar numbers across the country and prepare a report annually in relation to the extent and pattern of usage

of the aadhaar numbers along with its recommendations thereon and submit the same to the Central Government;

(h) that the Authority shall take measures (including security safeguards) to ensure that the information in the possession or control of the Authority (including information stored in the CIDR) is secured and protected against any loss or unauthorized access or use or unauthorized disclosure thereof; and

(i) for offences and penalties for contravention of the provisions of the proposed legislation.

C. Evolution of the UIDAI

5. The concept of a Unique Identification (UID) scheme was first discussed and worked upon since 2006 when administrative approval for the scheme “Unique ID for BPL families” was given on 3rd March, 2006 by the Department of Information Technology, Ministry of Communications and Information Technology.

6. Subsequently, a Processes Committee was set up on 3rd July, 2006 to suggest processes for updation, modification, addition and deletion of data fields from the core database to be created under the said project. The Committee appreciated the need of a UID Authority to be created by an executive order under the aegis of the Planning Commission to ensure a pan-departmental and neutral identity for the Authority.

7. Thereafter, since the Registrar General of India was engaged in the creation of the National Population Register (NPR) and issuance of Multi-purpose National Identity Cards to citizens of India, it was decided with the approval of the Prime Minister, to constitute an Empowered Group of Ministers (EGoM) to collate the two schemes – the NPR under the Citizenship Act, 1955 and the UID scheme. The EGoM was also empowered to look into the methodology and specific milestones for early and effective completion of the scheme and take a final view on these. The EGoM was constituted on 4th December, 2006 and a series of meetings took place as follows:-

a) First meeting of EGoM: 22nd November, 2007 :

- Recognized the need for creating an identity related resident database regardless of whether the database is created based on a

de-novo collection of individual data or is based on already existing data such as the voter list.

- Need to identify and establish institutional mechanism that will own the database and be responsible for its maintenance.

b) Second meeting of EGoM: 28th January, 2008

- The proposal to establish UID Authority under the Planning Commission was approved.

c) Third meeting of EGoM: 7th August, 2008

- Referred certain matters raised with relation to the UIDAI to a Committee of Secretaries for examination.

d) Fourth meeting of EGoM: 4th November, 2008

- It was decided to notify UIDAI as an executive authority. Decision on investing it with statutory authority would be taken up later.
- UIDAI would be anchored in the Planning Commission for five years after which a view would be taken as to where the UIDAI would be located within Government.

8. The UIDAI was constituted on 28th January, 2009 under the Chairmanship of Shri Nandan M. Nilekani as an attached office under the aegis of the Planning Commission. The UIDAI was *inter-aila* given the responsibility to lay down plan and policies to implement the UID scheme, own and operate the UID database and be responsible for its updation and maintenance on an ongoing basis. The Prime Minister's Council of UIDAI and a Cabinet Committee on UIDAI (called CC-UIDAI) were set up on 30th July, 2009 and 22nd October, 2009 respectively for achieving the objectives of the Authority.

9. Asked why the matter of conferring statutory status to the UIDAI was deferred, the Ministry of Planning have submitted their written response as under:-

“Based on the proposal that formation of the UIDAI under the Planning Commission would ensure better coordination with different departments, it was decided that initially the UIDAI may be notified as an executive authority under the Planning Commission and the issue of investing the UIDAI with statutory authority and the reconciliation of such statutory role with National Registration Authority (NRA) can be considered at an appropriate time”.

10. Justifying the extension of the UID scheme, which is initially intended for BPL families, to all residents and other categories of individuals, the Ministry of Planning in their written response have submitted as under:-

“The UID scheme was extended to all residents and other categories of individuals to gradually do away the *de novo* exercises each time for field level data collection. Simultaneously, it would also ensure that links to more and more identity based databases are created by inclusion of the UID number in their databases”.

11. In this regard, Dr. R. Ramakumar, Expert, in his post-evidence reply has, among other things, added as follows:-

“.....it has been proven again and again that in the Indian environment, the failure to enroll with fingerprints is as high as 15% due to the prevalence of a huge population dependent on manual labour. These are essentially the poor and marginalised sections of the society. So, while the poor do indeed need identity proofs, aadhaar is not the right way to do that....”

12. The Ministry in their written reply have stated, among other things, that :-

“While there may be a number of factors contributing to the failure to enroll (like geography, age groups, occupation etc.) and the figures quoted..... may not hold good in all situations, failure to enroll is a reality.... For enrolment purpose, UIDAI has already built in processes to handle biometric exceptions.”

D. Issuance of aadhaar numbers pending passing the Bill by Parliament

13. Justice Dr. M. Rama Jois, MP (Rajya Sabha) in his representation addressed to the Chairman, Standing Committee on Finance has *inter-alia* pointed out since the NIDAI Bill is pending for consideration before the Standing Committee on Finance, implementation of the provisions of the Bill, issue of aadhaar numbers and incurring expenditure from the exchequer by the Government is a clear circumvention of Parliament, and therefore, should be kept in abeyance awaiting debate in and decision of both Houses of Parliament.

14. On being asked about the legal basis under which the UIDAI is functioning at present, and the mechanism that the UIDAI has adopted, since its inception, to deal with any of the issues like security and confidentiality of

information and other offences related to issue of the aadhaar numbers, the Ministry of Planning in a written reply have *inter-alia* stated that:-

“....The matter about commencement of operation of the UIDAI before a legal framework was put in place was referred to the Ministry of Law & Justice wherein opinion was sought on the issue whether in absence of a specific enabling law, would there be any constraints in collecting the data (including biometrics) and in issuing the UID numbers to residents in accordance with the mandate given to the Authority. The Ministry of Law & Justice, after examining the matter, had mentioned that it is a settled position that powers of the Executive are co-extensive with the legislative power of the Government and that the Government is not debarred from exercising its executive power in the areas which are not regulated by specific legislation. It had also been opined that till the time such legislation is framed the Authority can continue to function under the executive order issued by the Government and the scheme that may be prepared by the UIDAI. It was also opined that the Authority can collect information/data for implementation of the UID scheme. Such implementation can be done by giving wide publicity to the scheme and persuading the agencies/individual to part with necessary information.

The UIDAI has not faced issues such as breach of security and confidentiality, manipulation of biometrics, unauthorized access to the CIDR or other related offences since its inception.....till the time Parliament passes the Bill, these matters will be covered by the relevant laws”.

15. The opinion of the Attorney-General of India on the above mentioned issues as obtained by the Ministry of Law & Justice (Department of Legal Affairs) is furnished below:-

“The competence of the Executive is not limited to take steps to implement the law proposed to be passed by Parliament. Executive Power operates independently. The Executive is not implementing the provisions of the Bill. The Authority presently functioning under the Executive Notification dated 28th January, 2009 is doing so under valid authority and there is nothing in law or otherwise which prevents the Authority from functioning under the Executive Authorisation.

The power of Executive is clear and there is no question of circumventing Parliament or the Executive becoming a substitute of Parliament. On the contrary, what is sought to be done is to achieve a seamless transition of the authority from an Executive Authority into a statutory authority.

All the expenditure which is being incurred is sanctioned by Parliament in accordance with the financial procedure set forth in the Constitution. If the Bill is not passed by any reason and if Parliament is of the view that

the Authority should not function and express its will to that effect, the exercise would have to be discontinued. This contingency does not arise.

The present Bill being implemented without Parliaments' approval does not set a bad precedent in the Parliamentary form of Government. On the contrary, the fact that the Authority is sought to be converted from an Executive Authority to a statutory authority, it underlines the supremacy of Parliament”.

16. On this issue, Dr. Usha Ramanathan, Expert, in her post-evidence reply has *inter-alia* stated that:-

“Article 73 of the Constitution delineates the extent of executive power of the Union and describes it as extending to matters with respect to which Parliament has power to make laws.....

While the executive power of the Union, and of the States, is co-extensive with the legislative power of the Union and the States, this is a provision that sets out the limits of the power. These are not provisions that are meant to make Parliament, or the legislatures, redundant. While executive power cannot extend beyond the legislative power of the Union and the States, Parliament and the legislatures can, and routinely do, set out the terms on which the executive is to function. This is also how 'delegated legislation' or 'subordinate legislation' has to be within the extent of the 'parent statute'.....

It is a plain misconception to think that the executive can do what it pleases, including in relation to infringing constitutional rights and protections for the reason that Parliament and legislatures have the power to make law on the subject”.

E. UID scheme

17. A resident who seeks to obtain an aadhaar number shall provide his / her demographic and biometric information to enrolling agencies appointed by Registrars. A resident who does not possess any documentary proof of identity or proof of address can obtain an aadhaar number by being introduced by an introducer.

18. The UIDAI has executed Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) with the partners including all the States and Union Territories, 25 financial institutions (including LIC) to act as Registrars for implementing the scheme. The roles and responsibilities of the partners flow from the MoU.

19. The UIDAI requires only basic identity data such as name, age, gender, address and relationship details in case of minors, for issue of unique identity number. This is commonly known as 'Know your Resident (KYR)'. The partner registrars are using this resident interface as an opportunity to update their own selected data bases such as ration card number, MGNREGS job card number, PAN card etc. This is commonly known as 'Know your Resident Plus' (KYR+). Collection of these information is purely an initiative of respective Registrars and not mandatory for issue of aadhaar number.

20. The UIDAI is collecting bare minimum demographic information from the residents; any other kind of information, viz., rural, semi-urban and urban areas, persons with disabilities, migrant unskilled and unorganized workers, nomadic tribes and others who do not have any permanent dwelling house, is not available with UIDAI. Asked how the coverage of marginalized sections of population, without having the data of aadhaar numbers issued to them, could be achieved, the Ministry has submitted that the Authority proposes to cover the marginalized and poor sections of the population through special enrolment camps organized for them.

21. In a news item dated 6th September, 2011, it has been reported that the Ministry of Home Affairs have identified flaws in the enrolment process followed by the UIDAI, citing cases where people have got aadhaar numbers on the basis of false affidavits.

22. Further, an expert has brought to the notice of the Standing Committee on Finance that issues of liability and responsibility for maintaining accuracy of data on the Register, conducting identity checks and ensuring the integrity of the overall operation of the UID scheme have not been resolved. On being asked to comment on this, the Ministry of Planning have submitted a written reply as follows:-

“.....Registrars have to put processes in place to ensure that the data collected is accurate. It is also the responsibility of the Registrars to appoint verifiers (for verifying the documents presented by the resident) and introducers to handle cases where the residents do not have any documents”.

23. It has been reported in a news item that the Ministry of Home Affairs have alleged that some of the registrars have not adhered to the laid down procedures under UIDAI. It has also been noticed that the Government of Kerala *vide* G.O.(MS)No:16/2011/ITD dated 3rd June, 2011 has *inter-alia* stated that the MoU was signed between UIDAI and Government of Kerala for implementation of the UID project subject to condition that the clauses on the standards, protocol, criteria etc. in the MoU shall be in accordance with the State IT policy.

F. Global Experience

24. It has been brought to the notice of the Standing Committee on Finance that on the basis of the findings of London School of Economics (LSE) report, the Government of United Kingdom has abandoned its ID project (repealed its Identity Cards Act, 2006) citing a range of reasons, which includes high cost, unsafe, untested and unreliable technology, and the changing relationship between the state and the citizen etc.

To a specific issue of relevance of any of the above mentioned factors in the Indian context, it has been informed by the Ministry as follows:-

“There are significant differences between the UK’s ID card project and the UID project and to equate the two would not be appropriate. The differences are as follows:-

- a) The UK system involved issuing a card which stored the information of the individual including their biometrics on the card. UID scheme involves issuing a number. No card containing the biometric information is being issued. UK already has the National insurance number which is used often as a means to verify the identity of the individual.
- b) The statutory framework envisaged made it mandatory to have the UK ID card. Aadhaar number is not mandatory.
- c) The data fields were large and required the individual to provide accurate information of all other ID numbers such as driver’s license, national insurance number and other such details thereby linking the UK ID card database to all other databases on which the individual was registered. UID Scheme collects limited information and the database is not linked to other databases.

d) In UK, the legislative framework and structure approached it from a security perspective. The context and need in India is different. The UID scheme is envisaged as a mean to enhance the delivery of welfare benefits and services”.

25. When asked as to whether any analysis has been carried out on the experience of countries where National IDs are in use as well as countries where it has been discontinued, the Ministry have *inter-alia* informed the Committee in a written reply as follows:-

“In some countries the use of smart cards to store significant data about the resident added to concerns about ID fraud and duplication.....

The comparisons between developed countries, which are looking at additional ID forms from a security perspective, versus India, a developing country which, like Brazil and Mexico, is attempting to, build the basic identity and verification infrastructure essential to delivering welfare benefits, and promoting inclusive growth, is not a reasonable one”.

G. Existing identity forms vs need for aadhaar number

26. A view has been expressed that adding another form of identity (i.e. aadhaar number) without studying the possibility of using the existing forms of identity, for example, Voter ID card, to solve the current problems appears to be a waste of resources.

27. The Ministry of Planning in a written submission have *inter-alia* stated the following:-

“.....in the current framework there is no single document which is uniformly acceptable as proof of identity across India – irrespective of age, gender and familial connections. Establishing identity is a challenge for the poor, particularly when they move from place to place as a consequence lack of proof of identity makes it difficult for the poor to access benefits and services.

.....Aadhaar number is an enabler..... The benefits of aadhaar number are:-

“**For residents:** The aadhaar number will become the single source of identity verification. Once residents enroll, they can use the number multiple times – they would be spared the hassle of repeatedly providing supporting identity documents each time they wish to access services such as obtaining a bank account, passport, driving license, and so on.... the number will also give migrants mobility of identity.

For Registrars and enrollers: The UIDAI will only enroll residents after de-duplicating records. This will help Registrars clean out duplicates from their databases, enabling significant efficiencies and cost savings. For Registrars focused on cost, the UIDAI's verification processes will ensure lower Know Your Resident (KYR) costs. For Registrars focused on social goals, a reliable identification number will enable them to broaden their reach into groups that till now, have been difficult to authenticate. The strong authentication that the aadhaar number offers will improve services, leading to better resident satisfaction.

For Governments: Eliminating duplication under various schemes is expected to save the Government exchequer a substantial amount. It will also provide Governments with accurate data on residents, enable direct benefit programs, and allow Government departments to coordinate investments and share information”.

28. The Ministry have further added that:

“...reason for starting the project is not for overriding existing Ids.....All the above documents are relevant to a domain and for a service. Aadhaar number is to be used as a general proof of identity and proof of address”.

H. Identity and Eligibility

29. According to a news item dated 7th July, 2011, the operationalisation of aadhaar, the unique identification number, will make it possible to link entitlements to targeted beneficiaries. But it will not ensure beneficiaries have been correctly identified. Thus, the old problem of proper identification that bedevils the present system will continue.

30. It has also been brought to the notice of the Standing Committee on Finance that a key issue in targeted welfare schemes is said to be of eligibility and not identity. Government entitlements are unavailable to the poor, primarily due to the eligibility determination process having many loopholes and lacunae. One identity like aadhaar number has nothing to do with such entitlements.

31. Asked to furnish comments, the Ministry of Planning in a written reply have stated that-

“...With aadhaar number integration in various Government schemes, the identity of the beneficiary gets established, by which it is ensured that the government scheme benefits reach the intended beneficiaries. Availability of identity and eligibility information together provides an important tool to plug the loopholes in the eligibility determination process, and in managing the eligibility life cycle for a beneficiary”.

32. Dr. Reetika Khera, Expert, while deposing before the Committee has *inter-alia* stated as follows:-

“.....exclusion is more on account of poor coverage of these schemes. Say, for instance, in the Public Distribution System, the Planning Commission says that only ‘x’ per cent of the rural population will get the BPL cards and because of that cap that is set at the Central level, we find that lots of people are excluded”.

I. Aadhaar Number and National Population Register (NPR)

33. The Standing Committee on Finance, during briefing on the Bill held on 11th February, 2011, raised *inter-alia* the issue of possibility of dovetailing the UID exercise with the census operation. In this regard, the Ministry of Planning in their written reply have, among other things, stated as follows:-

“the UIDAI is adopting a multiple registrar approach and the Registrar General of India (RGI) will be one of the Registrars of the UIDAI. To synergize the two exercises, an Inter Ministerial Coordination Committee has been set up to minimize duplication. The UIDAI is making all efforts to synergize with National Population Register (NPR) exercise....”.

34. According to a news item dated 6th September, 2011, the Ministry of Home Affairs said that it would not be preferable to rely entirely on private sector players’ for biometric enrolments into the NPR since the population register will form the basis on which citizenship would be determined in the future. Unlike the UIDAI system, the NPR system follows an elaborate procedure to verify and cover the entire population of every area; and the data collected is subjected to ‘social vetting’; and accountability can be fixed under the NPR system.

35. In an another news article it has been reported that while registration to the NPR is compulsory and a National Identity Number is linked to each name, the Citizenship (Registration of Citizens and Issue of National Identity Cards) Rules, 2003 does not approve of linking biometrics with personal information. However, according to, the annual reports of the Ministry of Home Affairs, it said that integration of photographs and finger biometrics of 17.2 lakh out of 20.6 lakh records has been completed.

J. Coordination between the agencies involved in the UID scheme

36. In a detailed note on the NIDAI Bill, the Ministry of Planning have *inter-alia* submitted that:-

“Implementation of a project of this size is challenging. It involves co-ordination with multiple stakeholders and effective monitoring of implementation at every level....”.

37. The Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure), however, while commenting on embedding aadhaar numbers in databases to enable interaction have stated that:-

“It must be done urgently by single agency, perhaps NPR. Cabinet has approved (22.7.2010) outlay of Rs. 3,023.01 crore *inter-alia* for assistance for Information Communication Technology (ICT) infrastructure of Rs. 450 crore for integrating/ synergizing Aadhaar numbers with existing databases. Concerned about lack of co-ordination leading to duplication effort and expenditure with at least 6 agencies collecting information (NPR, MNREGA, BPL Census, UID, RSBY and Bank Smart Cards)”.

38. It has been reported in a news item dated 3rd October, 2011 that the UID project has become focus of the ire of various arms of the government for rather disparate reasons. Asked to furnish the comments on the said news item, the Ministry of Planning have submitted a written reply as follows:-

Views reported in the news item	Comments of the Ministry of Planning
...the Finance Ministry rejected UIDAI's request for Rs.14,000 crore expenditure programme.	It is not correct that the Finance Ministry have rejected the budget expenditure. The proposal for phase III has been recommended by the EFC on 15 September, 2011 after optimizing the cost estimates with certain stipulations to be complied with by the UIDAI to achieve economy of scales, avoid duplication and avail convergence in the programme.
...the planning commission too jumped into the fray, suddenly awakening to the deficiency in the structure and functioning of the Authority.	Aadhaar programme is a complex project of its kind launched first time in the country. EFC is an Inter-Ministerial forum to appraise the proposal rigorously to facilitate decision making by the Competent Authority. Planning Commission is one of the nodal appraising agencies to the EFC forum. On approval by

	<p>Planning Commission some issues regarding design parameters, cost estimates and manner of implementation were emerged, which could not be visualized at project formulation stage. These issues have been deliberated in the EFC meeting and resolved through certain stipulations to be adhered to by UIDAI during execution of the project.</p>
<p>Adding to the confusion were the apparently negative comments made by the Ministry of Home Affairs(MHA) on the flaws in the enrolment process and the security of the biometric data. The Home Ministry's apparently nervous of the UIDAI's efforts to extend its aadhaar enrolment mandate, as the office of the Registrar General of India, an arm of the Ministry, is simultaneously compiling a National Population Register (NPR) which is a comprehensive identity database, as a part of the 2011 census operations currently under way.</p>	<p>While responding to the EFC memo of the UIDAI, the RGI (MHA) have observed as follows:- A security audit of the entire process of UIDAI including enrolment process in UIDAI, the enrolment software, data storage, data management, etc. should be conducted by an appropriate agency.</p> <p>The Comments of the UIDAI on this are:- UIDAI is developing a monitoring and evaluation framework to provide a comprehensive mechanism for continuously monitoring and evaluating the UIDAI program. Considering that a formal structured monitoring and evaluation framework will form the cornerstone for measuring the outcome of UIDAI programme, a distinct component 'Monitoring and evaluation' has been included in the current EFC proposal. Some of the audits planned on a periodic basis are:- (i) Enrolment Client Audit; (ii) Enrolment Process (Field) Audits; (iii) ASDMSA Application Audits; (iv) Authentication User Agency Audits; (v) Data Center Audits; (vi) Security Audits; (vii) Impact Assessment (Grants in Aid for Research); and (viii) Other Third Party Audit Services.</p>
<p>The confusion about the turf of UIDAI and the MHA is rather surprising,</p>	<p>UIDAI has no comments to offer.</p>

<p>given the fact that an EGoM was constituted as early as 2006 to collate the two schemes, namely the NPR and the unique identification number, as aadhaar was then known.</p>	
<p>RBI made the waters murkier by first going against the Finance Ministry notification that was issued in 2010 to permit the use of Know Your Customer (KYC) norms- by limiting the use of aadhaar numbers to “small accounts”. It then retracted, by allowing use of aadhaar numbers to all bank accounts without any limitations, but only after again insisting that the banks must satisfy themselves about the current address of the customer. RBI’s reluctance to fully accept the aadhaar numbers for the KYC norms is surprising, given that more than a dozen leading banks in the country are partnering with UIDAI to deliver aadhaar numbers to the citizens, and also when the aadhaar number have been accepted by the insurance companies and SEBI for meeting KYC norms.</p>	<p>It is clarified that-</p> <p>(i) aadhaar is sufficient KYC for opening all bank accounts now. This includes no-frill accounts- as per Reserve Bank’s circular dated January 27, 2011 – and any bank account as per September 28, 2011 circular.</p> <p>(ii) Banks may ask for additional proof of residence if the current residence is not the same as the address given on the aadhaar document. This procedure is consistent with bank policies applicable to all other officially valid documents including passport, driving license and is not specific to aadhaar.</p>

K. Civil Liberties Perspective

39. In a detailed note on the Bill, the Ministry of Planning have stated that issues like access and misuse of personal information, surveillance, profiling, prohibiting other data bases from storing aadhaar numbers; and securing confidentiality of information which is in the registrars domain need to be addressed in larger data protection legislation. In this connection, the Ministry have been asked to comment on the view that the Bill in its current form appears to be unsafe in law as there is no law at present on privacy, and data protection, therefore, it would be appropriate to consider the Bill for legislation only after passing the legislation on privacy, and data protection so as to ensure that there is no conflict between these laws. The Ministry in a written reply have *inter-alia* stated as under:-

“UIDAI has taken appropriate steps to ensure security and protection of data under this law and has incorporated data protection principles within its policy and implementation framework.....

Since appropriate steps have been taken, there is no dependency on the general data protection law.....when the data protection framework comes into place the Authority will follow the same since a national data protection law will apply to all agencies and institutions collecting information.

Collection of information without a privacy law in place does not violate the right to privacy of the individual....There is no bar on collecting information, the only requirement to be fulfilled with respect to the protection of the privacy of an individual is that care should be taken in collection and use of information, consent of individual would be relevant, information should be kept safe and confidential...

.....The proposed Privacy law should also seek to strike a balance between the legitimate demands of protecting individual liberties while recognizing the need for larger public interest to prevail in certain well defined circumstances”.

40. Responding to a suggestion received from PRS Legislative Branch that the existence of a unique identifier may facilitate record linkages across separate databases, the Ministry in a written reply have submitted that issues of linking and matching of databases need to be addressed through a data protection legislation which is currently being considered by the Department of Personnel.

41. The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), on being asked to comment on the implications of the provisions of the Bill on the individual’s right to privacy, has *inter alia* informed the Committee in their post-evidence reply as follows:-

....the right of privacy presupposes that such information relating to an individual which he would not like to share with others will not be disclosed. It may be mentioned that the right of privacy is not an absolute right.....”

42. On the same issue, Dr. Usha Ramanathan, expert, in her post-evidence reply has stated that:-

“....The right to dignity, the right to privacy, personal security and safety, the protection against surveillance, are constitutionally protected. The production of a number accompanied by the use of methods such as fingerprinting and iris scanning is even more invasive than is permitted to be applied to alleged offenders. Article 20 (3) provides protection against

compulsory extraction of personal information. Denying services, and rights, to persons because they are unwilling to part with the information in a manner that is more than likely to result in convergence and commodification of their personal information, surveillance, profiling, tagging and tracking is compulsory extraction that clearly reduces the constitutional rights of an ordinary citizen to less than that of an alleged offender. And that this is being done without the protection of law renders the exercise, per se, illegal. Apart from its 'uses', the potential for abuse is undeniable. In a similar context, another court – the Philippines Supreme Court – said:the data may be gathered for gainful and useful government purposes; but the existence of this vast reservoir of personal information constitutes a covert invitation to misuse, a temptation that may be too great for some of our authorities to resist”.

L. Financial Implications

(i) Feasibility Study

43. The Ministry of Planning in a detailed note on the Bill have stated that aadhaar number is cost-effective compared to other alternate targeted solutions to the problems identified in delivering services and benefits such as eliminating duplicate and fake identities. The Detailed Project Report (DPR) of the UID scheme has been prepared and submitted by M/s. Ernst & Young Pvt.Ltd. in April, 2011.

44. Asked whether any committee has been set up to study the financial implications of the UID scheme; and also to furnish the details of feasibility study carried out, if any, covering all aspects of the UID scheme such as setting up of the proposed NIDAI, and cost-benefit analysis, the Ministry in a written reply have, among other things, submitted that:-

“No committee has been set up to study the financial implications of the UID scheme. As per laid down guidelines/procedure the Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) reviews project proposals and its financial implications wherein the views of all stakeholders/ministries are taken in to account...

.....deliberations were held with all relevant stakeholders including Planning Commission, Registrar General of India, Election Commission of India, Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Urban Development and State Governments. A Proof of Concept study was undertaken in the States of Gujarat, Karnataka, U.P. and Orissa in four rural and one urban locations to establish the feasibility of linking UID with partner-databases and to validate the possibility of one-time linkage which once

established would be maintained on an ongoing basis by the UIDAI. An assessment study was carried out in 10 Central Ministries and their respective departments in four states (Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and West Bengal”.

(ii) Estimated cost of the UID scheme

45. The UID scheme is a Central Sector Scheme. The estimated cost of the Phase-I and Phase-II of the scheme spread over five years is Rs.3170.32 crore (Rs.147.31 crore for Phase-I and Rs.3023.01 crore for Phase-II). The estimated cost includes scheme components for issue of 10 crore UID numbers by March, 2011 and recurring establishment costs for the entire scheme up to March, 2014. The Budget for Phase-III of the scheme to the tune of Rs.8861 crore has been approved.

46. According to news items, the total cost of the UID scheme may run up to Rs. 1,50,000 crore. Even after the commitment of such levels of expenditures, the uncertainty over the technological options and ultimate viability of the scheme remains.

(iii) Comparative cost of aadhaar number and existing ID documents

47. Asked to furnish the details of comparative cost of existing ID documents (per individual), namely, Voter Id card, PAN card, driving license and aadhaar number, the Ministry has *inter-alia* informed the Committee in a written reply that the comparative costs of the documents mentioned above are not available.

(iv) Funding of other biometric projects

48. It is noticed that a project namely, Bharatiya - Automated Finger Print Identification System (AFSI), was launched in January, 2009, being funded by the Department of Information Technology, Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, for collection of biometric information of the people of the country.

49. Asked to clarify as to whether the biometric information (finger prints) being collected under the Bharatiya – AFSI project could also be used by the UIDAI, the Ministry have submitted that-

“The biometrics required for the aadhaar project are iris, ten finger prints and photograph. To ensure uniqueness of the individual, it is essential that the biometrics captured are as per the specifications laid down by the Biometrics Standards Committee. The quality, nature and manner of collection of biometric data by other biometric projects may not be of the nature that can be used for the purpose of the aadhaar scheme and hence it may not be possible to use the fingerprints captured under the Bhartiya-AFSI project”.

(v) Revenue model of the UIDAI

50. According to a detailed note on the bill furnished by the Ministry of Planning, demographic data and address verification will be provided free of cost till a separate pricing policy is announced in due course.

51. However, in a news item dated 6th September, 2011, it has been reported that the Ministry of Home Affairs pointed out uncertainties in the UIDAI’s revenue model.

M. Technology

52. The Biometrics Standards Committee set up by the UIDAI has recognized in its report that a fingerprints-based biometric system shall be at the core of the UIDAI’s de-duplication efforts. It has further noted that it is:

“...conscious of the fact that de-duplication of the magnitude required by the UIDAI has never been implemented in the world. In the global context, a de-duplication accuracy of 99% has been achieved so far, using good quality fingerprints against a database of up to fifty million. Two factors however, raise uncertainty about the accuracy that can be achieved through fingerprints. First, retaining efficacy while scaling the database size from fifty million to a billion has not been adequately analyzed. Second, fingerprint quality, the most important variable for determining de-duplication accuracy, has not been studied in depth in the Indian context”.

53. Asked to explain the reliability of technical architecture of the UID scheme, the Ministry of Planning in a detailed note on the NIDAI Bill have, among other things, stated as follows:-

“The UID project is a complex technology project. Nowhere in the world has such a large biometric database of a billion people being maintained. The frontiers of technology in biometrics are being tested and used in the project.....

The technical architecture of the UID scheme is at this point, is based on high-level assumptions. The architecture has been structured to

ensure clear data verification, authentication and de-duplication, while ensuring a high level of privacy and information security.....

The project team is learning and adapting to the challenges and ensuring that the solutions that are being offered are the best in the world to achieve the task....”.

54. Further asked as to given the high degree of assumptions on the reliability of technology adopted by the UIDAI and probability of system failures of different degrees, whether incurring huge costs on the UID scheme is prudent and affordable, the Ministry have stated in a written reply, among other things, as follows:-

“.....UIDAI is cognizant of the fact that biometric matching (which is a patterns matching) by its very nature will suffer from inaccuracy. However, these inaccuracy levels are less than 1%. This cannot be a reason for not attempting to use the technology.

It is well acknowledged that there will be failures in authentication for various reasons. After Proof of Concept studies on authentication, appropriate policies and processes will be developed to take care of situations where failure occurs for various reasons.....The choice of using the authentication services is left to the third party service provider.....Concerned agencies will have to develop policies and procedures to handle such exceptional situations.....”

55. In a news article, one of the representatives of the UIDAI has admitted that the quality of fingerprints is bad because of the rough exterior of fingers caused by hardwork, and this poses a challenge for later authentication.

N. National Security vs the UID scheme

(i) Illegal residents

56. A concern over the possibility of illegal residents getting aadhaar numbers, and the safeguards in this regard has been raised by the Standing Committee on Finance during the sitting held on 11 February, 2011. In a written reply, the Ministry of Planning have stated as under:-

“Aadhaar number is not a proof of citizenship or domicile [Clause 6 of the Bill]. It only confirms identity and that too subject to authentication [Clause 4(3)]. This is clearly mandated in the NIDAI Bill and the communication being sent to the resident.

It is the responsibility of the Registrars to enroll a resident after due verification as per the procedure laid down by the UIDAI. If a person is not a resident as per the Bill, the Authority is being vested with the power

to omit/deactivate the aadhaar number [Clause 23 (2) (g)]. Subsequent attempts to enter the system can be detected”.

(ii) Involvement of Private agencies

57. On the issue of security of proposed data of UIDAI, an unstarred question (no.2989) was raised in Rajya Sabha. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Planning and Minister of State in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs tabled the answer to the above said question in Rajya Sabha on 22 April, 2010 as follows:-

“National Informatics Centre (NIC) had pointed out that the issues relating to privacy and security of UID data, in case the data is not hosted in a Government data centre may be taken into consideration.

UIDAI is of the opinion that the hosting of data in a private data centre does not necessarily lead to a violation of privacy or security. Appropriate contractual arrangement shall be put in place with the data centre space provider to ensure security and privacy of the data.

At present, UIDAI does not have its own permanent facility to house its data centre. Therefore, 75 sq.ft of data centre space has been hired from M/s. ITI Ltd. for proof of concept and pilot on a rental basis”.

58. The Ministry of Home Affairs, according to a news item, have questioned the security of citizens’ biometric data in UIDAI’s ‘outsourced service oriented infrastructure’ model.

59. To a specific query as to could outside agencies be allowed to partake in the UID scheme when doubts have been expressed on possible compromise with the interests of the national security, the Ministry of Planning in a written reply have *inter alia* stated that:-

“...the UIDAI has followed government procurement process and engaged the appropriate agencies for the implementation of the UID scheme....The UIDAI has also implemented a comprehensive information security policy.....”

60. It is, however, reported in various news articles as late as dated 26th November, 2011 that controversies between the Ministry of Home Affairs and the UIDAI over the issues such as manner and processes followed by the UIDAI, duplication of efforts between National Population Register and aadhaar, and security of data remain unresolved.

PART – II

OBSERVATIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Committee have carefully examined the written information furnished to them and heard the views for and against the National Identification Authority of India (NIDAI) Bill from various quarters such as the Ministry of Planning, the Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI), the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) and experts. The clearance of the Ministry of Law & Justice for issuing aadhaar numbers, pending passing the Bill by Parliament, on the ground that powers of the Executive are co-extensive with the legislative power of the Government and that the Government is not debarred from exercising its Executive power in the areas which are not regulated by the legislation does not satisfy the Committee. The Committee are constrained to point out that in the instant case, since the law making is underway with the bill being pending, any executive action is as unethical and violative of Parliament's prerogatives as promulgation of an ordinance while one of the Houses of Parliament being in session.

2. The Committee are surprised that while the country is on one hand facing a serious problem of illegal immigrants and infiltration from across the borders, the National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010 proposes to entitle every resident to obtain an aadhaar number, apart from entitling such other category of individuals as may be notified from time to time. This will, they apprehend, make even illegal immigrants entitled for an aadhaar number. The Committee are unable to understand the rationale of expanding the scheme to persons who are not citizens, as this entails numerous benefits proposed by the Government. The Committee have received a number of suggestions for restricting the scope of the UID scheme only to the citizens and for considering better options available with the Government by issuing Multi-Purpose National Identity Cards (MNICs) as a more acceptable alternative.

3. The Committee observe that *prima facie* the issue of unique identification number, which has been referred to as “aadhaar number” to individuals residing in India and other classes of individuals under the Unique Identification (UID) Scheme is riddled with serious lacunae and concern areas which have been identified as follows:-

- (a) The UID scheme has been conceptualized with no clarity of purpose and leaving many things to be sorted out during the course of its implementation; and is being implemented in a directionless way with a lot of confusion. The scheme which was initially meant for BPL families has been extended for all residents in India and to certain other persons. The Empowered Group of Ministers (EGoM), constituted for the purpose of collating the two schemes namely, the UID and National Population Register(NPR), and to look into the methodology and specifying target for effective completion of the UID scheme, failed to take concrete decision on important issues such as (a) identifying the focused purpose of the resident identity database; (b) methodology of collection of data; (c) removing the overlapping between the UID scheme and NPR; (d) conferring of statutory authority to the UIDAI since its inception; (e) structure and functioning of the UIDAI; (f) entrusting the collection of data and issue of unique identification number and national identification number to a single authority instead of the present UIDAI and its reconciliation with National Registration Authority;
- (b) The need for conferring of statutory authority to the UIDAI felt by the Government way back in November, 2008, but was deferred for more than two years for no reason. In this regard, the Ministry of Planning have informed the Committee that till the time Parliament passes the NIDAI Bill, crucial matters impinging

on security and confidentiality of information will be covered by the relevant laws. The Committee are at a loss to understand as to how the UIDAI, without statutory power, could address key issues concerning their basic functioning and initiate proceedings against the defaulters and penalize them;

- (c) The collection of biometric information and its linkage with personal information of individuals without amendment to the Citizenship Act, 1955 as well as the Citizenship (Registration of Citizens and Issue of National Identity Cards) Rules, 2003, appears to be beyond the scope of subordinate legislation, which needs to be examined in detail by Parliament;
- (d) Continuance of various existing forms of identity and the requirement of furnishing 'other documents' for proof of address, even after issue of aadhaar number, would render the claim made by the Ministry that aadhaar number is to be used as a general proof of identity and proof of address meaningless;
- (e) In addition to aadhaar numbers being issued by the UIDAI, the issuance of smart cards containing information of the individuals by the registrars is not only a duplication but also leads to ID fraud as prevalent in some countries; and
- (f) The full or near full coverage of marginalized sections for issuing aadhaar numbers could not be achieved mainly owing to two reasons *viz.* (i) the UIDAI doesn't have the statistical data relating to them; and (ii) estimated failure of biometrics is expected to be as high as 15% due to a large chunk of population being dependent on manual labour.

4. The Committee regret to observe that despite the presence of serious difference of opinion within the Government on the UID scheme as illustrated below, the scheme continues to be implemented in an

overbearing manner without regard to legalities and other social consequences:-

- (i) The Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) have expressed concern that lack of coordination is leading to duplication of efforts and expenditure among at least six agencies collecting information (NPR, MGNREGS, BPL census, UIDAI, RSBY and Bank Smart Cards);
- (ii) The Ministry of Home Affairs are stated to have raised serious security concern over the efficacy of introducer system, involvement of private agencies in a large scale in the scheme which may become a threat to national security; uncertainties in the UIDAI's revenue model;
- (iii) The National Informatics Centre (NIC) have pointed out that the issues relating to privacy and security of UID data could be better handled by storing in a Government data centre;
- (iv) The Ministry of Planning have expressed reservation over the merits and functioning of the UIDAI; and the necessity of collection of iris image;
- (v) Involvement of several nodal appraising agencies which may work at cross-purpose; and
- (vi) Several Government agencies are collecting biometric(s) information in the name of different schemes.

5. The Committee are also unhappy to observe that the UID scheme lacks clarity on many issues such as even the basic purpose of issuing "aadhaar" number. Although the scheme claims that obtaining aadhaar number is voluntary, an apprehension is found to have developed in the minds of people that in future, services / benefits including food entitlements would be denied in case they do not have aadhaar number.

It is also not clear as to whether possession of aadhaar number would be made mandatory in future for availing of benefits and services. Even if the aadhaar number links entitlements to targeted beneficiaries, it may not ensure that beneficiaries have been correctly identified. Thus, the present problem of proper identification would persist.

It is also not clear that the UID scheme would continue beyond the coverage of 200 million of the total population, the mandate given to the UIDAI. In case, the Government does not give further mandate, the whole exercise would become futile.

6. Though there are significant differences between the identity system of other countries and the UID scheme, yet there are lessons from the global experience to be learnt before proceeding with the implementation of the UID scheme, which the Ministry of Planning have ignored completely. For instance, the United Kingdom shelved its Identity Cards Project for a number of reasons, which included:- (a) huge cost involved and possible cost overruns; (b) too complex; (c) untested, unreliable and unsafe technology; (d) possibility of risk to the safety and security of citizens; and (e) requirement of high standard security measures, which would result in escalating the estimated operational costs. In this context, the Report of the London School of Economics' Report on UK's Identity Project *inter-alia* states that ".....identity systems may create a range of new and unforeseen problems.....the risk of failure in the current proposals is therefore magnified to the point where the scheme should be regarded as a potential danger to the public interest and to the legal rights of individuals". As these findings are very much relevant and applicable to the UID scheme, they should have been seriously considered.

7. The UID scheme facilitates the UIDAI and the registrars to create database of information of people of the country. Considering the huge database size and possibility of misuse of information, the Committee are

of the view that enactment of national data protection law, which is at draft stage with the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, is a pre-requisite for any law that deals with large scale collection of information from individuals and its linkages across separate databases. In the absence of data protection legislation, it would be difficult to deal with the issues like access and misuse of personal information, surveillance, profiling, linking and matching of data bases and securing confidentiality of information etc.

8. The Committee note that the Ministry of Planning have admitted that (a) no committee has been constituted to study the financial implications of the UID scheme; and (b) comparative costs of the aadhaar number and various existing ID documents are also not available. The Committee also note that Detailed Project Report (DPR) of the UID Scheme has been done much later in April, 2011. The Committee thus strongly disapprove of the hasty manner in which the UID scheme has been approved. Unlike many other schemes / projects, no comprehensive feasibility study, which ought to have been done before approving such an expensive scheme, has been done involving all aspects of the UID scheme including cost-benefit analysis, comparative costs of aadhaar number and various forms of existing identity, financial implications and prevention of identity theft, for example, using hologram enabled ration card to eliminate fake and duplicate beneficiaries.

9. The Committee are afraid that the scheme may end up being dependent on private agencies, despite contractual agreement made by the UIDAI with several private vendors. As a result, the beneficiaries may be forced to pay over and above the charges to be prescribed by the UIDAI for availing of benefits and services, which are now available free of cost.

10. The Committee find that the scheme is full of uncertainty in technology as the complex scheme is built up on untested, unreliable technology and several assumptions. Further, despite adverse observations by the UIDAI's Biometrics Standards Committee on error rates of biometrics, the UIDAI is collecting the biometric information. It is also not known as to whether the proof of concept studies and assessment studies undertaken by the UIDAI have explored the possibilities of maintaining accuracy to a large level of enrolment of 1.2 billion people. Therefore, considering the possible limitations in applications of technology available now or in the near future, the Committee would believe that it is unlikely that the proposed objectives of the UID scheme could be achieved.

11. The Committee feel that entrusting the responsibility of verification of information of individuals to the registrars to ensure that only genuine residents get enrolled into the system may have far reaching consequences for national security. Given the limitation of any mechanism such as a security audit by an appropriate agency that would be setup for verifying the information etc., it is not sure as to whether complete verification of information of all aadhaar number holders is practically feasible; and whether it would deliver the intended results without compromising national security. As the National Identity Cards to citizens of India are proposed to be issued on the basis of aadhaar numbers, the possibility of possession of aadhaar numbers by illegal residents through false affidavits / introducer system cannot be ruled out.

12. The Committee take note that the Ministry of Home Affairs have alleged that some of the registrars have not adhered to the laid down procedures under UIDAI which renders the Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) signed between the UIDAI and the registrars meaningless; and it compromises the security and confidentiality of information of aadhaar

number holders. Even, according to the latest media reports, controversies between the Ministry of Home Affairs and the UIDAI over issues such as the manner and processes followed by the UIDAI, duplication of efforts between NPR and aadhaar, and security of data still remain unresolved.

13. In view of the afore-mentioned concerns and apprehensions about the UID scheme, particularly considering the contradictions and ambiguities within the Government on its implementation as well as implications, the Committee categorically convey their unacceptability of the National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010 in its present form. The data already collected by the UIDAI may be transferred to the National Population Register (NPR), if the Government so chooses. The Committee would, thus, urge the Government to reconsider and review the UID scheme as also the proposals contained in the Bill in all its ramifications and bring forth a fresh legislation before Parliament.

New Delhi
11 December, 2011
20 Agrahayana ,1933 (Saka)

YASHWANT SINHA
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Finance

NOTE OF DISSENT

Shri Raashid Alvi, MP

I do not agree with the paragraph “13” of the draft Report on “The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010”.

I suggest to delete “this para”.

Dated: 7 December, 2011

Sd/-
(RAASHID ALVI)

NOTE OF DISSENT

Prem Das Rai, MP

The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010

At the outset I do not believe that the bill should be rejected in the manner it has been. Since I have been inducted into the Committee recently I do not have the inputs that went in when the stakeholders and other Government departments were giving witness. I also do not know whether we gave enough time to the UID implementers to give evidence and present their point of view.

Hence, I would like to place on record that the issue of giving out Aadhaar numbers under the UID scheme, I believe, is one of the greatest import for social and economic inclusion in this country. I personally am privy to the kind of work that is needed at the grassroots as I was part of an organisation that did such work in the North East of India and other backward regions using some form of technology to bring in inclusion.

The linking of a person to a number and then being able to make give access to the right to that person is transformational. It is the next phase of transformation that technology can bring about in our own country. This has never been done anywhere in the world and we should be rightly proud of this.

I do agree there may be serious issues that need to be factored in which my esteemed colleagues have pointed out.

I recommend that the Bill may be discussed in Parliament bringing about some of the changes so desired and do not concur that the Bill be brought fresh.

Sd/-

(PREM DAS RAI)

Dated: 8 December, 2011

NOTE OF DISSENT

Manicka Tagore, MP

I could not attend this meeting on adoption of the draft report on the National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010 because a very important discussion on the price rise was going on in the Lok Sabha. The Govt. of India with a view to ensure that the benefits of centrally sponsored schemes reaches to right persons and not misused, they had decided to issue unique identification numbers to all residents in India and to certain other persons the basic idea was to identification of the persons. The Adhar programme has been launched first time in India. The UIDAI officials had taken all possible precautions to make the exercise safe and secure. Both demographic and biometric datas were collected and its method of collecting datas were approved by the Demofic Standard and Verification Procedure Committee.

It is surprising to know that the committee members have not yet recognized the value of UID. This system will cut down fraud and corruption in every area of administration.

I dissent the observation and recommendation of the Standing Committee on Finance regarding the Draft Report on the National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010. I request the Chairman that the UID bill may kindly be considered by the Government with our views and not rejected.

Dated 10 December, 2011

Sd/-
(MANICKA TAGORE)

NOTE OF DISSENT

Magunta Sreenivasulu Reddy, MP

I am writing this letter as a Dissent Note to the Draft Report on the National Identification of India Bill, 2010 which was adopted in the meeting held on 8.12.11. I could not attend the meeting fully since I was required to attend to Lok Sabha proceedings as my Congress Party had issued a Three Line Whip for 8.12.11 and left after signing.

After the meeting having gone into the matter again, I understand the Standing Committee have adopted the Draft Report with the recommendation as:

“considering the contradictions and ambiguities within the Government on its implementation as well as implications, the Committee categorically convey their unacceptability of the National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010 in its present form. The Committee would, thus, urge the Government to reconsider and review the UID Scheme as also the proposals contained in the Bill in all its ramifications and bring forth a fresh legislation before Parliament.”

I personally feel that instead the Bill may be considered in all its merits and the Draft Report may be modified accordingly. More extensive deliberations are therefore required to examine the Bill more thoroughly. This may therefore be treated as my Dissent Note to the Draft Report.

Dated 14 December, 2011

Sd/-
(MAGUNTA SREENIVASULU REDDY)

**MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
(2010-11)**

The Committee sat on Friday, the 11th February, 2011 from 1130 hrs to 1400 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Yashwant Sinha – Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
3. Smt. Jaya Prada Nahata
4. Shri Rayapati Sambasiva Rao
5. Dr. Kavuru Sambasiva Rao
6. Shri Manicka Tagore

RAJYA SABHA

7. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
8. Shri Raashid Alvi
9. Shri Piyush Goyal
10. Shri Moinul Hassan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Shri A. K. Singh | – | Joint Secretary |
| 2. Shri T. G. Chandrasekhar | – | Additional Director |
| 3. Shri Ramkumar Suryanarayanan | – | Deputy Secretary |
| 4. Smt. B. Visala | – | Deputy Secretary |

WITNESSES

Ministry of Planning

1. Ms. Sudha Pillai, Member-Secretary
2. Shri Pronab Sen, Pr. Adviser
3. Shri Chaman Kumar, Addl. Secretary & FA
4. Shri C. Muralikrishna Kumar, Sr. Adviser
5. Shri T.K. Pandey, Joint Secretary (Admn.)

Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI)

1. Shri Nandan Nilekani, Chairman
2. Shri R.S. Sharma, Director-General

2. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Planning and Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI) in connection with the examination of the National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010. Major issues discussed with the representatives included, need for providing statutory status to the Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI); Definition of 'Resident'; provision for de-activating the Aadhaar Number; collection of demographic information and biometric information; nature of enrolment and special measures for enrolment of weaker sections. The Chairman directed the representatives to furnish replies to the points raised during the sitting within one week.

The witnesses then withdrew.

A verbatim record of proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

**MINUTES OF THE NINETEENTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
(2010-11)**

The Committee sat on Wednesday, the 29th June, 2011 from 1130 hrs to 1400 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab – Acting Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri C.M. Chang
3. Shri Bhakta Charan Das
4. Shri Gurudas Dasgupta
5. Shri Nishikant Dubey
6. Shri Mangani Lal Mandal
7. Shri Magunta Sreenivasulu Reddy
8. Dr. Kavuru Sambasiva Rao
9. Shri Sarvey Sathyanarayana
10. Shri Dharam Singh

RAJYA SABHA

11. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
12. Shri Raashid Alvi
13. Shri Moinul Hassan

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Shri A. K. Singh | – | Joint Secretary |
| 2. Shri R.K. Jain | – | Director |
| 3. Shri T. G. Chandrasekhar | – | Additional Director |
| 4. Shri Kulmohan Singh Arora | – | Under Secretary |

Part I

(1130 hrs. to 1145 hrs.)

2. In the absence of the Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab, M.P. to chair the sitting under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure.
3. XX XX XX XX.
- XX XX XX XX.

Part II

(1145 hrs. to 1215 hrs.)

WITNESSES

National Human Rights Commission (NHRC)

1. Shri Rajiv Sharma - Secretary-General
2. Shri A.K. Garg - Registrar (Law)
3. Shri J.P. Meena - Joint Secretary (P&A)

4. The Committee heard the representatives of the National Human Rights Commission on “The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010”. The major issues discussed during the sitting broadly related to nature, objective and beneficiaries of aadhaar number; possible discrimination and specific provisions that are required to be built in; safeguards needed for securing the stored information by the proposed National Identification Authority of India; implications of the provisions of the Bill on the individual’s right to privacy, etc. The Chairman directed the representatives of the National Human Rights Commission to furnish replies to the points raised by the Members during the discussion within a week.

The witnesses then withdrew.

Part III

(1215 hrs. to 1300 hrs.)

WITNESSES

Indian Banks’ Association (IBA)

1. Shri M.D. Mallya - Chairman
2. Dr. K. Ramakrishnan - Chief Executive
3. Shri M.R. Umarji - Chief Advisor-Legal

5. Subsequently, the Committee heard the representatives of the Indian Banks’ Association (IBA) on “The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010”. The major issues discussed during the sitting broadly related to stipulations prescribed by the Ministry of Finance and the Reserve Bank of India for using aadhaar numbers for opening bank accounts; new account holders added through aadhaar numbers; and utility of aadhaar number in financial inclusion, social sector lending, etc. The Chairman directed the

representatives of Indian Banks' Association (IBA) to furnish replies to the points raised by the Members during the discussion within a week.

The witnesses then withdrew.

Part IV

(1300 hrs. to 1400 hrs.)

WITNESS

Dr. Reetika Khera, Visitor, Centre for Development Economics, Delhi School of Economics

6. The Committee then heard Dr. Reetika Khera, on "The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010". The major issues discussed broadly related to nature of Aadhaar number; existing ID proof documents and need for aadhaar number; usage and benefits of aadhaar number particularly in Mahatama Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, Public Distribution System, implications of the UID programme; relevance of Report of London School of Economics on UK's Identity Act 2006 in the context of aadhaar number etc. The Chairman directed the expert to furnish replies to the points raised by the Members during the discussion within a week.

A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The witness then withdrew

The Committee then adjourned at 1400 hours.

MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE (2010-11)

The Committee sat on Friday, the 29th July, 2011 from 1100 hrs to 1715 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Yashwant Sinha – **Chairman**

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Dr. Baliram (Lalganj)
3. Shri C.M. Chang
4. Shri Gurudas Dasgupta
5. Shri Nishikant Dubey
6. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
7. Shri Mangani Lal Mandal
8. Dr. Kavuru Sambasiva Rao
9. Shri Manicka Tagore

RAJYA SABHA

10. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
11. Shri Raashid Alvi
12. Shri Moinul Hassan
13. Shri Satish Chandra Misra
14. Shri Mahendra Mohan
15. Dr. Mahendra Prasad
16. Dr. K.V.P. Ramachandra Rao

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A. K. Singh – Joint Secretary
2. Shri R.K. Jain – Director
3. Shri Ramkumar Suryanarayanan – Deputy Secretary
4. Shri Kulmohan Singh Arora – Under Secretary

Part I

(1100 hrs. to 1130 hrs.)

2.	XX	XX	XX	XX.
.	XX	XX	XX	XX.

Part II

(1130 hrs. to 1300 hrs.)

WITNESSES

3.	XX	XX	XX	XX.
.	XX	XX	XX	XX.

The witnesses then withdrew.

Part III
(1400 hrs. to 1715 hrs.)

WITNESSES

Confederation of Indian Industry (CII)

1. Mr Arun Duggal,
Vice Chairman, International Asset Reconstruction Company (IARC)
and Chairman Shriram Capital Limited
2. Mr Chirag Jain,
Chief Operating Officer
Canara HSBC Oriental Bank of Commerce Life Insurance Company Limited
3. Mr Ravi Gandhi,
VP, Corporate Regulatory Affairs
Bharti Airtel
4. Mr Rameesh Kailasam,
Program Director
IBM India Pvt. Limited

4. The Committee heard the representatives of Confederation of Indian Industry (CII) in connection with examination of 'The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010'. The major issues discussed included, existing ID proof documents and the rationale and necessity of aadhaar number; usage, benefits and objects of aadhaar number; role of aadhaar number in planning and formulation of social policies; collection of biometric and demographic information; measures for enrolment of certain categories like persons with disability; exploration of alternate and economical identity system; opening up of Registrars and enrolment agencies to private sector; technological issues involved in the UID project; financial implications of the UID project; impact of the provisions of the Bill on the individual's right to privacy; potential of possible use of aadhaar numbers by illegal residents; lessons learnt from global practice and failures experienced in different countries in establishment of identity system similar to aadhaar number especially relevance of report of London School of Economics on UK Identity Act, 2006; legality of implementation of the UID project before the law is enacted by the Parliament;

making the penal provisions of the Bill in line with IT Act, 2000 etc. The Chairman directed the representatives of Confederation of Indian Industry (CII) to give suggestions clause-by-clause along-with the replies to the points raised by the Members within ten days.

The witnesses then withdrew.

WITNESSES

Experts

1. Dr. Usha Ramanathan,
Independent Law Researcher on the jurisprudence on Law,
Poverty and Rights, New Delhi
2. Dr. R. Ramakumar,
Associate Professor,
Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai
3. Shri Gopal Krishna,
Member, Citizen Forum for Civil Liberties, New Delhi

5. The Committee then heard the experts on “The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010”. The major issues discussed broadly related to beneficiaries of aadhaar number including the eligibility of children; feasibility study on the UID project; costs and benefits analysis of the UID project; global experience in creation of a national data base of its citizens with biometrics; convergence of data, its usage and its consequences; functioning of the UIDAI under Executive order and implementation of the UID project before an enactment of law; impact of the provisions of the Bill on civil rights and liberties; implications of the provisions of the Bill on RTI Act, 2005; responsibilities of ‘Introducer’ and liability of the UIDAI; outsourcing of works by the UIDAI and its responsibilities; alternate system of identification etc. The Chairman directed the experts to furnish replies to the points raised by the Members during the discussion within ten to fifteen days.

A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The witnesses then withdrew

The Committee then adjourned

Minutes of the Sixth sitting of the Standing Committee on Finance (2011-12)

The Committee sat on Thursday, the 08th December, 2011 from 1500 hrs. to 1615 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Yashwant Sinha – Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Shivkumar Udasi Chanabasappa
3. Shri Harishchandra Deoram Chavan
4. Shri Bhakta Charan Das
5. Shri Nishikant Dubey
6. Shri Chandrakant Khaire
7. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
8. Shri Prem Das Rai
9. Dr. Kavuru Sambasiva Rao
10. Shri Rayapati S. Rao
11. Shri Magunta Sreenivasulu Reddy
12. Shri G.M. Siddeswara
13. Shri Yashvir Singh
14. Shri R. Thamaraiselvan
15. Dr. M. Thambidurai

RAJYA SABHA

16. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
17. Shri Raashid Alvi
18. Shri Vijay Jawaharlal Darda
19. Shri Moinul Hassan
20. Shri Satish Chandra Misra
21. Shri Mahendra Mohan
22. Dr. Mahendra Prasad
23. Dr. K.V.P. Ramachandra Rao
24. Shri Yogendra P. Trivedi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A. K. Singh – Joint Secretary
2. Shri R.K. Jain – Director
3. Shri Ramkumar Suryanarayanan – Deputy Secretary

2. The Committee took up the following draft Reports for consideration and adoption:-

- (i) The Insurance Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2008;
- (ii) The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010; and
- (iii) The Banking Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2011.

3. The Committee adopted the above draft reports with some minor modifications/changes as suggested by Members. The Committee authorised the Chairman to finalise the Reports in the light of the modifications suggested and present these Reports to Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned