



UPSC & STATE PCS CURRENT AFFAIRS · UJIYARI.COM

DAILY QUIZ — SOLVED

Daily Quiz — April 15, 2026

15 April 2026



CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

linkedin.com/in/epicbharat

ALSO FROM THE CREATOR

BharatNotesFree UPSC notes, MCQs, PYQ analysis. **100% Free.**bharatnotes.com →

ADVERTISE

Advertise with Ujiyari

Reach thousands of UPSC aspirants daily.

epicbharat@gmail.com

DAILY QUIZ — SOLVED ANSWER KEY

Daily Quiz — April 15, 2026

15 April 2026 · 13 Questions · Answers & Explanations Included

Question 1

of 13

[Source →](#)

The constitutional procedure for Samrat Choudhary's appointment as Bihar Chief Minister on April 15, 2026 (following Nitish Kumar's resignation) is governed primarily by:

- A Article 74 — Council of Ministers to aid and advise the President
- B **Article 164(1) — The Chief Minister shall be appointed by the Governor, and other Ministers by the Governor on the advice of the CM ✓**
- C Article 356 — Failure of constitutional machinery in a State
- D Article 324 — Election Commission's powers over electoral processes

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: Article 164(1) provides that the Chief Minister is appointed by the Governor, and the other Ministers are appointed by the Governor on the advice of the CM. Since the pre-poll NDA coalition retained majority (BJP 89 + JD(U) 74 + allies = 182 of 243), the Governor invited the BJP Legislature Party's elected leader — Samrat Choudhary — without requiring assembly dissolution. **ANALYSIS:** Article 164(2) makes the CoM collectively responsible to the Assembly; Article 164(4) mandates that a non-MLA Minister be elected within 6 months; Article 163 limits the Governor's discretion to specific constitutional contingencies.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

Constitutional provisions relevant to a Chief Minister's appointment and change: **Article 163** — Governor acts on the 'aid and advice' of the CoM, with discretion limited to Articles 200 (bills reserved for President), 201, 213 (ordinances), 356 (emergency). **Article 164(1)** — CM appointment.

Article 164(2) — Collective responsibility. **Article 164(4)** — 6-month non-MLA window.

The Governor's discretion in appointing a CM arises only in a hung assembly — where there is a clear majority or a pre-poll coalition with majority, the Governor must invite the leader of that coalition. For Samrat Choudhary, the BJP Legislature Party first elected him leader; this formal election then became the basis for Governor Syed Ata Hasnain's invitation.

The oath of office and secrecy are under the Third Schedule. Nitish Kumar's resignation itself followed from his Rajya Sabha election — an MP cannot simultaneously be a CM (Article 164(4) requires an MLA/MLC).

Q1  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS2 — Polity (CM appointment, Governor's role, Article 163/164); GS2 — Federalism.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Article 164, Governor's discretion, aid and advice, Third Schedule, hung assembly.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing Article 74 (Union — PM/CoM aiding President) with Article 163 + 164 (State — CoM aiding Governor). The parallel structure is intentional but the Articles are different.

 **EXAM TIP**

UPSC Prelims has repeatedly tested Governor's powers — the distinction between discretion (limited) and ministerial advice (binding) is key.

 **INTERVIEW**

Does the Governor retain any meaningful discretion in appointing a CM when a pre-poll coalition exists, or is the Article 163 'aid and advice' principle now absolute?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 2

of 13

[Source →](#)

The Konyak Naga anti-cancer herbal study (April 2026) raises questions about traditional knowledge protection. Under India's Patents Act, 1970, the provision that specifically excludes traditional knowledge from patentability is:

- A Section 3(b) — Inventions contrary to public order or morality
- B Section 3(d) — New forms of known substances without enhanced efficacy
- C Section 3(j) — Plants and animals other than microorganisms
- D **Section 3(p) — An invention which in effect is traditional knowledge or an aggregation/duplication of known properties of traditionally known components ✓**

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: Section 3(p) of the Patents Act, 1970 (inserted via 2002 amendment) specifically excludes 'an invention which, in effect, is traditional knowledge or which is an aggregation or duplication of known properties of traditionally known component or components' from patentability. **ANALYSIS:** This provision — along with the TKDL (Traditional Knowledge Digital Library) maintained by CSIR + AYUSH — has been used to revoke foreign patents on turmeric (1995), neem (1997), and basmati (2001).






For the Konyak formulation, only novel derivative compounds (like the isolated 9,19-Cyclolanost-24-en-3-ol binding VEGFR2) could potentially be patented; the traditional formulation itself cannot.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

India's Patents Act 1970 has several categorical exclusions under Section 3: (a) frivolous inventions; (b) contrary to public order/morality; (c) mere discovery of a scientific principle; **(d) new forms of known substances without enhanced efficacy — the famous Novartis case (2013); (j) plants/animals other than microorganisms; (p) traditional knowledge.** The TKDL was created specifically to prevent biopiracy — the unauthorised patenting of Indian traditional knowledge abroad.

The Biological Diversity Act 2002 (amended 2023) provides the complementary framework: access to biological resources and associated traditional knowledge requires NBA approval and benefit-sharing agreements with local communities through BMCs (Biodiversity Management Committees) and People's Biodiversity Registers (PBRs). The Nagoya Protocol (2010, in force 2014) under the CBD creates the international parallel — requiring PIC (Prior Informed Consent) and benefit-sharing for transboundary access.

Q2  **CONCEPT KIT**

 CROSS-PAPER	GS3 — IPR, biotechnology, traditional knowledge; GS2 — IR (CBD, Nagoya).
 MAINS KEYWORDS	Section 3(p), TKDL, Biological Diversity Act 2002, Nagoya Protocol, biopiracy, traditional knowledge protection.
 COMMON MISTAKE	Confusing Section 3(d) (anti-ever-greening for pharma) with Section 3(p) (traditional knowledge). Both are important; they address different issues.
 EXAM TIP	UPSC GS3 2019 asked about IPR and traditional knowledge — key terms: TKDL, turmeric revocation (1995), neem revocation (1997), BDA 2002, NBA, BMC, PBR, ABS (Nagoya).
 INTERVIEW	Has India's legal architecture (BDA 2002 + TKDL + Section 3(p)) adequately prevented biopiracy, or does the Konyak study's route to commercialisation reveal remaining gaps?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 3

of 13

[Source →](#)

The ILO's 'Universal Social Protection in Changing Labour Markets' report (April 2026) is anchored in the organisation's foundational convention on social security standards. That convention — listing 9 branches of social protection — is:

- A ILO Convention 87 (1948) — Freedom of Association and Right to Organise
- B ILO Convention 98 (1949) — Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining
- C **ILO Convention 102 (1952) — Social Security (Minimum Standards)** ✓
- D ILO Convention 111 (1958) — Discrimination (Employment and Occupation)

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: ILO Convention 102 (1952) — Social Security (Minimum Standards) — establishes the 9 branches of social protection: (1) medical care, (2) sickness benefits, (3) unemployment benefits, (4) old-age benefits, (5) employment injury, (6) family benefits, (7) maternity benefits, (8) invalidity benefits, (9) survivors' benefits. **ANALYSIS:** This 1952 framework remains the backbone of modern social security systems globally, including India's architecture (EPF, ESIC, PMJJBY, Ayushman Bharat etc.).

The 2026 Report calls for universal coverage across all 9 branches, a shift from 'poverty reduction' to 'poverty prevention', and progressive financing via wealth/inheritance taxes.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

ILO (International Labour Organization) was founded in **1919** under the Treaty of Versailles; it became the first specialised agency of the UN in 1946. HQ: **Geneva**.

India is a **founding member**. The ILO is unique among UN bodies in its **tripartite** structure — governments, employers, and workers each have representation in governance.

Won the **Nobel Peace Prize in 1969**. Key Conventions India has ratified include Nos. 1, 6, 14, 81, 100, 102, 105 (abolition of forced labour), 111 (non-discrimination), 144, and the 2011 Domestic Workers Convention 189.

India has not ratified Conventions 87 (Freedom of Association) or 98 (Collective Bargaining), citing the existence of equivalent provisions in domestic law. The Social Security Code 2020 — part of India's four consolidated Labour Codes — is India's most direct legislative response to Convention 102's framework.

Q3  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS2 — IR (ILO, UN agencies); GS2 — Social Justice (social protection); GS3 — Economy (labour market, fiscal financing).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

ILO Convention 102, 9 branches, Code on Social Security 2020, universal social protection, tripartite structure, Nobel Peace 1969.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing Convention 102 (Social Security) with other core conventions — 87/98 (freedom of association, collective bargaining), 100/111 (non-discrimination), 29/105 (forced labour), 138/182 (child labour). All are important; Convention 102 specifically frames the 9-branch social security architecture.

 **EXAM TIP**

Remember ILO as the only UN agency with TRIPARTITE structure (Govt + Employers + Workers).

 **INTERVIEW**

Should India ratify ILO Convention 87 and 98, given that its labour code reforms (IR Code 2020) already touch on freedom of association?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 4

of 13

[Source →](#)

India's Code on Social Security, 2020 introduced a first-ever statutory framework for gig and platform workers. The Code specifically mandates contributions from 'aggregators' (the companies operating platforms). The contribution structure prescribed is:

- A 10% of the worker's monthly earnings, deducted from the worker and remitted by the aggregator
- B Fixed at ₹500 per month per registered gig worker, paid entirely by the aggregator
- C **1-2% of annual turnover of the aggregator, OR up to 5% of payments made to gig/platform workers, whichever is lower ✓**
- D A one-time ₹5,000 registration fee per gig worker, refundable upon successful scheme enrolment

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: Chapter IX of the Code on Social Security, 2020 specifies that aggregators (platform operators) must contribute 1-2% of annual turnover, OR up to 5% of payments made to gig/platform workers, whichever is LOWER. These contributions feed into the Social Security Fund under Section 114. **ANALYSIS:** This is India's first statutory recognition of gig workers as beneficiaries of a social security architecture.

However, implementation rules remain unnotified as of April 2026 — the aggregator contribution has not actually been collected at scale yet, and state-level frameworks (Rajasthan 2023, Karnataka 2024, Telangana 2025) have moved faster than central rules.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

The Code on Social Security 2020 consolidated 9 laws: EPF Act 1952, ESIC Act 1948, Maternity Benefit Act 1961, Payment of Gratuity Act 1972, Employee Compensation Act 1923, Unorganised Workers Social Security Act 2008, Employment Exchanges Act 1959, Cine Workers Welfare Fund Act 1981, Building & Other Construction Workers Cess Act 1996. Chapter IX introduces the gig/platform worker category — defined in Section 2(35) (gig worker) and 2(60) (platform worker).

Definitions matter: a 'gig worker' is outside the employer-employee relationship; a 'platform worker' does work via an online platform in exchange for payment. The e-Shram portal (launched August 2021 by MoLE) is the enrolment vehicle — 30+ crore unorganised workers registered by early 2026, making it the world's largest informal-worker database.

Rajasthan's Platform-based Gig Workers (Registration and Welfare) Act 2023 was the first state-level law; Karnataka's 2024 Act followed. These state frameworks levy 1-2% welfare cess on aggregator transactions — broadly aligned with central Code but operational earlier.

Q4  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS2 — Governance (labour codes, gig workers); GS3 — Economy (platform economy, labour markets); GS2 — Social Justice (informal workers).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Code on Social Security 2020, Chapter IX, gig worker, platform worker, aggregator contribution, e-Shram portal, Rajasthan 2023 Act.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Thinking the Code's gig provisions are fully operational — the central rules remain largely unnotified; implementation is far behind legislative intent.

 **EXAM TIP**

Four Labour Codes: Wages Code 2019, Industrial Relations Code 2020, Occupational Safety Code 2020, Social Security Code 2020.
All passed, none fully implemented as of 2026.

 **INTERVIEW**

With Rajasthan, Karnataka, and Telangana operationalising gig worker welfare ahead of the Code's rules, should the central framework defer to state innovation or enforce uniform central standards?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 5

of 13

[Source →](#)

The European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) — which directly affects India's green steel strategy under the Bharat Steel 2026 Summit — functions by:

- A Banning import of high-emission steel and cement from non-EU countries after 2026
- B Imposing a tariff on imports based on the embedded carbon emissions of the imported product, matched to the EU's internal carbon price under the Emissions Trading System ✓
- C Providing export subsidies to EU steel producers to offset their domestic carbon compliance costs
- D Requiring non-EU producers to co-finance 10% of the EU's Green Deal budget based on their export volume

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: CBAM is a carbon tariff — it imposes a levy on imports into the EU based on the embedded emissions of the imported good (cement, iron and steel, aluminium, fertilisers, electricity, hydrogen), matched to the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS) price. Importers must purchase CBAM certificates reflecting their product's emissions.

ANALYSIS: Because Indian steel emits ~2.6 tCO₂/tonne versus EU's ~1.3 tCO₂/tonne, Indian exports face substantially higher CBAM charges than EU-produced steel — creating commercial pressure to decarbonise Indian production to retain EU market access. CBAM's definitive phase took effect January 2026.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

CBAM Mechanism, phases: **Transitional phase (Oct 2023 – Dec 2025)** — only reporting obligations; no financial adjustment. **Definitive phase (from Jan 2026)** — financial adjustment begins; importers purchase CBAM certificates matched to EU ETS allowance prices.

Coverage: cement, iron & steel, aluminium, fertilisers, electricity, hydrogen (initially); may expand to downstream products.

Purpose: prevent 'carbon leakage' — where EU carbon rules push production to less-regulated countries.

Legal basis: EU Regulation 2023/956. CBAM is contested at the WTO — some developing countries (including India) argue it violates the Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR) principle of climate governance.

India's response has been multi-pronged: (1) Green Steel Taxonomy (Feb 2025) — defines emissions intensity thresholds; (2) National Green Hydrogen Mission (2023, ₹19,744 cr) — aims for 5 MMT annual green H₂ by 2030; (3) PLI for Specialty Steel (2021, ₹6,322 cr); (4) Planned domestic Carbon Credit Trading Scheme to give Indian producers monetisable emissions reductions.

Q5
 **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS2 — IR (climate governance, WTO, EU-India trade); GS3 — Economy (trade policy, carbon pricing); GS3 — Environment (climate change, steel decarbonisation).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

CBAM, EU ETS, carbon leakage, CBDR, Green Steel Taxonomy, National Green Hydrogen Mission, Paris Agreement Article 6.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Thinking CBAM is a blanket ban — it's a tariff matched to EU ETS prices, not a quantitative restriction.

 **EXAM TIP**

CBAM covers 6 sectors currently.
India's exposure is largest in steel (~\$5 billion annual EU exports) and aluminium.

 **INTERVIEW**

Does CBAM violate the WTO's non-discrimination principle and the UNFCCC's CBDR, or is it a legitimate climate-policy tool that WTO rules should accommodate?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 6

of 13

[Source →](#)

India's National Steel Policy 2017 set a quantitative target for crude steel capacity by 2030-31 — a key framework for the Bharat Steel 2026 Summit. That target is:

- A 200 MT, with per-capita consumption of 120 kg
- B 250 MT, with per-capita consumption of 140 kg
- C **300 MT capacity and 255 MT crude steel production, with per-capita consumption of 160 kg ✓**
- D 400 MT, with per-capita consumption of 200 kg

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: National Steel Policy 2017 targets 300 MT crude steel capacity and 255 MT production by 2030-31, with per-capita steel consumption rising to 160 kg (from ~95 kg currently). India currently produces ~145 MT (2024-25) — so meeting 255 MT by 2030 requires sustained 5.5%+ annual growth, which is challenging but aligned with announced private-sector expansions.

ANALYSIS: Per-capita consumption of 160 kg would still leave India below the global average (~220 kg) — but would represent a significant catch-up, driven by infrastructure (Bharatmala, Sagarmala, Gati Shakti), automobile, and real estate demand.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

The National Steel Policy 2017 (NSP 2017), notified by the Ministry of Steel, replaced NSP 2012. Key targets: **Capacity 300 MT, Crude production 255 MT, Finished steel consumption 230 MT, Per-capita consumption 160 kg, Exports 24 MT, Required investment ~₹10 lakh crore**, all by 2030-31.

India is currently 2nd globally (after China) in crude steel production; China produces ~1 billion tonnes (>7x India). The Indian steel sector employs ~2.5 million directly + indirectly.

Key players: Tata Steel, JSW Steel, SAIL (public), JSPL, RINL/Vizag Steel (public, under strategic divestment). Coal & iron ore intensive — India has ~8 billion tonnes iron ore reserves (self-sufficient) but imports ~85% of coking coal (mainly Australia).

The 2026 Summit will reflect policy updates: Green Steel Taxonomy (Feb 2025), PLI for Specialty Steel (2021, ₹6,322 cr), National Green Hydrogen Mission (2023, ₹19,744 cr).

Q6  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — Economy (industrial policy, self-reliance); GS3 — Environment (steel decarbonisation); GS2 — IR (CBAM, trade policy).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

National Steel Policy 2017, 300 MT target, per-capita consumption, PLI Specialty Steel, Green Steel Taxonomy, National Green Hydrogen Mission.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing production (255 MT) with capacity (300 MT) — both are in NSP 2017 but address different aspects. Capacity > production accounts for efficiency and utilisation rates.

 **EXAM TIP**

Memorise: India 2nd in steel production; per-capita 95 kg (2024) → target 160 kg (2030); target 300 MT capacity.

 **INTERVIEW**

Can India hit 300 MT capacity by 2030 purely on private-sector investment, or does RINL/SAIL's capacity expansion need state support?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 7

of 13

[Source →](#)

Heat waves are not currently part of the centrally notified disaster list under the Disaster Management Act, 2005 — a gap highlighted by The Hindu's April 15, 2026 editorial on India's heat crisis. The significance of centrally notifying a disaster under this Act is primarily that:

- A It makes the disaster a constitutionally recognised emergency under Article 352
- B It automatically triggers deployment of the NDRF and the armed forces
- C It enables access to the State Disaster Response Fund (SDRF) and National Disaster Response Fund (NDRF) for relief, which are constrained to 'notified' disasters ✓
- D It requires the Prime Minister's personal approval for relief disbursement

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: Under the Disaster Management Act 2005, centrally notified disasters unlock SDRF (State Disaster Response Fund) and NDRF (National Disaster Response Fund) for relief expenditure. Currently notified disasters include: cyclones, droughts, earthquakes, fires, floods, tsunamis, hailstorms, landslides, avalanches, cloud bursts, pest attacks, frost and cold waves — but NOT heat waves.

ANALYSIS: This legal gap means that despite mounting mortality (~100,000+ excess deaths linked to heat, per NEJM-India 2023 models), states cannot access SDRF/NDRF for heat-relief measures (cooling shelters, water supply, ex-gratia). The editorial argues for notifying heat waves under the DM Act — a Finance Commission-level recommendation that has been repeatedly made but not acted upon.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

The Disaster Management Act 2005 establishes the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA, chaired by PM), State Disaster Management Authorities (SDMAs, chaired by CM), and District Disaster Management Authorities (DDMAs, chaired by DM). SDRF and NDRF are fiscal instruments — SDRF funded 75:25 Centre-State (90:10 in NE and hill states); NDRF wholly central.

The current notified disaster list is determined by the 15th Finance Commission (2020-21 to 2025-26), which retained the previous categories. A state can use up to 10% of SDRF for 'local-specific' disasters (meaning even without central notification).

But for substantial relief access, central notification matters. NDMA's Heat Wave Guidelines (2019) provide advisory frameworks — state Heat Action Plans (HAPs) in Ahmedabad (pioneering, 2013), Odisha, Telangana — but these are not statutory.

The OSHWC Code 2020 (Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions) regulates indoor thermal limits in workplaces but does NOT mandate protections for outdoor workers (construction, delivery, agriculture) — a major protection gap.

Q7
 **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — Disaster Management; GS2 — Governance (Finance Commission, SDRF/NDRF); GS3 — Environment (climate adaptation).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Disaster Management Act 2005, notified disasters, SDRF, NDRF, NDMA Heat Wave Guidelines 2019, Heat Action Plans, OSHWC Code 2020.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing 'declared' (operational) with 'notified' (legal category under DM Act). Also, remember SDRF can be used for 'local-specific' disasters up to 10% even without notification — but the big-scale relief requires central notification.

 **EXAM TIP**

12+ categories of notified disasters currently; heat wave missing. Biological, chemical, radiological disasters notified post-COVID.

 **INTERVIEW**

Should heat waves be added to the notified disaster list, and what fiscal implications would that have for SDRF/NDRF?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 8

of 13

[Source →](#)

The Konyak tribe is one of the Naga sub-groups. Linguistically, the Konyak language belongs to which of the following language families?

- A Indo-Aryan (branch of Indo-European)
- B Dravidian
- C Austroasiatic (Mon-Khmer + Munda)
- D Sino-Tibetan (Tibeto-Burman branch) ✓

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: The Konyak language is classified under the Sino-Tibetan family, specifically its Tibeto-Burman branch. Most Naga languages (Ao, Angami, Sema, Lotha, Konyak, Chang, Phom etc.) are Tibeto-Burman.

ANALYSIS: This places the Konyaks linguistically with East Asian language traditions — contrasting with the Austroasiatic Munda languages (spoken by Santhali, Ho, Mundari in eastern India) and the Austroasiatic Mon-Khmer languages (Khasi in Meghalaya). India's linguistic diversity spans 4 major families: Indo-Aryan (~78% speakers), Dravidian (~20%), Austroasiatic (~1.2%), and Sino-Tibetan (~0.6%).

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

India's language family distribution (2011 Census, ~121 languages with >10,000 speakers): **Indo-Aryan** — Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, Gujarati, Punjabi, Odia, Assamese, Kashmiri etc.; largest family by speaker share. **Dravidian** — Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam, Tulu, Brahui (Pakistan).

Austroasiatic — Santhali, Mundari, Ho (Munda branch); Khasi, Nicobarese (Mon-Khmer branch). **Sino-Tibetan (Tibeto-Burman)** — Meitei, Bodo, Kokborok, Mizo, Manipuri languages, most Naga languages including Konyak.

Tai-Kadai — rarely represented; some NE border languages. **Andamanese** — independent isolate.

Nagaland has ~20 Naga tribes, each with distinct language/dialect. The Konyaks (Mon district) are one of the largest, famous for historical headhunting practice (ended mid-20th century) and facial tattoos.

Nagaland's state language policy uses Nagamese (a Creole lingua franca based on Assamese) for inter-tribal communication; English is the official state language. The Konyak population is ~2.5 lakh (Census 2011), ~95% Christian (Baptist majority).

Q8  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS1 — Society (tribal demographics, language diversity); GS1 — Geography (North-East India).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Konyak tribe, Sino-Tibetan family, Tibeto-Burman branch, Naga languages, Nagamese, Schedule VI, Scheduled Tribe.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Assuming all North-Eastern languages are Sino-Tibetan — Khasi (Meghalaya) is Austroasiatic (Mon-Khmer).

 **EXAM TIP**

4 main Indian language families: Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Austroasiatic, Sino-Tibetan. Schedule VIII of the Constitution lists 22 scheduled languages; Konyak is NOT one of them (Nagaland's scheduled language is... none — Nagaland's 20 Naga languages are recognised at state level but not in Schedule VIII).

 **INTERVIEW**

Should more tribal languages (including Konyak) be added to Schedule VIII, and what implications would that have for their preservation and digitisation?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 9

of 13

[Source →](#)

The Nagoya Protocol (2010, in force 2014) — referenced in the Konyak herbal study for its benefit-sharing framework — is an implementing agreement under which international convention?

- A UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
- B **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) ✓**
- C United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
- D Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is a supplementary agreement under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Adopted at Nagoya, Japan in October 2010; entered into force October 2014.

ANALYSIS: The CBD (Rio Earth Summit, 1992) has three pillars: conservation of biological diversity, sustainable use of components, and fair and equitable sharing of benefits from genetic resources. Nagoya operationalises the third pillar by setting rules for Prior Informed Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) for access to genetic resources, ensuring benefits flow back to provider countries and indigenous communities.

India ratified Nagoya in 2014; domestic implementation is via the Biological Diversity Act 2002 (amended 2023).

📖 CONCEPT NOTE

The CBD (Rio 1992) has three implementing protocols/agreements: **Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2000, in force 2003)** — regulates transboundary movement of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs/GMOs). **Nagoya Protocol on ABS (2010, in force 2014)** — access and benefit-sharing for genetic resources.

Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress (2010, in force 2018) — addresses damage from LMO movement. India ratified the CBD in 1994, Cartagena in 2003, Nagoya in 2014.

The Biological Diversity Act 2002 (amended significantly in 2023 to streamline access procedures for Indian users and AYUSH sector) implements both the Cartagena (via GEAC — Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee) and Nagoya (via NBA — National Biodiversity Authority) protocols. Other important biodiversity treaties not CBD-related: CITES (1973, trade in endangered species); Ramsar Convention (1971, wetlands); CMS (1979, migratory species); ITPGRFA (2004, plant genetic resources for food — a FAO instrument parallel to CBD).

Q9  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — Environment (biodiversity, genetic resources); GS2 — IR (international conventions, UN system).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

CBD, Nagoya Protocol, Cartagena Protocol, ABS, PIC, MAT, Biological Diversity Act 2002, NBA, TKDL.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing Nagoya (ABS under CBD) with Kyoto (under UNFCCC) or Stockholm (POPs — persistent organic pollutants).

Kyoto/Paris are climate treaties; Stockholm is chemicals. Nagoya is biodiversity-specific.

 **EXAM TIP**

CBD 1992 → Cartagena 2000 (biosafety) + Nagoya 2010 (ABS) + Nagoya-KL 2010 (liability). India ratified all three.

 **INTERVIEW**

Has the Nagoya Protocol been effective at preventing biopiracy, or does it only work if developed-country researchers voluntarily comply with source-country ABS laws?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 10

of 13

[Source](#) →

The Hate Speech Bill 2026 introduced by Telangana (reviewed in The Hindu's April 15 editorial) includes administrative content-removal powers without explicit judicial oversight. Which constitutional test — central to free-speech jurisprudence — is most directly implicated by such powers?

- A Basic structure doctrine — Kesavananda Bharati (1973)
- B Procedure established by law — Article 21; Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)
- C Reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2) — the doctrine of proportionality in free-speech regulation ✓
- D Separation of powers and independence of judiciary

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: Article 19(1)(a) guarantees freedom of speech and expression; Article 19(2) allows 'reasonable restrictions' on this right on specific grounds (sovereignty, public order, decency, morality, defamation, contempt, incitement to an offence, and 'friendly relations with foreign States'). The proportionality test requires that restrictions be (i) for a legitimate aim, (ii) necessary in a democratic society, (iii) proportionate to the harm addressed, and (iv) least restrictive among alternatives.

ANALYSIS: The Telangana Bill's overbroad definition of 'disharmony' and its administrative (non-judicial) content-removal powers raise proportionality concerns — following *Shreya Singhal v. UoI* (2015) which struck down Section 66A of the IT Act on similar grounds, and more recently the *Kunal Kamra v. UoI* (2024) stay on the Fact Check Unit notification.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

Landmark Supreme Court free-speech cases: **Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras (1950)** — first major 19(1)(a) case; struck down restrictions on circulation. **Bennett Coleman v. Union of India (1973)** — held press freedom includes right to circulate, under 19(1)(a).

Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015) — struck down Section 66A of the IT Act as unconstitutionally vague; established the standard that free-speech restrictions must be narrowly drafted. **S. Rangarajan v. P. Jagjivan Ram (1989)** — film certification; free speech subject to narrow restrictions.

S.G. Vombatkere v. UoI (2022) — sedition law (Section 124A IPC) held in abeyance pending parliamentary review. **Kunal Kamra v. UoI (2024)** — Bombay HC struck down (and SC stayed re-instatement of) the Fact Check Unit notification under IT Rules amendment.

The Telangana Hate Speech and Hate Crimes (Prevention) Bill 2026 represents a state-level experiment — but must pass constitutional muster on Article 19(1)(a)-(2) proportionality. Similar Bills in Karnataka (2023), Haryana (2024) have faced HC challenges.

Q10  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS2 — Polity (fundamental rights, free speech); GS2 — Governance (state-level legislation, police powers); GS4 — Ethics (hate speech regulation, majoritarian tensions).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Article 19(1)(a), Article 19(2), proportionality test, reasonable restrictions, *Shreya Singhal v. UoI* 2015, Section 66A, vagueness doctrine, *Kunal Kamra v. UoI*.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Thinking Article 19(2) is a blanket authorisation for restrictions — the SC has repeatedly held that restrictions must be narrowly tailored; vague and overbroad restrictions are unconstitutional (*Shreya Singhal*).

 **EXAM TIP**

The 8 grounds of restriction under 19(2): sovereignty and integrity of India, security of state, friendly relations with foreign states, public order, decency or morality, contempt of court, defamation, incitement to an offence.

 **INTERVIEW**

Is administrative content-removal (without prior judicial oversight) ever consistent with Article 19(2)'s proportionality requirement, or is judicial review essential in every case?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 11

of 13

[Source →](#)

The 'green steel' taxonomy released by India's Ministry of Steel in February 2025 — relevant to the Bharat Steel 2026 Summit — defines green steel certification through:

- A A binary classification (green / not green) based on whether the steel is produced using EAF route only
- B **A star-rating system (1 to 5 stars) based on emissions intensity thresholds (kg CO₂/tonne of steel produced)** ✓
- C A mandatory Indian BIS standard requiring 100% renewable-powered production from 2030
- D Certification granted only to steel produced using hydrogen as the reducing agent

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: India's Green Steel Taxonomy (Feb 2025) introduces a 1-to-5 star rating system based on the emissions intensity of steel production — measured in kg CO₂ per tonne of finished steel (t CO₂e/tCrude Steel). Steel with lower emissions gets higher stars; the baseline threshold (below which steel cannot claim 'green' status) is defined separately for different production routes.

ANALYSIS: This taxonomy is a market-signalling instrument — it helps buyers (especially EU importers facing CBAM) verify emissions claims, and helps green-steel producers command a premium. It does not mandate emissions reductions, but creates a graded disclosure architecture that supports market-led decarbonisation.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

India's Green Steel Taxonomy (notified by Ministry of Steel, February 2025) has these key features: **Classification thresholds** — based on emissions intensity: 1-star (<2.5 tCO₂/t), 2-star (<2.2), 3-star (<2.0), 4-star (<1.8), 5-star (<1.5). (Specific numbers vary by published version; consult the latest notification). **Scope** — covers crude steel, hot-rolled, cold-rolled, galvanised and other finished steel grades.

Verification — third-party verification required; BIS (Bureau of Indian Standards) and accredited entities conduct audits.

Mandatory reporting — for producers above certain scale.

Parallel policies: **PLI for Specialty Steel (2021, ₹6,322 cr)** — incentivises high-end steel production; **National Green Hydrogen Mission (2023, ₹19,744 cr)** — 5 MMT H₂ target by 2030 with steel sector allocation; **National Steel Policy 2017** — 300 MT capacity target by 2030-31. For context: current Indian steel emissions ~2.6 tCO₂/t (global avg 1.85, EU 1.3, best-in-class H-DRI projects 0.5-0.8).

Green steel premium in international markets: ~\$50-150/t over conventional steel.

Q11  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS3 — Environment (industrial decarbonisation); GS3 — Economy (steel industry, industrial policy); GS2 — IR (CBAM, trade standards).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Green Steel Taxonomy, emissions intensity, CBAM, National Green Hydrogen Mission, star rating, BIS, H-DRI.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Thinking green steel certification requires a specific technology (hydrogen-based).
In fact, the taxonomy is technology-neutral — it rewards emissions intensity regardless of whether emissions reductions come from H₂-DRI, EAF + renewables, CCUS, or biomass substitution.

 **EXAM TIP**

Green Steel Taxonomy (Feb 2025) + PLI Specialty Steel (2021) + National Green Hydrogen Mission (2023) = India's three-pillar green steel policy.

 **INTERVIEW**

Is a voluntary star-rating taxonomy sufficient, or does India need a binding emissions cap on steel producers (mirroring the EU's ETS) to drive rapid decarbonisation?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 12

of 13

[Source →](#)

The Bihar caste survey released in October 2023 — still politically consequential in 2026 — estimated the OBC + EBC population share in Bihar as:

- A Approximately 42% — confirming existing NSSO assumptions
- B Approximately 52% — slightly higher than previous estimates
- C **Approximately 63.1% — substantially higher than the 52% assumed by earlier central surveys ✓**
- D Approximately 75% — including all reserved categories combined

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

EXPLANATION

FACT: The Bihar Caste Survey 2023 (conducted under the state's jurisdiction) reported OBC at 27.1% and EBC (Extremely Backward Classes) at 36.0%, totalling 63.1% OBC+EBC. SC was 19.7%, ST 1.7%, and General (upper castes including Brahmins, Rajputs, Bhumihars, Kayasthas) 15.5%. **ANALYSIS:** This survey was politically consequential because it was the first state-level systematic caste enumeration since the 1931 British census; it became a template for other states (Karnataka's 2015 study now seeking implementation; Telangana's 2023-24 survey).

The BJP's 2026 appointment of Samrat Choudhary (Koeri — an EBC caste) as Bihar CM is partly a response to the survey's political implications — solidifying the non-Yadav OBC coalition.

CONCEPT NOTE

Caste census politics in India: The last comprehensive caste census was the 1931 British census. Post-independence decennial censuses (1951 onwards) record only SC/ST data; broader OBC/EBC enumeration was not conducted centrally. The 2011 Socio-Economic Caste Census (SECC) attempted a partial caste enumeration but was widely criticised for methodological errors and never released in full. States have increasingly moved to independent surveys: **Karnataka (2014-15)** — Kantharaj Commission survey; never officially released.

Bihar (2023) — released October 2023; legally upheld by SC. **Telangana (2024)** — ongoing. **Andhra Pradesh (2024-25)** — announced.

Politically, caste enumeration is consequential because reservation policies (SC/ST at 15+7.5%, OBC at 27% centrally) were historically based on Mandal Commission data (1980) and 1931 census projections. Fresh caste data can fundamentally alter political and policy arithmetic.

The BJP's position has shifted from opposition to selective acceptance — Samrat Choudhary's elevation reflects this pragmatic shift. The Congress and RJD, meanwhile, have pushed for a nationwide caste census.

Q12  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS1 — Society (caste, social stratification); GS2 — Polity (reservation, electoral politics); GS2 — Social Justice (affirmative action).

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

Bihar Caste Survey 2023, OBC/EBC, Mandal Commission, SECC 2011, reservation jurisprudence, Koeri/Kurmi/Yadav politics.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Confusing the 1931 census (comprehensive caste data) with subsequent censuses (SC/ST only). Also, SECC 2011 partial enumeration was not a full caste census.

 **EXAM TIP**

Mandal Commission (1980) recommended 27% OBC reservation, implemented 1990 (V.P. Singh era). Bihar Caste Survey 2023 upheld by SC (Oct 2023).

 **INTERVIEW**

Should India conduct a nationwide caste census as part of the next Census (delayed from 2021 to TBD), and what policy implications might that have?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 13

of 13

[Source →](#)

India's e-Shram portal (launched August 2021) is the world's largest database of unorganised workers. Which ministry administers e-Shram, and under what legal framework?

- A Ministry of Rural Development — under the Mahatma Gandhi NREGA Act, 2005
- B Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment — under the Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016
- C **Ministry of Labour & Employment — under the Unorganised Workers Social Security Act, 2008 (now absorbed into the Code on Social Security, 2020) ✓**
- D Ministry of Finance — as part of the Direct Benefit Transfer architecture

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

 **EXPLANATION**

FACT: e-Shram is administered by the Ministry of Labour & Employment (MoLE). It was launched in August 2021 as the registration portal envisaged under the Unorganised Workers Social Security Act, 2008 (UWSSA), which has since been absorbed into the Code on Social Security, 2020.

ANALYSIS: The portal enables self-registration of unorganised workers with Aadhaar authentication, creating a 12-digit Unique Activity Number (UAN) and Shramik Card. As of early 2026, 30+ crore workers are registered — but scheme-delivery on the back of this registration remains uneven. e-Shram is intended to be the targeting backbone for PM-SYM, PMJJBY, PMSBY, and other unorganised-worker schemes.

 **CONCEPT NOTE**

Ministry of Labour & Employment (MoLE): administers India's labour regime, including EPFO, ESIC, Labour Bureau, and the new Labour Codes (Wages 2019, IR 2020, Social Security 2020, OSH 2020). e-Shram portal (est. Aug 2021) — self-registration portal for unorganised workers (agricultural, construction, domestic, gig/platform, street vendors, etc.).

Aadhaar-based authentication; IFSC/bank linkage; 12-digit UAN (Unique Activity Number); portable across states. Statistics (early 2026): 30+ crore registrations; ~60% from rural areas; ~55% female; ~35% aged 18-30.

Concerns: registration without follow-through — most registrants haven't received structured social protection. Integration with other schemes: PM-JAY (Ayushman Bharat) linking ongoing; PM-SYM (₹3,000/month pension post-60); PMJJBY (₹2 lakh life cover for ₹436/year premium); PMSBY (₹2 lakh accident cover for ₹20/year premium).

The Code on Social Security 2020 provides the statutory backing going forward — e-Shram becomes the central unorganised worker registry under Chapter V of the Code.

Q13  **CONCEPT KIT**
 **CROSS-PAPER**

GS2 — Governance (welfare delivery, Aadhaar, DBT); GS3 — Economy (informal labour, social protection); GS2 — Social Justice.

 **MAINS KEYWORDS**

e-Shram, Ministry of Labour & Employment, UWSSA 2008, Code on Social Security 2020, Shramik Card, unorganised workers.

 **COMMON MISTAKE**

Assuming e-Shram is under Ministry of Social Justice (which handles disabilities, SC/ST, OBC) or Ministry of Rural Development (NREGA, rural welfare). e-Shram is squarely under Labour & Employment.

 **EXAM TIP**

e-Shram launch Aug 2021; 30+ crore registered by 2026 = largest informal-worker database globally. Under Code on Social Security 2020 (Chapter V).

 **INTERVIEW**

Has e-Shram's registration success translated into meaningful social protection delivery, or is the registration-benefit gap India's current social-protection bottleneck?

 [Read Full Article →](#)



CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

[LinkedIn](#)[Read Full Edition](#)**ALSO FROM THE CREATOR**

BharatNotes

Free UPSC study platform — notes across all 4 GS papers, MCQs, PYQ analysis & progress tracking. **100% Free.**

bharatnotes.com →**ADVERTISE WITH UJIYARI**

Reach **thousands of UPSC & State PCS aspirants** daily through our PDFs, website & social channels.

Coaching • EdTech • Publishers • Exam apps

[✉ epicbharat@gmail.com](mailto:epicbharat@gmail.com)

“You have to dream before your dreams can come true.”

— A.P.J. Abdul Kalam