

Making 'Make in India' Work

What is the issue?

\n\n

∖n

- Electronics, principally mobile devices and telecom equipment, were the cornerstones of "Make in India" policy.
- But the measures taken as part of this are not encouraging in their achievements, calling for more workable policy decisions.

\n\n

What are the key measures?

\n\n

\n

- The key objective of 'Make in India' scheme is to reduce the ever-increasing import bill on electronic items.
 - \n
- To this end, the government announced in 2017 an ambitious <u>phased</u> <u>manufacturing programme</u> (PMP).
- This is to transform India into a major hub for domestic mobile device production and increase value addition by creating a large component vendor base.

\n

- Backing this was a punitive import duty on components that were not manufactured in India during the financial year set under the policy. \n
- To boost "Make in India", the government also offered <u>preference to</u> <u>companies</u> that met the mandated local content levels in public procurement contracts.

\n

\n\n

What are the claims in this regard?

\n\n

∖n

- **PMP** Indian Cellular Association (ICA) has achieved the PMP target of Rs 500 billion for domestic component manufacturing a year ahead of schedule (2019-20).
 - \n
- Its members have manufactured over Rs 1,650 billion in terms of value of mobile devices in the country, ahead of the target of Rs 1,500 billion. \n
- Also, over 120 manufacturers have set up units in India. $\ensuremath{\sc vn}$
- Imports as a percentage of total production has fallen to 10%. $\ensuremath{\sc vn}$

\n\n

What is the real scenario?

\n\n

\n

- **PMP** Local manufacture of crucial components has still not taken off. \n
- So the average industry value addition on mobile devices is around 20%, though the target is double that by FY2020 for smartphones. \n
- Indeed, ICA admits that production of microphones and receivers, die-cut parts and camera modules have not taken off. \n
- But, notably, these were listed as key components under the 2017-19 PMP programme. \n
- **Preferential purchase** The rule does not extend to private mobile operators.

\n

- But government contracts account for just one sixth of total equipment value (Rs 20,000 - Rs 30,000 annually).
- Also, domestic manufacturers complain that public sector tenders are often tweaked with additional specifications, so that they cannot participate, leaving it to global players.
 \n
- So in all, the preferential purchase policy to domestic manufacturing has also not been that effective. \n

What is the government's response?

\n\n

\n

- The government recently decided to advance by two months the target for locally manufacturing a new set of key components, under the 2018-19 PMP. \n
- These include display assembly, touch panels, cover glass assembly, vibrator motors and ringers.
- But there is opposition from the industry side because manufacturing these components requires large investments and between 18 and 24 months to set up.
 - ∖n
- Moreover, most manufacturers have not invested yet. $\slash n$

\n\n

What do the manufacturers demand?

\n\n

\n

- Manufacturers are demanding that the deadline be postponed for a year. $\ensuremath{\sc n}$
- If not, the stiff 10% duty on importing these components will increase the cost of producing mobile devices in India. \n
- It will also encourage many manufacturers to simply import the entire device.

∖n

• Manufacturers call for strengthening the domestic manufacturing base for products like camera modules and other items which are under the earlier PMP.

∖n

- This is more feasible than adding new components to the list for which large investments would be required. \n
- Meanwhile, importing the other items makes sense for many global players that have factories in countries like Vietnam.
- \bullet From there, they can import without duty under the free trade agreement. \n

What are the policy shortfalls in India?

\n\n

\n

- Global players say they would like to manufacture more in India but the value addition norms are too steep. \n
- The local content requirement ranges from 50 to 100% in 2019-20 and that is impossible to do so as the component vendor base is poor. \n
- Even in Vietnam and Taiwan the value addition is less than 20%. $\ensuremath{\sc n}$
- At the heart of the problem is inadequate incentives to set up a global component base. $\space{\space{1.5}n}$
- Unlike in the auto industry, global vendors for key components are limited to five or six big players and they prefer to set up a few mega plants to leverage cost through volumes.

∖n

- So they set up units in countries from where they can serve at least a fourth or fifth of their global market. \n

\n\n

What is to be done?

\n\n

∖n

- Manufacturers not only look for domestic market but also for an export hub to efficiently export, for government's incentives and ease of doing business. \n
- So merely increasing duty on components and hoping manufacturers to come to India is far-fetched.

\n

- The slowdown in China and the trade war has offered new opportunities. $\slash n$
- Mobile device manufacturers and telecom equipment makers and their vendors search for an alternative.
 \n
- India has an opportunity, but it is Vietnam and Malaysia that are more competitive now.
 \n
- India has to bring in place more relevant and practical policies, to make 'Make in India' work.

∖n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: Business Standard

