

# ANNEXURES



**Annexure-2.1**  
**(Refer para-2.5)**

**Outstanding Advances<sup>1</sup>**

Sl. No.	State	Outstanding advances	Amount (₹ in crore)
1.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	Advances amounting to ₹ 22.90 crore were outstanding for the period ranging one to four years with the Implementing agencies	22.90
2.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In test-checked Sirmour district, ₹ 1.69 crore was deposited with HPSCSCL for purchase of medicines during 2011-15 which was lying unadjusted (as of June 2016) for periods ranging between 18 and 52 months.</li> <li>➤ Between 2013-15, three test-checked districts deposited ₹ 61.64 lakh with Post Graduate Institute (PGI), Chandigarh for treatment of children suffering from various diseases. It was observed that an amount of ₹ 17.07 lakh was adjusted as of June 2016, leaving outstanding advance of ₹ 44.57 lakh with PGI. No record was available with the concerned Chief Medical Officers whether recommended patients actually availed treatment at PGI Chandigarh.</li> </ul>	1.69  0.44
3.	<b>Odisha</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ At the State level, audit found that advance of ₹ 94.55 crore was outstanding against districts, other agencies and staff as of March 2016. This included ₹ 64.02 crore relating to execution of civil works. ₹ 20.92 crore<sup>2</sup> was lying unadjusted for periods ranging from three to more than 60 months against 31 other agencies as of March 2016.</li> <li>➤ In seven test checked districts, CDMOs sanctioned advance of ₹ 20.57 crore<sup>3</sup> as of 31 March 2016 which were lying unadjusted for a period ranging from three to 96 months. Audit noticed that CDMOs did not maintain advance register to review the outstanding advances and did not enforce timely adjustment. In response to audit, the CDMOs stated (July 2016) that instructions had been issued either to adjust or to refund the unutilised fund lying with them.</li> </ul>	20.92  20.57
4.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	M/s Rajasthan Medical Service Corporation Ltd., (RMSCL) was given advance during 2011-16 without adjustment of previous advances, which resulted in unadjusted/unspent advance accumulation of ₹ 181.75 crore as of March 2016, of which, ₹ 131.45 crore was outstanding for periods ranging from more than 3 to 44 months. State Institute of Health and Family Welfare (SIHFW) was also given advances for providing training to SHS staff. Due to continuous release of advances without adjustment of previous advance to SIHFW, ₹ 16.86 crore remained unadjusted/unspent as of March 2016, of which ₹ 12.69 crore was outstanding for periods ranging from more than 3 to 101 months.	131.45  12.69
5.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	The procurement and supply of drugs, equipment, etc., was entrusted with Tamil Nadu Medical Service Corporation Ltd (TNMSC) a state	83.35

<sup>1</sup> In terms of para 6.91 of the operational guidelines for financial management, advances are to be settled within a period of 90 days

<sup>2</sup> More than five years: ₹ 0.07 crore, One year to five years : ₹ 6.02 crore, Three months to one year : ₹ 7.35 crore and upto three months: ₹ 7.48 crore.

<sup>3</sup> Balasore: ₹ 3.30 crore (12 to 48 months), Bargarh : ₹ 4.74 crore (3 to 96 months), Boudh: ₹ 1.48 crore (3 to 60 months), Kandhamal: ₹ 0.59 crore (3 to 12 months), Keonjhar : ₹ 0.05 crore (3 months), Nuapada : ₹ 2.65 crore (13 to 28 months) and Puri : ₹ 7.76 crore (23 to 47 months)

Sl. No.	State	Outstanding advances	Amount (₹ in crore)
		public sector under taking. ₹ 123.93 crore was neither utilized nor refunded by the Corporation to NRHM as of March 2016, of which an amount of ₹ 83.35 crore was outstanding for 12 to 96 months.	
6.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	Advances amounting to ₹ 843.64 crore given for construction of buildings, procurement of equipment etc. were outstanding as on March 2016, with various agencies of these, ₹ 578.46 crore were outstanding for periods ranging from more than 3 to 36 months. SHS was paying advances very liberally to the construction agencies much beyond the contractual norms used by state/central government in award of works.	578.46
7.	<b>West Bengal</b>	Advance was given from RCH and Mission Flexible Pool fund (NRHM additionalities) to different government and non-government agencies for construction of health facilities and implementation of various programmes. Against total advances of ₹ 363.50 crore to 298 agencies (Government/Non-government) age-wise breakup was not available for ₹ 141.65 crore (35 agencies). Out of the remaining ₹ 221.85 crore (263 agencies), as of March 2016, ₹ 37.49 crore was lying for more than two years with 91 agencies.	37.49
<b>Total</b>			<b>909.96</b>

**Annexure-3.1**  
**(Refer para-3.1)**

**Availability of SCs, PHCs and CHCs in States/UT**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of SCs required as per population norms as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Number of SCs available as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Shortfall	Number of PHCs required as per population norms as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Number of PHCs available as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Shortfall	Number of CHCs required as per population norms as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Number of CHCs available as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Shortfall
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	123	123	0	22	22	0	4	4	0
2.	Andhra Pradesh	7,142	7,626	-484	1,182	1,157	25	296	192	104
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	461	588	-127	69	143	-74	17	63	-46
4.	Assam	6,817	4,621	2,196	1,112	1,014	98	278	151	127
5.	Bihar	20,760	9,696	11,064	3,460	533	2,927	865	70	795
6.	Chhattisgarh	5,533	5,186	347	870	790	80	217	155	62
7.	Gujarat	9,066	9,156	-90	1,490	1,342	148	366	331	35
8.	Haryana	3,006	2,630	376	501	486	15	125	119	6
9.	Himachal Pradesh	2,288	2,071	217	343	518	-175	86	79	7
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	2,918	2,450	468	444	398	46	97	84	13
11.	Jharkhand	8,813	3,958	4,855	1,376	330	1,046	344	188	156
12.	Karnataka	7,805	9,332	-1,527	1,300	2,353	-1,053	325	206	119
13.	Kerala	6,847	5,781	1,066	1,141	924	217	285	234	51
14.	Madhya Pradesh	11,780	9,192	2,588	2,000	1,172	828	487	334	153
15.	Maharashtra	15,390	10,580	4,810	2,461	1,811	650	596	363	233
16.	Manipur	690	421	269	109	85	24	27	17	10
17.	Meghalaya	759	431	328	114	109	5	28	27	1
18.	Mizoram	364	370	-6	54	57	-3	14	9	5

Performance Audit of Reproductive and Child Health under National Rural Health Mission

Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of SCs required as per population norms as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Number of SCs available as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Shortfall	Number of PHCs required as per population norms as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Number of PHCs available as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Shortfall	Number of CHCs required as per population norms as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Number of CHCs available as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	Shortfall
19.	<b>Odisha</b>	9,983	6,688	3,295	1,597	1,305	292	399	377	22
20.	<b>Punjab</b>	3,468	2,950	518	578	427	151	144	150	-6
21.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	10,995	14,408	-3413	1,800	2,080	-280	450	571	-121
22.	<b>Sikkim</b>	203	147	56	30	24	6	7	2	5
23.	<b>Telangana*</b>	4708	4863	-155	768	668	100	192	114	78
24.	<b>Tripura</b>	1054	1033	21	125	94	31	30	20	10
25.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	10920	8712	2208	1,812	1,368	444	538	385	153
26.	<b>Uttaranchal</b>	3372	1847	1525	505	257	248	126	59	67
27.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	32017	20,521	11,496	5,183	3,621	1,562	1,555	818	737
28.	<b>West Bengal</b>	18,280	10,369	7911	3,046	909	2,137	914	340	574
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,05,562</b>	<b>1,55,750</b>	<b>49,812</b>	<b>33,492</b>	<b>23,997</b>	<b>9,495</b>	<b>8,812</b>	<b>5,462</b>	<b>3,350</b>

\* Data as on 31 March 2015

**Annexure-3.2**  
**(Refer para-3.4)**

**Details of construction of SCs, PHCs and CHCs in States/UT**

Sl. No.	State	Number of Health Centres established								
		Construction of SCs			Construction of PHCs			Construction of CHCs		
		T	A	S	T	A	S	T	A	S
1.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	318	233	85	249	163	86	3	3	0
2.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	129	129	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
3.	<b>Assam</b>	626	165	461	65	4	61	55	9	46
4.	<b>Bihar</b>	119	5	114	90	1	89	0	0	0
5.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	158	75	83	1	0	1	0	0	0
6.	<b>Gujarat</b>	458	141	317	142	51	91	94	75	19
7.	<b>Haryana</b>	245	214	31	78	72	6	22	19	3
8.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	167	45	122	100	36	64	14	10	4
9.	<b>Jammu and Kashmir</b>	198	101	97	99	57	42	75	36	39
10.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	665	416	249	16	2	14	4	2	2
11.	<b>Karnataka</b>	654	463	191	67	41	26	3	1	2
12.	<b>Kerala</b>	100	89	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
13.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	310	231	79	12	5	7	13	9	4
14.	<b>Maharashtra</b>	285	142	143	107	33	74	0	0	0
15.	<b>Manipur</b>	109	60	49	11	2	9	0	0	0
16.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	49	46	3	6	2	4	0	0	0
17.	<b>Mizoram</b>	60	60	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
18.	<b>Odisha</b>	1,323	831	492	100	70	30	123	120	3
19.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	927	580	347	109	55	54	2	2	0
20.	<b>Sikkim</b>	1015	735	280	150	120	30	35	10	25
21.	<b>Telangana</b>	192	134	58	101	90	11	4	0	4
22.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	178	167	11	215	151	64	129	108	21
23.	<b>Uttaranchal</b>	6	5	1	1	1	0	3	3	0
24.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	659	505	154	28	26	2	32	4	28
25.	<b>West Bengal</b>	613	517	96	79	38	41	122	84	38
<b>Total</b>		<b>9,563</b>	<b>6,089</b>	<b>3,474</b>	<b>1,830</b>	<b>1,024</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>733</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>238</b>

T: Target

A: Achievement

S: Shortfall

**Annexure-3.3**  
**(Refer para-3.4.4)**

**Abandoned/dropped works**

Sl. No.	State	Number of works	Cost of the work (₹ in crore)	Expenditure incurred (₹ in crore)	Remarks
1.	<b>Assam</b>	1	1.31	0.53	The work of Rural Health Block Pooling Complex at Pandu FRU costing ₹ 130.70 lakh was started in December 2011, but after the fence was constructed, the Railway Authorities alleged illegal grabbing of Railway land and asked to stop the work immediately, which did not happen. Ultimately after completion of 40 per cent of work and paying ₹ 26.27 lakh leaving committed liability of another amount ₹ 26.27 lakh against the value of work done, the work was stopped (November 2014) on the basis of an interim order of Hon'ble Gauhati High Court. This resulted in abandoned infrastructure after incurring an amount of ₹ 52.54 lakh (including liability amount).
2.	<b>Gujarat</b>	1	0.61	0	The work of construction of Staff Quarters at PHC, Moyad (Taluka Prantij) for the year 2012-13 was awarded (August 2013) to an agency at a cost of ₹ 0.61 crore with stipulated date of completion in May 2014. Due to non-availability of approach road, the site was not found (January 2016) suitable for the purpose. The agency was relieved (July 2016) from the work and finally the work was dropped. The acquisition of suitable land was stated to be in progress. (August 2016).
3.	<b>Jammu and Kashmir</b>	1	0.50	0.44	Construction of SC Charat in Udhampur district was taken up (2010-11) at an estimated cost of ₹ 49.50 lakh without accord of administrative approval and without proper acquisition and transfer of title of land in favour of the Department. After incurring expenditure of ₹ 43.50 lakh and execution upto plinth level as of 2014-15 through R&B Division Udhampur, the construction work was abandoned due to land dispute and subsequent court stay (July 2014).
4.	<b>Karnataka</b>	17	3.42	0.40	In respect of 586 SCs approved during 2011-13, 17 works were dropped due to site problems.
5.	<b>Manipur</b>	2	Not furnished	Not furnished	The construction of retaining wall on the eastern side of CHC Mao, Senapati district has remained abandoned since 2011. The construction work for Institutional Building (IB) at PHSC Maram Khullen had been left incomplete without any care and as such, the building had started to deteriorate. Currently, this PHSC is working from the old wooden building as the new building had not been completed.
<b>Total</b>		<b>22</b>			

**Annexure-3.4**  
**(Refer para-3.5)**

**Shortages of staff quarters in health facilities**

Sl. No.	Type of Health facility	Availability of Staff Quarters
1.	<b>Sub-Centre</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In 68 SCs (Type 'B') of eight States (Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Tripura and Uttarakhand), no staff quarters were available.</li> <li>➤ In 248 SCs (Type 'B') of ten States (Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttarakhand and Uttar Pradesh), against the requirement of 538 staff quarters, 182 quarters were available (shortfall of 66 per cent).</li> <li>➤ Out of 182 staff quarters available, 81 staff quarters were vacant in seven States (Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Tripura and Uttarakhand).</li> </ul>
2.	<b>Primary Health Centre</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In 125 PHCs of 15 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal), no staff quarters were available.</li> <li>➤ In 441 PHCs of 22 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal) against the requirement of 4,109 quarters, only 1,087 were available (shortfall of 74 per cent).</li> <li>➤ Out of 1,087 staff quarters available, 274 staff quarters were vacant in 20 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Mizoram, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura and West Bengal).</li> </ul>
3.	<b>Community Health Centre</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In 36 CHCs of 10 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Odisha, Rajasthan, Telangana, and Uttar Pradesh), no staff quarters were available.</li> <li>➤ In 241 CHCs of 21 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal), against the requirement of 7,588 quarters, 2,542 were available (shortfall of 66 per cent).</li> <li>➤ Out of 2,542 staff quarters available, 451 staff quarters of CHCs were vacant in 18 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttarakhand and West Bengal).</li> </ul>
4.	<b>District Hospital</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In 10 DHs of six States (Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Telangana and Uttar Pradesh), no staff quarters were available.</li> <li>➤ In 111 DHs of 21 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Telangana, Tripura, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal), against the requirement of 13,315 quarters, 2,846 were available (shortfall of 79 per cent).</li> <li>➤ Out of 2,846 staff quarters available, 229 staff quarters were vacant in 15 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Manipur, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Telangana, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal).</li> </ul>

**Annexure-4.1**  
**(Refer para-4.3)**

**State-wise details of equipment lying idle/unutilised in health centres**

Sl. No.	State	Details of equipment lying idle/ unutilised	Number of equipment lying idle	Expenditure incurred (₹ in crore)
1.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	Equipment in district hospital, Eluru	50	0.22
2.	<b>Assam</b>	USG Colour Doppler machines and Single Puncture Laparoscopic set	26	1.99
3.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	Nine equipment	9	0.47
4.	<b>Gujarat</b>	Biosafety Cabinet <sup>4</sup> for Micro Biology Laboratory, Multipara Cardiac Monitor and Automated External Defibrillator, Easy Diagnostic Machine, X-ray machine, dental chair, etc.	13	0.27
5.	<b>Haryana</b>	Medical Equipment, X-ray machines	49	3.76
6.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	Ultrasound Machine, X-ray machine, Digital ECG machine, chest stand dryer	4	0.19
7.	<b>Jammu and Kashmir</b>	Ultrasound Machine, Ultrasound, scanner accessories with thermal printer and Whole Body Multi Slice Scanner	5	5.21
8.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	Auto Analyzer, Path Fast, Three Channel ECG Machines, etc.	26	3.05
9.	<b>Karnataka</b>	X-ray equipment, ECG machines, blood storage units, etc.	18	0.29
10.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	Incinerator, OT equipment and surgical set	2	0.19
11.	<b>Punjab</b>	Laparoscope for Sterilization	1	0.12
12.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	Eye equipment, ventilators, equipment of ICU ward, etc.	8	1.34
13.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	X-ray equipment	2	0.04
14.	<b>Telangana</b>	Transport Incubator in SNCU in DH, Nalgonda	1	0.02
15.	<b>Tripura</b>	Laparoscope machine	5	0.35
16.	<b>Uttarakhand</b>	CT Scan Machine, Electromagnetic Shock Wave, Radio Meter, etc.	14	8.79
17.	<b>West Bengal</b>	New Born Stabilisation Unit, Blood Storage Units, etc.	195	4.09
<b>Total</b>			<b>428</b>	<b>30.39</b>

<sup>4</sup> Biosafety Cabinet is designed to protect the operator, the laboratory environment and work materials from exposure to infectious aerosols and splashes that may be generated when manipulating materials containing infectious agents, such as primary cultures, stocks and diagnostic specimen, etc.

**Annexure-4.2**  
**(Refer para-4.6)**

**State-wise details of distribution of expired/sub-standard medicines to patients**

Sl. No.	State	Audit observation
1.	<b>Assam</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 6.22 crore IFA tablets (small) supplied to central store, Guwahati during April 2014 and June 2014, had a shelf-life up to February 2016. Of these, 1.94 crore tablets valued at ₹ 48.52 lakh expired due to non-issue of tablets within shelf-life. It was observed that procurement was made on the basis of projected estimate of beneficiaries at the State level without obtaining requirements from the districts.</li> <li>➤ In 16 health centres<sup>5</sup> 67 medicines costing ₹ 51.15 lakh expired during 2011-16.</li> <li>➤ The health centres stated that medicines got expired due to excess supply against requirement without indent and due to supply of short lifespan medicines.</li> </ul>
2.	<b>Bihar</b>	There was no proper system of quality testing of drugs and medicines were distributed to the patients without ensuring the quality of drugs.
3.	<b>Haryana</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 17 samples of medicines were sent to laboratory for testing during September and October 2014. However, the test reports of 13 samples were received late or not received. However, these 13 samples were released for distribution due to shortage.</li> <li>➤ 26 batches of medicines received between June 2013 and December 2015 were declared not of standard quality.</li> <li>➤ Out of samples of eight drugs costing ₹ 38.21 lakh declared not of standard quality by the empanelled laboratory, medicines worth ₹ 6.99 lakh had already been distributed by the warehouses for dispensing to the patients.</li> <li>➤ Expired medicines worth ₹ 2.33 crore were lying across the state in the drug warehouses for a period ranging between 19 to 811 days (as of July 2016). As per policy the supplier should have been intimated six months before expiry but no action had been initiated to get the drugs replaced resultantly the cost of these expired drugs had to be borne by the Department.</li> </ul>
4.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Out of 14,052 bottles of Paracetamol Syrup 125 mg/5 ml (60 ml each bottle) costing ₹ 1.54 lakh received in Dumka in June 2015 for distribution to 2,813 Sahiyas<sup>6</sup> (five bottles/Sahiya) in test checked CHCs (Jama and Shikaripara), 9,028 bottles were found substandard as per the test report of State Drug Testing Laboratory, Ranchi (November 2015). These medicines were supplied during June-July 2015 i.e., 4-5 months before obtaining test certificate.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Kamrup DH, KarbiAnglong DH, Golaghat DH; Ligeripukhuri SDCH, Hamren SDCH, Azara CHC, Sipajhar CHC, Sualkuchi CHC, Bokota PHC, Gorol MPHC, Geleky PHC, Hazarikapara PHC, Joljoli PHC, Jharbari SD, Kulshi SD and Rangamati MPHC

<sup>6</sup> In Jharkhand, an alternate name devised for ASHA is Sahiya.

Sl. No.	State	Audit observation
5.	<b>Karnataka</b>	Out of 8,356 batches of drugs received from warehouses during the period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2016, only 4,444 batches (53 <i>per cent</i> ) were tested. Random test check of 105 batches of drugs revealed that by the time the samples were sent for testing, more than 20 <i>per cent</i> of the stock had already been issued to health facilities in respect of 10 batches.
6.	<b>Kerala</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ During 2011-16, out of 30,767 batches of drugs sent to empanelled laboratories for quality testing, 364 were declared not of standard quality. Though the NSQ drugs were frozen subsequently based on the lab report, the possibility of administration and distribution of such NSQ drugs to patients could not be ruled out as these medicines had already been supplied to the health facilities.</li> <li>➤ During 2014-16, out of 2,017 batches sent for quality test, the empanelled labs failed to submit the test result within the stipulated time and in respect of 248 batches, there were delays ranging from one month to 318 days.</li> </ul>
7.	<b>Maharashtra</b>	In two test checked districts (Bhandara and Nanded), 14 drugs (quantity 1.71 lakh) were declared substandard about six to seven months after they were supplied to RHs and SDHs. As a result, the medicines might have been issued to patients also.
8.	<b>Manipur</b>	Joint physical verification of the store of DHS, Ukhrul, revealed that medicines were kept inside the store room without proper labeling (batch number and expiry date). It was found that nine types of medicines (3,285 units) were found beyond expiry date.
9.	<b>Odisha</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ During 2011-16, in five out of seven DHHs and four out of 21 sample CHCs, due to delay in testing and receipt of test reports from SDMU, 29 types of NSQ drugs worth ₹ 11.79 lakh were administered to the patients during September 2011 to December 2015.</li> <li>➤ Medicines worth ₹ 70.93 lakh from nine suppliers received during 2006-16 were declared NSQ. Though SDMU intimated the suppliers for replacement of these medicines within 15 to 243 days, drugs were not replaced as of July 2016.</li> <li>➤ Similarly, in six out of seven sample districts, NSQ drugs worth ₹ 53.83 lakh were lying unused as of July 2016 in central store of districts and CHCs without replacement. The SDMU had not instructed CDMOs to return the NSQ drugs to the suppliers. Due to lapses on the part of SDMU to enforce provisions of the drugs management policy, ₹ 53.83 lakh became wasteful.</li> </ul>
10.	<b>Punjab</b>	During Physical verification of SC, Budh Singh Wala, District Moga showed (May 2016) it was noticed that 'Erythromycin tartrate' tablets IP 250 mg (batch no BT 40,180) having expiry date of April 2016 were lying in the drug tray used for administering/ distributing medicines to patients. The MD while admitting the facts stated (September 2016) that the expired medicines had been ordered to be disposed of under relevant provisions of Drugs and Cosmetics Act and rules/guidelines of the Punjab Pollution Control Board.
11.	<b>Telangana</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 5,200 Injections of "Hydrocortisone Succinate" was issued during 2015 to health institutions in Nalgonda district by TSMSIDC. However, subsequently on failure of quality control test, the injections were rejected. It was observed that only 712 injections were returned by the health institutions. The remaining 4,488 injections were neither received back nor the details of their disposal available. In view of this, it could not be</li> </ul>

Sl. No.	State	Audit observation
		<p>verified whether the injections were consumed by beneficiaries or destroyed.</p> <p>➤ Quality control tests conducted on a batch of Rantac 150 mg tablets (10,000) failed after they were distributed to patients.</p>
12.	<b>Tripura</b>	<p>2.18 crore IFA (large) and 1.84 crore IFA (Small) tablets supplied between July 2012 to December 2012 by a firm were issued for distribution to the school children during September 2012 to November 2012. However, subsequently the sample quality check revealed that these medicines did not conform to the prescribed standard. Orders were issued (December 2013) to all CMOs, SDMOs and MoICs, not to use and withdraw the tablets from the schools and educational institutions. Accordingly, 12.16 lakh tablets were returned back in the Central store during December 2013 to February 2014. It was further noticed that, 14.20 lakh tablets were distributed to the school children and probably consumed.</p>
13.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	<p>In the test checked districts (except Jalaun and Muzaffarnagar), drugs and consumables worth ₹ 62.32 crore were procured during 2011-16, however, these were not tested for quality. Thus, the drugs and consumables were issued to the patients without ensuring their quality. CMOs replied that RC firms had presented quality test reports of NABL in respect of supplies made by them. However, no quality test reports were found on record of the sampled districts.</p>
14.	<b>West Bengal</b>	<p>During 2011-16, in two selected districts, seven batches (Paschim Medinipur District-four, Murshidabad Medical College and hospital-three) of sub-standard medicines had been administered to the patients by the time the test report was received. Further, District Reserve Stores at Murshidabad did not send any of the batches for testing during 2011-14.</p>

**Annexure-5.1.1  
(Refer para-5.2)**

**Position of Doctors/Specialist in District Hospital**

Sl. No.	State/UT	District Hospitals audited	Essential number of staff as per IPHS-2012	Sanctioned strength of the facility	Men in Position	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against IPHS	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against sanctioned strength
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	2	58	39	21	-37	-18
2.	Andhra Pradesh	3	113	72	78	-35	6
3.	Bihar	10	290	299	133	-157	-166
4.	Chhattisgarh	4	116	119	101	-15	-18
5.	Gujarat	3	110	90	71	-39	-19
6.	Haryana	2	58	97	67	9	-30
7.	Himachal Pradesh	3	118	112	92	-26	-20
8.	Jammu and Kashmir	4	116	158	102	-14	-56
9.	Jharkhand	5	145	86	62	-83	-24
10.	Karnataka	5	145	127	80	-65	-47
11.	Kerala	2	87	63	57	-30	-6
12.	Madhya Pradesh	10	290	547	307	17	-240
13.	Maharashtra	3	127	150	106	-21	-44
14.	Manipur	2	58	100	41	-17	-59
15.	Meghalaya	3	87	48	36	-51	-12
16.	Odisha	7	254	272	171	-83	-101
17.	Punjab	3	87	76	63	-24	-13
18.	Rajasthan	7	203	329	164	-39	-165
19.	Sikkim	2	58	58	65	7	7
20.	Tamil Nadu	3	97	122	83	-14	-39
21.	Telangana	3	103	76	55	-48	-21
22.	Uttar Pradesh	20	580	396	286	-294	-110
23.	Uttarakhand	5	145	67	57	-88	-10
<b>Total:</b>		<b>111</b>	<b>3,445</b>	<b>3,503</b>	<b>2,298</b>	<b>-1,147</b>	<b>-1,205</b>

**Annexure-5.1.2  
(Refer para-5.2)**

**Position of Staff Nurses in District Hospital**

Sl. No.	State/UT	District Hospitals audited	Essential number of staff as per IPHS-2012	Sanctioned strength of the facility	Men in Position	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against IPHS	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against sanctioned strength
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	2	90	76	33	-57	-43
2.	Andhra Pradesh	3	270	154	132	-138	-22
3.	Bihar	10	450	483	259	-191	-224
4.	Chhattisgarh	4	180	164	136	-44	-28
5.	Gujarat	3	153	158	135	-18	-23
6.	Haryana	2	90	75	67	-23	-8
7.	Himachal Pradesh	3	315	118	130	-185	12
8.	Jammu and Kashmir	4	180	102	68	-112	-34
9.	Jharkhand	5	45	22	39	-6	17
10.	Karnataka	5	225	333	233	8	-100
11.	Kerala	2	225	201	197	-28	-4
12.	Madhya Pradesh	10	450	1026	844	394	-182
13.	Maharashtra	3	235	356	317	82	-39
14.	Manipur	2	90	68	29	-61	-39
15.	Meghalaya	3	135	99	98	-37	-1
16.	Odisha	7	630	252	268	-362	16
17.	Punjab	3	135	159	103	-32	-56
18.	Rajasthan	7	315	552	482	167	-70
19.	Sikkim	2	90	90	37	-53	-53
20.	Telangana	3	225	164	158	-67	-6
21.	Tamil Nadu	3	225	175	169	-56	-6
22.	Uttar Pradesh	20	900	467	402	-498	-65
23.	Uttarakhand	5	225	85	69	-156	-16
<b>Total:</b>		<b>111</b>	<b>5,878</b>	<b>5379</b>	<b>4405</b>	<b>-1473</b>	<b>-974</b>

**Annexure-5.1.3  
(Refer para-5.2)**

**Position of Paramedical staff in District Hospitals**

Sl. No.	State/UT	District Hospitals audited	Essential number of staff as per IPHS-2012	Sanctioned strength of the facility	Men in Position	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against IPHS	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against sanctioned strength
1.	<b>Andaman and Nicobar Islands</b>	2	62	29	23	-39	-6
2.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	3	139	51	51	-88	0
3.	<b>Bihar</b>	10	310	190	82	-228	-108
4.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	4	124	57	63	-61	6
5.	<b>Gujarat</b>	3	134	49	41	-93	-8
6.	<b>Haryana</b>	2	62	79	33	-29	-46
7.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	3	150	88	76	-74	-12
8.	<b>Jammu and Kashmir</b>	4	124	126	109	-15	-17
9.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	5	31	26	25	-6	-1
10.	<b>Karnataka</b>	5	155	135	81	-74	-54
11.	<b>Kerala</b>	2	97	34	37	-60	3
12.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	10	310	232	171	-139	-61
13.	<b>Maharashtra</b>	3	111	100	70	-41	-30
14.	<b>Manipur</b>	2	62	76	52	-10	-24
15.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	3	93	20	34	-59	14
16.	<b>Odisha</b>	7	312	176	154	-158	-22
17.	<b>Punjab</b>	3	93	63	54	-39	-9
18.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	7	217	232	87	-130	-145
19.	<b>Sikkim</b>	2	62	62	69	7	7
20.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	3	115	107	62	-53	-45
21.	<b>Telangana</b>	3	115	56	41	-74	-15
22.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	20	620	257	205	-415	-52
23.	<b>Uttarakhand</b>	5	155	70	59	-96	-11
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>3653</b>	<b>2315</b>	<b>1679</b>	<b>-1974</b>	<b>-636</b>

**Annexure-5.2**  
**(Refer para-5.3)**

**Position of Doctors/Specialists, Staff Nurse and Paramedical staff in Sub-District/Sub-Divisional Hospital**

Sl. No.	State	Sub-District Hospitals audited	Essential number of staff as per IPHS-2012	Sanctioned strength of the facility	Men in Position	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against IPHS	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against sanctioned strength
<b>Doctors/Specialists</b>							
1	Andhra Pradesh	4	80	36	38	-42	2
2	Bihar	6	120	147	50	-70	-97
3	Gujarat	1	20	25	15	-5	-10
4	Himachal Pradesh	6	72	33	25	-47	-8
5	Jharkhand	1	20	11	6	-14	-5
6	Karnataka	10	200	120	59	-141	-61
7	Maharashtra	8	160	121	102	-58	-19
8	Tamil Nadu	1	18	10	8	-10	-2
9	Telangana	4	80	47	47	-33	0
10	Uttarakhand	2	40	30	19	-21	-11
<b>Total:</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>-441</b>	<b>-211</b>
<b>Staff Nurse</b>							
1	Andhra Pradesh	4	80	36	38	-42	2
2	Bihar	6	108	260	82	-26	-178
3	Gujarat	1	18	78	53	35	-25
4	Himachal Pradesh	6	60	28	31	-29	3
5	Jharkhand	1	18	6	3	-15	-3
6	Karnataka	10	180	176	130	-50	-46
7	Maharashtra	8	144	153	134	-10	-19
8	Tamil Nadu	1	18	6	5	-13	-1
9	Telangana	4	72	91	81	9	-10
10	Uttarakhand	2	36	35	30	-6	-5
<b>Total:</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>869</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>-147</b>	<b>-282</b>
<b>Paramedical Staff</b>							
1	Andhra Pradesh	4	180	104	91	-89	-13
2	Bihar	6	162	153	51	-111	-102
3	Gujarat	1	27	15	10	-17	-5
4	Himachal Pradesh	6	66	42	30	-36	-12
5	Jharkhand	1	27	12	4	-23	-8
6	Karnataka	10	270	162	66	-204	-96
7	Maharashtra	8	216	153	122	-94	-31
8	Tamil Nadu	1	22	7	3	-19	-4
9	Telangana	4	108	44	39	-69	-5
10	Uttarakhand	2	54	24	21	-33	-3
<b>Total:</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>1,132</b>	<b>716</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>-695</b>	<b>-279</b>

**Annexure-5.3**  
**(Refer para-5.4)**

**CHCs functioning without specialist doctors**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of CHC audited	General Surgeon	Per cent	General Physician	Per cent	Obstetrician Gynaecologist	Per cent	Paediatrician	Per cent	Anaesthetist	Per cent
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	2	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100
2.	Andhra Pradesh	5	4	80	2	40	3	60	2	40	2	40
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	6	4	66.66	4	66.66	5	83.33	5	83.33	4	66.66
4.	Assam	9	8	88.88	8	66.66	6	66.66	8	88.88	6	66.66
5.	Bihar	13	8	61.53	8	61.53	10	76.92	10	76.92	11	84.61
6.	Chhattisgarh	8	8	100	8	100	8	100	7	87.5	8	100
7.	Gujarat	12	10	83.33	10	83.33	10	83.33	10	83.33	10	83.33
8.	Himachal Pradesh	6	6	100	6	100	6	100	6	100	5	83.33
9.	Jammu and Kashmir	8	3	37.5	6	75	3	37.5	3	37.5	4	50
10.	Jharkhand	12	11	91.66	10	83.33	11	91.66	10	83.33	12	100
11.	Karnataka	19	19	100	17	89.47	10	52.63	17	89.47	16	84.21
12.	Kerala	9	8	88.88	8	88.88	8	88.88	8	88.88	8	88.88
13.	Madhya Pradesh	21	20	95.23	18	85.71	18	85.71	19	90.47	21	100
14.	Maharashtra	9	9	100	8	88.88	7	77.77	8	88.88	8	88.88
15.	Manipur	3	3	100	3	100	3	100	3	100	3	100
16.	Meghalaya	3	3	100	2	66.66	3	100	3	100	3	100
17.	Mizoram	2	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100
18.	Odisha	21	9	43.00	17	80.95	12	57.14	18	85.71	21	100
19.	Punjab	8	7	87.5	8	100	8	100	8	100	8	100
20.	Rajasthan	15	10	66.66	8	53.33	11	73.33	12	80	13	86.66
21.	Sikkim	1	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	0	0
22.	Tamil Nadu	6	6	100	6	100	6	100	6	100	6	100

Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of CHC audited	General Surgeon	Per cent	General Physician	Per cent	Obstetrician Gynaecologist	Per cent	Paediatrician	Per cent	Anaesthetist	Per cent
23.	<b>Tripura</b>	2	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100	2	100
24.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	28	24	85.71	26	92.85	20	71.42	25	89.28	24	85.71
25.	<b>Uttarakhand</b>	4	3	75	4	100	4	100	3	75	4	100
26.	<b>West Bengal</b>	11	11	100	11	100	8	72.72	11	100	11	100
27.	<b>Telangana</b>	5	5	100	3	60	3	60	2	40	2	40
	<b>Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>206</b>	83.06	<b>208</b>	83.06	<b>190</b>	76.61	<b>211</b>	85.08	<b>216</b>	87.09

**Annexure-5.4**  
**(Refer para-5.4)**

**CHCs functioning without paramedical staff**

Laboratory Technician				Pharmacist			
Sl. No.	State	Number of CHCs audited	Number of CHCs functioning without Lab. Technician	Sl. No.	State	Number of CHCs audited	Number of CHCs functioning without Pharmacist
1.	Gujarat	12	3	1.	Arunachal Pradesh	6	2
2.	Haryana	7	3	2.	Gujarat	12	3
3.	Himachal Pradesh	6	3	3.	Haryana	7	2
4.	Jharkhand	12	1	4.	Himachal Pradesh	6	2
5.	Karnataka	19	1	5.	Jammu and Kashmir	8	1
6.	Maharashtra	9	2	6.	Maharashtra	9	1
7.	Odisha	21	3	7.	Jharkhand	12	4
8.	Rajasthan	15	3	8.	Karnataka	19	2
9.	Uttar Pradesh	28	6	9.	Madhya Pradesh	21	2
10.	Uttarakhand	4	1	10.	Rajasthan	15	5
11.	West Bengal	11	2	11.	Uttar Pradesh	28	5
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>28</b>	12.	<b>Punjab</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>30</b>

Health Worker (Male)				Statistical Assistant/Data Entry Operator			
Sl. No.	State	Number of CHCs audited	Number of CHCs functioning without HW(M)	Sl. No.	State	Number of CHCs audited	Number of CHCs functioning without Statistical Assistant/Data Entry Operator
1.	Assam	9	9	1.	Arunachal Pradesh	6	2
2.	Gujarat	12	12	2.	Assam	9	2
3.	Haryana	7	2	3.	Chhattisgarh	8	3
4.	Himachal Pradesh	6	1	4.	Gujarat	12	3
5.	Jammu and Kashmir	8	2	5.	Haryana	7	4
6.	Jharkhand	12	12	6.	Himachal Pradesh	6	2
7.	Karnataka	19	19	7.	Jammu and Kashmir	8	4
8.	Madhya Pradesh	21	9	8.	Jharkhand	12	2
9.	Maharashtra	9	3	9.	Karnataka	19	16
10.	Manipur	3	2	10.	Madhya Pradesh	21	1
11.	Meghalaya	3	1	11.	Maharashtra	9	4
12.	Mizoram	2	2	12.	Manipur	3	1
13.	Odisha	21	9	13.	Meghalaya	3	3
14.	Rajasthan	15	7	14.	Odisha	21	13
15.	Uttar Pradesh	28	13	15.	Rajasthan	15	6
16.	Uttarakhand	4	4	16.	Uttar Pradesh	28	3
17.	West Bengal	11	9	17.	Uttarakhand	4	1
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>116</b>		<b>Total:</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>70</b>

Health Worker (Female)				Health Assistant (Female)/ Lady Health Visitor			
Sl. No.	State	Number of CHCs audited	Number of CHCs functioning without HW(Female)	Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of CHCs audited	Number of CHCs functioning without HA(F)/LHV
1.	Assam	9	7	1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	2	2
2.	Gujarat	12	12	2.	Assam	9	5
3.	Haryana	7	2	3.	Chhattisgarh	8	2
4.	Himachal Pradesh	6	2	4.	Gujarat	12	12
5.	Jharkhand	12	11	5.	Haryana	7	2
6.	Karnataka	19	19	6.	Himachal Pradesh	6	4
7.	Maharashtra	9	2	7.	Jammu and Kashmir	8	1
8.	Mizoram	2	2	8.	Jharkhand	12	11
9.	Odisha	21	3	9.	Karnataka	19	19
10.	Rajasthan	15	4	10.	Madhya Pradesh	21	2
11.	Uttar Pradesh	28	8	11.	Maharashtra	9	2
12.	West Bengal	11	7	12.	Meghalaya	3	2
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>78</b>	13.	Mizoram	2	2
				14.	Odisha	21	2
				15.	Rajasthan	15	6
				16.	Tripura	2	1
				17.	Uttar Pradesh	28	8
				18.	Uttarakhand	4	1
				19.	West Bengal	11	7
				<b>Total:</b>		<b>199</b>	<b>91</b>

**Annexure-5.5**  
**(Refer para-5.4)**

**Availability of Staff Nurses in CHCs**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of CHC audited	Essential number of staff as per IPHS-2012	Sanctioned strength of the facility	Men in Position	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against IPHS	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against sanctioned strength
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	2	20	16	25	5	9
2.	Andhra Pradesh	5	50	37	26	-24	-11
3.	Bihar	13	130	114	80	-50	-34
4.	Chhattisgarh	8	80	80	47	-33	-33
5.	Gujarat	12	120	88	78	-42	-10
6.	Haryana	7	70	58	35	-35	-23
7.	Himachal Pradesh	6	60	28	31	-29	3
8.	Jammu and Kashmir	8	80	63	42	-38	-21
9.	Jharkhand	12	120	52	35	-85	-17
10.	Karnataka	19	190	119	89	-101	-30
11.	Kerala	9	90	65	63	-27	-2
12.	Madhya Pradesh	21	210	81	118	-92	37
13.	Maharashtra	9	90	51	44	-46	-7
14.	Manipur	3	30	24	22	-8	-2
15.	Meghalaya	3	30	19	28	-2	9
16.	Odisha	21	210	79	77	-133	-2
17.	Punjab	8	80	58	50	-30	-8
18.	Rajasthan	15	150	160	155	5	-5
19.	Sikkim	1	10	10	1	-9	-9
20.	Tamil Nadu	6	60	24	24	-36	0
21.	Telangana	5	50	28	27	-23	-1
22.	Uttar Pradesh	28	280	139	105	-175	-34
23.	Uttarakhand	4	40	30	16	-24	-14
24.	West Bengal	11	110	117	85	-25	-32
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>2360</b>	<b>1540</b>	<b>1303</b>	<b>-1057</b>	<b>-237</b>

**Annexure-5.6  
(Refer para-5.5)**

**Position of manpower in audited PHCs**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Number of PHCs audited</b>	<b>Number of PHCs where neither allopathic doctor nor AYUSH doctor posted during the year (contractual/permanent)</b>
1.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	18	1
2.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	11	2
3.	<b>Assam</b>	30	8
4.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	16	6
5.	<b>Haryana</b>	12	2
6.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	12	1
7.	<b>Karnataka</b>	20	2
8.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	40	9
9.	<b>Odisha</b>	38	1
10.	<b>Punjab</b>	12	1
11.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	30	4
12.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	55	27
13.	<b>Uttarakhand</b>	11	3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>67</b>

**Annexure-5.7  
(Refer para-5.5)**

**Position of Nurse-midwife (Staff Nurse) in PHCs**

Sl. No.	State	Number of PHCs audited	Essential number of staff as per IPHS-2012	Sanctioned strength of the facility	Men in Position	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against IPHS	Shortage(-)/ Excess(+) against sanctioned strength
1.	Andhra Pradesh	18	70	25	23	-47	-2
2.	Chhattisgarh	16	48	48	9	-39	-39
3.	Gujarat	12	36	29	18	-18	-11
4.	Haryana	12	38	46	36	-2	-10
5.	Himachal Pradesh	12	36	6	9	-27	3
6.	Jammu and Kashmir	16	48	17	12	-36	-5
7.	Jharkhand	23	69	51	38	-31	-13
8.	Karnataka	20	60	31	30	-30	-1
9.	Kerala	12	36	25	24	-12	-1
10.	Madhya Pradesh	40	120	37	27	-93	-10
11.	Maharashtra	26	78	19	7	-71	-12
12.	Manipur	5	15	5	11	-4	6
13.	Odisha	38	114	13	7	-107	-6
14.	Punjab	12	36	25	26	-10	1
15.	Rajasthan	30	90	55	49	-41	-6
16.	Sikkim	4	12	12	2	-10	-10
17.	Tamil Nadu	12	36	36	32	-4	-4
18.	Telangana	18	54	29	26	-28	-3
19.	Tripura	7	21	49	22	1	-27
20.	Uttar Pradesh	55	165	45	20	-145	-25
21.	Uttarakhand	11	33	6	4	-29	-2
22.	West Bengal	22	66	56	34	-32	-22
	<b>Total</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>1,281</b>	<b>665</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>-815</b>	<b>-199</b>

**Annexure-5.8**  
**(Refer para-5.5)**

**PHCs functioning without paramedical staff**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of PHCs audited	PHCs functioning without					
			Lab Technician	Pharmacist	Accountant cum Data Entry Operator	Health Worker (Female)	Health Worker (Male)	Health Assistant (Female)/ Lady Health Visitor
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	6	0	0	6	0	4	4
2.	Andhra Pradesh	18	11	7	13	12	8	1
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	11	3	4	9	3	3	8
4.	Assam	30	5	6	6	15	26	20
5.	Chhattisgarh	16	7	4	5	0	15	6
6.	Gujarat	12	1	1	0	1	2	7
7.	Haryana	12	3	2	10	4	3	5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	12	4	3	5	5	5	3
9.	Jammu and Kashmir	16	7	0	15	6	14	16
10.	Jharkhand	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
11.	Karnataka	20	9	4	18	5	5	13
12.	Madhya Pradesh	40	26	13	32	16	31	22
13.	Maharashtra	26	8	1	23	9	13	4
14.	Meghalaya	8	1	0	0	0	2	2
15.	Mizoram	7	0	3	0	7	7	7
16.	Odisha	38	38	2	38	5	35	25
17.	Punjab	12	1	1	12	6	9	4
18.	Rajasthan	30	11	27	21	8	17	12
19.	Sikkim	4	0	0	1	1	2	0
20.	Tamil Nadu	12	8	0	12	0	0	0
21.	Tripura	7	4	4	3	4	2	6
22.	Uttar Pradesh	55	33	3	52	15	47	35
23.	Uttarakhand	11	8	0	10	4	9	4
24.	West Bengal	22	15	0	22	22	22	22
	<b>Total</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>249</b>

**Annexure-5.9**  
**(Refer para-5.6)**

**Availability of Staff at SCs**

Sl. No.	State	Number of SCs audited	Number of Sub Centres where no ANM /Health Worker (Female) posted		Sl. No.	State	Number of Sub-centres audited	Number of Sub Centres where no ANM /Health Worker (Female) posted	
			Number	Per cent				Number	Per cent
1	Andhra Pradesh	54	6	11.11	8	Maharashtra	78	5	6.41
2	Chhattisgarh	48	3	6.25	9	Rajasthan	88	5	5.68
3	Gujarat	36	2	5.56	10	Sikkim	15	1	6.67
4	Himachal Pradesh	34	6	17.65	11	Tripura	17	12	70.59
5	Jammu and Kashmir	38	9	23.68	12	Uttar Pradesh	165	6	3.64
6	Karnataka	57	15	26.32	13	Uttarakhand	33	1	3.03
7	Madhya Pradesh	114	9	7.89		<b>Total</b>	<b>777</b>	<b>80</b>	

**Availability of Health Worker-Male at SCs**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of Sub-centres audited	Number of Sub Centres where no Health Worker (Male) posted.		Sl. No.	State	Number of Sub-centres audited	Number of Sub Centres where no Health Worker (Male) posted.	
			Number	Per cent				Number	Per cent
1	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	24	17	70.83	12	Maharashtra	78	19	24.36
2	Andhra Pradesh	54	25	46.30	13	Meghalaya	24	24	100.00
3	Arunachal Pradesh	31	20	64.52	14	Mizoram	18	4	22.22
4	Chhattisgarh	48	14	29.17	15	Odisha	114	56	49.12
5	Gujarat	36	11	30.56	16	Punjab	18	12	66.67
6	Haryana	18	7	38.89	17	Rajasthan	88	70	79.55
7	Himachal Pradesh	34	19	55.88	18	Sikkim	15	6	40.00
8	Jammu and Kashmir	38	27	71.05	19	Tripura	17	2	11.76
9	Jharkhand	69	69	100.00	20	Uttar Pradesh	165	160	96.97
10	Karnataka	57	25	43.86	21	Uttarakhand	33	33	100.00
11	Madhya Pradesh	114	69	60.53	22	West Bengal	66	60	90.91
						<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,159</b>	<b>749</b>	

**Annexure-5.10**  
**(Refer para-5.7)**

**Engagement of ASHA and their training**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Number of districts audited	Number of ASHAs					
			Selection		Induction training		Other modules of training	
			T	A	T	A	T	A
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	2	232	232	232	232	0	0
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	4	3,692	3,300	4	0	4,349	3,262
3.	Bihar	10	75,122	72,429	37,666	15,447	73,796	35,267
4.	Chhattisgarh	4	64,473	64,332	19,854	18,858	53,898	51,613
5.	Gujarat	3	23,522	21,633	4,500	3,889	24,391	18,876
6.	Haryana	3	13,294	11,904	9,896	8,496	4,926	3,762
7.	Himachal Pradesh	3	1,587	1,584	1,586	1,584	1,586	1,584
8.	Jammu and Kashmir	4	670	670	791	640	2,295	1,887
9.	Jharkhand	5	54,911	41,412	0	0	51,429	42,677
10.	Karnataka	5	13,964	12,364	12,233	11,488	15,178	13,864
11.	Kerala	2	2,906	3,055	106	106	0	6,262
12.	Madhya Pradesh	10	32,586	29,263	14,399	12,845	28,943	22,591
13.	Maharashtra	5	38,910	38,105	8,316	6,094	36,679	31,595
14.	Meghalaya	2	8,444	7,768	0	0	7,953	3,596
15.	Odisha	7	19,457	18,530	8,730	8,539	38,043	34,258
16.	Punjab	3	14,373	13,932	5,134	4,632	11,157	11,031
17.	Rajasthan	7	26,141	19,137	12,523	7,626	18,549	19,668
18.	Uttar Pradesh	10	26,324	23,071	21,829	21,038	45,080	27,180
19.	Uttarakhand	3	141	640	94	94	4,045	9,106
<b>Total:</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>4,20,749</b>	<b>3,83,361</b>	<b>1,57,893</b>	<b>1,21,608</b>	<b>4,22,297</b>	<b>3,38,079</b>

(T: Target, A: Achievement)

**Annexure-5.11  
(Refer para-5.8.1)**

**Training to ANMs, Staff Nurses and Medical Officers**

Sl. No.	State	Number of districts audited	Number targeted to be trained	Number actually trained	Shortfall	Per cent
<b>Training to ANMs</b>						
1.	Bihar	10	8,537	6,122	2,415	28.29
2.	Chhattisgarh	4	3,267	2,958	309	9.46
3.	Gujarat	3	5,133	2,334	2,799	54.53
4.	Haryana	3	3,610	3,269	341	9.45
5.	Karnataka	5	4,894	3,911	983	20.09
6.	Kerala	2	1,050	1,016	34	3.24
7.	Odisha	7	7,124	6,136	988	13.87
8.	Punjab	3	1,327	1,256	71	5.35
9.	Rajasthan	7	6,895	3,044	3,851	55.85
10.	Tamil Nadu	3	3,153	1,724	1,429	45.32
11.	Uttar Pradesh	10	5,339	3,872	1,467	27.48
<b>Total</b>		<b>57</b>	<b>50,329</b>	<b>35,642</b>	<b>14,687</b>	
<b>Training to Staff Nurses</b>						
1.	Bihar	10	1,330	558	772	58.05
2.	Gujarat	3	4,015	1,314	2,701	67.27
3.	Haryana	3	2,323	1,977	346	14.89
4.	Karnataka	5	5,954	4,503	1,451	24.37
5.	Madhya Pradesh	10	875	732	143	16.34
6.	Maharashtra	5	1,660	1,461	199	11.99
7.	Odisha	7	2,258	1,849	409	18.11
8.	Punjab	3	687	586	101	14.70
9.	Rajasthan	7	1,588	363	1,225	77.14
10.	Tamil Nadu	3	1,948	1,045	903	46.36
<b>Total:</b>		<b>56</b>	<b>22,638</b>	<b>14,388</b>	<b>8,250</b>	
<b>Training to Medical Officers</b>						
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	4	907	786	121	13.34
2.	Bihar	10	1,952	858	1,094	56.05
3.	Chhattisgarh	4	690	543	147	21.30
4.	Gujarat	3	665	518	147	22.11
5.	Haryana	3	1,223	756	467	38.18
6.	Karnataka	5	1,228	989	239	19.46
7.	Madhya Pradesh	10	455	401	54	11.87
8.	Maharashtra	5	3,536	2,826	710	20.08
9.	Odisha	7	1,330	1,143	187	14.06
10.	Rajasthan	7	653	487	166	25.42
11.	Tamil Nadu	3	3,114	1,937	1,177	37.80
12.	Tripura	2	140	116	24	17.14
13.	Uttar Pradesh	10	709	542	167	23.55
<b>Total</b>		<b>73</b>	<b>16,602</b>	<b>11,902</b>	<b>4,700</b>	

**Annexure-5.12**  
**(Refer para-5.8.1)**

**State specific findings on training of ASHA and ANM**

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observations
1.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	<p>Shortfall in training to ASHAs in round 1 to 4 of Module 6-7 ranged between 22 and 100 <i>per cent</i> which indicated that the ASHAs were not fully conversant with the various health activities/ programme being implemented at grass root level. Besides, against the available funds of ₹ 6.49 crore received for training, the Department could utilise only ₹ 3.54 crore, leaving unspent funds to the extent of ₹ 2.95 crore due to non-conducting of complete training programme.</p> <p>The MD NRHM while confirming the facts stated (July 2016) that induction training was not imparted to ASHAs who left the job and training in module 6 and 7 could not be imparted well in time due to delay in procurement process of Home Based New born Care (HBNC) kits , required for training under Module 6 and 7.</p>
2.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	<p>During the period 2011-12 to 2015-16, training could not be imparted as planned, as 42 <i>per cent</i> shortfall was noticed in number of batches as well as participant/trainees. As a result only ₹ 46.80 crore (47 <i>per cent</i>) were utilised under training component against the available funds of ₹ 99.86 crore.</p>
3.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	<p>Out of 3,824 HSC<sup>7</sup>s, SBA trained ANMs were posted in 2,292 HSCs while remaining 1,532 HSCs (40 <i>per cent</i>) with SBA un-trained ANMs.</p>

---

<sup>7</sup> Equivalent to a sub-centre.

**Annexure-6.1**  
**{Refer para-6.1.1 (D) (iv)}**

**Details of monitoring of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) at the health facilities**

Sl. No.	State	Number of selected health facilities	Facilities where Monitoring of Key Performance Indicators was done		Per cent of health facilities where monitoring of KPIs was not done
			Number	Reporting Key Outcome indicators to DQAC and SQAC	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	30	0	0	100
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	19	0	0	100
3.	Bihar	55	55	55	0.00
4.	Chattisgarh	28	3	1	89.29
5.	Gujarat	28	7	8	75
6.	Haryana	22	2	2	90.91
7.	Himachal Pradesh	21	0	0	100
8.	Jharkhand	41	0	0	100
9.	Karnataka	54	4	3	94
10.	Madhya Pradesh	71	17	15	76.06
11.	Maharashtra	46	12	24	73.91
12.	Mizoram	11	0	0	100
13.	Odisha	66	20	13	69.70
14.	Punjab	23	3	0	86.96
15.	Rajasthan	52	8	4	84.62
16.	Tamil Nadu	21	3	1	85.71
17.	Telangana	30	0	0	100
18.	Tripura	13	13	13	0.00
19.	Uttar Pradesh	93	0	0	100
20.	Uttarakhand	22	0	0	100
<b>Total</b>		<b>746</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>80.29</b>

**Annexure-6.2**  
**{Refer para-6.1.1 (D) (v)}**

**Details of availability of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and Orientation of Staff**

Sl. No.	State	Number of selected health facilities	Availability of SOPs		Staff oriented	
			Number of health facilities	Per cent shortfall	Number of health facilities	Per cent shortfall
1.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	30	0	100	0	100
2.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	19	1	94.74	0	100
3.	<b>Bihar</b>	55	7	87.27	7	87.27
4.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	28	7	75	7	75
5.	<b>Gujarat</b>	28	6	78.57	18	35.71
6.	<b>Haryana</b>	22	1	95.45	1	95.45
7.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	21	0	100	0	100
8.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	41	0	100	0	100
9.	<b>Karnataka</b>	54	10	81.5	8	85
10.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	71	21	70.42	12	83.09
11.	<b>Maharashtra</b>	46	29	36.95	22	52.17
12.	<b>Mizoram</b>	11	5	54.55	11	0.00
13.	<b>Odisha</b>	66	15	76.92	15	77.27
14.	<b>Punjab</b>	23	1	95.65	1	95.65
15.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	52	8	84.62	8	84.62
16.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	21	12	42.86	12	42.86
17.	<b>Telangana</b>	30	0	100	0	100
18.	<b>Tripura</b>	13	3	76.92	3	76.92
19.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	93	93	0	0	100
20.	<b>Uttarakhand</b>	22	0	100	0	100
	<b>Total</b>	<b>746</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>70.64</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>83.24</b>

**Annexure-6.3**  
**(Refer para-6.2)**

**Shortfall in holding the meetings by the committees of SHM and SHS during 2011-16**

Sl. No.	State	Year	Name of the committee	Number of meetings required as per norms	Number of meetings actually held	Shortfall (Per cent)
1.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	2011-16	SHM <sup>8</sup>	7	2	71
			SHS <sup>9</sup> GB <sup>10</sup>	7	0	100
2.	<b>Gujarat</b>	2011-16	SHS GB	7	4	43
			SHS EC <sup>11</sup>	33	20	39
3.	<b>Himachal</b>	2011-16	SHM	7	4	43
4.	<b>Karnataka</b>	2011-16	SHM	7	2	71
5.	<b>Kerala</b>	2011-16	SHM	7	1	86
			SHS GB	7	5	29
			SHS EC	33	9	73
6.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	2011-16	SHS GB	7	2	71
7.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	2011-16	SHM	7	0	100
			SHS GB	7	5	29
8.	<b>Mizoram</b>	2011-16	SHM	7	1	86
			SHS GB	7	1	86
			SHS EC	33	6	82
9.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	2011-16	SHM	7	0	100
			SHS GB	7	2	71
			SHS EC	33	22	33
10.	<b>West Bengal</b>	2011-15	SHFWS-EC	48	11	77

<sup>8</sup> State Health Mission

<sup>9</sup> State Health Society

<sup>10</sup> GB: Governing Body

<sup>11</sup> Executive Committee

**Annexure-6.4**  
**(Refer para-6.4)**

**Results of Beneficiary Survey**

Sl. No.	Findings
1.	96.28 per cent and 97.94 per cent of the beneficiaries were aware about the ASHA and ANM respectively. In relation to response of ASHA, 4.7 per cent beneficiaries said that ASHA did not respond quickly while 11.56 per cent beneficiaries said some times the response was quick.
2.	78.47 per cent beneficiaries registered their pregnancy with AWW/ANM/ASHA/Doctor within 12 weeks of pregnancy. Significantly, in the three States of <b>Bihar, Meghalaya and Uttarakhand</b> , 54 per cent to 73 per cent of the beneficiaries did not register their names within 12 weeks of pregnancy.
3.	Home delivery was preferred by only 7.51 per cent beneficiaries. However, in three States <b>Manipur, Meghalaya and Nagaland</b> , 64 per cent to 79 per cent of the beneficiaries preferred home delivery.
4.	While, 78 per cent beneficiaries stated that, food was provided free of cost under the scheme Janani Shishu Suraksha Karyakram (JSSK), 19.53 per cent beneficiaries stated that food was not provided.
5.	26.58 per cent beneficiaries stated that the ambulance did not arrive on time when called by them. The percentage was higher (42 per cent to 47 per cent) in three States of <b>Karnataka, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh</b>
6.	The delay in receipt of JSY cash assistance by 20 per cent beneficiaries ranged between 31 to 869 days.
7.	11.08 per cent beneficiaries reported that no health worker visited them at home within seven days after delivery in line with IPHS.
8.	22.89, 19.27 and 21.66 per cent of the beneficiaries reported non- receipt of paediatric IFA tablets/syrups, Vitamin-A dose and de-worming tablets/syrup respectively.
9.	In <b>Sikkim</b> , out of 145 beneficiaries surveyed, 113 beneficiaries (78 per cent) reported payment of money for availing delivery services.
10.	In response to the questions on problems/difficulties faced by the beneficiaries, the reasons/answers were Place is far away (20.46 per cent), Service not good (13.88 per cent), Service not available (17.94 per cent). Mode of transportation not available (21.88 per cent), Facility overcrowded (20.82 per cent).

**Annexure-7.1**  
**{Refer para-7.2.1 (a)}**  
**Institutional deliveries during 2011-16**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Total number of pregnant women registered	Number of pregnant women registered opting for Institutional delivery	Per cent of pregnant women registered opting for Institutional delivery	Reasons for not opting for institutional delivery
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	30,030	22,876	76	Not willing
2.	Andhra Pradesh	47,05,896	40,09,452	85	Not furnished
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	1,56,905	63,362	40	Not mentioned
4.	Assam	38,85,118	25,40,188	82	Not furnished
5.	Bihar	127,70,674	76,07,461	60	Not furnished
6.	Chhattisgarh	33,19,466	16,92,487	51	Not furnished
7.	Gujarat	70,87,861	55,66,206	79	Pregnant women were not opted for institutional deliveries due to various customs.
8.	Haryana	29,23,650	21,42,725	73	Not furnished
9.	Himachal Pradesh	6,47,711	3,79,620	59	Area from which women belong is land locked due to snow or other reasons. In some pockets, the cultural belief is such that they opt home delivery.
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	19,98,896	8,49,984	43	Due to tough and difficult terrain.
11.	Jharkhand	37,51,047	22,35,097	60	Not furnished
12.	Karnataka	67,16,166	42,60,879	63	Not furnished
13.	Kerala	25,45,009	24,98,313	98	Not furnished
14.	Madhya Pradesh	93,72,406	60,87,160	65	Lack of referral transport, hard to reach areas, delayed network problem to connect call centre delayed call to call centre for referral transport, etc.
15.	Maharashtra	1,09,11,869	84,18,096	77	Lack of awareness, knowledge, illiteracy, superstitions, poverty, belief, traditions etc.
16.	Manipur	3,95,640	1,49,992	38	Not furnished
17.	Meghalaya	6,37,351	2,13,701	34	Not furnished
18.	Mizoram	1,24,686	93,621	75	Not furnished
19.	Odisha	40,93,249	30,98,355	76	Not furnished
20.	Punjab	24,25,932	17,64,957	73	Not furnished
21.	Rajasthan	95,31,052	67,03,450	70	Not furnished
22.	Sikkim	46,963	32,026	68	Not furnished
23.	Tamil Nadu	55,66,427	48,40,948	87	Not furnished
24.	Telangana	40,05,365	22,63,105	56	Not furnished
25.	Tripura	3,81,530	2,23,166	58	Not furnished
26.	Uttar Pradesh	2,68,09,476	1,16,10,806	43	Not furnished
27.	Uttarakhand	10,89,506	4,50,277	42	Not furnished
28.	West Bengal	94,26,292	56,70,434	60	Lack of awareness/ desired home delivery

**Annexure-7.2**  
**{Refer para-7.2.2 (a)}**

**Detail of the antenatal checkups received by pregnant women during 2011-16**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Total number of pregnant women registered	Number of registered pregnant women received antenatal; check-ups			
			At the stage of registration	First Visit: 20-24 weeks	Second Visit: 28-32 weeks	Third Visit: 34-36 weeks
1.	<b>Andaman and Nicobar Islands</b>	30,030	30,030	30,030	22,358	24,032
2.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	47,05,896	47,05,896	33,76,703	NA	44,27,748
3.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	1,56,905	1,56,905	NA	NA	58,119
4.	<b>Assam (2012-16)</b>	30,83,543	30,16,003	26,47,372	24,66,138	21,47,237
5.	<b>Bihar</b>	1,30,10,357	1,30,10,357	1,30,10,357	NA	79,11,162
6.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	33,19,466	17,79,981	NA	NA	NA
7.	<b>Gujarat</b>	70,87,861	70,87,861	51,63,719	62,10,657	54,61,946
8.	<b>Haryana</b>	29,23,650	29,23,650	14,82,561	NA	20,12,834
9.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	6,47,711	NA	4,11,156	NA	5,32,646
10.	<b>Jammu and Kashmir</b>	19,98,896	19,98,896	7,48,746	6,43,087	12,94,845
11.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	37,51,047	37,51,047	10,69,325	NA	26,50,537
12.	<b>Karnataka</b>	67,16,166	45,10,198	NA	NA	NA
13.	<b>Kerala</b>	25,45,009	25,45,009	20,43,967	23,14,461	23,14,461
14.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	93,72,406	NA	NA	NA	74,27,958
15.	<b>Maharashtra (2012-16 )</b>	86,15,037	53,74,074	72,21,738	63,88,474	60,60,774
16.	<b>Manipur</b>	3,95,640	3,95,640	2,24,843	NA	2,20,461
17.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	6,37,351	NA	NA	NA	NA
18.	<b>Mizoram</b>	1,24,686	1,24,686	80,174	NA	87,607
19.	<b>Odisha</b>	40,93,118	40,93,118	23,11,400	24,87,246	36,01,422
20.	<b>Punjab</b>	24,25,932	24,25,932	16,75,126	NA	21,67,041
21.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	95,31,052	51,36,326	NA	NA	NA
22.	<b>Sikkim</b>	46,963	NA	33,148	NA	39,626
23.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	55,66,427	55,66,427	0	0	51,40,664
24.	<b>Telangana</b>	40,05,365	NA	NA	NA	36,21,545
25.	<b>Tripura</b>	3,81,530	NA	NA	NA	2,42,980
26.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	2,68,09,476	NA	1,42,00,649	NA	1,91,62,821
27.	<b>Uttarakhand</b>	10,89,506	6,23,954	NA	NA	8,34,557
28.	<b>West Bengal</b>	94,26,292	63,66,258	NA	NA	73,50,113

NA: Not available

**Annexure-7.3**  
**{Refer para-7.2.2 (a) (i)}**

**Detail of the pregnant women given 100 IFA tablets during 2011-16**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Total number of pregnant women registered	Number of pregnant women given 100 IFA tablets	Per cent of pregnant women given 100 IFA tablets	Number. of pregnant women who had been detected with severe anaemia	Per cent of pregnant women who had been detected with severe anaemia
1.	<b>Andaman and Nicobar Islands</b>	30,030	82,192	273.70	981	3.27
2.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	47,05,896	45,47,676	96.64	1,42,064	3.02
3.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	1,56,905	76,141	48.53	2,683	1.71
4.	<b>Assam (2012-16)</b>	30,83,543	25,62,087	83.09	28,270	0.92
5.	<b>Bihar</b>	1,30,10,357	65,59,191	50.42	68,788	0.53
6.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	33,19,466	26,45,906	79.71	NA	NA
7.	<b>Gujarat</b>	70,87,861	61,43,535	86.68	1,52,716	2.15
8.	<b>Haryana</b>	29,23,650	21,39,014	73.16	1,14,501	3.92
9.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	6,47,711	4,63,245	71.52	4,158	0.64
10.	<b>Jammu and Kashmir</b>	19,98,896	7,39,241	36.98	1,22,086	6.11
11.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	37,51,047	21,12,355	56.31	24,852	0.66
12.	<b>Karnataka</b>	67,16,166	59,38,257	88.42	2,52,581	3.76
13.	<b>Kerala</b>	25,45,009	21,38,592	84.03	12,013	0.47
14.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	93,72,406	89,96,236	95.99	2,20,498	2.35
15.	<b>Maharashtra</b>	1,09,11,869	77,10,613	70.66	2,60,470	2.39
16.	<b>Manipur</b>	3,95,640	1,00,258	25.34	701	0.18
17.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	6,37,351	2,59,197	40.67	13,256	2.08
18.	<b>Mizoram</b>	1,24,686	81,062	65.01	840	0.67
19.	<b>Odisha</b>	40,93,118	29,63,741	72.41	25,007	0.61
20.	<b>Punjab</b>	24,25,932	19,98,668	82.39	22,738	0.94
21.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	95,31,052	64,58,792	67.77	2,07,284	2.17
22.	<b>Sikkim</b>	46,963	38,007	80.93	134	0.29
23.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	55,66,427	39,69,211	71.31	1,48,939	2.68
24.	<b>Telangana</b>	40,05,365	38,88,854	97.09	68,675	1.71
25.	<b>Tripura</b>	3,81,530	2,29,215	60.08	2,295	0.60
26.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	2,68,09,476	2,03,15,500	75.78	3,81,353	1.42
27.	<b>Uttarakhand</b>	10,89,506	5,37,151	49.30	21,382	1.96
28.	<b>West Bengal</b>	94,26,292	71,51,349	75.87	25,970	0.28

**Annexure-7.4  
(Refer para-7.2.5)**

**Increasing trend in deliveries with obstetric complications between 2011-12 and 2015-16**

Sl. No.	State/UT	Year	Total number of institutional deliveries	Number of deliveries with obstetric complications	Per cent of deliveries with obstetric complications
1.	<b>Andaman and Nicobar Islands</b>	2011-12	4,870	527	10.8
		2012-13	4,856	799	16.5
		2013-14	4,411	701	15.9
		2014-15	4,649	418	9.0
		2015-16	4,090	1,178	28.8
		<b>Total</b>	<b>22,876</b>	<b>3,623</b>	<b>15.8</b>
2.	<b>Haryana</b>	2011-12	4,34,144	27,823	6.4
		2012-13	3,90,153	34,477	8.8
		2013-14	4,27,375	97,236	22.8
		2014-15	4,59,284	106,334	23.2
		2015-16	4,56,411	34,040	7.5
		<b>Total</b>	<b>21,67,367</b>	<b>2,99,910</b>	<b>13.8</b>
3.	<b>Jammu and Kashmir</b>	2011-12	1,52,998	12,545	8.2
		2012-13	1,69,012	2,206	1.3
		2013-14	1,76,738	20,859	11.8
		2014-15	1,79,191	23,983	13.4
		2015-16	1,72,045	27,721	16.1
		<b>Total</b>	<b>8,49,984</b>	<b>87,314</b>	<b>10.3</b>
4.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	2011-12	3,72,229	11,247	3.0
		2012-13	4,35,668	13,514	3.1
		2013-14	5,04,644	16,328	3.2
		2014-15	5,00,177	27,179	5.4
		2015-16	5,55,785	34,123	6.1
		<b>Total</b>	<b>23,68,503</b>	<b>1,02,391</b>	<b>4.3</b>
5.	<b>Karnataka</b>	2011-12	7,88,977	35,017	4.4
		2012-13	8,37,707	44,581	5.3
		2013-14	8,53,689	56,283	6.6
		2014-15	8,84,610	60,609	6.9
		2015-16	8,95,896	67,739	7.6
		<b>Total</b>	<b>42,60,879</b>	<b>2,64,229</b>	<b>6.2</b>
6.	<b>Kerala</b>	2011-12	5,33,260	60,192	11.3
		2012-13	4,94,504	94,112	19.0
		2013-14	4,96,257	102,873	20.7
		2014-15	4,93,636	110,922	22.5
		2015-16	4,80,656	97,662	20.3
		<b>Total</b>	<b>24,98,313</b>	<b>4,65,761</b>	<b>19</b>
7.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	2011-12	2,51,357	7,468	3.0
		2012-13	2,33,869	7,939	3.4
		2013-14	2,26,946	13,550	6.0
		2014-15	2,33,131	26,527	11.4
		2015-16	2,34,631	29,174	12.4
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11,79,934</b>	<b>84,658</b>	<b>7.2</b>
8.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	2011-12	38,511	4,782	12.4
		2012-13	41,266	4,122	10.0
		2013-14	43,541	6,123	14.1
		2014-15	44,369	7,283	16.4
		2015-16	46,014	7,701	16.7
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2,13,701</b>	<b>30,011</b>	<b>14</b>

Sl. No.	State/UT	Year	Total number of institutional deliveries	Number of deliveries with obstetric complications	Per cent of deliveries with obstetric complications
9.	Odisha	2011-12	6,23,299	35,394	5.7
		2012-13	6,03,831	56,475	9.4
		2013-14	6,29,106	69,494	11.0
		2014-15	6,27,484	84,529	13.5
		2015-16	6,14,635	1,05,732	17.2
		<b>Total</b>	<b>30,98,355</b>	<b>3,51,624</b>	<b>11.3</b>
10.	Punjab	2011-12	3,25,642	20,828	6.4
		2012-13	3,48,514	21,862	6.3
		2013-14	3,59,582	26,425	7.3
		2014-15	3,69,008	50,793	13.8
		2015-16	3,62,211	71,802	19.8
		<b>Total</b>	<b>17,64,957</b>	<b>1,91,710</b>	<b>10.9</b>
11.	Sikkim	2011-12	6,780	768	11.3
		2012-13	6,593	405	6.1
		2013-14	6,518	522	8.0
		2014-15	6,205	746	12.0
		2015-16	6,011	1,156	19.2
		<b>Total</b>	<b>32,107</b>	<b>3,597</b>	<b>11.2</b>
12.	Uttarakhand	2011-12	78,590	5,809	7.39
		2012-13	84,930	7,823	9.21
		2013-14	92,425	8,447	9.13
		2014-15	98,520	9,581	9.72
		2015-16	95,812	9,419	9.83
		<b>Total</b>	<b>4,50,277</b>	<b>41,079</b>	<b>9.12</b>
13.	West Bengal	2011-12	10,71,509	77,634	7.2
		2012-13	10,71,312	94,185	8.8
		2013-14	11,86,842	1,19,158	10.0
		2014-15	11,53,207	1,52,398	13.2
		2015-16	12,05,967	2,42,518	20.1
		<b>Total</b>	<b>56,88,837</b>	<b>6,85,893</b>	<b>12.1</b>

**Annexure-7.5**  
**(Refer para-7.5.2)**

**Proportion of Vasectomy, in total sterilization cases during 2011-16**

Sl No.	State/UT	Number of Vasectomy/ NSV cases	Number of Tubectomy cases	Number of Laparosc opy cases	Total	Per cent of Vasectomy/ NSV to total sterilisation
1.	<b>Andaman and Nicobar Islands</b>	14	535	3,538	4,087	0.34
2.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	14,724	11,37,736	80,815	12,33,275	1.19
3.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	13	5,925	3,499	9,437	0.14
4.	<b>Assam</b>	26,225	2,55,428	NA	2,81,653	9.31
5.	<b>Bihar</b>	23,521	27,39,877	NA	27,63,398	0.85
6.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	22,542	2,45,094	2,47,308	5,14,944	4.38
7.	<b>Gujarat</b>	11,806	8,32,274	8,42,726	16,86,806	0.70
8.	<b>Haryana</b>	23,146	3,36,498	85,401	4,45,045	5.20
9.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	9,669	94,580	NA	1,04,249	9.27
10.	<b>Jammu and Kashmir</b>	3,594	78,597	0	82,191	4.37
11.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	34,290	5,37,873	43,195	6,15,358	5.57
12.	<b>Karnataka</b>	10,422	7,79,589	8,16,024	16,06,035	0.65
13.	<b>Kerala</b>	8,261	3,82,012	92,041	4,82,314	1.71
14.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	82,775	0	15,89,437	16,72,212	4.95
15.	<b>Maharashtra</b>	85,372	23,52,887	7,45,205	31,83,464	2.68
16.	<b>Manipur</b>	553	4,686	1,769	7,008	7.89
17.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	121	12,832	220	13,173	0.92
18.	<b>Mizoram</b>	1	8,636	614	9,251	0.01
19.	<b>Odisha</b>	11,865	6,32,121	2,47,958	8,91,944	1.33
20.	<b>Punjab</b>	23,387	2,86,119	1,32,000	4,41,506	5.30
21.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	23,304	3,24,557	11,78,528	15,26,389	1.53
22.	<b>Sikkim</b>	263	496	71	830	31.69
23.	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	7,036	14,12,432	1,61,440	15,80,908	0.45
24.	<b>Telangana</b>	34,178	8,41,949	2,28,589	11,04,716	3.09
25.	<b>Tripura</b>	416	0	19,108	19,524	2.13
26.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	33,845	14,65,477	0	14,99,322	2.26
27.	<b>Uttarakhand</b>	7,259	1,10,692	1,10,474	2,28,425	3.18
28.	<b>West Bengal</b>	25,353	8,81,468	72,646	9,79,467	2.59
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5,23,955</b>	<b>1,57,60,370</b>	<b>67,02,606</b>	<b>2,29,86,931</b>	<b>2.27</b>

**Annexure-8.1**  
**{Refer para-8.3.3(f)}**

**Difference in data as per HMIS and as per Records (Maharashtra)**

Bhandara District			Ratnagiri District		Buldhana District		Nanded District		Yavatmal District	
Year	Institutional Deliveries		Institutional Deliveries		Institutional Deliveries		Institutional Deliveries		Institutional Deliveries	
	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records
2011-12	15,860	17,994	7,929	22,745	26,109	0	38,912	36,358	24,524	42,131
2012-13	16,407	18,505	8,616	20,781	20,568	0	51,070	45,157	25,396	43,961
2013-14	16,756	19,542	8,341	19,583	21,879	48,626	43,734	35,194	21,724	39,581
2014-15	16,436	19,536	8,068	13,656	22,581	34,731	43,802	29,146	25,148	45,448
2015-16	16,826	19,967	7,885	20,334	19,203	42,491	57,642	29,313	24,168	44,977

Bhandara District			Ratnagiri District		Buldhana District		Nanded District		Yavatmal District	
Year	Total No. of live birth M/F		Total No. of live birth M/F		Total No. of live birth M/F		Total No. of live birth M/F		Total No. of live birth M/F	
	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records
2011-12	17,609	17,609	24,067	22,449	46,285	0	73,582	35,719	41,597	41,415
2012-13	82	18,173	17,592	20,623	51,204	0	83,033	44,636	43,300	43,282
2013-14	19,191	19,105	15,753	19,452	47,851	47,851	64,821	34,705	35,112	39,059
2014-15	19,101	19,110	13,581	13,581	40,769	34,400	64,415	28,901	44,918	44,942
2015-16	19,599	19,617	20,164	20,163	29,882	42,246	84,295	29,094	32,098	44,333

Bhandara District			Ratnagiri District		Buldhana District		Nanded District		Yavatmal District	
Year	No. of pregnant woman given IFA tables		No. of pregnant woman given IFA tables		No. of pregnant woman given IFA tables		No. of pregnant woman given IFA tables		No. of pregnant women given IFA tables	
	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records
2011-12	7,827	7,827	14,638	25,040	13,248	0	37,323	24,948	30,388	37,844
2012-13	13,353	13,353	17,181	21,664	14,819	0	42,300	31,443	26,840	27,236
2013-14	12,111	12,317	14,424	19,432	37,240	37,282	54,698	45,572	43,221	37,871
2014-15	9,876	9,876	14,094	20,155	39,369	39,369	41,844	36,553	36,588	36,616
2015-16	8,939	8,943	13,909	21,540	37,776	40,055	22,166	25,404	30,555	32,781

Year	Bhandara District		Ratnagiri District		Buldhana District		Nanded District		Yavatmal District	
	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records	HMIS Data	Records
2011-12	3,427	3,404	7,246	7,252	4,357	5,822	5,998	6,347	9,259	8,809
2012-13	2,955	3,012	7,509	5,934	5,484	5,778	6,122	6,085	8,159	7,973
2013-14	2,697	2,468	6,969	6,667	6,483	6,419	6,445	6,193	7,440	8,279
2014-15	2,976	2,267	6,030	5,928	6,356	6,953	6,857	6,492	6,980	7,273
2015-16	2,964	2,956	6,504	6,439	5,618	6,668	8,708	8,597	6,975	7,746

**Annexure-8.2**  
**{Refer para-8.3.(f) (4)}**

**Variation in data as per HMIS and data as per records of the selected health facilities, 2015-16 (Meghalaya)**

Sl. No.	Data element	As per HMIS	As per Records
<b>Selected District Hospitals (3)</b>			
1.	Number of pregnant women registered for ANC	1,540	2,002
2.	Out of above, number registered within first trimester (within 12 weeks)	399	522
3.	Number of women registered under JSY	1,159	1,621
4.	Number of pregnant women who received 3 ANCs	1,190	1,543
5.	Number of pregnant women who received TT1	641	953
6.	Number of pregnant women who received TT2 or Booster	1,270	1,598
7.	Number of pregnant women having Haemoglobin level < 11	1,601	2,373
8.	Number of women getting post partum check up between 48 hours and 14 days	892	1,012
9.	Number of PNC maternal complications attended	315	217
10.	Number of children given BCG	1,260	1,625
11.	Number of children given DPT1	643	821
12.	Number of children given DPT2	740	946
13.	Number of children given DPT3	892	1,115
14.	Number of children given hepatitis B3	870	1,093
15.	Number of children given DPT booster	641	797
<b>Selected Community Health Centres (3)</b>			
16.	Number of pregnant women who received TT2 or booster	1,171	960
17.	Number of pregnant women having Haemoglobin level < 11	1,165	1,066
18.	Number of children between 9 to 12 months who received JE 1 <sup>st</sup> dose	148	269
19.	Number of children suffering from diarrhoea and dehydration	815	573
20.	Number of children admitted with respiratory infection	439	319

Selected Primary Health Centres (8)			
21.	Number of pregnant women given 100 IFA tablets	624	795
22.	Number of pregnant women having Haemoglobin level < 11	1,405	1,232
23.	Number of condom pieces distributed	3,730	2,735
24.	Number of children given OPV1	1,765	1,880

**Annexure-8.3**  
**{Refer para-8.3.3 (i) (5)}**

**Difference of data between HMIS and records of selected health faculties (Odisha)**

**(1) District Hospitals (Seven)**

Data Item	Data as per		
	Record	HMIS	Difference
Obstetrics and Gynaecology	7	4	3
<b>Maternity care</b>			
Number of JSY beneficiaries	36,686	19,915	16,771
Number of maternal death	58	42	16
Number of infant deaths	1,037	1,032	5

**(2) Community Health Centres (21)**

Data Item	Data as per		
	Record	HMIS	Difference
Obstetrics and Gynaecology	15	16	1
Paediatric	7	1	6
Antenatal care	16	11	5
New born care	19	13	6
Postnatal care	19	15	4
Deliveries	21	17	4
<b>Maternity care</b>			
Number of ANC Registration	25,083	21,862	3,221
Number of Deliveries	15,817	15,031	786
Number of maternal deaths	31	2	29
Number of infant deaths	411	96	315

**(3) Primary Health Centres (38)**

Data Item	Data as per		
	Record	HMIS	Difference
Antenatal care	18	11	7
Post Natal care	14	13	1
New born care	10	3	7
Services under JSY and JSSK	11	14	3
<b>Maternity care</b>			
Number of deliveries	1,130	1,122	8
Number of JSY beneficiaries	807	513	294

**(4) Sub-Centres (114)**

Data Item	Data as per		
	Record	HMIS	Difference
Antenatal care	107	78	29
New born care	80	40	40
Post Natal care	104	78	26
Services under JSY	83	50	33
<b>Maternity care</b>			
Number of ANC Registration	12,833	12,134	699
Number of deliveries	3,923	495	3,428
Number of JSY beneficiaries	7,070	3,072	3,998
Number of infant deaths	257	142	115
Number of maternal deaths	18	10	8

**Annexure-8.4  
(Refer para-8.4)**

**Cases of data in HMIS defying the prescribed validation description/checks**

(1) **Data item:** New women registered under JSY

**Validation description:** Number of women registered under JSY < Total number of women registered for ANC

Sl. No.	State	Year	Month	District	Total Number	Total number of women registered for ANC
1.	Uttar Pradesh	2015-16	May	Allahabad	10,547	10,545
2.	Madhya Pradesh	2012-13	August	Bastar	2,026	2,024
			December		2,229	2,126

(2) **Data item:** No. of women given TT1 (Vaccine)

**Validation description:** Number of pregnant women given TT1 <= Total number of PW Registered for ANC

Sl. No.	State	Year	Month	District	Total Number	Total number of women registered for ANC
1.	Uttar Pradesh	2015-16	April	Allahabad	12,007	10,908
			May		12,261	10,545
			June		12,865	11,866

(3) **Data item:** Number of Infants 0 to 11 months old who received BCG

**Validation description:** Number of infants (0-11 months) immunized for BCG

Sl. No.	State	Year	Month	District	Total Number	Live Birth Male + Live Birth female
1.	Madhya Pradesh	2014-15	July	Tikamgarh	2623	2,577
2.	Uttar Pradesh	2015-16	April	Allahabad	11,145	4,248
			May		10,498	5,041
			June		10,649	5,391
			July		11,277	6,288
			August		11,811	9,447
			September		12,706	9,537
			October		14,021	9,900
			November		13,569	8,537
			December		13,340	7,430
			January		12,904	7,894
			February		12,529	6,822
			March		14,467	7,545
			3.		Meghalaya	2013-14
May	869	690				
June	657	566				
July	659	465				
August	640	494				
October	734	514				
November	644	533				
December	419	408				
January	636	594				
February	757	629				
March	737	620				

**Annexure-8.5**  
**(Refer para-8.5)**

**State wise observations on Computerization and Networking**

Sl. No	State	Audit Observation																				
1.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	Connectivity to the HMIS was available only at the level of districts as 54 out of 84 blocks did not have internet connectivity. The blocks without internet connectivity were uploading the reports on the portal from the district headquarter or the nearest internet accessible area. The data uploading by the blocks without internet connectivity and adequate manpower was delayed and not available in time in HMIS.																				
2.	<b>Assam</b>	In the test health facilities, the computer, internet connection and data entry operator were not available in all the health centres as detailed below: <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Number in which Data entry operator available</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Category of health centres</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Number of health centres selected</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Number in which functional computer available</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Number in which internet available</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">08</td> <td style="text-align: center;">PHC</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18</td> <td style="text-align: center;">07</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">03</td> <td style="text-align: center;">CHC/SDCH</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">09</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">04</td> <td style="text-align: center;">DH</td> <td style="text-align: center;">07</td> <td style="text-align: center;">07</td> <td style="text-align: center;">06<sup>12</sup></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Number in which Data entry operator available	Category of health centres	Number of health centres selected	Number in which functional computer available	Number in which internet available	08	PHC	30	18	07	03	CHC/SDCH	13	10	09	04	DH	07	07	06 <sup>12</sup>
Number in which Data entry operator available	Category of health centres	Number of health centres selected	Number in which functional computer available	Number in which internet available																		
08	PHC	30	18	07																		
03	CHC/SDCH	13	10	09																		
04	DH	07	07	06 <sup>12</sup>																		
3.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	Out of 12 test-checked PHCs, only one PHC at Bhota (Hamirpur) had computer and internet facility whereas 11 PHCs had no computer with printer/ internet facility and as such the data was being maintained manually.																				
4.	<b>Maharashtra</b>	Details of maintenance of data in selected PHCs and SDHs/CHCs is given below: <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Type of health facility</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Number of health facilities selected</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Number in which functional computer available</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Number in which internet available</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Number in which Data entry operator available</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">PHC</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> <td style="text-align: center;">18</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">CHC/SDCH</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17</td> <td style="text-align: center;">16</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of health facility	Number of health facilities selected	Number in which functional computer available	Number in which internet available	Number in which Data entry operator available	PHC	26	25	18	20	CHC/SDCH	17	16	15	2					
Type of health facility	Number of health facilities selected	Number in which functional computer available	Number in which internet available	Number in which Data entry operator available																		
PHC	26	25	18	20																		
CHC/SDCH	17	16	15	2																		
5.	<b>Manipur</b>	SHS, Manipur as well as both the sampled districts upto PHC level were computerized with standalone computers without networking. However, internet connection was provided either through cables or dongles.																				
6.	<b>Mizoram</b>	Reporting from the block/main centres was not done in the audited districts due to internet connectivity problem. Consolidation in the District/State Level was also not fully inclusive due to non-updating of data from the centres.																				
7.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	A provision of ₹ 2.45 crore (for procurement of laptops - ₹ 2.25 crore, data card and rental - ₹ 0.20 crore) was made in 2014-15 under Rashtriya Bal Swasthya Karyakram for Mobile Health Teams to upload data in MIS. However, only ₹ 5.99 lakh was released to the districts for purchase of data card/rental, whereas no sanction for procurement of laptops was issued.																				
8.	<b>Sikkim</b>	Physical verification revealed that the computer networking in most of the PHCs was not satisfactory. None of the 15 PHCs (selected) had any computer or internet facility. No data entry operator was appointed in two PHCs (Dentam in West District and Hee-Gyathang in North Sikkim).																				
9.	<b>West Bengal</b>	In the selected 22 PHCs of four districts, it was noticed that 21 PHCs did not have computer whereas one PHC <sup>13</sup> had computer with internet connection but no DEO/statistical assistant.																				

<sup>12</sup> Internet facility was not available at DH, Sivasagar.

<sup>13</sup> PHC, Godapiasal in Salboni block of Paschim Medinipur.

**Annexure-8.6**  
**(Refer para-8.6)**

**Status of maintenance of Registers/records at the facilities**

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation																																														
1.	<b>Arunachal Pradesh</b>	In four selected districts, none of the 30 selected SCs maintained the full set of 12 registers. The number of registers not maintained ranged from 2 to 10.																																														
2.	<b>Assam</b>	<p align="center"><b>Registers not maintained/updated regularly in the selected health facilities</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility (Number)</th> <th>Types of register</th> <th>Number of health facilities not maintaining/updating registers</th> <th>Remarks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="8"><b>SC (45)</b></td> <td>Eligible Couple register</td> <td>16</td> <td>Not maintained</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ante Natal/Pregnancy register</td> <td>13</td> <td>Not updated</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Birth and Death Register</td> <td>10</td> <td>Not maintained</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Drug Register</td> <td>14</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equipment/furniture registers</td> <td>25</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communicable/epidemic register</td> <td>41</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Register for Surveillance/Malaria</td> <td>31</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>JSY Register</td> <td>38</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"><b>CHC (12)</b></td> <td>Vaccine Stock Register</td> <td>01</td> <td>Not updated</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Temperature Monitoring Register</td> <td>3</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3"><b>DH (7)</b></td> <td>Vaccine Stock Register</td> <td>02</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Temperature Monitoring Register</td> <td>01</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Immunization register</td> <td>6</td> <td>-do-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Due to non-maintenance/ updating of registers, source of data submitted in the monthly report was not verifiable leaving possibilities of misreporting as well.</p>	Health facility (Number)	Types of register	Number of health facilities not maintaining/updating registers	Remarks	<b>SC (45)</b>	Eligible Couple register	16	Not maintained	Ante Natal/Pregnancy register	13	Not updated	Birth and Death Register	10	Not maintained	Drug Register	14	-do-	Equipment/furniture registers	25	-do-	Communicable/epidemic register	41	-do-	Register for Surveillance/Malaria	31	-do-	JSY Register	38	-do-	<b>CHC (12)</b>	Vaccine Stock Register	01	Not updated	Temperature Monitoring Register	3	-do-	<b>DH (7)</b>	Vaccine Stock Register	02	-do-	Temperature Monitoring Register	01	-do-	Immunization register	6	-do-
Health facility (Number)	Types of register	Number of health facilities not maintaining/updating registers	Remarks																																													
<b>SC (45)</b>	Eligible Couple register	16	Not maintained																																													
	Ante Natal/Pregnancy register	13	Not updated																																													
	Birth and Death Register	10	Not maintained																																													
	Drug Register	14	-do-																																													
	Equipment/furniture registers	25	-do-																																													
	Communicable/epidemic register	41	-do-																																													
	Register for Surveillance/Malaria	31	-do-																																													
	JSY Register	38	-do-																																													
<b>CHC (12)</b>	Vaccine Stock Register	01	Not updated																																													
	Temperature Monitoring Register	3	-do-																																													
<b>DH (7)</b>	Vaccine Stock Register	02	-do-																																													
	Temperature Monitoring Register	01	-do-																																													
	Immunization register	6	-do-																																													
3.	<b>Gujarat</b>	Nine out of 36 selected SCs, maintained the mandatory 12 registers. Non-maintenance of mandatory registers ranged from 6 to 11 in five SCs. No register was maintained by Bhuvar SC.																																														
4.	<b>Haryana</b>	In the selected 18 SCs, 2 to 5 registers were not being maintained.																																														
5.	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	In the selected SCs, one to seven registers were not maintained during 2011-16.																																														
6.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	In 69 selected SCs of five test checked districts <sup>14</sup> four to nine registers were not being maintained.																																														
7.	<b>Kerala</b>	Out of the nine selected CHCs, Outbreak report and Routine Immunization chart were not maintained at Mundakkayam CHC and Weekly Surveillance report was not maintained at Sachivothampuram CHC. In the 36 selected SCs, only five maintained all the 12 registers and the remaining 31 SCs maintained nine to 11 registers only.																																														
8.	<b>Manipur</b>	None of the 17 selected SCs maintained all the prescribed 12 registers. Two to 10 registers were not maintained at these SCs.																																														
9.	<b>Meghalaya</b>	In 24 selected SCs, two registers viz. Communicable diseases/epidemic register/ Syndromic surveillance register and Water quality and sanitation were not found maintained.																																														
10.	<b>Odisha</b>	In 71 selected SCs of six districts, one to nine registers had not been maintained.																																														

<sup>14</sup> Dumka, Giridih, Gumla, Jamtara and West Singhbhum.

Sl. No.	State	Audit Observation
11.	<b>Rajasthan</b>	Nine out of 88 selected SCs did not maintain any register, 29 SCs were not maintaining five to 11 registers and 50 SCs were not maintaining one to four registers
12.	<b>Sikkim</b>	15 selected SCs in South and West Districts maintained only four to seven registers.
13.	<b>Telangana</b>	In two districts, Medak and Nalgonda, Register for water quality and sanitation was not maintained in the selected facilities.
14.	<b>Tripura</b>	In 17 selected SCs, only three to eight were maintained. As a result, information pertaining to JSY, minor ailments, water quality and sanitation, communicable/epidemic diseases, etc. was not found available at SC level.
15.	<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	In the selected SCs, three to 10 registers were not maintained. The registers viz., Eligible couple register, Drug register, Communicable disease/epidemic register/register for Syndromic surveillance, birth and death register <i>etc.</i> , were not maintained.

**Annexure-8.7**  
**(Refer para-8.8)**

**RCH Indicators/Parameters showing abnormal variations**

Sl. No.	Indicator Name	Range variation of HMIS data with data collected from States (in per cent)*
1.	Total number of pregnant women Registered for ANC	-74 to 75
2.	Number of pregnant women given TT2 or Booster during current pregnancy	-911 to 70
3.	Total number of pregnant women given 100 IFA tablets	-874 to 78
4.	Number of Pregnant women having severe anaemia (Hb<7) treated at institution	-285 to 91
5.	Number of Eclampsia cases managed during delivery	-57 to 96
6.	Deliveries_Total_Institutional_Public_Private (calculated field)	-77 to 73
7.	Number of cases of pregnant women with Obstetric Complications and attended at Public facilities i.e. PHC, CHC, SDH, DH and other public Institutions	-774 to 94
8.	Total number of women received JSY incentive money (calculated field)	-2,89,270 to 10,04,978 (in numbers)
9.	Total number of male and female live births (4.1.1.a and 4.1.1.b)	-75 to 75
10.	Still Births	-31 to 90
11.	Total Number of NSV or Conventional Vasectomy conducted at Public facilities i.e. PHC, CHC, SDH, DH and other State owned public institution	-197 to 100

\* (-) variation represents data collected from States is less than the data extracted from HMIS and (+) variation represents data collected from States is more than the data extracted from HMIS data.

**Annexure-8.8**  
**(Refer para-8.8.1)**

**RCH Parameters showing achievements more than 100 per cent)**

Sl. No.	RCH parameter (Calculated Field)	Description	Exceptions (Out of 3,218 records)
1.	ANC Ratio	Ratio of number of pregnant women (PW) received 3 ANC Vs check-ups to number of PW Registered	In 115 records, the ratio of Number of PW received 3 ANC check-ups to Number of PW registered for ANC was more than 105 per cent.
2.	TT1 ratio	Ratio of No. of PW given TT1 Vs number of PW Registered	In 52 records, the ratio of Number of PW given TT1 to Number of PW registered for ANC was more than 105 per cent.
3.	TT2 ratio	Ratio of number of PW given TT2 Vs Number of PW Registered	In 77 records, the ratio of Number of PW given TT2 to Number of PW registered for ANC was more than 105 per cent.
4.	100 IFA tablets ratio	Ratio of number of PW given 100 IFA Tablets Vs number of PW Registered	In 213 records, the ratio of Number of PW given 100 IFA tablets to Number of PW registered for ANC was more than 105 per cent.
5.	Total deliveries at Public/Private/Home	Ratio of total deliveries at Public/Private/Home Vs number of PW registered for ANC	In 120 records, the ratio of total deliveries at Public/Private/Home to total Number of PW registered for ANC was more than 105 per cent.
6.	Total Deliveries including abortions	Ratio of Total deliveries including abortions Vs number of PW registered for ANC	In 215 records, the ratio of total deliveries including abortions to Number of PW registered for ANC was more than 105 per cent.
7.	JSY ratio	Ratio of number of PW given JSY benefits Vs number of PW Registered under JSY	In 147 records, the ratio of PW given JSY benefits to number of PW registered under JSY was more than 105 per cent.
8.	New-born weighed Vs Total Births	Ratio of No. of New-born weighed Vs Total Births (Live + Still)	In 10 records, the ratio of number of new-born weighed Vs Total Births (Live+Still) was more than 105 per cent.
9.	New-born breast-fed within one hour	Ratio of number of New-born breast-fed within 1 hour of birth Vs Total number of Births	In 13 records, the ratio of number of new-born breastfed to the number of total live births (males and females) was more than 105 per cent.
10.	OPV-0 cases	Ratio of number of infants given OPV-0 Vs total number of Institutional deliveries	In 899 records, ratio of number of infants given OPV-0 to total number of Institutional deliveries was more than 105 per cent.
11.	New-born visited within 24 hours of delivery	Ratio of number of new-born visited within 24 hours of delivery Vs Total number of deliveries conducted at Home and attended to by trained or non-trained SBA	In 71 records, the ratio of number of new-born visited within 24 hours of delivery to total number of deliveries conducted at Home and attended to by trained or non-trained SBA was more than 105 per cent.
12.	Percent Immunisation cases	Ratio of number of Immunisation sessions held during the month where ASHAs were present Vs Number of Immunisation sessions held during the month	In 23 records, the ratio of Number of Immunisation sessions held during the month where ASHAs were present to number of Immunisation sessions held during the month was more than 100 per cent.

Sl. No.	RCH parameter (Calculated Field)	Description	Exceptions (Out of 3,218 records)
13.	JSY paid against total deliveries in Private Institutions	Ratio of number of mothers paid JSY Incentive for deliveries conducted at accredited Private Institutions Vs Deliveries conducted at Private Institutions (Including C-Sections)	In 35 records, the ratio of number of mothers paid JSY Incentive for deliveries conducted at accredited Private Institutions to Deliveries conducted at Private Institutions (Including C-Sections) was more than 100 <i>per cent</i> .
14.	Asha paid JSY (Institutional Delivery)/Total Institutional Delivery	Ratio of number of Asha workers paid JSY incentive for deliveries conducted at Public and Private Institutions Vs Total institutional deliveries	In 98 records, the ratio of number of Asha workers paid JSY incentive for deliveries conducted at Public and Private Institutions Vs Total institutional deliveries was more than 100 <i>per cent</i> .
15.	Asha paid JSY (Institutional Delivery)/Total deliveries	Ratio of number of Asha workers paid JSY incentive for deliveries conducted at Public and Private Institutions Vs Total institutional deliveries including Home	In 53 records, the ratio of number of Asha workers paid JSY incentive for deliveries conducted at Public and Private Institutions Vs Total institutional deliveries including home was more than 100 <i>per cent</i> .
16.	JSY beneficiaries Vs PW registered for ANC ratio	Ratio of JSY beneficiaries Vs PW registered for ANC	In 39 records, JSY beneficiaries were more than PW registered.

