

Chapter-4
Supervision, Monitoring and
Quality Control

Chapter-4: Supervision, Monitoring and Quality Control

4.1 Introduction

A well defined supervision, monitoring and quality control mechanism in programme implementation provides reasonable assurance that the necessary regulations are followed, resources are used in a planned manner and are protected from mismanagement so that the intended objectives of the programme are achieved.

The programme implementation in various departments was examined in the light of existing supervision, monitoring and quality control mechanism in the respective departments and in terms of the provisions of the Disaster Management Act, 2005. The audit findings are discussed below:

4.2 Role and monitoring mechanism of designated committees/institutions

4.2.1 State Executive Committee

In compliance of the provisions of Disaster Management Act, 2005, the Government of Uttarakhand (GoU) formed (January 2008) a State Executive Committee (SEC) headed by the Chief Secretary to assist the Uttarakhand State Disaster Management Authority (USDMA) in performance of its functions. The SEC met twice (2016-17) during the period of Medium & Long Term Reconstruction (MLTR) funded reconstruction project (2013-14 to 2016-2017).

4.2.2 Core Committee and High Powered Committee

The guidelines⁸² of Uttarakhand Emergency Assistance Project (UEAP) and Uttarakhand Disaster Recovery Project (UDRP) stipulated that a Core Committee be set up by the GoU under chairmanship of the Chief Secretary for periodic monitoring and reviewing of the post-disaster reconstruction works. The guidelines further envisage constitution of a High Powered Committee (HPC) under chairmanship of Additional Chief Secretary for speedy approval and single window clearance of the reconstruction projects of disaster of 2013.

The GoU set-up the Core Committee⁸³ and HPC⁸⁴ in August 2013 under chairmanship of the Chief Secretary and Additional Chief Secretary respectively. However, subsequently on the promotion of the Additional Chief Secretary to Chief Secretary, these two committees were merged with common nomenclature of HPC but notification to this effect was not issued by the GoU. As a result, the composition and formation could not

⁸² Project Administrative Manual of UEAP and Projects appraisal document of UDRP.

⁸³ **Members of Core Committee:** Commissioner-Infrastructure, Rural Development & Forest; Principal Secretary- Finance, Planning, Public Works Department; Secretary cum Commissioner- Revenue Board; Vice-chairman- State Public Service Commission; Secretary- Disaster Management Department.

⁸⁴ **Members of HPC:** Commissioner-Infrastructure, Principal Secretary- Finance, and Planning; 02 Additional Secretaries (nominated by the Principal Secretary-Finance); Secretary- Disaster Management Department.

be ascertained in audit. HPC met on 52 occasions⁸⁵ during the period from 2013-14 to July 2017.

4.2.3 District Disaster Management Authorities

As per the provision of the Disaster Management Act, 2005, District Disaster Management Authorities (DDMAs) were constituted (December 2007) in all the districts of Uttarakhand for carrying out all the disaster related management/activities in the district. The findings on the working of DDMAs were as below:

- The monitoring and supervision works of the post reconstruction activities related to disaster of June, 2013 were not done by DDMAs as neither any staff was appointed nor any monitoring cell constituted in the DDMAs.
- DDMAs did not prescribe any returns and reports of the reconstruction works for regularly watching and monitoring the progress of works. They thereby failed to monitor the physical and financial progress of the works and take corrective action accordingly.

The Secretary, Disaster Management Department replied that DDMAs were undertaking measures in accordance with the provision of the DM Act, 2005 and had been reviewing post-disaster reconstruction works. However, it failed to provide documentary evidence in support of the review works being undertaken by it.

4.3 Departmental supervision, monitoring and quality control mechanisms

In the Engineering Departments of State Government, the Executive Engineer (EE) and Assistant Engineers at divisional level are responsible for first tier inspection and supervision of works. The responsibility of second and third tier inspections, supervision and monitoring of works rests with the Superintending Engineers and Chief Engineer(s) respectively. Besides, at the State level, Quality Control Units (QCU) are also set-up in the Public Works Department and Forest Department for supervision/quality control of works.

4.3.1 Lack of centralised records of Inspections

In test checked Project Implementing Units (PIUs)/Offices, audit noticed that no centralised record or periodic returns showing details of inspections carried out by the departmental authorities were maintained by the PIUs/offices. The PIUs/offices failed to provide details of inspections carried out by the departmental authorities for the sampled works. The adequacy of inspections actually carried out by various authorities could not, therefore, be ascertained in audit.

4.3.2 Ineffective supervision and quality control

Audit scrutiny of sampled works revealed several instances of deficiencies in the supervision and quality control mechanism as discussed below:

- UDRP work (Naugaon-Syuri Motorable Road) of district Uttarkashi was found to be substandard quality by the Chief Engineer (CE) during his site inspection

⁸⁵ Meetings: 21 in 2014, 15 in 2015, 10 in 2016 and six in 2017.

(December 2015) and CE directed to rectify the same at the cost of the contractor. The CE, further, instructed to file charge sheets against the departmental staff responsible for the negligence. However, the contract of work was finalised (October 2016) by the PIU without rectifying the defects and no action was initiated against the staff responsible for the substandard work.

- In another case of UDRP work (Kotkhal-Jagtoli Motorable Road) of district Rudraprayag, an inspection carried out (March 2016) by the Superintending Engineer (SE) disclosed that the execution of base-course works of the road was substandard against which the PIU submitted (April 2016) a compliance report stating that the work had been rectified. However, a separate inspection carried out by the CE (WB) PWD, Dehradun after three months (May 2016) noticed the same shortcomings in execution of work which indicates that the compliance report submitted by the PIU-UDRP, Rudraprayag was unreliable.
- Quality of bituminous works executed in 9.90 km long Ganai-Bankot Motor Road (MR) by PIU-UDRP, Pithoragarh was observed (October 2015) to be very poor by the District Administration-Pithoragarh as the bituminous surface was apparently found damaged at various places. The PIU in its reply (June 2017) stated that the defects had been rectified. However, no documentary evidence was produced to audit by the PIU regarding carrying out of fresh bituminous work on the road.
- Inspection note (October 2016) of SE, Srinagar pertaining to 2.85 km long Kusumgad-Sursal MR of PIU-UDRP, Rudraprayag revealed that hard rock cutting was not executed by the contractor at many places and only one layer (50 mm) of base-course was executed in km-2 (chainage-1.850) against required three layers (200 mm thickness).
- Construction of Parapets, Water Bound Macadam (WBM) and Premix Carpet in Sonla-Kandar MR of UDRP (Chamoli) was found substandard by the SE in his inspection (March 2016) after receipt of a complaint from the Deputy Speaker, Uttarakhand Vidhan Sabha. SE directed the PIU for dismantling of the work and taking action for blacklisting the contractor after making recovery. However, the PIU did not blacklist the contractor and got the work re-executed by the same contractor.
- General Manager, Uttar Pradesh Rajkiya Nirman Nigam (UPRNN) during site inspection observed (June 2017) that tile work in external wall cladding was damaged at various places in newly constructed 120 Cottages at Kedarnath and required replacement and re-execution of the work. However, no replacement/ re-execution work was carried out by the UPRNN as noticed during site inspection (October 2017) of the work by audit.
- Site laboratories in six road works⁸⁶ were set-up by the contractors' after delay of two to 11 months from the date of start of works whereas the laboratories were

⁸⁶ Solana-Kandar MR and Seema-Bairon MR of district Chamoli, Kanda-Sanaidiyaar-Rawatsera MR of district Bageshwar, Chilyanisaud-Jogath MR of district Uttarkashi, Didihaat-Dunakot and Didihaat-Aadichaura MR, Quitesain Rathi Shishu Mandir Sahid Pushkar MR of district Pithoragarh.

required to be set up by the contractors within 15 days as per terms and conditions of the contracts. No penalty was imposed by the PIUs on the contractors for delay in setting up of the field laboratories.

4.3.3 Non-conducting of third party assessments

State Government directed (September 2015) that an independent third party concurrent quality control and audit of all the works being constructed under the Irrigation Department costing above ₹ five crore shall be carried out by an empanelled agency (Shriram Institute, Delhi).

Audit noticed that none of the 31 test checked flood protection works (FPW) (costing more than ₹ five crore), were assessed/technically evaluated by the aforesaid empanelled agency. However, third party assessment was carried out in case of three works of Bageshwar district by the newly established ‘Seemant Institute of Technology-Pithoragarh’ and in case of one FPW of Rudraprayag district by Indian Institute of Technology-Roorkee.

Similarly, third party evaluation of reconstruction works under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan was not carried out by the State Project Office (SPO), Dehradun despite the fact that 1.5 per cent cost (₹ 28.06 lakh) of sanctioned works was retained by the SPO for third party evaluation/monitoring.

4.3.4 Poor quality of road works

State level Quality Control Unit (QCU) of PWD, Dehradun carried out technical inspections in respect of reconstruction works of the affected roads being executed by the field PIUs/territorial divisions. It was observed that out of 162 reconstruction works inspected in five test checked districts, the reconstruction work of eight roads (five per cent) was marked as ‘Unsatisfactory’ whereas reconstruction work of 96 roads (59 per cent) was marked as ‘Required Improvement’, as detailed in **Table-4.1** below:

Table-4.1: Details of technical inspections conducted by the QCU-PWD

Name of district	No. of MR inspected by the QCU				Rating given by QCU for execution of works		
	SPA-R	UEAP	UDRP	Total	Satisfactory	Required Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Bageshwar	1	4	21	26	5	21	0
Chamoli	2	13	32	47	17	29	1
Pithoragarh	1	7	17	25	14	9	2
Rudraprayag	0	3	31	34	15	17	2
Uttarkashi	3	7	20	30	7	20	3
Total	7	34	121	162	58	96	8
State as whole	07	92	197	296	115	169⁸⁷	12⁸⁸

Source: State level Quality Control Unit (QCU) of PWD, Dehradun.

The high percentage (61 per cent) of below standard road works (unsatisfactory/ required improvement) indicates poor quality control mechanism at various levels in the PWD.

⁸⁷ SPA-R: 03 work, UEAP: 54 work and UDRP: 112 work.

⁸⁸ UEAP: 03 work and UDRP: 09 work.