IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)
e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 21, Issue 5. Ser. I (May. 2019), PP 80-82
www.iosrjournals.org

FDI in Defence Sector in India

Dr. Rajesh Kumar
Associate professor Commerce Seth Phool Chand Bagla (PG) College Hathras UP

Abstract
Recent media reports have indicated that internal Ministry of Commerce memoranda are being forwarded to the cabinet secretariat with recommendations to raise the cap on FDI in the defence sector from 26% to 100%. "There is no requirement to tender, but these businesses must respond to RFPs in order to meet the technical requirements and win the finance bids that are necessary under the FIPB/CCEA clearance process." The government agency may stipulate in its request for proposals that the successful bidder establish system integration in India with a specified minimum value-added ratio. The government is encouraged to invest more than 51% of its FDI in the defence sector, according to the report's recommendations. There is no need for a legislative act to raise this cap; rather, the administration can simply issue an order to do so.

I. Background

In the past, only the government could legally manufacture weapons and other military hardware. As a result of the resolution of industrial strategy in 1948, private companies were limited in their involvement in this field. In May 2001, the government authorised up to 26% FDI in the defence sector, marking the beginning of the era for the sector. The Ministry of National Defense and the Ministry of Industrial Policy and Promotion (DIPP) collaborated in January 2002 to create comprehensive regulations for the issuance of licences to manufacture weapons and ammunition (press release 2 of the 2002 series). However, the 26% FDI cap failed to entice many foreign investors to the defence industry; FDI in the sector totaled only 70 rupees from 2001 to 2009. Groups representing many industries, such as ASSOCHAM, have repeatedly requested this. CII increased from 26% in 2008 to 49% in 2010. As reported by the National Assembly's Standing Committee in December 2008, they urged the administration to increase the BDI cap to 49%. The United States government has followed a similar course. The government suggested increasing the FDI cap from 26% to 49% in the first federal budget transfer of the re-elected UPA government in July 2009. According to the results of the study, the percentage of foreign capital used in the manufacturing of modern military hardware must be raised to 100 percent. Despite these requests and proposals, the Ministry of Defense has made it plain that foreign investment in joint military in the defence sector is capped at 26%. Case-by-case reviews will be conducted for over 26% of FDI. Foreign firms can keep their layered positions at the discretion of MoD thanks to Press 2009 Series Note 2's allowance of higher FD through a multilayer structure.

Except for certain instances, such as a joint venture with Russia for the manufacturing of multi-role transport aircraft, MoD received a 50% foreign participation from the prime minister. HAL and the French firm Snecma are permitted to form 50-50 partnerships for MoD to develop aircraft engines, while Russia has a 50% stake in the BrahMos missile factory. Yet, the MoD has just recently shot down 9 out of 49 percent.

Foreign direct investment in the Indian defense industry

Marindra Defense Systems, BAE Systems of the United Kingdom, and an overseas stake in the L&T–EADS joint venture are all examples of such companies. Of course, the defence industry was the only public sector sector that allowed direct foreign investments to exceed the 26% cap.

The need for more foreign investment

Foreign direct investment (FDI) into the defence industry has been shown to have significant economic effects. Foreign direct investment (FDI) is growing in tandem with rising levels of foreign currency inflow. This ensures that money from taxes and other sources stays within the community. This is a barrier that hinders foreign firms from joining the Indian defence sector. There is a high demand for venture capital from overseas enterprises, but few advantages for the local public sector or guarantees of purchase, capacity, exports, or access to other markets. If the Ministry of Defense has already bought from foreign suppliers, there is no reason for a foreign firm to set up a 26% subsidiary in this country. In order to operate, the world's largest military manufacturers need access to cutting-edge technologies. However, overseas multinationals are not accustomed to giving away their proprietary technology to a firm in which they have little to no investment. With billions of dollars in development expenditures and no feasible return based on the current FDI laws, high technology is unattractive (lack of control over the technologies and know-how). Many foreign corporations are now present in India. By boosting FDI, foreign corporations can transfer sensitive technology to Indian joint ventures and assume a larger portion of the risk and reward. To add insult to injury, present FDI restrictions prevent India's primary domestic markets and supply chains are attractive to multinational corporations because of the country's potential as a global production hub. The United States contributes to the largest and most sophisticated defence industry on the planet. To the contrary, establishing a cap on FDI in the defence sector encourages investment from the United States and strengthens the strategic nature of the relationship between India and the United States. The rise in the BDI cap will also help India's huge corporations that have diversified into the military industry. Expanding FDI will safeguard the transfer of technology from overseas businesses and encourage further FDI. When working in a highly advanced development environment, such as the defence industry, it is crucial to minimise commercial risks. Defense systems, typically at the technological forefront, demand significant capital investments and may not guarantee actual orders. Indeed, Indian makers of civil defence equipment are compelled to look outside for business partners, funding, and technology.

Acquired rights

Reports indicated that the Defense Ministry did not welcome the Ministry's proposal.

Defense Public Sector interests weigh in alongside military needs and defence strategy considerations to shape the Ministry of Defense's stance (DPSUs). The latter contributed to the Raksha Udyog Ratna [RUR] status, which culminated in a proposal starting in 2006 to pick a top Indian private business in the defence industry. Civilian businesses can now compete on an equal footing with DPSUs like HAL thanks to the RUR status, which grants them access to the same level of foreign technology and allows the government to invest up to 80% in the design, development, and production of defence products like hunters and tanks that the warship would have produced. There is significant opposition to increasing the FDI limit for private Indian enterprises with established expertise in the defence industry, therefore despite certain assurances, no company has yet been awarded RUR status. These firms allegedly persuaded industry bodies like CII to tighten the MoD's BDI limit in order to halt the transfer and prevent the emergence of new competitors.

Foreign direct investment in the Indian defense industry

Those who advocate for a continued FDI cap in the defence industry point to offset policy as a way to bring in cutting-edge tech without jeopardising national security. The compensating policy mandates that any international firms entering into a defence contract must provide 30% of the contract's value in Indian-made defence goods and services. Contracts worth more above Rs 300 crore have been reimbursed at 30 percent since the Defensive Engagement Procedure 2005 (DPP 2005), but greater FDI flows are becoming unavoidable. India lacks the expertise and experience in the relevant industry to take on the $ 9 billion in compensation liabilities that it faces in 2012. To avoid any complications, international suppliers with large compensation responsibilities should engage in non-commercial and off-site trading with Indian firms. An additional danger is that a foreign supplier will submit an offset to an Indian offset partner for a lesser technology component by including a minimal technical value to avoid compensation. It is prudent to presume that the necessary level of technology can be reached only with compensation within the existing FDI limits. There is an unrealistic expectation among domestic firms, especially DPSUs, that they will be able to acquire production technology, technology, and efficiency within off-grid technology. Actually, the disadvantages in the defence trade will not cause greater compensation costs, as the massive influx of FDI through knowledge transfer will help to compensate for them.

The Ministry of Defense (MoD) contends that the main reasons for the resistance to the FD cap are concerns about Indian sovereignty, supply security, and the encouragement of organic development. There will be less indigenization and reliance on foreign suppliers if the degree of FDI is increased to less than 49%, because more control will be held by foreign partners. The Ministry of Defense maintained that allowing foreign investors to take over management was possible if FD levels were above 50%. Because of the strategic importance of the defence sector and the potential for withdrawal due to embargoes, sanctions, and pressure from foreign governments or international organisations, there is concern that the business will fail. The Commerce Department provided solutions to the wartime supply chain security challenges. To ensure national security, the Indian government has decided it can require compensation in exchange for restrictions on industrial facilities. "There may be anxiety over the provision of equipment, design, or source code to the enemy country," the commentator notes. In theory, the government might retain oversight over the manufacturing and distribution of these installations. By sending in the appropriate law enforcement. Using a "negative list," exports can be restricted from hostile countries. This is illustrated by a model that permits up to one hundred percent foreign investment in the defence sector without the usual safeguards of control, security, and confidentiality in the United States, the United Kingdom, and several European countries. Strict regulation of the final use of products and export sales; a cap on the percentage of foreign board members; and restrictions on physical and electronic access to sensitive information and production processes. With the exception of its foreign ownership and investment, the corporation is wholly local and fully compliant with all national military regulations for security and secrecy. You just need to make some little tweaks to make it work in this context.

Because India insists on India's control over defense-producing enterprises, most branch organisations and foreign companies pushed for the Indian government to lift the Indian ceiling for FDI to 49%. The degree of foreign control over enterprises that have 26% FDI compared to those with 49% FDI is not statistically significant. Because foreign suppliers do not transfer fundamental technologies without the ownership and management control of Indian enterprises, increasing FDI from 26% to 49% will not have a substantial influence on fulfilling India's main technology improvement goals. Improvements to the current level of foreign direct investment (26% presently) will be possible if the FD level is increased to 49%. Increases to 51% from 100% FDI will have a significant impact on India's defence sector.

CONCLUSION

Since India is now the world's second-largest importer of defence equipment, the country's defence strategy, notably its FDI cap, has garnered significant attention abroad. Joint partnerships between international corporations and private Indian businesses are increasingly common as they establish research and manufacturing infrastructure. The Indian government's defence compensation policy has also hastened this development. Many international firms have established Indian joint ventures under the current investment limitations, with the public assumption that these limits will be raised in the near future. There is a heated debate in India over whether or not the country should allow greater foreign direct investment (FDI) in the defence sector. Proposals to entice investors will lead to more money being put into the Indian military sector, and the introduction of foreign technologies will propel its growth to new heights. People in favour of FDI, on the other hand, base 26% of their arguments on sovereignty and security concerns and favour the growth of the organic industry, despite the fact that all of these objections may be solved through strict government regulation. The government must have the courage to fight the vested interests of the DPSUs and their trade unions, established private sector companies, and the outdated bureaucratic attitude. Furthermore, we need to assist with this. Although FDI is an important tool, it is not the only safeguard the government may use for the economy. A closer look at the data reveals that FDI has altered the level of sophistication of technology, increased employment opportunities, and enhanced the efficiency of service delivery. Because of India's FDI cap, the country's military can't move as quickly toward a more contemporary structure. No way can I pay for that.

References

[1]. https://newsonair.com/2022/07/26/india-received-rs-494-crore-fdi-in-defence-sector-since-revising-policy-govt/
[2]. https://www.investindia.gov.in/foreign-direct-investment
[3]. https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1654091
[4]. https://www.business-standard.com/about/what-is-fdi