

ANNEXURE - V
(PARA 3.7.1)

**DETAILS OF REPORTS ISSUED UPTO 31.12.1997 ON WHICH
REPLIES HAVE NOT BEEN RECEIVED TILL 31.12.1998**

S. NO	ORGANISATION	DATE OF ISSUE OF REPORT
1.	Northern Railway	19.4.96
2.	Northern Railway	19.4.96
3.	Metro Railway	7.7.97
4.	Metro Railway	8.7.97
5.	Indian Council of Agricultural Research	8.8.97

The observations in brief in these reports are given below:

1. The work regarding provision of second distant signal on Subzi Mandi - Ambala Section being executed by Northern Railway at a cost of Rs.241 lacs was inspected in January, 1996. The dimensions of the trench were specified as 1100 x 350 mm. The work executed at site had dimensions as 940 mm x 300 mm. Thus, there had been execution of work not as per contract and the contractor saved more than Rs.3 lacs on this account. It was also seen that lowest tender was not accepted and measurements were not recorded properly. A loss of Rs.43 lacs was also caused because tender was not accepted within 90 days. Site records were also not maintained. There had been serious lapses, but no action has been taken by Railways.

2. The work regarding provision of tokenless block instruments at 15 stations on Moradabad-Ghaziabad Section being executed by Northern Railway was inspected in February, 1996. The original tender and other documents were not found sealed and kept in safe custody. Measurements were not recorded properly and test-checked. While executing the work, angle irons and M.S. Flats were found of smaller size. The wires were not properly bunched. The steel parts were not painted with anti-corrosive primer/paint. The platform provided was 3 ft. x 1 ft. instead of 3 ft. x 2 ft. and thickness of the planks used was 15 mm instead of 30 mm. There had been serious lapses but no action has been taken by Railways so far.

3. The work of reconstruction of building at premises No.191, C.R. Avenue, Calcutta, costing Rs.56.83 lacs was inspected in May, 1997. It was observed that tenders have not been invited for a long time and suddenly emergency was felt to adopt single tender method. The estimated cost was inflated and higher rates were justified. Excessive mobilisation advance was paid and period of completion was not properly assessed. The steel issued was not properly account for and cube tests were not performed. The execution of the work was not as per specifications.

4. The work regarding reconstruction of buildings in contract section 3B, Belgachia, Calcutta, costing about Rs.271 lacs was inspected during May, 1997. While inviting the tenders and executing the work, proper examination was not carried out for legal and

financial implications. Single tender process was adopted for such a big work and the work even commenced before its award. Richer specifications were adopted without proper justification and accepted rates appeared to be on much higher side. This was a special type of work and minimum expenditure ought to be incurred just to meet with legal/social obligations. The test records were not maintained properly and execution of work was not as per terms of agreement.

5. The horticulture maintenance work and landscaping work of I.A.R.I., Pusa Road, New Delhi was inspected during August, 1997. Certain procedural deficiencies were observed and brought out in the report. The comments on the report have not been received in spite of repeated reminders.