Minutes of Meeting of Consultative meeting on the National rollout of the E-District held on 2nd May 2011 at 10.30 PM at Room No. 1007 Electronics Niketan

1. The consultative meeting on the National rollout of the E-District was held on 2nd May 2011 at 10.30 PM under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (e-Governance) Department of Information Technology (DIT) in Conference Hall No. 1007, Electronics Niketan.

   The list of participants is at Annex-I

2. At the outset, Additional Secretary e-Governance, Shri Shankar Aggarwal welcomed all the participants and informed of the approval of the Cabinet Committee on Infrastructure for the National Rollout of the E District Mission Mode Project. He also requested the participants if any of them had any opening remarks to make.

3. Representative of Delhi Government provided information to the participants on the intention of the Delhi Government to implement the e SLA framework which gives a right to the citizens for time bound and guaranteed service delivery.

4. AS (e-Gov) stated that Department of Information Technology (DIT) Government of India has proposed to enact Electronic Service Delivery Bill and the draft Bill has been circulated for consultations to all Central Government Ministries and State Governments. The E District MMP will enable provision of electronic delivery of high volume citizen centric services at the district and sub district level.

5. AS (e-Gov) thereafter requested Director General NIC to give his opening remarks.

6. DG NIC stated that as on date both the hardware and software infrastructure has been put in place, however now the challenge is to provide various e-Governance services to the Citizens. This will be greatly enabled with the implementation of the e District MMP.

7. Thereafter AS (e-Gov) requested Shri Abhishek Singh to make a presentation to explain the salient features of the Scheme.

8. Shri Abhishek Singh Director DIT in his presentation covered the following points

   a. The e-District project is a Mission Mode Project of the National e-Governance Plan under the State category.

   b. The e-District Project aims at delivery of high volume, citizen centric services

of the District and Sub district level

c. These services will be web enabled and will be accessible to the citizens through the Common Services Centres.

d. To effect delivery of services, there is a need to undertake Business Process Re-engineering of services and determine service levels of each service. Further e-District envisages end to end service delivery which can be enabled only through back end computerisation of the service delivery processes. This also requires digitization of legacy data.

e. The solution architecture of the e-District project envisages a centralised application and database and will leverage the core e-infrastructure of State Wide Area Network , State Data Centre and State Service Delivery Gateway. Further e-District service will be integrated with a mobile service delivery gateway and Aadhaar numbers of the Unique Identification Authority of India.

f. The e-District Project emphasizes capacity building, training and change management of all levels of Government, specially at State, District and Sub district levels.

g. Regarding the status of pilots it was stated that Pilot projects were initiated in 41 districts across 16 States and e-Services have been launched in 30 districts of 10 states namely, UP, Assam, TN, Bihar, West Bengal, Mizoram, Orissa, Haryana, MP and Kerala. Four states of Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Punjab, Uttarakhand were at an advanced stage of rolling out e-District services.

h. The benefits of the e-District project were that the Citizens could access services at their door-steps through the CSCs thereby resulting in substantial cost savings in accessing services. The e-district project has also resulted in empowerment of Citizens.

i. The Salient features of the current scheme are

   i. The e-District Project would be implemented in all States and Union Territories of the country across all the 640 Districts.

   ii. The cost of implementation of the project would be shared between the Centre and States in a ratio of 75:25

   iii. The funding of the States share of the project would be met through Additional Central Assistance.

iv. The E-District project would be implemented in two phases. Under phase 1, those districts would be covered where atleast 70% CSCs are operational. The balance districts would be covered in the second phase

v. The e-District project would be implemented over a timeframe of 4 years which would also include 2 years of operations and maintenance support

vi. Only a single software solution would be implemented in a state and further the application and data would be hosted at the at the SDC

vii. Under the e-District project, five mandatory category of services would need to be implemented across all the States. These would include

1. <u>Issue of Certificates</u>: Domicile ,Nationality, Caste, Marriage, Income, Employment , Birth/Death, Solvency, Legal heir, Disability, Relationship, Non cream layer, Inner Line (NER), etc

2. <u>Social Welfare/Pensions –</u> Enrollment and disbursal of benefits under various Social Welfare Schemes, Pensions (Old age, Widow, Handicap, Destitute)

3. <u>Revenue Court Services</u> – Issue of notices, Case listing, Case adjournment and Stay orders, Status and issue of execution of orders: Information, tracking, and filing of miscellaneous applications.

4. <u>Ration Card services</u> – Ration cards ; Issue of new, modification/surrender/duplicate of old card, etc.

5. <u>RTI services including redressal of Grievances</u> – Application, tracking, monitoring, redressal, appeals etc. related to various departments

6. States need to choose 5 more categories of services, subject to these services not being covered under any other MMP. These service categories may *inter alia* include Certificates, Marriage services, License, utility services, collection of Taxes and dues, grievance redressal, employment services.

viii. Service Levels for each of these services will need to be defined

ix. To enable electronic delivery of these services, the States need to issue required Government Orders and notifications. They would also define a cut-off date for stopping manual services. Necessary legal; and statutory changes would have to be made by the State Governments to enable e Services.

x. The e-District project envisages ICT enablement of field offices of the Government at District, Tehsil and Block level

xi. The Scheme has provisions for extensive Training and Capacity Building at all levels and

xii. The Scheme emphasizes comprehensive Programme Management at National , State and District level

1. An Empowered Committee will be established under the Chairmanship of Secretary, DIT, GoI

2. Program Management Units will be established at the National, State and District level

3. At the State level, 24 Senior Officers, who would have served as Secretary to GOI or Chief Secretary of the State, would be identified to oversee and guide the overall implementation of the Scheme at the State level.

4. At the State level, the State PMU will oversee the implementation of the MMP. Further District e-Governance Society will be established that will oversee the implementation at the District level. During the O & M phase of the e-District Project an SPV will need to be constituted

xiii. The implementation schedule for the Project is as following

S.No.	Major Milestones	Timelines
1	Approval of Scheme by Cabinet	April'11
2	Appraisal and Approval of Detailed Proposals from States	July'11
3	Empanelment of Programme Management Consultants and System Integrators	August'11

4	Selection of Implementation Agencies in the States	October'11
5	Readiness of Delivering eServices (Go-Live) for Pilot States	April'12
6	Readiness of Delivering eServices (Go-Live) for Non-Pilot States	Feb'13
7	State-wide Delivery (electronic) of Identified Services - Pilot States	July'12
8	State-wide Delivery (electronic) of Identified Services - Non-Pilot States	April'13
9	Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Support and Post-Implementation Assessment – Pilot States	June'14
10	Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Support and Post-Implementation Assessment -Non-Pilot States	March'15

xiv. The proposed funding for the e-District project would be as following:

1. Funding at State Level

S No.	Funding Components	Amount
1	DPR Preparation	
A	Non Pilot States	Rs 10 lakhs per State
B	Pilot State	Part of Scope of Consultant engaged presently
2	Systems at Data Center	Rs 175 lakhs per State
3	Application Software	
A	Non Pilot States	Rs 55 lakhs per State
B	Pilot States	Rs 15 lakhs per State
4	Support for Application Software –	Rs 18 lakhs per State per year
5	STQC Testing of Application Software	Rs 35 lakhs per State
6	State PMU	– Rs 12 lakhs per man per annum for 77 resources

S No.	Funding Components	Amount
7	Awareness and Communication –	Rs 20 lakhs per State
8	Impact Assessment	Rs 15 lakhs per State
9	Contingency	3 % of State costs

2. Funding at District level

S No.	Components	Amount
1	IT Infrastructure for Districts	– Rs 88 lakhs per district
2	Connectivity for District Offices	– Rs 25 lakhs per district
3	Capacity Building / Training of District officials	– Rs 15 lakhs per district
4	Site Preparation	– Rs 30 lakhs per district
5	Data Digitisation	– Rs 50 lakhs per district
6	Project Manager	– Rs 3.6 lakhs per year for 3 years
7	Technical Support	– Rs 2.4 lakhs per year for 3 years
8	Awareness and Communication	– Rs 10000 per district
9	Seed money to District e Governance Society	– Rs 10 lakhs per district
10	Contingency	– 3 % (approx Rs 6 lakhs per district)

xv. The various issues in the implementation of the pilot e-District project were that

1. As of date 4 States – Maharashtra, Punjab, Uttarakhand and Jharkhand are yet to go-live with their Services.

2. Rajasthan and Puducherry are yet to select the Implementing Agency.

3. Some States have gone live with only partial list of services

4. In most states there is only a partial conformance to the proposed service delivery as per the new GOs

5. There is substantial variations in service delivery standards in

the different districts within a state

6. STQC certification of the e-District applications in the various states is yet to be done

7. RFP / DPR for full-scale roll-out yet to be finalized in Pilot States

8. In case of Rajasthan and Puducherry, the Pilot is yet to be initiated

xvi. To initiate faster rollout of the e-District Project the following are proposed

1. There needs to be information and knowledge sharing between Pilot and Non-Pilot States which would include sharing of best practices , BPR reports, Government orders,

2. Given the stringent timelines proposed by the Cabinet, it was imperative that all states identify the services to be delivered under the e-District Project by 20th May 2011and DPRs are submitted by 15th June 2011

3. The States also need to initiate digitization of legacy data on a priority basis

4. The Scheme also proposes target linked incentives for District Collector & their teams for faster implementation of the Scheme in their districts.

5. There is a need to leverage applications developed in Pilot States for deployment in the Non Pilot States

6. A methodology for faster deployment of services could be through the cloud model for union territories

7. In order to facilitate the faster rollout of e-District Project it was further proposed that

   a. Central Empanelment of State Wise Consultants and System Integrators

   b. National level empanelment of hardware vendors/agencies for deployment under the e-District Project

xvii. The following issues of concern were also identified:

1. In view of the need to ensure delivery of services even when connectivity is not available, it was suggested that the application should also work in an asynchronous mode to ensure operations in all times.

2. There is a delay in issuance of digital signatures by NIC

3. Further in the service delivery phase, there is unauthorized use of digital certificates by the support staff

4. The quality of digitization of legacy data as has been observed in the Pilot projects to be poor.

5. There is a need for standardized hardware procurement and installation

6. Thin Clients may need to be deployed at Block and Tehsil Offices as they are easy to maintain and also need less power.

7. The issues of Power back up needs to be addressed

8. There is a need to expedite rollout of CSCs for providing access to the citizens

9. There is a need to incorporate feedback of users for continuous improvement of services

10. There is a need for integration of services with Aadhar numbers issued by the UIDAI

11. The e-District solution needs to integrate with SSDG and the Payment Gateway

12. The e-District application needs to have a mobile Interface for purpose of Status tracking

13. Capacity Building and Training were important components of the Project

14. There is a need to enter into deliverables based contracts with the various vendors and service providers to the Project

15. There is a need to monitoring compliance to SLAs and enforce appropriate penalties

16. There is a need to streamline project monitoring and review mechanism of the Project.

The various issues raised by the attendees during the meeting were the following

1. **E-District Mentors –**

   a. AS (e-Gov) in his opening remarks has said that under the current scheme, it is proposed to appoint e-District Mentors for the purpose of guiding and overseeing the implementation of the Scheme. These e-District Mentors would be officisa who have retired as Secretary to Government of India or as Chief Secretary of the concerned State. These e-District Mentors would be of the same State cadre to which they would be appointed. These e-District Mentors would provide invaluable help in implementation of the project as their influence would cut across the various departments of the State Government and thereby facilitate smooth rollout of the various services

   b. Principal Secretary, IT, Punjab expressed a view that this concept needs to evaluated as it might not add value in all cases. The view was shared by Madhya Pradesh.

   c. AS (e-Gov) stated that commitment of Senior Political and Administrative leadership for e-Governance reforms varies from State to State and such e-District Mentors can play a facilitating role. However DIT, GOI would take the views of the concerned State prior to assigning Mentors for this role.

2. **Funding components**

   a. The various participants wanted flexibility in spending of the various components under the scheme. For e.g. Madhya Pradesh mentioned that funding for publicity at District level was not adequate.

   b. It was amply clarified by AS (e-Gov) that the approval as obtained from the Cabinet did not provide for any such flexibility and the e-District Scheme would need to be implemented as per the Cabinet approval. He also added that funding for awareness and communication was adequate.

   c. MD RAJCOMP requested for clarification if the funding under e-District Project covered the administrative expenses of the State Nodal Agency that would be implementing the e-District project in the State.

   d. On the issue of administrative expenses of the Nodal agency, it was clarified that these would not be admissible under the e-District Project and the States would

need to provide for these administrative expenses of the State nodal agency. This aspect would be explicitly covered in the e-District Project guidelines.

e. To a specific query on the subject of data digitization, it was asked if savings on digitization of data can be utilized against other components, it was clarified once again that digitization of legacy data was an important component of the Project and given the large volume of legacy data available, there might not any savings under this head.

3. **Gap funding for infrastructure**

a. It was clarified that only gap funding for ICT infrastructure was being provided under the e-District Scheme and consultants preparing the DPR would need to assess the infrastructure already available in the District.

b. It was mentioned that in Rajasthan this process is already underway

4. **Need for provision of Gensets**

a. Given the shortage of power, many participants requested for provisioning of Gensets for the project. This was specially highlighted by District Magistrate, Nalanda, Bihar.

b. To mitigate the issue of shortage of power two solutions were suggested

   i. The genset provided under the SWAN could be used

   ii. AS e-Gov said that Solar back up of 1 KW could be provided in the District office and 5-6 sub district offices. Funding for solar power back up from the component of the Site preparation needs to be examined.

5. **Reuse of application**

a. To ensure faster rollout of the e-District project it was envisaged that the non pilot states would reuse the existing solutions deployed in the pilot states. The various issues regarding this as expressed by the participants were that

   i. Even in the Pilot States the application would need to be re-architected to incorporate use of the SSDG.

   ii. Since the State portal under the SSDG project was being developed, this State portal would be the gateway for the e-District services and single sign on will be need to be implemented.

   iii. All documents, including SRS, reference architecture, design documents and source code of the application would need to be shared. A central

repository for the SRS, source code and documentation needs to be established for sharing of knowledge relating to the software application.

iv. All States agreed to share the applications developed under the pilot implementation

v. Humanitics, the vendor that had developed the e-District application in Madhya Pradesh said that their experience demonstrated that reuse of the application developed for Madhya Pradesh in another State saved atleast 80% manpower effort.

vi. It was accepted that all Software applications need to have a local language interface.

b. AS (e-Gov) directed that all application developers need to get their applications certified by STQC. Those who fail to do so will not be eligible for the empanelment as System Integrators

6. Importance of **proactive functioning of the District Administration** for implementation of the e-District Project

a. Various participants expressed the view that the success of implementation of e-District project was dependent on the proactive involvement of the District Magistrate or Collector and the various district officials hence emphasis on training, capacity building, change management and provisioning of incentives was very important

7. **Digital Certificates**

a. The delay in issue of digital certificates by NIC was highlighted by all participants

b. Some states had mitigated this issue by enrolling State level and district level sub registrars for issue of digital certificates and such digital certificates are issued within 48 hours.

c. AS (e-Gov) directed that NIC should issue digital certificates within a maximum period of 7 days and necessary process changes should be effected.

d. It was stated that in some states that the Defence officials were not accepting digitally signed certificates.

e. West Bengal had mitigated this issue through a formal communication on the digital signing of the various certificates through a formal communication to the Defence authorities.

f. AS (e-Gov) concurred with this approach and stated that if required DIT would send a formal communication on use of digital signature for signing of the various certificates

g. Tamil Nadu mentioned that the digital signature was provided as a QR code at the bottom of the certificate and this could be validated with a simple GPRS enabled phone. Further they maintained a central repository of all digital signed certificates. Haryana also followed this practice.

h. CEO, NeGD mentioned that we need to evolve a mechanism to maintain a repository of all electronic documents on the lines of NSDL.

8. **SPV at State / District Level**

a. For the O & M phase of the e-district project it was required to establish an SPV at the district level. Some participants felt that the SPV needs to be formed at the State level as most hardware vendors had inadequate presence in all districts and this way a single entity could ensure uptime and maintenance of all equipment established in all districts of the State.

b. In case of Tamil Nadu , it was stated that the ELCOT had undertaken a centralized mechanism for maintenance of all IT infrastructure of the State. Gujarat also advocated a state level approach.

c. AS (e-Gov) opined that given the project was being implemented in a decentralized fashion it was necessary for the District authorities to be responsible for management and maintenance of the district level IT infrastructure. Thus a mechanism for getting the SPV operationalised both at State and District level needs to be worked out.

9. **Single System Integrator or bidding in blocks**

a. Some states expressed the view that for large states it may be necessary to divide the State into 2-3 bidding blocks and invite bids for each of the bidding blocks. Having more than one SI would reduce the risk of failure of implementation of the Project.

b. However it was opined that in view of the fact that the overall responsibility of the for implementing the e District application would be with the SI for the entire state, there was a need to select only one SI for the entire state.

10. **Consortium bidding** for the task of System Integration for the e-District Project

a. It was agreed that given the disparate activities that need to be carried out under

the e-District Project, there was need to allow consortium comprising of a vendors with different skill sets for this project likew Hardware OEMs, Training agencies etc

11. Assam stated that currently the project has been implemented in only 2 districts and there is a huge demand for services across the state. Thus it was urgently required to rollout the e-District project in the entire state and the DPR for the entire state was ready.

12. Chattisgarh expressed an opinion of harmonisation of the e-District project with the CHOICE project that is already under implementation in the State.

13. **Data Digitization**

    a. AS (e-Gov) expressed the opinion that priority should be given to the CSCs for digitization of legacy data and rates for digitization could be fixed centrally.

    b. It was desired to validate the digitized data through a two step process

14. **Selection of Consultants**

    a. To ensure adherence to the ambitious timelines of the e-District project it was stated by DIT that regarding the Pilot States, the preparation of the DPRs and the RFPs was the responsibility of the consultants already appointed for these states. Regarding Non pilot states, the consultants already empanelled by DIT for projects like SSDG/ E District Pilot/ SeMT wet lease project would be appointed for the task of preparation of the DPR report.

    b. Maharashtra asked if the State could appoint consultants from the empanelled list prepared by the State. However, since Maharashtra was one of the pilot States, the DPR is to be prepared by their existing consultant

15. **Issue of services being offered by private operators (CSCs)**

    a. Regarding concerns expressed by participants of the issue of accepting applications for services in CSCs it was clarified that the IT act through the IT Ammendment Act 2008 and the Rules notified under section 6A of the IT Act http://mit.gov.in/content/cyber-laws , an enabling mechanism has been created for delivery of services through private service providers including provisioning of service charges for this purpose.

16. **Issue of asynchronous applications**

    a. Divergent views regarding the requirement of the e-District application to accept requests in an asynchronous mode were expressed. The advantage would be that applications could be accepted and services provided in absence of

connectivity but provisioning of asynchronous mode in application would increase complexity in the software application. The software application for the CCTNS project provided for asynchronous mode of connectivity. The same model could be followed.

17. **Central Empanelment of Vendors / Agencies for finalization of specifications and costs for hardware components**

    a. The issue was deliberated upon and overall the participants felt that the proposed empanelment of hardware vendors and rate fixation for common IT and networking components will help standardize the ICT infrastructure as also bring down costs. Tamil Nadu expressed the view that the State already had a process for empanelment of hardware vendors and rate fixation.

18. **Training and Change Management** -The views of the participants were elicited on whether the SI would be responsible for the training component or a separate training partner appointed.

    a. The consensus was that the SI's did not have specialised teams for training and a separate training agency should be appointed for this purpose. This specialized training provided can be a consortium partner to the SI.

    b. AS (e-Gov) stated that three types of training needs to be provided under the e-District program which were

         i. Training on National e-governance Plan

        ii. Training on use of the software application

        iii. Soft Skills training on service delivery

    While training on the software application could be provided by the System Integrator for the other components, separate vendor needs to be enlisted and he suggested leveraging UN APCICT for this purpose.

19. **Mobile Gateway** – It was suggested that the e-District application should comprehensively use the Mobile Service Delivery Gateway not just for the purpose of Status tracking but also for other purposes like submission of application, receipt of service.

20. **Selection of SI** - View were expressed of extending the scope of work of the existing vendors to the Project in the Pilot districts for the rollout and such extension can be made through innovative means like Swiss Challenge method. Another alternative could be award higher technical scores to the existing vendors.

21. **Pilots in Rajasthan and Puduchery** – It was decided that the e-District Pilot program in Rajasthan and Puduchery would be subsumed under the Scheme for National Rollout of the e-District Project.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks and it was decided that the Guidelines for the Scheme would be formulated by incorporating the various suggestions received in the meeting

Annex 1

List of Participants

DIT, Govt. of India

1. Shri Shankar Aggarwal, Additional Secretary (eGovernance)   **(In Chair)**
2. Shri Abhishek Singh, Director
3. Shri A.K. Balani, Director
4. Shri Anurag Goyal, Director
5. Smt. Archana Dureja, Director
6. Shri Muniram, Director
7. Smt. Renu Budhiraja, Sr. Director
8. Shri S.P. Singh, Sr. Director

NIC & STQC

9. Shri B.K Gairola, Director General, NIC, Govt. of India
10. Smt. Shefali Dash, Deputy Director General, NIC, Govt. of India
11. Shri U.K Nandwani, Director, STQC, Govt. of India

States

12. Shri M.K Yadava, Managing Director, AMTRON, Govt. of Assam
13. Shri Devjyoti Hazarika, Additional Deputy Commissioner, Sonitpur, Govt. of Assam
14. Shri Arup Kumar Burman, Deputy Manager, AMTRON, Govt. of Assam
15. Shri S. DE Sarkar, Director IT, Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh
16. Shri Sanjay K Aggarwal, District Magistrate, Nalanda, Govt. of Bihar
17. Shri Vijay Kumar Sinha, Project Leader, Beltron, Govt. of Bihar
18. Shri Sridhar Reddy, Sr. Officer, BeST, Govt. of Bihar
19. Shri A.M Pariyal, CEO CHiPS, Govt. of Chhattisgarh
20. Shri Sravan Bagaria, Joint Secretary IT, Govt. of Delhi
21. Shri Sushil Singh, Joint Secretary IT, Govt. of Delhi
22. Shri Sandeep Ahlawat, System Analyst, Govt. of Delhi
23. Shri K S Bansal, System Analyst Rev (Delhi), Govt. of Delhi
24. Shri Sandeep Sharawat, AP, Rev (Delhi), Govt. of Delhi
25. Dr. Neeta Shah, Director (eGov), Govt. of Gujarat
26. Shri G.S Bansal, State Informatics Officer (SIO), Govt. of Haryana
27. Shri Saranjit Singh, SE (SDC/CSC), Govt. of Haryana
28. Shri S.S Chaudhary, Joint Director (IT), Govt. of Himachal Pradesh
29. Shri Nazim Zai Khan, Deputy Secretary IT, Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir
30. Shri Anurag Shrivastava, OSD, IT, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh
31. Shri D.P Wahlang, Commissioner & Secretary IT, Govt. of Meghalaya
32. Shri Lalthlamuana, PID, ICT Department, Govt. of Mizoram
33. Shri Pradeep Jena, Secretary IT, Govt. of Orissa
34. Shri Aditya Mohapatra, OSD, OCAC, Govt. of Orissa

35. Shri Sarvesh Kaushal, Principal Secretary IT, Govt. of Punjab
36. Shri Ashwini Kumar, Director (Tech) RISL, Govt. of Rajasthan
37. Smt. Abhina Thapa, PRO Sikkim Tourist, Govt. of Sikkim
38. Dr. Santosh Babu, Managing Director, ELCOT & CEO, TNeGA, Govt. of Tamil Nadu
39. Shri V.K Jain, Resident Manager, ELCOT, Govt. of Tamil Nadu
40. Shri Chandra Prakash, Principal Secretary IT, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh
41. Shri Indra Mani Tripathi, SDM Sitapur, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh
42. Shri Ravindra Singh, Member, CeG, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh
43. Shri Susanta Majumdar, Joint Secretary IT, Department of IT, Govt. of West Bengal
44. Shri Abhishek Verma, Principal Consultant, SeMT, GoM, Maharashtra
45. Shri Manojit Bose, Head SeMT, Jharkhand
46. Shri Arun Gangal, Chandigarh

NeGD

47. Shri Ajay Sawhney, President & CEO, NeGD
48. Shri V. Sivasubramanian, Director, NeGD
49. Shri Bhushan Mohan, Principal Consultant, NeGD
50. Ms. Vineeta Dixit, Principal Consultant, NeGD
51. Dr. Rajesh Narang, Chief Technical Officer, NISG
52. Shri P.K Gupta, Sr. Consultant, NeGD
53. Shri Anirban Mukerji, Sr. Consultant, NeGD
54. Shri Koushlendra Singh, Sr. Executive, NeGD

Participants from Industries

55. Shri G.J Kulkarni, CEO, Humanitics
56. Shri R. Kumar, Delivery Manager, Interlace India
57. Shri Ravi S Chagaty, CEO, Medha Infotech
58. Shri Rajdeep Sahrawat, SGM, TCS
59. Shri Sanat Jethva , Sr. Consultant, TCS
60. Shri Pratik Kr. Dhaboo, Consultant, PwC (Mumbai)
61. Shri Neel Ratan, Executive Director, PwC
62. Shri Kanishka Katara, Principal Consultant, PwC
63. Shri Anurag Saxena , Principal Consultant, PWC
64. Shri Jagbandhu Singh, AVP, Vayamtech
65. Shri Milan Narendra, Partner, Wipro
66. Shri Surender Rana, Manager, Wipro
67. Shri Parvinder Singh, Manager, Wipro
68. Shri Ajay Sindhwani, Sr. Manager, Wipro