



## Chapter 2

# PLANNING

# Planning

## 2.1 Planning for MKM

For effective management of any event, proper planning at macro level as well as micro level is important. This becomes even more critical when the activities of the event are managed by more than one department. During MKM, arrangements on a massive scale were planned to provide basic services and facilities to a floating population of more than eight crore people.

Audit examined whether planning for MKM was comprehensive and formulation of individual projects by various executing agencies was proper and coordinated.

## 2.2 Project formulation

At the outset, the State Government assessed (May 2010) that 78 permanent works costing ₹ 1,848.85 crore would be executed and sent (May 2010) a proposal to GoI for seeking financial assistance. A team of Planning Commission and GoI, acceding to the request of the State Government, visited Allahabad in May 2011. The team recommended (May 2011) works costing ₹ 1,318.91 crore and proposed that the expenditure would be shared in the ratio of 30:70 between the GoI and the State Government respectively. GoI, while approving the proposal, as recommended by the team of Planning Commission, ordered that the funds would be released in two years (2011-12: ₹ 667 crore and in 2012-13: ₹ 651 crore) subject to submission of detailed projects by the State Government.

Scrutiny of the records made available by the Principal Secretary, Urban Development Department (UDD), Mela Administration (MA) and executing agencies including departments, revealed shortcomings/deficiencies in the process of preparation/approval and in the quality of the projects/estimates.

### 2.2.1 Non-preparation of Detailed Project Report

For organising an event of the magnitude of MKM and ensuring synergy of purpose among multiple departments, governments and agencies responsible for creation of infrastructure and delivery of services to pilgrims/visitors, preparation of a Detailed Project Report (DPR) was imperative. However, no DPR was prepared for executing real time monitoring and real time response mechanisms for the projects executed and services delivered by multiple executing agencies.

Instead, the departments prepared plans/projects separately and independent of other executing agencies at various levels, within the departments/agencies.

Scrutiny of the records of *Mela Adhikari (MA)* revealed that there was no formal documented set of guidelines for preparation of project proposals. Instead, *MA* simply sent the projects as and when received from the executing agencies to the State Government for sanction of funds without subjecting these to required scrutiny. Further, *MA* was neither provided any dedicated manpower for preparing project guidelines nor for scrutinising project proposals received from various agencies for approval by the Government. Techniques like Programme Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) and Critical Path Method (CPM) were not adopted in preparation of projects/plan.

*No reply was furnished by the Government. However, the MA stated (May 2013) that DPR was prepared by each department. The reply confirms that aggregated DPR for entire MKM was not prepared, thus rendering the planning process ineffective.*

### 2.3 Absence of mechanism for assessment of requirements

A scientific method, based on certain criteria and need analysis should have been employed essentially to assess the needs of pilgrims during MKM and requirements of infrastructure (both permanent and temporary); deployment of human resource and their capacity building by imparting training; procurements/arrangements of/for material & equipment; medicines, arms & ammunitions, logistics etc. for creation of the required infrastructure and for ensuring optimum security, safety, medical & health services and sanitation to the pilgrims/visitors.

We observed that:

- No scientific criterion/method was adopted for assessing the number of pilgrims/visitors during MKM. Pertinently, in the previous Performance audit of AKM in 2007, it was recommended that assessment of the number of pilgrims should be done properly but no mechanism was put in place for scientific assessment of number of pilgrims expected and those who turned up during MKM;
- Police department did not make any assessment of requirement of infrastructure such as number and location of police/fire stations, man-power, arms & ammunition, equipment, vehicles, logistics etc. Senior Superintendent of Police, MKM (SSP) stated (August 2013) that the assessments were made based on *Kumbh Mela (KM)*, together with the present dispensations. Scrutiny of the records of SSP, however, revealed that deployment of manpower for MKM had no co-relation with those in KM. Short or excess deployments, compared to KM were observed as detailed in *Appendix-2.1*. No justification or the basis of the changed assessment, requirement and deployment for MKM as compared to those in KM were on record;
- About 47 per cent of the total fund allotments for MKM were on road works, executed by Public Works Department (PWD); Allahabad Nagar Nigam (ANN); Allahabad Development Authority; *Uttar Pradesh Awas*

*Vikas Parishad; Jhunsi Nagar Panchayat* etc. but no aggregated, coordinated and comprehensive plan for execution of road works was put in place. Each executing agency had framed its own plans using different criteria/specifications which resulted in defective and deficient estimates, drawings, designs, quality of material used etc. as commented in para 4.3.8 and 7.1.2;

- Medical, Health & Family Welfare (MH&FW) department was responsible for delivery of health & medical services and cleanliness arrangements in MKM area, which was divided into five Sanitation Zones<sup>1</sup> housing 15 hospitals<sup>2</sup>, 20 first aid points, 123 ambulances and four river ambulances together with proposed 25441 PRAI<sup>3</sup> type toilets, 3,410 public toilets, 5,052 flag area toilets and 1625 urinals. Scrutiny of the records of the Additional Director (AD), MH&FW, Allahabad revealed that no need based analysis was undertaken nor any scientific criterion adopted for assessing the number and location of hospitals, toilets, urinals etc. The plan merely mentioned number and locations of the toilets and urinals, purportedly on the basis of population density of *Mela* area without actually having information about it as there was no mechanism to determine/assess the sector-wise density; and
- Concerted and specific plans were needed to be in place to protect the environment; ensure welfare of labourers engaged in the organisation of MKM, differently abled persons and women visiting MKM. We observed that no planning for the aforesaid issues were made. These issues have been discussed in Chapters 6 & 7.

*The Government, in respect of police department reiterated (November 2013) that requirements of infrastructure were assessed on the basis of arrangements made during previous KM. Moreover scrutiny of records in audit revealed that the assessment made in MKM did not have any co-relation with those during KM. The fact remains that because of absence of scientific methodology for estimation of pilgrims, the corresponding assessment of required infrastructure and services were not realistic which either led to excess provision and consequent avoidable blocking of funds or avoidable wasteful expenditure as mentioned in paragraph 4.5.8.*

#### 2.4 Past *mela* experiences not utilised

While planning for any event, lessons from such previous events are to be learnt to ensure that the shortcomings/deficiencies noticed during previous events are not repeated. After AKM, *Mela* Administration had published its administrative report which *inter-alia* brought out deficiencies in planning and execution noticed during AKM. In that report, it was recommended that necessary action to overcome such deficiencies during the subsequent *Mela*

<sup>1</sup> Zone-1: four circles; Zone-2: five circles; Zone-3: five circles; Zone-4: six circles; and Zone-5: two circles.

<sup>2</sup> One 100 bedded Central Hospital, one 30 bedded Police Hospital; ten 20 bedded Circle Hospitals; one five bedded Hospital and two Infectious Disease Hospitals.

<sup>3</sup> Toilets developed by Planning, Research and Action Institute, Lucknow.

would be ensured. We observed that (i) MA did not issue any directive to the departments/other executing agencies for making provisions for rectifying those deficiencies and (ii) the Department also, did not consider the recommendations made in the Administrative report of the Mela Administration prepared after AKM 2007(*Appendix-2.2*).

## 2.5 Non-adherence to GoI's covenants

The position is tabulated below:

**Table-1: GoI's covenants and their compliance**

Sl. No.	GOI's covenant	Status of compliance by the State Government
(1)	(2)	(3)
1	GoI had approved plan of ₹ 1,318.91 crore with department-wise allocation of funds for execution of works.	The State Government revised the department-wise allocation of funds without GoI's approval.
2	Detailed projects were to be sent for release of funds by GoI.	The State Government did not send projects costing ₹ 104.54 crore for approval of GoI. Besides, projects of ₹ 75.33 crore were not approved by GoI for want of details.
3	GoI released <sup>4</sup> a grant (Additional Central Assistance) of ₹ 800 crore and directed the State Government to give these funds to the implementing agencies without any delay, failing which the amounts would be recovered from the State Government with interest for the period of delay. It was also directed to submit Utilisation certificates.	The State Government did not release the funds to the implementing agencies but adjusted the same by recouping its share (out of ₹ 1318.91 crore). No utilization certificates were sent to GoI. This resulted in avoidable creation of liability of interest <sup>5</sup> of ₹ 34.56 crore <sup>6</sup> as of July 2013.
4	GoI had directed that the funds would be utilised for MKM only.	The funds released by GoI were not limited to expenditures on MKM projects <sup>7</sup> .

(Source: Information collected from different departments and Ministries of the State Government and GoI respectively)

No reply was furnished by the Government (March 2014).

## 2.6 No plan for post-mela utilisation of usable and unused items

Keeping in view the procurement of various materials, equipment etc. for MKM, a well thought out plan for post-mela utilisation of these assets was imperative. The State Government, however, did not make any comprehensive plan in this regard. Instead, after completion of MKM, the Chief Secretary, Government of Uttar Pradesh (CS), issued (16 March 2013) an order for utilisation of some of the specific items such as medicines, generators, street light fittings leaving a number of other items which were procured by the departments, specially for MKM. Scrutiny of records revealed that many of

<sup>4</sup> Letter No. 44(6) PF-1/2012-869 dated 9/12.11.2012.

<sup>5</sup> Rate of Interest: Average interest rate for last three years: 6.48 per cent (source: Report on State Finance 2012-13).

<sup>6</sup> Interest of eight months (December 2012 to July 2013): ₹ 800 crore X 6.48% X 2/3 years = ₹ 34.56 crore.

<sup>7</sup> Construction of *Bargad ghat* by Irrigation Department.

items such as hand carts, equipment for Jal police, sanitation items etc. were left with departments without any plan for their utilisation.

*No reply was furnished by the Government (March 2014).*

## **2.7 Recommendations**

- *A Detailed Project Report to assess the required infrastructure, facilities and services for Mela, utilising the past Mela experiences and adopting Programme Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) & Critical Path Method (CPM) should be prepared;*
- *A set of standardised guidelines prioritising the issues for MKM should be provided to the executing departments for preparation of shelf of projects and a mechanism should also be placed at the level of MA to scrutinise the projects before sending these to the State Government; and*
- *A well thought out plan should be conceived and executed for post-mela utilisation of usable and unused items.*