India's Rare Earth Processing Gap: From Resource Abundance to Value-Chain Security

A Structural Analysis of India's Reserve Base, Regulatory Architecture, Midstream Capacity and 2030 Demand

Deepti Anand[1], Maleeta Angelina Goddard[2], and Riya Rani[1]

[1]IDCONS TECHNOVA PRIVATE LIMITED (ITPL), New Delhi, India

[2]IDC India — Innovation Development Council, New Delhi, India

Author Note

Deepti Anand https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7685-466X

Maleeta Angelina Goddard https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8540-9498

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Author Contributions: D.A. (Director, ITPL) supervised the study and contributed the behavioural-economics framing. R.R. identified the underlying problem, developed the survey instrument, and collected the data. M.A.G. (Editor, IDC India Innovation Development Council) reviewed the manuscript for editorial and academic standards. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to IDC India- Innovation Development Council, 5th Floor, Wing A, Statesman House, Barakhamba Road, Connaught Place, New Delhi – 110001, India. Email: editorial@idcijst.com

This manuscript is prepared for submission to IDCIJST — Innovation Development Council's International Journal of Science and Technology, ISSN (Online): 3139-7395, published by IDC India Innovation Development Council, New Delhi.

INDIA'S RARE EARTH PROCESSING GAP

Abstract

India has a large rare-earth resource base but remains dependent on external suppliers for important midstream and downstream products, especially rare-earth permanent magnets. This study examines the reserve-to-value-chain gap using documentary and comparative analysis of Indian government, parliamentary, regulatory and international sources. The evidence shows that India's position cannot be explained by geology alone. As of 2026, official estimates identify 13.15 million tonnes of monazite containing about 7.23 million tonnes of rare-earth-oxide equivalent in beach and inland placer deposits, plus about 1.29 million tonnes of oxide-equivalent resources in hard-rock deposits. At the same time, India's commercial value chain remains constrained by the radioactive-element association of monazite, limited commercial mining, under-utilisation of existing processing assets, and a relatively weak midstream ecosystem for metal, alloy and magnet conversion. A key regulatory feature is the classification of monazite as a prescribed substance under the Atomic Energy Act, which keeps mining, processing and refining under government control. The policy environment changed materially during 2025–26 through the National Critical Mineral Mission, the ₹7,280 crore Sintered Rare Earth Permanent Magnet scheme and dedicated rare-earth corridors. Importantly, 2026 government data now estimate India's 2030 REPM requirement at 8,220 metric tonnes per annum, compared with the scheme's 6,000 MTPA planned capacity. The paper argues that India's strategic challenge is therefore not simply to mine more ore, but to build a reliable,

scalable and commercially viable separation-to-magnet chain while maintaining appropriate nuclear-material safeguards.

Keywords: rare earth elements; monazite; critical minerals; India; value chain; Atomic Energy Act; permanent magnets; industrial policy

1. Introduction

Rare earth elements (REEs) comprise seventeen chemically similar elements whose physical and chemical properties make them important inputs for high-performance magnets, electric mobility, wind-energy systems, electronics, advanced manufacturing and other strategic technologies. The policy importance of REEs has increased because the global supply chain is geographically concentrated. The International Energy Agency reports that China continues to dominate the mining and refining of rare earths used in magnets and that global concentration is expected to remain high even as additional capacity is developed elsewhere (International Energy Agency [IEA], 2025).

India occupies an unusual position within this global system. It has significant geological resources and established public-sector capabilities in rare-earth extraction and refining, yet it has not developed a sufficiently broad commercial ecosystem across the full chain from mineral feedstock to separated oxides, metals, alloys and finished magnets. Government statements in 2026 explicitly describe the principal industrial gap as midstream and downstream capacity, while also noting that Indian resources are relatively low grade and associated with radioactive elements, making extraction more complex and costly (Press Information Bureau [PIB], 2026a).

INDIA'S RARE EARTH PROCESSING GAP

The distinction matters. A country can be resource-rich without being supply-chain secure. The ability to extract a mineral from domestic deposits is only one stage of industrial capability. For many high-value applications, the economically decisive stages are separation, purification, metal and alloy production, powder processing and magnet manufacturing. A disruption at any one of these stages can expose downstream manufacturers even when the underlying mineral is available domestically.

The original version of this study identified regulatory control over monazite as the central structural explanation for India's processing deficit. Updated 2026 evidence supports the importance of that regulatory architecture, but also requires a more nuanced conclusion: government sources now identify a combination of controlled access to monazite, resource quality, environmental and land constraints, technology gaps, and the absence of sufficiently deep midstream and downstream industries. The central question is therefore not whether regulation alone explains the gap, but how regulation interacts with industrial economics and missing processing capacity.

This paper addresses that question by mapping India's rare-earth value chain, separating resource estimates from commercially usable reserves, reviewing the regulatory framework, examining production and capacity constraints, assessing China-related supply-chain exposure, and evaluating the 2025–26 policy response against the measurable 2030 demand outlook.

2. Research Problem and Questions

India's rare-earth challenge can be expressed as a reserve-to-value-chain paradox: significant domestic resources coexist with import dependence for critical processed products. The policy problem is not adequately described as a simple shortage of minerals. It is a capability problem involving access to feedstock, separation, conversion, scale, commercial demand and supply-chain coordination.

The study addresses four research questions:

- RQ1: What is the current scale and composition of India's rare-earth resource base, and how should resource, reserve and oxide-equivalent figures be distinguished?
- RQ2: Which regulatory, technological, environmental and industrial factors constrain conversion of domestic resources into commercially scalable rare-earth products?
- RQ3: Where does India's import dependence sit within the value chain, and what does the 2025–26 international supply disruption reveal about the associated strategic risk?
- RQ4: Do the policy measures announced through 2025–26 address the binding constraints, and is the planned REPM manufacturing capacity aligned with the latest 2030 domestic demand estimate?

3. Objectives of the Study

- To distinguish India's broad geological REE resources from more conservative oxide-equivalent reserve estimates.

- To examine the regulatory status of monazite and its implications for mining, processing and private-sector participation.
- To assess the relationship between installed processing capacity, actual production and non-capacity constraints such as environmental, coastal and land clearances.
- To locate India's import dependence across the rare-earth value chain rather than treating 'rare earths' as a single commodity.
- To evaluate the National Critical Mineral Mission, the Sintered Rare Earth Permanent Magnet scheme and the 2026 rare-earth corridors against identified bottlenecks.
- To compare the government's planned 6,000 MTPA REPM manufacturing capacity with the latest official 2030 demand estimate of 8,220 MTPA.
- To develop policy recommendations that combine supply-chain resilience with appropriate nuclear-material safeguards.

4. Literature Review and Policy Context

The literature relevant to India's rare-earth position can be grouped into three strands. The first is global supply-chain research, which focuses on concentration, processing dominance and the strategic implications of export controls. The IEA's work shows that the rare-earth supply chain is more concentrated in processing and magnet production than a simple comparison of mine output would suggest (IEA, 2025).

The second strand consists of Indian government and parliamentary material. These sources provide the most important evidence on resource estimates, monazite governance,

IREL's role, exploration, processing facilities and recent industrial policy. Their importance is methodological: statements about India's resources or processing capability should not be based only on media estimates when a parliamentary or departmental source is available.

The third strand is emerging industrial-policy literature around critical minerals. India's National Critical Mineral Mission, overseas resource acquisition, recycling incentives, processing parks and REPM manufacturing scheme indicate a shift from treating critical minerals as a mining issue to treating them as strategic value chains. The 2026 demand assessment further improves the policy evidence base because it gives a sector-wise estimate of REPM requirements rather than only stating that demand will rise.

A gap remains in the literature. Resource estimates are often presented without explaining the difference between ore resources, monazite resources and REO-equivalent content. Conversely, discussions of magnet dependence sometimes start at finished magnets and work backward, without identifying whether the missing capability lies in mining, separation, metal production, alloying or magnet manufacturing. This paper contributes by keeping those stages analytically separate.

5. Methodology

5.1 Research Design

The study uses structured documentary analysis and value-chain mapping. It does not claim to be a laboratory, engineering or primary cost study. Evidence was organised around five

stages: (1) resource and reserve estimation; (2) mining and mineral-sands concentration; (3) separation and oxide refining; (4) metal and alloy conversion; and (5) permanent-magnet manufacturing.

5.2 Source Hierarchy

Primary evidence was prioritised from the Government of India, including the Ministry of Mines, Department of Atomic Energy, Ministry of Heavy Industries and Press Information Bureau. International evidence was drawn principally from the IEA and USGS. Secondary reporting was used only where it added context to events or market conditions not fully described in primary documents. Claims that remain contested are explicitly identified as such.

5.3 Analytical Framework

For each value-chain stage, the analysis asks four questions: Is domestic capability available? Is it commercially scalable? What constraint limits scale? Does current policy directly address that constraint? This framework prevents downstream manufacturing subsidies from being treated automatically as solutions to upstream or midstream shortages.

5.4 Limitations

- Resource figures use different definitions and cut-off grades; they should not be added together as though all were commercially recoverable reserves.
- State-wise monazite distribution remains dependent on older public assessments even though the national resource estimate has been revised.

INDIA'S RARE EARTH PROCESSING GAP

- Some import-dependence estimates in the source literature are expressed as ranges rather than a single official series, so this study does not treat 60–90% as a precise annual ratio for every rare-earth product.
- The study does not independently model ore economics, recovery rates, separation yields, energy costs or project-level capital expenditure.
- The 2030 demand estimate is an official assessment, but realised demand may differ from the estimate depending on EV, wind, electronics and industrial-motor deployment.

6. Findings: India's Resource Base

India's rare-earth resource story becomes clearer when three different numbers are separated. First, the country has broad geological REE resources identified through exploration. Second, monazite resources are reported in tonnes of mineral. Third, government agencies report rare-earth oxide equivalent (TREO/REO-equivalent) content contained within those deposits. These measures are not interchangeable.

Resource category	Latest public estimate	Interpretation
Monazite in beach, teri and inland placer deposits	13.15 Mt monazite; about 7.23 Mt TREO equivalent	Resource base; not identical to economically recoverable reserve
Hard-rock REE deposits	About 1.29 Mt TREO equivalent	Identified resources in parts of Rajasthan and Gujarat
Earlier ministry-confirmed REO reserve figure	About 8.52 Mt	A narrower figure used in the source paper; should not be combined mechanically with the 2026 resource figures
Broader GSI-augmented REE ore resources	767 Mt as reported in 2026	Large geological resource estimate assessed at different cut-off grades; not a reserve-equivalent figure

INDIA'S RARE EARTH PROCESSING GAP

The latest 2026 government material places 13.15 million tonnes of monazite across beach, teri and inland alluvium in parts of Andhra Pradesh, Odisha, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, West Bengal, Jharkhand, Gujarat and Maharashtra. The same source reports approximately 7.23 million tonnes of rare-earth-oxide equivalent within these deposits and 1.29 million tonnes of oxide-equivalent resources in hard-rock terrains of Gujarat and Rajasthan (PIB, 2026b).

This evidence supports a resource-rich interpretation, but it should not be converted into a claim that India possesses 8–13 million tonnes of immediately mineable, separated REO. Monazite is a mineral feedstock containing both rare-earth elements and thorium/uranium associations. Its grade, mineralogy, location, environmental permissions and processing route determine how much can ultimately be recovered economically.

The state-wise distribution available in earlier Geological Survey/Atomic Minerals Directorate assessments shows a strong coastal concentration. Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Odisha and Kerala account for major portions of the older publicly reported monazite resource base, while West Bengal and Jharkhand also contain identified resources. The geographic concentration means that environmental, coastal-regulation and land-access rules can have a disproportionate effect on national supply.

7. Findings: The Regulatory Architecture

Monazite remains central to India's regulatory challenge because it contains rare earths as well as thorium and uranium-associated material. Under Section 2(g) of the Atomic Energy Act, 1962, monazite is treated as a prescribed substance. The associated rules place its mining,

milling, processing, handling, transfer, import and export within a tightly controlled regulatory framework. Government sources have historically stated that IREL is the principal government entity authorised to handle and process monazite for rare-earth production (Department of Atomic Energy, 2013; PIB, 2026a).

The policy rationale is not simply mineral policy. The regulatory architecture reflects nuclear-material safeguards. That makes a straightforward liberalisation model inappropriate: any reform has to distinguish the commercial value of rare-earth elements from the strategic and radiological characteristics of the associated material.

At the same time, the regulatory framework affects industrial scale. A 2022 government statement reported that IREL had installed capacity to process about 10,000 tonnes per year of rare-earth-bearing mineral while actual monazite production was about 4,000 tonnes per year. The constraints cited included mining leases, environmental clearance, coastal-regulation-zone clearance, forest restrictions, consent-to-operate requirements and uncontrolled habitation around resource areas (PIB, 2022).

The 2026 policy record adds an important nuance: the government now describes India as having upstream mining, separation and high-purity oxide-refining capability, while identifying inadequate midstream and downstream industries as a major weakness. Therefore, the strongest evidence-based conclusion is not that India has no processing capability; it is that existing capabilities are insufficiently scaled and insufficiently connected to a broader commercial value chain (PIB, 2026a).

8. Findings: Where the Value Chain Breaks

Stage	India's position	Primary constraint / gap
Resource & exploration	Large identified resources	Low grades, dispersed deposits and different resource classifications
Mining & mineral-sands processing	Public-sector capability exists	Controlled monazite regime, leases, environmental/CRZ and land constraints
Separation & oxide refining	Established IREL capability exists	Limited commercial scale and concentration of capability
Metal & alloy production	Capability exists but is limited relative to potential demand	Insufficient industrial scale and market depth
Permanent magnets	Domestic capacity expansion now being subsidised	6,000 MTPA planned versus 8,220 MTPA estimated 2030 demand
End-use manufacturing	Large and growing potential market	Exposure to imported magnets and other processed inputs

This value-chain map changes the policy question. The objective should not be framed simply as 'increase rare-earth mining.' India needs coordinated capacity across feedstock, separation, oxide purification, metal and alloy conversion and magnet production. If only the final manufacturing stage is expanded, producers may still face a shortage or price volatility in separated inputs. Conversely, if upstream resources are expanded without downstream demand and industrial buyers, new material may not translate into commercially sustainable projects.

The government's 2026 position is especially useful because it explicitly identifies the absence of midstream and downstream industries as a limiting factor. This is consistent with the industrial logic of critical-mineral supply chains: a mine does not create supply security if the country remains dependent on imported conversion technologies, metals, alloys or magnets.

9. Findings: Import Dependence and Strategic Exposure

India's import dependence should be measured by product stage. The source paper reports negligible raw-ore imports and highlights much higher dependence for separated oxides, metals, alloys and permanent magnets. Government statements in 2026 similarly indicate that India currently imports all of its sintered NdFeB permanent-magnet demand for downstream applications (PIB, 2026c).

This distinction is strategically important. If the raw material is domestic but the magnet is imported, a foreign export-control decision can interrupt Indian production even when Indian mines are operating. The relevant resilience metric is therefore not domestic mineral availability alone, but the share of each critical processing stage that can be performed domestically or accessed through diversified suppliers.

The 2025 export-control episode illustrated this vulnerability. China introduced licensing requirements affecting several heavy rare-earth elements and related products. Indian automotive manufacturers subsequently reported difficulty obtaining magnets, prompting government and industry efforts to secure supplies. The episode demonstrated that supply-chain exposure can emerge quickly at the processed-product stage even when upstream geological resources remain physically available.

The IEA's broader assessment reinforces the structural point. China remains highly dominant in rare-earth refining and magnet production, and concentration is expected to remain

significant through 2030 despite diversification. India therefore faces a global, not purely bilateral, supply-chain concentration problem (IEA, 2025).

10. Findings: Government Policy Response, 2025–26

Policy instrument	Timing	Scale / capacity	Primary target
National Critical Mineral Mission	January 2025	₹16,300 crore government expenditure; ₹34,300 crore including expected PSU/stakeholder investment	Exploration, mining, processing, recycling, technology and overseas sourcing
Sintered REPM Manufacturing Scheme	November 2025	₹7,280 crore; 6,000 MTPA planned capacity	Integrated permanent-magnet manufacturing
Rare-earth corridors	Budget 2026–27	Four states announced	Mining, processing, R&D and manufacturing ecosystem
Critical Mineral Recycling Incentive	2025	₹1,500 crore scheme	Recovery of critical minerals from secondary resources
Processing parks / industrial support	2025–26	Public support including critical-mineral processing parks	Shared infrastructure and industrial clustering

11. Findings: The 2030 Capacity-Demand Gap

A major improvement in the evidence base occurred in July 2026, when the Ministry of Heavy Industries reported an official assessment of India's 2030 REPM requirement. The consolidated requirement was estimated at 8,220 MTPA. The largest components were wind turbines at 1,800 MTPA, electric vehicles at 3,250 MTPA, BLDC fans at 980 MTPA, smartphones and computers at 600 MTPA, and other applications at 820 MTPA (PIB, 2026c).

INDIA'S RARE EARTH PROCESSING GAP

Demand segment	Estimated 2030 REPM requirement (MTPA)
Electric vehicles (2/3/4 wheelers)	3,250
Wind turbines	1,800
BLDC fans	980
Smartphones and computers	600
Industrial motors	500
Other applications	820
Solar-powered pumps	170
Elevators and escalators	100
Total	8,220

The comparison with the 6,000 MTPA REPM manufacturing target is revealing. If the planned capacity is fully realised and is comparable in product mix and availability with the assessed demand, it would cover approximately 73% of the 8,220 MTPA 2030 requirement, leaving a theoretical gap of about 2,220 MTPA. This is not a forecast of an actual shortage because capacity utilisation, imports, exports, recycling, product mix and demand realisation will change the outcome. It is, however, a useful policy benchmark that was unavailable when the earlier version of this paper was prepared.

The demand-capacity comparison also demonstrates why downstream manufacturing cannot be evaluated in isolation. A 6,000 MTPA magnet target is meaningful only if adequate NdPr and other required oxides, metal/alloy conversion, powder-processing capability, power, skilled labour and quality systems are available at the same time. The scheme's integrated design is intended to address this chain, but the success of that integration remains an empirical question as projects are built and commissioned.

12. Discussion

The evidence supports a revised interpretation of India's rare-earth problem. The country is not starting from zero: it possesses substantial resources, government-controlled mineral-sands operations, separation and refining capability, research institutions and a large potential domestic market. The challenge is that these capabilities have historically operated at a scale and level of integration insufficient to create a resilient commercial value chain.

Regulation remains a central structural variable because monazite is not an ordinary mineral. The government's continuing control reflects its association with thorium and uranium. However, describing the entire deficit as a consequence of a single sixty-year-old rule would now be too narrow. Official 2026 evidence points to multiple interacting constraints: low-grade and radioactive-element-associated resources, environmental and coastal restrictions, limited commercial mining, inadequate midstream industries, technology requirements and the lack of a sufficiently deep downstream manufacturing ecosystem.

The policy response is consequently moving in the right direction in one important respect: it is becoming value-chain oriented. NCMM covers exploration through processing and recycling, while the REPM scheme focuses on a strategically important downstream product. The rare-earth corridors add a cluster-based dimension. Yet policy effectiveness will depend on coordination. The most important performance question is whether the new magnet factories receive reliable domestic feedstock and whether separation, metal, alloy and powder capacity expands at a comparable pace.

INDIA'S RARE EARTH PROCESSING GAP

The 8,220 MTPA demand estimate makes this coordination test measurable. The government can now track, year by year, whether planned 6,000 MTPA magnet capacity is being built, how much is actually produced, how much separated oxide is available domestically, what share of demand is met by imports, and whether the 2,220 MTPA indicative gap is narrowing through additional capacity, recycling or diversified imports.

A second issue is economic competitiveness. Domestic production should not be judged only by physical self-sufficiency. If Indian rare-earth products remain substantially more expensive than imported alternatives, manufacturers may continue to depend on foreign material unless policy support is carefully designed around productivity, technology and scale. Industrial resilience is strongest when domestic capacity is both strategically available and commercially competitive.

A third issue is diversification. Reducing dependence on one supplier does not necessarily require complete autarky. India can combine domestic processing with diversified international supply agreements, overseas mineral assets, recycling and substitution research. The strategic objective should be resilience rather than isolation.

13. Policy Recommendations

13.1 Separate Nuclear Safeguarding from Commercial Value-Chain Development

India should examine whether the current regulatory structure can be redesigned so that thorium and other strategically sensitive materials remain under strict custody while rare-earth recovery and commercial processing can be expanded under a specialised licensing regime. Any change should be evidence-based and should preserve nuclear-material accounting, radiation safety and traceability.

13.2 Treat Separation as a Strategic Industrial Capability

Policy monitoring should track separated-oxide capacity separately from magnet capacity. Public reporting should identify installed capacity, actual output, utilisation, product mix and new project timelines for separation and refining. This would make it possible to detect an upstream bottleneck before downstream magnet plants face feedstock constraints.

13.3 Close the Existing Utilisation Gap

Where government-owned facilities already have significant installed capacity, project-level bottlenecks such as mining leases, environmental approvals, CRZ permissions, forest restrictions and consent-to-operate issues should be mapped and resolved transparently. Increasing utilisation of existing assets can be faster and less capital-intensive than constructing an entirely new chain.

13.4 Use the 8,220 MTPA Demand Estimate as a Planning Benchmark

The government should publish an annual capacity-demand dashboard comparing the 8,220 MTPA 2030 assessment with actual magnet production, commissioned capacity, oxide availability and imports. The dashboard should also report by major demand segment so that capacity is matched to actual industrial requirements.

13.5 Build a Multi-Tier Domestic Supplier Ecosystem

Large integrated manufacturers should be complemented by specialist firms in separation, metal production, alloying, powder processing, magnet machining, recycling, testing and quality certification. Industrial policy should reward capability creation rather than only final installed tonnage.

13.6 Develop Recycling as a Parallel Supply Source

Critical-mineral recycling can reduce pressure on primary feedstock and provide a second source of material for magnet manufacturing. The NCMM's recycling incentives and the development of dedicated processing infrastructure should therefore be integrated with the permanent-magnet ecosystem rather than treated as a separate environmental programme.

13.7 Maintain International Diversification

Domestic capacity should be supplemented by diversified overseas sourcing and strategic partnerships. The goal should be to reduce single-supplier exposure while retaining access to

international markets, technology and materials. This approach is more resilient than attempting to eliminate all imports.

13.8 Publish Comparable Data

The rare-earth policy debate is weakened when resource, reserve, ore, oxide, metal and magnet figures are presented without definitions. Ministries should use consistent units and publish a common statistical framework. A national rare-earth balance sheet covering resources, mine output, oxide production, metal/alloy production, magnet output, imports, exports, recycling and demand would substantially improve policy evaluation.

14. Conclusion

India's rare-earth challenge is best understood as a value-chain problem rather than a simple resource problem. The country has substantial identified resources and established public-sector capabilities, but the commercial chain connecting mineral feedstock to high-value processed products remains incomplete and insufficiently scaled.

The regulatory status of monazite is an important part of that story because it reflects the legitimate strategic importance of thorium and radioactive-material control. At the same time, 2026 government evidence shows that regulation is only one part of the explanation. Resource quality, environmental and land constraints, limited commercial mining, technology requirements and the historical absence of deep midstream and downstream industries all matter.

India's policy response has become materially stronger. The National Critical Mineral Mission provides a broad framework, the ₹7,280 crore REPM scheme targets a strategically important downstream industry, and the 2026 rare-earth corridors seek to create geographically integrated ecosystems. The new official estimate of 8,220 MTPA REPM demand for 2030 also provides a benchmark against which policy performance can be tested.

The most important conclusion is therefore forward-looking: India does not need to choose between nuclear-material safeguards and rare-earth industrialisation. The policy challenge is to design institutions that can protect strategically sensitive materials while enabling transparent, scalable and commercially viable rare-earth value addition. If separation, metal/alloy conversion, magnet manufacturing, recycling and demand growth are developed in parallel, India can convert a resource advantage into greater supply-chain resilience. If downstream capacity grows faster than the upstream and midstream chain that feeds it, the country may simply shift its import dependence from finished magnets to the processed inputs required to make them.

15. Research Implications and Future Work

Future research should move from documentary analysis toward project-level industrial assessment. Three areas are especially important. First, a techno-economic model should estimate recovery rates and production costs across major Indian deposit types. Second, a supply-chain model should quantify the domestic oxide, metal and alloy volumes required to support the 8,220 MTPA 2030 magnet-demand estimate. Third, policy research should compare alternative regulatory models for monazite that preserve nuclear safeguards while allowing controlled industrial participation. Such work would allow future studies to test whether the announced capacity targets are merely adequate on paper or economically competitive in practice.

References

Department of Atomic Energy. (2013, March 13). Permission to export monazite. Government of India, Press Information Bureau.

Department of Atomic Energy. (2026, January 29). Parliament question: Rare earth minerals. Government of India, Press Information Bureau.

Geological Survey of India. (2015). Indian Minerals Yearbook 2015: Rare earths. Indian Bureau of Mines.

International Energy Agency. (2025). Renewables 2025: Analysis and forecasts to 2030. International Energy Agency.

Ministry of Mines, Government of India. (2025, July 23). Written reply in Lok Sabha on rare earth reserves, resources, imports and exports.

Press Information Bureau. (2025a, January 29). Cabinet approves National Critical Mineral Mission to build a resilient value chain for critical mineral resources vital to green technologies. Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2025b, November 26). Cabinet approves ₹7,280 crore scheme to promote manufacturing of sintered rare earth permanent magnets (REPM). Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2025c, March 26). Extraction of critical minerals from tailings. Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026a, February 3). India steps up exploration, mining and value addition of rare-earth minerals. Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026b, April 2). Rare-earth resources and domestic beneficiation capability. Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026c, July 21). Assessment of rare earth permanent magnet demand in India. Ministry of Heavy Industries, Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026d, July 29). Ministry of Heavy Industries extends bid submission timeline for global tender under the REPM scheme. Government of India.

Press Information Bureau. (2026e, April 2026). Rare-earth corridors and permanent-magnet manufacturing ecosystem. Government of India.

United States Geological Survey. (2025). Mineral commodity summaries 2025: Rare earths. U.S. Department of the Interior.