CHAPTER VI : MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Department of Secondary and Higher Education

Aligarh Muslim University

6.1 Unauthorised expenditure

Aligarh Muslim University did not adhere to the conditions of financial sanction resulting in unauthorised expenditure of Rs. one crore on repair of roads.

University Grants Commission (UGC) New Delhi sanctioned (January 2004) Rs. one crore as a one time special grant for special repairs and maintenance of heritage buildings of Aligarh Muslim University (AMU) with the specific condition that the earmarked fund for one time special assistance be utilised by 31 March 2004 and may not be diverted for any other purpose.

Audit scrutiny (August 2005) brought out that the entire amount of Rs. one crore was unauthorisedly utilised on the repairs of 20 roads instead of special repairs and maintenance of heritage buildings of AMU

In response to audit observation, AMU stated (September 2005) that as the grant was sanctioned at the fag end of the financial year 2003-04 and was to be utilised during the same financial year, the amount was utilised for the repairs of various university roads which were also part of the buildings. Reply of the University is not tenable as the University should have sought extension of time for utilisation of grant for maintenance and preservation of heritage buildings rather than paying the entire amount of grant towards repair of roads.

Thus, the purpose of sanctioning one-time special grant for repairs and preservation of heritage buildings was defeated as the grant was unauthorisedly spent on repairs of various roads.

Matter was referred to the Ministry in August 2006; their reply was awaited as of December 2006.

Indian Council of Social Science Research

6.2 Irregular grant of advance increments

The Indian Council of Social Science Research in blatant violation of the Ministry's specific orders, granted advance increments to nine officials. This resulted in excess payment of Rs. 10.04 lakh.

In pursuance of the decision of the Planning and Administration Committee (PAC) of the Indian Council of Social Science Research (Council) taken in the meeting held in July 1971, the Council granted two advance increments to its employees who acquired PhD degree during the course of their service. The Ministry of Human Resource Development, after becoming aware of the practice followed by the Council, observed (November 1988) that the grant of advance increments was irregular and directed it to withdraw such increments.

Audit noticed (September 2005) that while the Council stopped giving the benefit of advance increments to the employees who had acquired PhD degree after November 1988, it did not withdraw the irregular benefits which were being paid to the employees who had acquired the degree before this date. Five officials were being paid advance increments since August 1983. Further, PAC of the Council in its meeting held in July 1992 decided, in principle, to grant advance increments to employees who had acquired PhD degree during the course of their service in the Council but deferred the implementation of this decision due to the financial stringencies faced by the Council. The Ministry after becoming aware of the said decision of the Council, specifically instructed (August 1992) it not to implement the decision without the prior approval of the Government. Audit noticed that despite these instructions, the Council, without the approval of the Government, resumed the grant of two advance increments from 15 November 1994 to those officials who had acquired PhD degree after November 1988. Four such officials were granted the benefit of advance increments. Thus, irregular grant of advance increments to nine officials resulted in excess payment of Rs. 10.04 lakh for the period from August 1983 to July 2006.

In response to audit observation, the Ministry stated (August 2006) that it had already requested the Council to recover the amount paid for granting of the irregular advance increments. It also decided to ask the Council to ascertain the circumstances in which the irregularity was committed and fix the responsibility for the lapses.

Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi

6.3 Deficient procurement planning resulting in idling of equipment

Procurement of equipment by the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi without finalising its installation led to the idling of the equipment and the investment of Rs. 56.87 lakh on its purchase for over two years.

The Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi (IITD) placed an order (March 2004) on a foreign firm for purchase of a high performance digital NMR Spectrometer for its chemistry department at a cost of Rs. 56.87 lakh. The equipment was received in IITD in July 2004. The warranty period of the equipment was 12 months from the date of installation or 15 months from the date of shipment (July 2004) whichever was earlier.

Audit noticed (October 2005) that the equipment had been lying uninstalled in IITD since its procurement due to non-availability of space. The warranty had expired in October 2005. Purchase of the equipment without ensuring availability of space for its installation indicated deficient planning, which resulted in idling of investment of Rs. 56.87 lakh for over one and a half years as of May 2006. Further, with the warranty having expired, IITD will have to incur additional expenditure in case after its installation, the equipment is found to have suffered any damage during its storage or does not otherwise perform according to its specifications.

In response to the audit observation, IITD stated (May 2006) that after the engineer of the company pointed out that the machine should be installed only on the ground floor, it was decided to install the equipment in the laboratory on the ground floor and the renovation work started which was being completed. The reply is not tenable, as suitable space for installation of the equipment should have been selected in advance of actual procurement. Even after the engineer of the company had suggested installation of equipment on the ground floor in September 2004, IITD selected the space after eight months in May 2005. It has already taken a year after selection of the space to complete the renovation work for installation of the equipment.

The Ministry stated (January 2007) that the machine had been installed on 21 September 2006 and it had been functioning satisfactorily. The fact, however, remains that installation of the equipment was delayed by over two years and the warranty had also expired in the uninstalled state due to deficient planning.

6.4 Loss of interest

The Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi suffered loss of interest of Rs. 20.13 lakh due to belated claim of annual interest on its 37 investments involving Rs. 114.45 crore under Time Deposit Scheme of the Post Office.

According to the Post Office Time Deposit (POTD) Rules, 1981, a time deposit shall carry interest at the rate prescribed from time to time and such interest shall be payable to the depositor at the end of each year during the period of deposit.

The IITD invested, in 37 cases, a total of Rs. 114.45 crore in time deposit accounts of the post office between the period February 2002 and January 2004 for a term of five years. Audit noted that IITD failed to claim the interest each year on these investments on due dates. It received the interest after a delay ranging between five days to one year from the post office which resulted in loss of interest amounting to Rs. 20.13 lakh calculated at quarterly compounding basis applicable for each deposit. Glaring instances where loss of interest amounted to Rs. 50,000 or more are listed below. Loss of interest has been arrived at by adopting the rate of interest applicable to the respective term deposit account.

(Amount in Rupees)

Sl. no.	Account no.	Amount deposited	Interest due on	Amount of interest	Actual date of receipt of interest (delay in days)	Loss of interest that could have been saved
1	11988	6,25,00,000	31.8.2004	54,84,248	31.8.2005 (365)	4,81,232
2	39122	6,00,00,000	29.11.2004	46,27,800	18.5.2005 (170)	1,66,260
3	39112	10,00,00,000	1.7.2005	77,13,000	13.9.2005 (74)	1,17,280
4	39113	10,00,00,000	26.7.2004	77,13,000	25.9.2004 (61)	96,677
5	39130	4,00,00,000	17.1.2005	30,85,200	18.5.2005 (121)	78,892
6	39109	2,00,00,000	23.1.2004	17,54,800	20.7.2004(178)	75,092
7	39118	2,00,00,000	13.10.2004	15,42,600	18.5.2005 (217)	70,742

In response to the audit observation, IITD stated (January 2006) that action had been initiated to recover the dues from the post office. However, audit noticed that the post office in its reply (April 2006) to IITD had clarified that interest on interest could not be paid as per rules on Time Deposit Accounts. It also clarified that non-withdrawal of interest in time did not entitle the account holder for adding the unpaid interest to the principal for calculation of future interest.

Thus, IITD suffered loss of interest of Rs. 20.13 lakh due to belated claim of annual interest.

The Ministry stated (July 2006) that a constant liaison was now being maintained between IITD and the post office to monitor the due dates and timely withdrawal of interest. It added that the investment decisions were taken by the Institute's investment committee on the basis of surplus funds and safety and liquidity of the investment and, therefore, all withdrawn interests might or might not be re-investible depending on cash flows. It also stated that Audit had calculated interest on interest which was hypothetical only and that the Institute had got the due interest from the post office for the complete period of investment. The reply is not tenable as had the Institute claimed the interest timely, it could have been gainfully re-invested even at rates higher than the term deposit rates, to generate further returns.

Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur

6.5 Shortcomings in the computerised payroll accounting system resulted in incorrect payment of salary, pension and irregular disbursements of advances

- **The Indian Institute of Technology at Kharagpur implemented the Payroll Accounting System (PAS) developed in-house for computation of salary of the staff in 1989. IT Audit of the system revealed several deficiencies such as lack of documentation, lack of proper inbuilt validation checks, non-incorporation of business rules in the online system leading to inadequate data integrity, reliability and security.**
- **The documentation of the System, physical access controls, and security against natural disasters were inadequate.**
- **Non-incorporation of business rules combined with lack of proper input and validation controls resulted in over/under payment of salary, pension and irregular disbursement of advances.**

6.5.1. Introduction

The Indian Institute of Technology at Kharagpur (Institute) is the first in the chain of five IITs established by the Government of India in 1950, with the specific purpose of providing technical education of internationally recognised standards of excellence. The Institute has extensive computing facilities with Mainframe, Mini, Micro computers and PCs which are connected in a network.

The Institute implemented the Payroll Accounting System (PAS) for computation of salary of the staff in 1989. Subsequently, in the year 1995 the system was transformed to Sybase with APT[1] interface. In the year 2003, the system was converted to object based module with Power Builder-7 at front-end and Sybase at back-end. The Web-based MIS and Personal Information System were developed in VB/Java Script and ASP with IIS (web server). The package was developed in-house. The Administrative Computer Service Support Center (ACSSC) under the Registrar of the Institute looks after the implementation and maintenance of the system.

The salient functional features of the PAS *inter alia* includes:

- computation of salary of the staff of the institute;
- maintaining the provident fund accounts of employees;
- accounting of interest-bearing advance and
- pension accounting.

6.5.2 Audit Findings

Data for the period from April 2004 to July 2005 (which was extended to earlier periods wherever required) was analysed using IDEA[2]-2001, MS-Excel and dbase-IV wherever required to get the targeted outputs. Manual records of the institute were cross checked wherever required. The audit findings are discussed in the following paragraphs.

6.5.2.1 General controls

The system was developed in-house in 1989. Audit analysis revealed the following deficiencies relating to general controls.

- The institute did not have any documented IT-policy in respect of computerisation.
- User Manual, Programme, Flowcharts, Data Flow Diagram, File layout, Source code etc. were not available.
- No documented duty list for the users was available.
- Lack of personnel training policy resulted in dependence on few individuals.

[1] Application Programming Tool
[2] Interactive Data Extraction and Analysis – Computer Aided Auditing Tool

- Physical access controls were inadequate and Log book for usage were not maintained exposing the system to unauthorised use.
- Adequate protection against fire and lightning did not exist, making the system vulnerable.
- Although backup of the data was being done twice a week, no monitoring was done and backup data were stored in the same location making it vulnerable.

The Institute replied (July 2006) that the observations made by audit were noted and would be taken care of in the proposed comprehensive Enterprise Resource Planning solution.

6.5.2.2 Non-incorporation of business rules and inadequate application controls

Data analysis revealed that the business rules have not been duly incorporated and the system lacked proper input controls and validation checks in different modules thereby resulting in over/under payment of salary, pension and irregular disbursement of advances are detailed below:

- In 472 cases, HBA amounting to Rs. 6.22 crore was granted more than once leading to undue financial benefit and blockade of funds.
- In 679 cases, the Provident Fund subscription exceeded the total emoluments of the employee for that month and interest was also allowed to the tune of Rs. 1.15 lakh during the period from March 2002 to July, 2005 on such amounts which was irregular.
- 216 employees were allowed to subscribe during previous three months of service resulting in excess payment of interest of Rs. 24,731.
- Five officials other than the regular cashier were irregularly allowed to draw cash handling allowance from August 1997 to July 2005 resulting in excess payment of Rs. 91,000.
- Pension after deducting the commuted value was paid short in respect of three retired employees resulting in short-payment of Rs. 14,000.
- HRA was paid to five employees from November, 2004 to June, 2005 though they were provided accommodation during the period. Further scrutiny revealed that the data base was not updated with

current allotment and the duration of transport allowance and did not have any built in validation checks to prevent such irregular payments.

- Three re-employed employees were paid excess House Rent Allowance Rs. 12,213.
- Salary paid to an employee, who was on EOL for 9 days from 16-10-2004 to 24-10-2004 (Rs. 5,806) was yet to be recovered (November 2006) indicating that the system has no inbuilt controls to deduct proportionate amount from the employee after such spells of leave. It was also seen that the system could not compute salary for fractional months.
- An employee, who was in the pay scale of Rs. 12000-420-18300, was paid salary (July 2004) by adopting basic pay as Rs. 23,000. This indicated absence of validation checks in the system.
- Arrears of Cycle Maintenance Allowance for six months (January to June 2004) was paid to 147 staff in August, 2004, although for April, 2004 this allowance had already been paid. This resulted in over-payment of Rs. 4,410. Similarly there was an overpayment of Rs. 180 towards Cycle Maintenance Allowance to an employee from July 2004 to December 2004.

While accepting the observations, the Institute stated (July 2006) that the necessary corrective steps have been taken/are being taken.

6.5.2.3 Non-utilisation of MIS and PIS module

MIS and Personal Information System based on data warehouse concept was developed in-house in 2003. It was noticed that the data were not updated in the server and hence the objective of development of such system was not achieved. The Institute has assured (July 2006) that the MIS & PIS modules would be operationalised when the integrated ERP solutions is developed.

6.5.3. Conclusion and recommendations

The Payroll Accounting system lacked validation checks in many vital aspects. As a result data integrity, reliability and safety across the system were inadequate. Though, the institute depends on the system for disbursement of pay & allowances, advances, pension to its employees, the business rules were not correctly mapped.

The Institute needs to plug the loopholes and implement the system in a more efficient way.

The matter was referred to the Ministry in January 2007; their reply was awaited as of January 2007.

National Council of Educational Research and Training

6.6 Delays in procurement process leading to excess expenditure

The National Council of Educational Research and Training did not take timely action to procure paper to meet its requirement for printing text books for the year 2005-06. This resulted in extra expenditure of Rs. 1. 04 crore.

The National Council of Educational Research and Training (Council) has been printing text books for classes I to XII for distribution to Central Board of Secondary Education schools all over the country. Its Publication Department (PD) works out the annual requirement of text and cover paper for use in printing of text books.

Audit ascertained (April 2006) that PD assessed total requirement of 23,000 Metric Tonnes (MTs) and 1450 MTs of text paper and cover paper respectively to meet the requirement of text books for Chhattisgarh, Haryana and Jharkhand for the year 2005-06 and submitted a proposal which was to be placed before the Finance Committee’s (FC) meeting scheduled to be held on 25 June 2004. The proposed meeting did not take place as scheduled and was finally held on 2 September 2004. FC in its meeting authorised PD for procurement of only 3000 MTs of text paper and 100 MTs of cover paper at the Directorate General of Supplies and Disposals (DGS&D) rates. FC also recommended that the proposal for deciding the mode of further procurement of paper be placed in its next meeting after examining the paper purchase policy of the Ministry. Audit noticed that these recommendations of FC were communicated to the PD after one month on 4 October 2004. In the meanwhile, the rate contract of DGS&D expired on 13 September 2004. Subsequently the Council took up the matter with the Ministry who advised that the old DGS&D rates may be offered to Hindustan Paper Corporation Limited (HPC), a central Public Sector Undertaking, for procurement of 3000 MTs of paper and the balance quantity be procured through open tendering system. Accordingly, the Council approached HPC on 26 October 2004 offering them the rate of Rs. 27,052 (old DGS&D rate including Rs. 250 per MT for water marking) for the supply of printing paper. HPC accepted the offer on 8 November 2004 but with the condition that the papers would be supplied in reels only. Despite this condition, the Council placed an order with the firm on 11 November 2004 for supply of 900 MT paper in reels and 2100 MT paper in sheets at the rate of Rs. 27,052 per MT. This was not agreed to by HPC and it offered (December 2004) to supply only 900 MT paper in reels at this rate and the remaining 2100 MTs of paper in sheets at a higher rate of Rs. 29,252 per MT. Before the deal could be concluded, FC observed in its meeting held on 3 December 2004, that the Council should have initiated action for purchase of paper through open tender system. However, considering that the open tender system would take another two months with corresponding delay in timely supply of text books, it recommended placing order for another 3000 MT of paper with HPC. Thus, in addition to the earlier supply order of 3000 MT paper, it placed order (January 2005) with HPC for additional 3000 MTs paper (2500 MTs in sheets and 500 MTs in reels). Audit noticed that HPC charged old DGS&D rate of Rs. 27052 per MT for paper in reels but for paper in sheet it charged enhanced rate of Rs. 29252 per MT though DGS&D rate for paper both in reel and sheet was the same. As a matter of fact, even as per subsequent DGS&D rate contract (February 2005) the rate of paper was Rs. 27714 per MT both in reel and sheets which was lower than the rate of Rs. 29252 per MT paid by the Council to HPC. Thus, due to the delays at different stages of the procurement process particularly in holding of the meeting of FC, Council incurred an additional expenditure of Rs. 1.04 crore worked out at the differential rate of Rs. 2200 per MT for the 4710 MT paper in sheets that it received.

In response to audit observation, the Ministry stated (August 2006) that the time was lost on account of the Finance Committee meeting not being held as per schedule due to the voluntary retirement of the then Director of the Council in July 2004. The reply is not tenable as the Director of the Council retired in July 2004 whereas the meeting of the Finance Committee was to be held in June 2004. The Director could have arranged to hold the meeting of the Finance Committee well before his retirement. Even thereafter, the Acting Director could have arranged the meeting of the Finance Committee well in time. Further, though the meeting of the Finance Committee was held on 2 September 2004, the Council communicated its decision to the Publication Department only on 4 October 2004 although it was known to it that the DGS&D rate contract was valid upto 13 September only. Thus, delays in the procurement process resulted in procurement of paper at enhanced rate and consequential extra expenditure of Rs. 1.04 crore.

University Grants Commission

6.7 Irregular award of construction work

The University Grants Commission irregularly awarded consultancy work to Educational Consultants India Limited without obtaining administrative and financial sanctions from the Ministry of Human Resource Development and No Objection Certificate from the Ministry of Urban Development resulting in extra liability of Rs. 6.45 crore. UGC also irregularly paid interest free mobilisation advance of Rs. four crore to Ed.CIL. Even after lapse of 37 months from signing of agreement, the construction was yet to commence as of June 2006.

The University Grants Commission (UGC) had in its possession 20 acre of land in the campus of Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU). The land was sub-leased by JNU to UGC on no rent basis for construction of UGC complex in January 1990. UGC allotted the work of construction to Education Consultant India Limited (Ed.CIL) in December 2002 on project management basis. Formal agreement was signed in May 2003. According to the agreement, Ed.CIL was to be paid 9.5 *per cent* of the actual project cost as consultancy charges and also service tax on Ed.CIL's margin. As per the preliminary estimate, the project cost was Rs. 68.11 crore and the construction was to be completed in 24 to 30 months. Audit scrutiny (November 2004 and October 2005) brought out the following:

- UGC was required to obtain administrative and financial approval for the construction of the complex from the Ministry as the Ministry had not delegated these powers to UGC. UGC allotted the work to Ed.CIL without obtaining the formal administrative and financial approval. Subsequently, in July 2003 UGC had requested the Ministry to accord administrative and financial sanctions. In response to this request, the Ministry communicated that it had no objection to award this project to Ed.CIL subject to observance of relevant norms and rules. However, formal administrative and financial sanctions have not yet been accorded by the Ministry (November 2006).

- The work was awarded to Ed.CIL without obtaining 'no objection certificate' from the Ministry of Urban Development as required under GFRs for not getting the work executed through CPWD.

- Since CPWD does not recover departmental charges for executing the work of autonomous bodies fully funded by the Central Government, UGC incurred additional liability of Rs. 6.45 crore on account of consultancy charges (including service tax of Rs. 59.75 lakh) payable to Ed.CIL over and above the project cost.

- UGC had released (September 2003) Rs. four crore as interest free mobilisation advance. This was irregular since according to paragraph 32.7 of CPWD Manual, the amount of mobilisation advance can be paid at a simple interest of 10 *per cent per annum* subject to a maximum of 10 *per cent* of the estimated cost or Rs. one crore whichever is less. In this case, UGC not only exceeded the limit of Rs. one crore but even the 10 *per cent* interest clause was not incorporated in the agreement which resulted in undue benefit to Ed.CIL which worked out to Rs. one crore upto March 2006.

- Clause 3.10 of the agreement provided that if the project got extended beyond the time frame specified in the agreement for reasons beyond the control of Ed.CIL, UGC shall pay Rs. 0.40 lakh per month for the extended period to Ed.CIL towards maintenance of its site establishment. There was, however, no clause in the agreement to protect the interest of UGC in the event of delays attributable to Ed.CIL.

- According to clause 6.2 of the agreement, UGC was required to pay service tax of Rs. 59.75 lakh (10.2 *per cent* on estimated cost) on consultancy charges payable to Ed.CIL which was also irregular as according to provision contained in Finance Act 1994, service tax is not leviable on construction of government buildings which are not used for commercial purposes.

- As per agreement the work was to be completed by November 2005. But even after 37 months since award of work, only the master plan, preliminary drawings and designs had been prepared and certain approvals of the local bodies such as DDA, Airport Authority of India and Delhi Fire Service etc. had been obtained.

Thus, UGC irregularly awarded the work of construction of Ed.CIL resulting in additional liability of Rs. 6.45 crore (including service tax of Rs. 59.75 lakh) on account of consultancy charges. Besides, irregular release of interest-free mobilisation advance of Rs. four crore to Ed.CIL resulted in undue benefit to the firm. The work of construction of the complex on the land allotted in 1990 was not commenced as of June 2006 i.e. even after lapse of more than three years since signing of agreement despite release of mobilisation advance in September 2003.

In response to audit observation, UGC stated (June 2006) that although UGC was aware that the construction was to be carried out by CPWD but keeping in view that UGC and Ed.CIL were organisations under the Ministry of Human Resource Development, it had decided to allot the work to Ed.CIL for better coordination as UGC did not have the technical man-power. It added that advance of Rs. four crore was given to Ed.CIL for appointing an architect and getting the master plan and technical design prepared. The reply is not tenable as the organisations getting construction work done through CPWD do not need to have their own technical manpower. The fact that Ed.CIL is yet to commence construction (November 2006) work defies the assumption of better coordination.

The matter was referred to the Ministry in July 2006; their reply was awaited as of December 2006.

6.8 Injudicious release of grants

The University Grants Commission released advance grant amounting to Rs. 5.48 crore to 24 Universities in March 2004 in violation of the provisions of the schemes as well as General Financial Rules resulting in blocking of funds for a period ranging between 8 and 24 months and consequent loss of interest of Rs. 59.02 lakh for the period from April 2004 to March 2006.

UGC formulated two new schemes for the Xth plan period (2002-2007) namely (i) Special Development Grant for Young Universities (SDGYU) and (ii) Special Development Grant for Universities in Backward Areas (SDGUBA). The main objectives of these schemes were to create basic and bare minimum infrastructure in and to improve/expand the existing infrastructure of young universities and in the case of universities in backward areas, to improve infrastructure to achieve optimum teaching equity and access at least to the threshold level. UGC prescribed norms for the eligibility of the universities for getting financial assistance under these schemes according to which eligible and desirous universities were required to submit their proposals in the prescribed format to UGC. Thereafter, selected universities were to be invited to give presentation before an expert committee based on whose recommendations admissible grants were to be approved.

Audit observed (October 2005) that an expert committee of officials of UGC met in March 2004 to assess the proposals received from different universities under the above schemes and recommended 13 universities under SDGYU and 11 under SDGUBA for release of advance grant at the rate of Rs. 21 lakh and Rs. 25 lakh respectively subject to condition that the grant may be used only after receiving item-wise final approval of UGC. The expert committee also recommended that the eligible universities be called for presentation of their projects. Accordingly, UGC released (March 2004) Rs. 5.48 crore as advance grant to these 24 universities with the above mentioned conditions.

Audit ascertained that UGC conveyed its approval for incurring the expenditure on the said schemes to 20 universities after a lapse of time ranging between 8 and 23 months and approvals to three universities under SDGYU and one university under SDGUBA scheme were yet to be conveyed as of March 2006. Thus pre-mature release of grant by UGC pending presentations from the universities and subsequent delay in conveying the final approvals to 20 universities and non-approval to four universities resulted in blocking of funds amounting to Rs. 5.48 crore for a period ranging between 8 and 24 months and consequent loss of interest of Rs. 59.02 lakh for the period from April 2004 to March 2006 computed at union government's borrowing rate of 8.4 *per cent per annum*. The release of grants by UGC was to avoid lapse of funds which was against the provisions of the GFRs according to which rush of expenditure particularly in the closing months of the financial year would be regarded as a breach of financial propriety.

In response to audit observation, the Ministry endorsed (August 2006) the views of UGC that since the universities took very long time in sending their presentations, it was decided by the latter to release an 'on account' grant to these universities. It added that interest accrued out of the grant would be treated as an additional grant. The reply is not tenable as UGC failed to ensure that funds are not released on half –baked proposals. The fact that universities themselves took long time in sending their presentations and delay in approval in 20 cases and non approval in case of remaining four universities put a question mark on the soundness of the initial proposals based on which funds were released.