

Annexure 1
(Referred to Para 3.3)

Statement showing the number of districts and packages selected for test check and their expenditure

(Rs. in lakh)

| Sl. No. | Name of State | No. of Districts selected | Total No. of selected packages | Sanctioned cost | Expenditure incurred as on March 2005 |
|---------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. | Andhra Pradesh | 6 | 114 | 16435.16 | 13754.2 |
| 2. | Arunachal Pradesh | 4 | 22 | 912.38 | 572.16 |
| 3. | Assam | 6 | 27 | 4964.76 | 3331.81 |
| 4. | Bihar | 9 | 45 | 6326.00 | 4204.00 |
| 5. | Chhattisgarh | 4 | 20 | 7107.59 | 4829.54 |
| 6. | Goa | 2 | 50 | 825.21 | 648.64 |
| 7. | Gujarat | 6 | 28 | 3072.83 | 2604.03 |
| 8. | Haryana | 5 | 9 | 3302.78 | 3124.95 |
| 9. | Himachal Pradesh | 3 | 50 | 4680.63 | 1418.63 |
| 10. | Jammu and Kashmir | 4 | 11 | 1806.58 | 1425.84 |
| 11. | Jharkhand | 6 | 27 | 5334.44 | 4199.99 |
| 12. | Karnataka | 7 | 35 | 6423.00 | 5839.00 |
| 13. | Kerala | 4 | 15 | 3476.47 | 2238.09 |
| 14. | Madhya Pradesh | 16 | 70 | 30911.53 | 29215.40 |
| 15. | Maharashtra | 8 | 48 | 5385.77 | 4970.74 |
| 16. | Manipur | 2 | 10 | 1767.28 | 1135.44 |
| 17. | Meghalaya | 2 | 19 | 1399.27 | 1203.94 |
| 18. | Mizoram | 2 | 9 | 1512.92 | 1148.34 |
| 19. | Nagaland | 3 | 24 | 1440.00 | 1429.00 |
| 20. | Orissa | 8 | 162 | 35926.00 | 17967.00 |
| 21. | Punjab | 5 | 22 | 2825.71 | 2401.27 |
| 22. | Rajasthan | 8 | 133 | 13330.58 | 7854.61 |
| 23. | Sikkim | 4 | 40 | 5076.68 | 3849.43 |
| 24. | Tamil Nadu | 7 | 35 | 5008.16 | 4097.80 |
| 25. | Tripura | 2 | 28 | 2768.78 | 1484.43 |
| 26. | Uttar Pradesh | 23 | 191 | 39987.77 | 28025.21 |
| 27. | Uttaranchal | 6 | 21 | 2976.61 | 2719.62 |
| 28. | West Bengal | 5 | 33 | 8193.08 | 3804.72 |
| | Total | 167 | 1298 | 223177.97 | 159497.83 |

Annexure 2
(Referred to Para 4.3.1)

Year-wise coverage of Unconnected Habitations under the PMGSY

| Sl.No. | States | Eligible Unconnected Habitations | | | Total | Habitations being Covered | | | | | | Total |
|--------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| | | 1000+ | 500-999 | 250-499 | | 1000+ | | 500-999 | | 250-499 | | |
| | | | | | | 2000-04 | 2004-05 | 2000-04 | 2004-05 | 2000-04 | 2004-05 | |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 167 | 417 | 396 | 980 | 160 | 0 | 399 | 0 | 354 | 0 | 913 |
| 2 | Arunachal Pradesh | 43 | 105 | 267 | 415 | 10 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 84 |
| 3 | Assam | 6149 | 4196 | 2799 | 13144 | 967 | 490 | 346 | 166 | 179 | 84 | 2232 |
| 4 | Bihar | 11717 | 6203 | 0 | 17920 | 1531 | 0 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1793 |
| 5 | Chhattisgarh | 2604 | 6313 | 3644 | 12561 | 756 | 268 | 555 | 298 | 238 | 115 | 2230 |
| 6 | Goa | 0 | 20 | 35 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 7 | Gujarat | 472 | 2288 | 1493 | 4253 | 382 | 2 | 442 | 127 | 47 | 1 | 1001 |
| 8 | Haryana | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | Himachal Pradesh | 262 | 853 | 2379 | 3494 | 124 | 0 | 362 | 0 | 548 | 0 | 1034 |
| 10 | Jammu and Kashmir | 785 | 942 | 1065 | 2792 | 171 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 300 |
| 11 | Jharkhand | 2622 | 4178 | 3896 | 10696 | 728 | 0 | 331 | 0 | 282 | 0 | 1341 |
| 12 | Karnataka | 156 | 118 | 602 | 876 | 151 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 322 |
| 13 | Kerala | 117 | 303 | 18 | 438 | 72 | 40 | 195 | 71 | 11 | 4 | 393 |
| 14 | Madhya Pradesh | 5804 | 10645 | 2043 | 18492 | 1501 | 428 | 391 | 133 | 296 | 104 | 2853 |
| 15 | Maharashtra | 203 | 794 | 754 | 1751 | 165 | 0 | 462 | 135 | 73 | 53 | 888 |
| 16 | Manipur | 71 | 187 | 340 | 598 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | Meghalaya | 9 | 150 | 597 | 756 | 6 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 98 |
| 18 | Mizoram | 47 | 114 | 124 | 285 | 23 | 11 | 18 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 71 |
| 19 | Nagaland | 21 | 32 | 41 | 94 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 42 |
| 20 | Orissa | 3850 | 6738 | 3805 | 14393 | 1445 | 254 | 630 | 135 | 160 | 44 | 2668 |
| 21 | Punjab | 103 | 433 | 0 | 536 | 92 | 2 | 288 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 418 |
| 22 | Rajasthan | 2906 | 6073 | 2036 | 11015 | 2304 | 314 | 41 | 987 | 44 | 36 | 3726 |
| 23 | Sikkim | 16 | 138 | 164 | 318 | 10 | 5 | 30 | 28 | 7 | 20 | 100 |
| 24 | Tamil Nadu | 577 | 1825 | 238 | 2640 | 540 | 2 | 1008 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 1813 |
| 25 | Tripura | 203 | 706 | 1182 | 2091 | 65 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 260 |
| 26 | Uttar Pradesh | 8839 | 15358 | 87 | 24284 | 5101 | 0 | 1246 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6347 |
| 27 | Uttaranchal | 171 | 667 | 1767 | 2605 | 95 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 211 |
| 28 | West Bengal | 11941 | 11668 | 1679 | 25288 | 2009 | 0 | 530 | 0 | 178 | 0 | 2717 |
| | Total | 59855 | 81466 | 31451 | 172772 | 18420 | 1825 | 7958 | 2387 | 2821 | 464 | 33875 |

Annexure 3
(Referred to Para 4.3.2)

**Statement showing statewise position of funds released and expenditure incurred during
2000-05**

| Sl. No. | State | Value of proposals (Rs. in crore) | Amount Released (Rs. in crore) | No. of road works | No. of road works completed (upto March' 05) | Exp. (upto March' 05) (Rs. in crore) | % Exp. To Amount released |
|---------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 918.53 | 827.91 | 3733 | 3075 | 713.07 | 86.13% |
| 2 | Arunachal Pradesh | 365.32 | 127.46 | 442 | 316 | 123.33 | 96.76% |
| 3 | Assam | 674.10 | 564.46 | 808 | 502 | 326.75 | 57.89% |
| 4 | Bihar | 656.84 | 329.48 | 1044 | 286 | 277.22 | 84.14% |
| 5 | Chhattisgarh | 1086.24 | 676.38 | 1034 | 458 | 545.13 | 80.60% |
| 6 | Goa | 9.72 | 10.00 | 90 | 70 | 5.17 | 51.70% |
| 7 | Gujarat | 325.20 | 215.86 | 1200 | 813 | 190.48 | 88.24% |
| 8 | Haryana | 173.83 | 136.52 | 85 | 50 | 105.97 | 77.62% |
| 9 | Himachal Pradesh | 563.55 | 315.66 | 843 | 337 | 207.18 | 65.63% |
| 10 | Jammu and Kashmir | 171.69 | 75.00 | 178 | 31 | 42.76 | 57.01% |
| 11 | Jharkhand | 472.10 | 353.92 | 501 | 309 | 343.71 | 97.12% |
| 12 | Karnataka | 424.70 | 365.68 | 1709 | 1252 | 342.25 | 93.59% |
| 13 | Kerala | 131.18 | 79.56 | 366 | 144 | 56.48 | 70.99% |
| 14 | Madhya Pradesh | 2089.72 | 1424.44 | 2486 | 1461 | 1344.62 | 94.40% |
| 15 | Maharashtra | 684.75 | 454.29 | 2158 | 1386 | 306.03 | 67.36% |
| 16 | Manipur | 120.71 | 98.00 | 790 | 417 | 59.06 | 60.27% |
| 17 | Meghalaya | 145.72 | 115.67 | 347 | 256 | 82.22 | 71.08% |
| 18 | Mizoram | 211.24 | 165.96 | 80 | 48 | 109.43 | 65.94% |
| 19 | Nagaland | 124.23 | 106.95 | 185 | 159 | 80.51 | 75.28% |
| 20 | Orissa | 1360.53 | 878.54 | 2140 | 1173 | 630.08 | 71.72% |
| 21 | Punjab | 217.90 | 127.40 | 516 | 359 | 103.60 | 81.32% |
| 22 | Rajasthan | 1385.40 | 1178.78 | 3289 | 2953 | 1153.73 | 97.87% |
| 23 | Sikkim | 149.37 | 70.97 | 115 | 40 | 48.73 | 68.66% |
| 24 | Tamil Nadu | 550.51 | 432.92 | 2230 | 1414 | 298.94 | 69.05% |
| 25 | Tripura | 116.19 | 76.60 | 247 | 199 | 53.88 | 70.34% |
| 26 | Uttar Pradesh | 2569.10 | 1571.32 | 10891 | 6537 | 1175.05 | 74.78% |
| 27 | Uttaranchal | 258.93 | 201.04 | 213 | 108 | 117.38 | 58.39% |
| 28 | West Bengal | 1356.71 | 855.07 | 906 | 415 | 564.70 | 66.04% |
| | Total (States) | 17314.01 | 11835.84 | 38626 | 24568 | 9407.46 | 79.48% |
| | Union Territories | | | | | | |
| 29 | Andaman and Nicobar Island | 32.39 | 10.59 | 18 | 0 | 0.26 | 2.46% |
| 30 | Dadar and Nagar Haveli | 9.95 | 5.00 | 37 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00% |
| 31 | Daman and Diu | 15.00 | 5.00 | 0 | 0 | 4.94 | 98.80% |
| 32 | Delhi | 5.00 | 5.00 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00% |
| 33 | Lakshadweep | 4.89 | 4.89 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00% |
| 34 | Pondicherry | 12.40 | 5.00 | 86 | 66 | 8.73 | 174.60% |
| | Total (UTs) | 79.63 | 35.48 | 142 | 66 | 13.93 | 39.26% |
| | Grand Total | 17393.64 | 11871.32 | 38768 | 24634 | 9421.39 | 79.36% |

Annexure 4
(Referred to Para 4.3.2.1)

Diversion of Funds

| State | District | Year | Phase | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--|
| Andhra Pradesh | Nellore, Mahabobnagar, Adilabad | 2001 to 2004 | - | 30.72 | Diverted for construction of office building class room and other construction works not relating to PMGSY and not recouped. |
| Arunachal Pradesh | (i) 8 DRDAs | 2000-01 | I | 70.00 | Fund released during 2000-01 for completion of incomplete works under erstwhile BMS was utilized for maintenance work of Rural Roads. |
| | (ii) RWD | 2000-01 | I | 410.00 | Expenditure incurred on construction and maintenance of buildings, maintenance of schemes other than PMGSY. |
| | (iii) DRDA Papumpare | 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05 | II, III and IV | 11.28 | Expenses incurred on account of office expenses, temporary loan and for administration expenses. |
| | (iv) West Siang, Upper Siang | April 2002 to March 2005 | - | 32.13 | Expenditure incurred towards contingency and work charged establishment. |
| Haryana | Hisar (Provincial Division I) | 2002-03 | II | 11.84 | Expenditure incurred on works not covered under PMGSY. No action was taken to recoup the amount. |
| Himachal Pradesh | (i) Kangra | 2000-01 | | 9.40 | Interest earned was diverted to other road works executed under state plan scheme. |
| | (ii) Shimla | | I and II | 51.59 | PMGSY funds utilized for annual repair and maintenance works not covered by PMGSY. |
| | (iii) Shimla, Kangara, Mandi | 2000-01 | I, II and III | 183.00 | Expenditure incurred on repairs and maintenance of roads constructed under state plan schemes and BMS roads which was not allowed under PMGSY. |
| Jammu and Kashmir | (i) Administrative Department | May 2003 to Nov. 2003 | II | 11.91 | Unnecessary payment of bank commission of Rs. 11.91 lakh due to transferring of money by AD to DRDA through bank draft. |
| | (ii) Commissioner cum Secretary (RDD), ACD Jammu, | Feb. 2002 to March 2005 | - | 21.27 | Meeting travel expenses, purchase of computer table, photostat machine, fan, legal charges, stationery items, POL, etc. |
| | (iii) Samba | - | - | 1.08 | Material (steel) worth Rs. 1.08 lakh was diverted to works taken up under NABARD. |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|------------|----------------|--|
| Karnataka | (i) Belgaum, Chamarajanagar, Gadag, Haveri, Koppal, Raichur | 2000-05 | | 78.00 | Amount spent on works like survey, preparation of estimates, stationery items, purchase of logo etc. |
| | (ii) ZP Belgaum, Haveri, Dy. Director KLAC Koppal | 2000-05 | | 80.00 9.00 | Amount diverted to watershed and social forestry programmes but was recovered by Jun'03. Amount diverted towards payment of EMD and for installation of computer (not recouped). |
| Kerala | (i) Ernakulam, Malappuram, Kannur | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 7.44 | Expenditure incurred towards shifting charges of utilities against the provisions of PMGS. |
| | (ii) Ernakulam | | | 0.96 | Expenditure incurred on maintenance of water supply lines damaged by contractor during execution of work. |
| Madhya Pradesh | (i) Guna, Seoni, Sagar, Dhar, Chhindwara, Dindori | 2002-03 to 2004-05 | I and II | 16.23 | Expenditure incurred towards shifting of electricity poles from the site of road. |
| | (ii) State | 2002-03 | II | 43.00 | Amount spent on office expenses travelling expenses debited to PMGSY funds in excess of the prescribed limit. |
| Nagaland | (i) Wokha , Phek | 2001-02, 2003-04 | II and III | 1.30 | Interest earned diverted to other expenses and programmes against the provision of guidelines. No action has been taken to deposit the same in the programme fund. |
| | (ii) Wokha | | | 4.50 | Expenditure incurred on maintenance. |
| Orissa | Angul, Khurda | 2001-02 | I and II | 43.04 | Purchase of printer, fax and payment to OCC for Divisional Automation System, other contingent expenditure and hire charges of vehicle out of accrued interest. |
| Tamil Nadu | Madurai, Virudhanagar, Sivagangai | - | | 2.64 | Expenditure was incurred towards payment to Tamil Nadu Electricity Board for shifting/ removal of electricity poles. |
| Uttaranchal | State (URRDA) | Dec. 2003 to March 2004 | | 500.00 | Fund diverted temporarily to state fund for land compensation payment. |
| West Bengal | | | | 309.00 | Interest money to an extent spent towards administrative charges, of which Rs. 120 lakh was transferred to programme funds up to March 2005. |
| Total | | | | 1939.33 | |

Annexure 5
(Referred to Para 4.3.2.6)

Delayed release/transfer of fund by State Government/DRDA

| State | District | Year | Phase | Delay period in months | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Loss of interest (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------------|---------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Andhra Pradesh | State | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I II | One and 12 | 63894.00 | | Delayed release of funds to DRDA. Interest of Rs. 79.29 crore accrued on the amount was not remitted to APSRRDA alongwith the programme fund. |
| Assam | State | | I | 3 to 4 | 7035.00 | 123.47 | Delay in release of funds from GOA to P&RD. |
| Bihar | State | 2000-01 | I | Above one month | 14990.00 | 75.00 | Delayed transfer of funds to DRDA. |
| Jammu and Kashmir | State | 2000-01, 2002-03 | I II | 5-11 | 5500.00 | | Delay in release of funds to DRDA. |
| Jharkhand | State | 2000-01 | I | Above 4 | 11000.00 | 113.00 | Delay in transfer of scheme fund to DRDA. |
| Maharashtra | State | 2000-01 | I | One to above 6 | 256.00 | | During 2000-01, the MoRD released Rs. 130 crore to State Govt. in Feb./March 2001 and was kept in consolidated fund of state which was drawn by DRDA's in 11/01 and 1/02. |
| Manipur | (i) State | 2000-01 | I | 10 to 48 | 3182.00 | 327.00 | Fund released to DRDA during the period between January 2002 and February 2005. |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---------------------|----|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|--|
| | (ii) | 2001-02 | II | Upto 28 | 3998.00 | | Fund received on 25.2.2002 was released to DRDA during the period 17.10.2003 to 25.6.2004. |
| Orissa | Kendrapada,, Koraput, Puri, Khurda, Jajpur, Nayagarh, Raygada, Cuttack | 2000-01 | I | 5 and 32 | 17970.00 | 825.00 | Delayed release to PIU and the amount stood uncleared upto March'05 for lack of budget provision. |
| Rajasthan | State /DRDA | 2000-01 | I | 2-3 | 13552.00 | 107.00 | Delayed transfer by the State Govt. to Personal Deposit of DRDA and delayed transfer of funds by DRDA to respective PIUs resulted in loss of interest. |
| Tripura | West, South, Dhalai | March to April 2004 | | One to above 2 months | 4399.00 | 22.60 | Delayed transfer of fund to TRRDA. Interest amount of Rs. 17.07 lakh accrued on PMGSY not transferred to TRRDA by DRDA, North Tripura . |
| Total | | | | | 145776.00 | 1593.07 | |

Annexure 6
(Referred to Para 4.4.2.3)

Inadmissible connectivity

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | No. of works | Amount (Rs. In lakh) | Remarks |
|--------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------|---|
| Andhra Pradesh | (i) Nizamabad, Kurnool, Guntur, Prakasam, Medak | 11 | 2000-01, 2001-03, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 15 | 353.34 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to 16 habitations with less population and not falling within designated population norms. |
| | (ii) Prakasam | 1[AP 1603-A] | 2004 | III | 1 | 90.00 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 500 (census 2001). |
| | (iii) Prakasam | 6[AP-1601 to AP 1606] | 2001-02 | I and II | 2 | 31.84 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 500 (census 2001). |
| | (iv) Nizamabad, Nellore, Kurnool | 6 | 2001-02 | II | 18 | 81.64 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations located within the distance of 500m from all weather roads. |
| Arunachal Pradesh | West Siang , Papumpare | 2[AR 1204 RWD, AR 0704 RWD] | 2001-03 | II | 2 | 235.04 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 250. |
| Assam | Karbi Anglong , NC Hills | 4[AS 1201, AS 1203, AS 1206, AS 1801] | 2000-01, 2001-03, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 9 | 328.02 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 250. |
| Bihar | (i) Buxar | 1 [BR-0803] | 2001-02 | II | 2 | 22.77 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 250. |
| | (ii) Buxar | 3[BR 0801 BR 0802 BR 0803] | 2001-02 | II | 3 | 57.81 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 500. |
| Gujarat | Vadodara | 1 [GJ 2501] | - | - | 1 | 36.00 | Expenditure incurred on upgradation of Major District Road which was not permitted under the programme. |
| Himachal Pradesh | Kangra, Mandi, Shimla | N.A. | 2000-01, 2004-05 | I , II and III | 64 | 1010.00 | Expenditure incurred for providing connectivity to habitations falling within the distance of 1.5 Km from all weather roads. |
| Kerala | Ernakulam | 1[KR 0202] | 2001-02 | II | 3 | 78.37 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to three habitations having population below 500. |
| Madhya Pradesh | (i) Rajgarh, Guna, Seoni, Narsinghpur, Sagar | 7 [MP 4401, MP1801, MP 3603, MP 2602, MP 2603, MP 2606, MP 4801] | 2000-02 | I and II | 9 | 50.82 | Expenditure incurred on roads, falling within 500 mtrs of all weather roads by showing them more than 500 mtrs from all weather roads in the Detailed Project Report (DPR). |
| | (ii) Chhindwara, Seoni, Shahdol, Sagar | 5[MP0714,MP3609, MP6001, MP4801, MP3307] | 2000-03 | I , II and III | 5 | 969.50 | Expenditure incurred on Major District Road which was not permitted under the scheme |
| Maharashtra | Raigad, Amravati, Bhandara, Hingoli | - | 2000-01 | I | 11 | 152.42 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 250. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|------------------|------------|----------------|--|
| Meghalaya | Ri Bhoi | 2[MG 0402, MG 0403] | 2001-02 | II | 2 | 244.18 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to 11 habitation having population below 250. |
| Nagaland | Phek | 1[NG 0501] | 2001-02 | II | 1 | 244.00 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 250. |
| Orissa | Khurda, Puri | 3[OR 1807 OR 2603, OR2614] | 2000-01, 2001-02, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 3 | 82.47 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations located within 500 m from all weather roads. |
| Punjab | Jalandhar, Gurdaspur | 4 | 2001-04 | I, II and III | 7 | 168.89 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations within 500 m from connected habitations. |
| Rajasthan | Jaipur | 1 [RJ 16-01] | 2000-01 | I | 2 | 14.14 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations within 500 m from connected habitations. |
| Sikkim | North, East , South | 3[SK 01/05, SK 03/11, SK 03/06] | 2001-02 | II | 4 | 147.75 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to habitations having population below 250. |
| Tamil Nadu | Madurai , Sivagangai | - | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 3 | 56.53 | Expenditure incurred on road works for providing connectivity to places not defined as habitations. |
| Tripura | (i) South Tripura, West Tripura | 4 | 2001-02 | II | 4 | 214.36 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to 12 habitations having population below 250. |
| | (ii) State | - | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 6 | 65.64 | Expenditure incurred on road works which did not benefit any habitations. |
| Total | | | | | 177 | 4735.53 | |

Multi connectivity

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | No. of works | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------------|--|
| Andhra Pradesh | Kurnool, Nellore , Prakasam, Nizamabad, Medak | 10 | | | 14 | 348.94 | Expenditure incurred for providing connectivity to the habitations already provided connectivity under other scheme like NABARD. |
| Karnataka | Chamarajanagar, Gadag, Haveri | 7 | 2000-01, 2002-03 | I and II | 13 | 558.00 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to 26 villages already provided connectivity. |
| Kerala | Ernakulam, Kannur, Malappuram, Wayanad | 8 [KR02-02, KR 02-04, KR 04-01, KR 04-02, KR 04-03, KR 09-01, KR 09-02, KR 12- 01] | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 25 | 1152.00 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to 25 habitations already provided connectivity. |
| Orissa | Khurda | 2[OR 18-04, OR 18-08] | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 2 | 53.52 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to already connected habitations . |
| Punjab | Jalandhar, Gurdaspur, Mansa | 4 | - | - | 8 | 220.17 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to already connected habitations . |
| Tamil Nadu | Virudhunagar, Tirunelveli, Madurai, Sivagangai | - | 2000-01 to 2003-04 | I, II and III | 24 | 559.06 | Expenditure incurred on providing connectivity to 24 habitations which were already connected |
| Total | | | | | 86 | 2891.69 | |

Annexure 7B
(Referred to Para 4.4.2.3)

Repair Works

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | No. of works | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|-----------------------|--|--|------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------|--|
| Andhra Pradesh | Kurnool, Prakasam, Nizamabad, | 9 | 2000-04 | I, II and III | 9 | 307.21 | Expenditure incurred on repairs of Black Topped (BT) roads. |
| Chhattisgarh | Raipur | 1[CG 143] | 2000-01 | I | 1 | 314.00 | Existing BT road selected and work completed. |
| Haryana | Jhajjar | - | - | - | 1 | 58.30 | Expenditure incurred on upgradation of Black Topped (BT) road. |
| Karnataka | Belgaum, Chamarajanagar, Gadag, Haveri | 11 | 2000-01, 2002-03 | I and II | 22 | 916.00 | Expenditure incurred on repairs of Black Topped (BT) / cement roads. |
| Kerala | Ernakulam, Kannur, | 2 [KR 0201, KR 0401] | 2001-02 | II | 6 | 190.38 | Expenditure incurred on repairs of Black Topped (BT) roads. |
| Maharashtra | Jalgaon | - | 2000-01 | I | 7 | 82.99 | Repairs to Major District Road works. |
| Orissa | Khurda, Nayagarh, Cuttack, Kendrapada, Koraput, Rayagada | 18 | 2000-01 | I | 35 | 899.65 | Expenditure incurred on upgradation of BT Metal roads. |
| Uttaranchal | Bageshwar | 2 [UT0201, UT0202] | 2000-01 | | 2 | 236.96 | Expenditure on upgradation of Major District Roads. |
| West Bengal | Malda, Bankura | 4 [WB 1101, WB 0301, WB0304 , WB 0305] | 2000-01 | I | 4 | 426.00 | Expenditure incurred on repairs of Black Topped (BT) roads. |
| Total | | | | | 87 | 3431.49 | |

Delay in Tender finalisation

| State | District | Year | Phase | No. of tenders | Delay in months ranging between | Value of tender (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|--------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Assam | State | | I to IV (total 356 packages) | 111 39 18 | 1-3 3-6 over 6 | | Delay attributed by CE, PWD (Roads) was the delay in recommendation from Bid Evaluation Committee. |
| Bihar | (i) Begusarai | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 5 | 5 and 12 | 606.65 | Delay in finalization and execution of agreement. |
| | (ii) Jamui | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 5 | 1 and 3 | 709.45 | Delay in execution of agreement. |
| | (iii) Darbhanga | 2001-02 | II | 2 | 16 | 319.88 | Delay in retendering. |
| Chhattisgarh | State | 2000-01 to 2004-05 | I to IV | 48 31 4 | 1 and 3 3 to 6 above 6 | 241.98 115.18 9.75 | Delay was due to excessive rates in first Notice Inviting Tenders (NIT). |
| Goa | State | 2003-04 | III | 3 | 5 and 14 | 343.41 | Projects approved by STA in 1/04 and 10/04 and by GOI in 02/04 and 11/04 could not be tendered till 3/2005. |
| Gujarat | State | 2000-01 to 2004-05 | III and IV I and IV II | 25 115 91 | 1-3 3-6 over 6 | 3186.18 12365.85 10787.73 | Delay in finalisation of tender. It was stated that delay was non-controllable without specifying any reasons. |
| Haryana | Hisar, Karnal, Sonapat | 2003-04 | III | 8 | 2 to 19 | 1695.80 | Delay in award of work. |
| Jharkhand | - | 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 | - | 156 62 | 3 and 6 over 6 | - | Delay due to creation of new state and parliamentary election. |
| Karnataka | Belgaum, Chamarajanagar, Gadag, Haveri, Koppal, Raichur, Mysore | 2000-04 | I, II and III | 18 | 1 and 6 | 2858.02 | Delay in tender finalization in 18 packages by ZPEDs. |
| Maharashtra | Bhandara, Hingoli, Jalgaon, Nandurbar, Parbhani, Raigad, Ratnagiri, Amravati | | | 48 | 3 to 6 | 5385.77 | Delay in tender finalisation. |
| Manipur | (i) Bishnupur | 2001-02 | II | 4 | 14 | 877.52 | Delay in processing and finalization of tender. |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|---|
| | (ii) Churachandpur | 2001-02 | II | 6 | 14 and 18 | 889.76 | Delay in processing and finalization of tender. |
| Meghalaya | State | 2001-02 | II | 34 | 3 to 6 | 4087.06 | Reasons not on record. Controllable delays. |
| | | 2002-03 | II | 11 | above 6 | 1570.85 | Reasons not on record. Controllable delays. |
| Mizoram | State | 2001-02 | | 6 | 1 and 6 | 13070.69 | Delay was attributed to the process of calling of NIT and finalization of tenders. |
| | | 2004-05 | | 4 | over 6 | 1318.60 | |
| Nagaland | (i) Peren, Phek, Wokha | 2000-01 | I | 6 | 1 and 3 | 307.50 | The projects were approved by GOI on 22.3.2001 but the detailed projects were submitted in May'2001. |
| | (ii) Peren, Wokha | 2004-05 | IV | 2 | 1 and 3 | 742.07 | Due to imposition of code of conduct for the parliamentary elections. |
| Orissa | Cuttack, Khurda, Kendrapada, Nayagarh, Puri, Koraput, Jajpur, Rayagada | 2000-05 | I, II and III | 337 | 1 and 6 | 57628.00 | Delay in processing and finalization of tenders. |
| | | | | 78 | over 6 | 9748.00 | |
| Punjab | Amritsar | - | I, II and III | 2 | - | - | 2 Packages were sanctioned in October'2003 by MoRD. The estimated cost of the work was Rs. 274.06 lakh but work was not awarded as of March 2005. |
| Rajasthan | Udaipur, Churu, Jhalawar, Sikar, Pali, Jaipur, Jhunjhunu, Nagaur | 2000-01, 2001-02, 2003-04, 2004-05 | II, III and IV | 48 | 1 and above 6 | 6153.43 | Delay was in finalisation of tenders due to non response or receipt of higher tender premium in NIT . |
| Sikkim | East, West, North, South | 2000-05 | II | 23 | 1 to 7 | | Delay in tender finalization i.e. date of clearance from STA to award of work by ZPEDs. |
| Tripura | Dhalai, West Tripura | 2000-01, | | 13 | 3 and 6 | 164.53 | Non response or higher quotation by contractors. |
| | | 2000-01, 2001-02 | | 87 | over 6 | 1599.08 | |
| Uttar Pradesh | 23 PIUs | 2002-03, 2003-04 | II and III | 76 | 1 and 25 | 17606.17 | Delay in award of works. |
| West Bengal | Uttar Dinajpur, , Malda, Darjeeling, Bankura, Bardhaman | 2000-01, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 24 | 1 and 6 | 6217.22 | Delay in tender finalization. |
| Total | | | | 1623 | | 160707.96 | |

Deviation from standard Design and Specifications of Rural Road Manual (RRM) /sanctioned estimate

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | No. of works | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|----------------------|---|
| Andhra Pradesh | (i) Kurnol, Prakasham, Medak, Nizamabad, Guntur, Nellore | 28 | 2000-01 to 2004-05 | I to III | 176 | 48.75 | Expenditure incurred on the works for which DPRs prepared without considering the rainfall for the applicable seal coat. |
| | (ii) Medak, Guntur, Prakasham | 12 | 2000-04 | I to III | 37 | 548.00 | Expenditure incurred on construction of WBM roads which were not sustainable and requiring further upgradation. |
| Bihar | Nawada, Chapra, Buxar, Patna, Begusarai | 7 | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 15 | 571.54 | Expenditure incurred on works without provision of application of tack coat over primer coat in the DPR led to substandard quality of work. |
| Chhattisgarh | (i) Durg | - | 2000-01 | I | 1 | 307.00 | Use of superior specification (in road width, crust thickness) ignoring the recommendation of STA. |
| | (ii) Raipur | 2 [CG-1401, CG-1403] | 2000-01 | I | 3 | 336.00 | Expenditure on superior specification in disregard to traffic survey. |
| Gujarat | Amreli, Dahod, Gandhinagar, Panchmahal, Vadodara, Surat | 25 | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 153 | 54.15 | Excess consumption of asphalt for tack coat against the provisions of MoRTH specifications. |
| Haryana | (i) Karnal | 3 | | | 3 | 17.58 | Excess expenditure incurred on use of 9.8 k.g Bitumen instead of the prescribed 6.8 k.g. |
| | (ii) Karnal, Jhajjar | 3 1 | 2002-03 | II | 3 1 | 23.65 13.84 | Excess expenditure incurred due to tack coat of 10 kg. and 5 kg. bitumen applied instead of 4 kg. and 2 kg. |
| Himachal Pradesh | (i) Shimla, Mandi, Kangra | NA | 2000-01 to 2002-03 | I and II | 129 | 34.33 | Extra expenditure incurred in construction of road width of 3.05 m. instead of 3 meters as required for less than 100 motor vehicles per day. |
| | (ii) Shimla, Mandi, Kangra | NA | 2000-01 to 2004-05 | I to IV | 95 | 161.00 | Extra expenditure incurred for laying premix carpet and seal coat instead of one layer of premix carpet. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------------|----|---------|---|
| Karnataka | (i) Belgaum, Chamarajanagar, Gadag, Koppal, Raichur, Mysore, Haveri | 13 | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 88 | 2124.00 | Works executed by using 0.91 cu.metre of loose metal for spreading across 10 sqm against the required standard of one cubic metre resulting in non-achievement of desired crust thickness of 75 mm. |
| | (ii) Gadag, Haveri | 5 [KN1702 KN1704 KN1403 KN1407 KN1408] | 2000-01, 2001-03, 2003-04 | I,II and III | 21 | 183.00 | Expenditure incurred on roads constructed with carriageway width of 3.75 mm. even when the traffic density of these roads varied from 20 to 50 vehicles per day. |
| Madhya Pradesh | (i) Dewas, Hoshangabad, Rajgarh, Vidisha, Chhindwara, Seoni, Shahdol, Umria | 12 | 2000-03 | I, II and III | - | 256.00 | Road works executed with extra thickness of the crust which was above the required specification and resulted in excess payment. |
| | (ii) Chindwara, Panna, Umaria, Shivpuri | | 2000-04 | I, II, III and IV | - | 63.20 | Extra expenditure incurred due to use of costlier specification hume pipes in the construction of CD work. |
| | (iii) Ujjain, Ratlam, Dewas, Shajapur, Guna, Ashok Nagar, Chhindwara, Sagar, Dhar | 11 | 2000-01 | I | - | 45.50 | Extra expenditure incurred due to use of costlier Bitumen instead of Bitumen emulsion in tack coat. |
| | (iv) State | 367 | 2000-03 | I, II and III | - | 2076.00 | Extra expenditure was incurred on application of superfluous primer coat not required as per IRC specification in respect of works measuring 5750 km. of length. |
| Maharashtra | (i) Hingoli, Amravati, Parbhani, Jalgaon, Alibagh, Bhandara, Nandurbar, Ratnagiri | | 2001-03 | II | | 387.77 | Extra expenditure incurred on additional BBM layer. |
| | (ii) Nasik | | 2000-01 | I | | 180.00 | Extra expenditure incurred on use of unsuitable costly grade (30/40) of bitumen as against the suitable and cheaper grade (60/70) bitumen. |
| | (iii) Amravati, Bhandara, Hingoli, Parbhani, Raigad, Nandurbar, Ratnagiri | | 2000-01 | I | | 6.98 | Expenditure incurred on tack coat with a dose of 50 kg/100 sq. m. each for BUSG and open grade carpet as against specified norm of 35kg/25kg in MOST specification (1977). |
| Meghalaya | Ri Bhoi, West Garo Hills | 5 | 2001-02 | II | 9 | 147.22 | Avoidable expenditure due to adoption of higher SOR rates. |
| Mizoram | Saiha | 9 | 2000-01 to 2003-04 | I, II and III | 9 | 4.24 | Extra expenditure incurred on WBM-I, WBM-II and GSB works due to adoption of higher analysed rates than the SOR of 2000, 2002 and 2003 and National Highway rates. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-----|------------------------------|---------------|-----|---------|---|
| Orissa | (i) Khurda, Puri, Cuttack, Kendrapada | 24 | 2000-01, 2001-03, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 42 | 202.63 | Works executed with three layers of WBM Grade-II, in 75 mm thickness as against the stipulated provision of two layers of WBM in 75 mm thickness to function as base course, without ascertaining soil bearing capacity. |
| | (ii) Cuttack, Khurda, Kendrapada, Nayagarh, Puri, Koraput, Jajpur, Rayagada | 107 | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 298 | 2574.00 | Expenditure incurred on construction of road works with higher carriageway width (3.75m) without assessing the traffic intensity. |
| | (iii) Cuttack, Khurda, Kendrapada, Nayagarh, Puri, Koraput, Jajpur, Rayagada | 177 | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I, II and III | 448 | 682.53 | Expenditure incurred on providing sand sub-base in 200 mm./150 mm. of compacted thickness as against 100 to 150 mm. compacted thickness and also in contrary to the instructions of Chief Engineer not to provide sand base in sand moorum zones. |
| Rajasthan | (i) Churu, Jaipur, Jhunjhunu, Sikar | 68 | 2000-01 to 2003-04 | I, II and III | 197 | 324.25 | Expenditure incurred on costlier hard stone aggregate used for construction of sub-base. |
| | (ii) Nagaur | 8 | 2003-04 | III | 15 | 32.15 | Expenditure incurred on sub-base not desired. |
| | (iii) Jaipur, Jhunjhunu, Nagaur, Pali, Sikar | 48 | 2003-04, 2004-05 | III, IV | 194 | 31.40 | Higher rates adopted for construction of shoulders. |
| | (iv) Churu, Jaipur, Jhalawar, Jhunjhunu, Nagaur, Sikar, Udaipur | 20 | 2000-01 | I | 99 | 35.94 | Excess expenditure on account of excess use of bitumen than that prescribed in Rural Road Manual. |
| | (v) Sikar | 2 | 2000-01 | I | 16 | 6.75 | Avoidable expenditure on second tack coat over 20 m.m PMC not required. |
| | (vi) Churu, Jhalawar, Nagaur, Sikar, Udaipur | 125 | 2001-02, 2003-04 | II and III | 282 | 1399.70 | Expenditure incurred on construction of road works with higher carriageway width (3.75 meter) and roadway width (7.50 meter) even when traffic intensity was below 52 vehicles per day. |
| Sikkim | East, West, North, South | 17 | 2001-02 | II | 17 | 42.77 | Work executed with carriage way width of 3.75 metres even when the traffic density varied between 15 and 45 vehicles per day. |
| Tamil Nadu | (i) Sivagangai, Madurai, Virudhunagar, Erode, Tirunelveli, Thanjavur, Namakkal | 30 | 2000-01, 2001-03 and 2003-04 | I, II and III | 234 | - | Pavements were uniformly designed in all the works without conducting any traffic survey, over looking the provisions of IRC Manual would have impact on the desired quality. |
| | (ii) Virudhunagar, Tirunelveli, Madurai, Thanjavur, Erode, Namakkal | 35 | 2000-01, 2001-03 and 2003-04 | I, II and III | 203 | 132.48 | RCC culverts at costlier rates were used without any justification when the pipe culverts at economical rates could serve the purpose. |
| | (iii) Tirunelveli, Virudhunagar, Erode, Madurai, Sivagangai, Namakkal, Thanjavur | 35 | 2000-01, 2001-03, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 234 | 119.52 | Excess expenditure on utilization of higher type of sealcoat in deviation to IRC specification. |
| | (iv) Tirunelveli, Virudhunagar, Erode, Madurai, Sivagangai, Namakkal, Thanjavur | 33 | 2000-01, 2001-03, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 129 | 572.00 | Expenditure incurred on roads due to adoption of excess carriageway width of 3.75m even when the recorded traffic density was less than 100 vehicles per day. |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| | (v) Madurai, Sivagangai | 10 | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 33 | 274.47 | Expenditure on WBM layer I and II using gravel binder which did not conform to specification. |
| | (vi) 7 districts | 35 | 2000-01, 2001-03, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 234 | | Sand gravel mix was only to be provided for the carriageway width of 3.75 m. as against the approved provision for full width of road (7.5 m.) |
| Uttaranchal | Uttarkashi | 1 [UT 1302] | 2000-01 | I | | | Work executed with seal coat 'B' as against the provision of seal coat 'A' in the DPR as well as in the agreement. |
| Uttar Pradesh | (i) Allahabad, Bareilly, Farrukhabad, Ghazipur, Rae Bareli, Ballia, Deoria, Jalaun, Kanpur Nagar, Sultanpur | 31 | 2001-02 | II | 125 | 713.39 | Expenditure incurred on laying granular sub-base in-excess of designed thickness. |
| | (ii) Bulandshahr, Gonda, Gorakhpur, Kushinagar, Lalitpur, Mathura, Saharanpur, Varanasi, Ballia, Deoria, Jalaun, Sultanpur | 35 | 2001-02 | II | 168 | 1350.00 | Expenditure incurred on laying of drainage layer on the sub-grade of such roads where it was not required as the nature of the soil and the rainfall data did not attract the provision of drainage layer. |
| | (iii) Agra, Allahabad, Bulandshahr, Farrukhabad, Kanpur Dehat, Mathura, Deoria, Kanpur Nagar, Sultanpur | 29 | 2001-02 | II | 183 | 404.83 | Expenditure incurred on GSB substituted with costlier ingredients (coarse sand, stone ballasts 22.4 to 53 mm and stone chips) against the original provision for GSB approved by NRRDA/ MoRD which consisted of coarse sand/ moorum and brick metal.. |
| | (iv) Agra | - | - | - | - | 33.40 | Avoidable expenditure incurred on substitution of work of surface dressing by first and second coat painting with open graded premix carpet. |
| West Bengal | (i) Malda | 7 | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 7 | 161.00 | DPRs were prepared as per norms of design and specifications of rural roads but locally available material like brick bats, laterite, chelli etc not provided in the sub base layer as per specification instead stone materials were provided and resultant escalation in the cost. |
| | (ii) Bardhaman, Malda | 39 [WB 1108- 12, WB 0517-20, WB 0523, WB 0531-32, WB 0514 to WB 0540] | 2003-04 | III | 40 | 83.22 | Cost increased due to erroneous composition of stone metal in base course layer in the estimates which were not prepared as per norms laid down in RRM. |
| Total | | | | | 3941 | 16766.28 | |

Suspended/Abandoned/incomplete works/ not taken up

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | No. of works | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|-------------------|---|------------------------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------------------|--|
| Andhra Pradesh | (i) Nellore, Kurnool, Guntur | 17 | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 36 | 1008.95 | Expenditure incurred on roads which remained incomplete as of March 2005 as a result envisaged habitations not connected. |
| | (ii) Kurnool, Nizamabad, Medak, Nellore | 15 | 2001-03 | II | 22 | 465.37 | Works valuing Rs. 4.65 crore were dropped during executions for the reasons attributed to insufficient allocation of funds, land acquisition problems, forest clearance, etc. |
| | (iii) Kurnool | AP-II-1004 | 2001-03 | II | 1 | 24.11 | Expenditure incurred on incomplete road work constructed upto a length of 2.30 k.m. as against the sanctioned length of 4.00 k.m. |
| | (iv) Nellore, Medak | AP 3A 1403 AP 1104 | 2000-01, 2003-04 | I and III | 3 | 67.49 | (i) Full connectivity was not provided as a result of reduction of length by 0.40 k.m. (ii) Works remained incomplete due to non-completion of 7 cross drainage (CD) works. |
| Bihar | (i) Purnea | 1 [BR-2701] | 2000-01 | I | 2 | 97.86 | 7 habitations to be benefited works stopped after constructing the road upto WBM level. |
| | (ii) Begusarai, Buxar | 2 [BR-0408, BR-0805] | 2001-02 | II | 2 | 39.13 | Land was not available. Rs. 39.13 lakh sanctioned remained unutilized as of March 2005 |
| Gujarat | (i) Dahod, Gandhinagar | 2 [GJ0703, GJ1802] | | | 2 | 0.28 | Works held up midway since June 2003 and October 2004 as the entire land required was not acquired. |
| | (ii) Dahod | 2 [GJ0707, GJ0708] | | | | 292.00 | Work valuing Rs. 292 lakh awarded was not started as on March 2005, reasons not available. |
| Himachal Pradesh | (i) Mandi, Kangra | 5 | 2001-02, 2003-04 | II and III | 7 | 228.00 | Expenditure incurred on abandoned works due to disputes over private, defence and forest land and Court cases. |
| | (ii) Kangra | | 2001-02, 2003-04 | II and III | 3 | 570.00 | Road works could not be taken up due to involvement of forest land and court cases. |
| | (iii), Shimla, Mandi, Kangra | | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 11 | 712.00 | Expenditure incurred on road works completed in 3/02(4) and June/04(7), but roads were not put to use due to non construction of major bridges and railway crossing |
| Jammu and Kashmir | Jammu, Kathua, Samba | 3 [JK0506, 0702, 0703] | | | 5 | 137.90 | Expenditure incurred on roads which remained incomplete as of 31.3.05 due to court stay, non availability of land, land dispute, non clearance from forest department. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|
| Karnataka | Gadag, Raichur | 2[KA 14-05, KA 23-05] | 2001-03 | II | 3 | 57.00 | Works not taken up but the amount meant for these works was utilized for other works thereby 9 identified habitations were denied the benefit of connectivity. |
| Madhya Pradesh | (i) Rajgarh, Guna, Sagar, Shahdol | 7 [MP 4506, MP 1307, MP 1308, MP 3310, MP 3313, MP 3315, MP 3804] | 2001-04 | II , III and IV | 7 | 375.51 | Expenditure incurred on roads passing through forest area and abandoned for want of forest clearance. |
| | (ii) Sagar, Rajgarh, Guna, Seoni, Shahdol | 10 [MP 3309, MP 3314, MP 3317, MP 3004, MP 4401, MP 3005, MP 1307, MP 1310, MP 2603, MP 3807] | 2000-04 | I , II , III and IV | 13 | 559.97 | Expenditure incurred on roads taken up on encroached/disputed land, thus were abandoned. |
| Maharashtra | Jalgaon | | 2000-01 | | 5 | 133.24 | (i) Out of 9 works sanctioned two works valuing Rs. 52 lakh were deleted. (ii) 3 works abandoned after incurring Rs. 81.25 lakh due to forest land and land dispute. |
| Manipur | (i) Bishnupur | - | 2000-01 | I | 7 | 81.11 | Incomplete works closed without completion. |
| | (ii) Churachandpur | | 2000-01 | I | 3 | 58.91 | Works valuing Rs. 58.91 sanctioned in 2000-01 were not taken up as of March 2001. |
| Mizoram | Saiha | 1 [MZ 0706] | 2002-03 | II | 1 | 114.59 | Work abandoned in January 2003. |
| Orissa | (i) Kendrapada, Jajpur | 2 [OR 16-14, OR 13-13] | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 5 | 154.01 | Expenditure incurred on incomplete works. Works valuing Rs. 127.68 lakh is yet to be completed. |
| | (ii) Deogarh, Dhenkal, Khurda, Sambalpur, Sundergarh, Angul, Bhadrak, Nawarangpur, Baripada | 12 | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 14 | 149.00 | Expenditure incurred on works abandoned due to non fulfillment of site survey, condition of road. |
| Punjab | (i) 2 districts | 7 | | | 9 | 195.00 | Road works shown as completed though these were abandoned/incomplete due to non availability of land width, area falling in railway jurisdiction, etc. |
| | (ii) Mansa, Amritsar, Jalandhar | 3[PB-1101, PB 0105, PB 0802] | 2001-03 | II | 6 | 128.03 | Works dropped due to alignment dispute insufficient land width. |
| Rajasthan | (i) Jhalawar, Nagaur, Pali, Udaipur, Churu | 11 | 2000-01, 2001-02, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 6 (PMGSY) 5 (BMSP) | 175.11 82.82 | Works suspended due to reasons like land dispute, permission of railway authority, fresh proposal not approved and contractor left the works midway. |
| | (ii) Sikar, Udaipur | 2 | 2000-01 | I to IV | 3 | 18.00 | Works were withdrawn after incurring Rs. 18 lakh as these were already covered under other schemes. |

Report No. 13 of 2006

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|----------------|---|
| | (iii) Jaipur, Jhalawar, Jhunjhunu, Nagor, Pali, Sikar, Udaipur | 18 | 2000-01, 2001-02, 2003-04, 2004-05 | I, II, III and IV | 30 | 1168.88 | Works sanctioned not taken up because BT roads were already constructed in other schemes or population of habitation was below 1000 or being constructed by other agencies in other scheme or works not approved by STA due to expensive CD works . |
| Tamil Nadu | (i) Virudhunagar | | 2000-01 | I | 1 | 432.00 | Works sanctioned in March '02 against additional proposals out of savings, not started for want of clearance from Forest Department. |
| | (ii) Virudhunagar | | 2000-01 | I | 2 | 50.38 | Expenditure incurred on works partially completed and completion of works pending for want of land width as roads proposed were on private land. |
| Tripura | North Tripura, West Tripura | 2 | | | 2 | 248.45 | GOI deleted two roads as State Government could not make land available. |
| Uttaranchal | Dehradun | 1 [UT-502] | 2000-01 | I | 1 | 71.46 | Upgradation work remained incomplete as the State Government failed to make available forest land. |
| Uttar Pradesh | 17 | 34 | 2001-02 | II | 75 | 1959.81 | Works were deleted for the reasons that either the roads were constructed by other agencies or were providing double connectivity, besides land was not available. |
| Total | | | | | 292 | 9856.37 | |

Annexure 11
(Referred to Paras 4.5.7 and 4.5.7.1)

Delayed completion/Time over-run

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | No. of works | Delay period Ranging between in months | Amount of Liquidated Damages (LD) not recovered (Rs. in lak h) | Remarks |
|--------------------------|---|--|--------------------|----------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Arunachal Pradesh | Papumpare, West Kameng, West Siang, Upper Siang | 8[AR-1204 RWD, AR 0704 PWD, AR1204 RWD, AR 1203 RWD, AR 1104 RWD,AR1303 RWD, AR 1301 PWD, AR 1301 RWD] | 2001-02 | II | 8 | 5 and 22 | - | Works were executed departmentally or through work orders, neither time schedule was prescribed nor penal provision incorporated in the agreement. |
| Bihar | Begusarai, Patna, Jamui, Chapra, Samastipur, Purnea, Nawada, Buxar, Darbhanga | 33 | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 102 | 9 and 36 | 476.70 | Non enforcement of penalty clause led to non-realisation from the contractors. |
| Goa | North Goa, South Goa | 70 | 2000-01 | I | 52 | 6 and 36 | | Works were delayed due to obstacles, protests and shortage of funds. |
| Gujarat | (i) Dahod | 4 [GJ0702 GJ0704 GJ0703 GJ0701] | 2001-02 to 2004-05 | | | 14 and 32 | 55.00 | LD imposed for Rs. 84 lakh of which only Rs. 29 lakh was recovered. |
| | (ii)Vadodara, Panchmahal, Surat | 10 | | | | 6 and 31 | 101.00 | LD imposed but recovery awaited. |
| Haryana | Hisar | | 2004-05 | IV | 3 | | | Liquidated damages amounting to Rs. 19.11 Lakh was neither levied nor recovered from the contractor on account of delay in completion. |

Report No. 13 of 2006

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------|------------------|-----|--------------------|---------|--|
| Himachal Pradesh | (i) Shimla, Mandi, Kangra | 12 | 2002-03 | II | 38 | 2 and 18 | 123.00 | Amount of short recovery of LD from 13 contractors out of total LD of Rs. 127 lakh. |
| | (ii) Kangra, Mandi | NA | 2001-02, 2003-04 | II and III | 31 | 2 and more than 27 | | Cost over run of Rs. 192 lakh (sanctioned cost Rs. 1366 lakh) due to time over run ranging between 2 months and 12 months in 21 works. |
| Jammu and Kashmir | Jammu | 2[JK 0501, 0503] | 2001-02 to 2004-05 | I | 2 | 8 and 9 | | Delayed execution of work. Recovery of LD not initiated. |
| Jharkhand | Chatra, Giridih, Dhanbad, Lohardaga, Hazaribagh | 52 | 2000-03 | I and II | 116 | 3 and 39 | - | Delay in completion of works, due to late commencement of work, delay in decision of tenders, slow progress, etc. |
| Kerala | Ernakulam, Mallapuram, Wayanad, Kannur | 9[KR-0201-0204, 1006,1201,0401, 0402, 0403] | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 44 | 10 and 30 | | Delay was due to delayed finalisation of design, getting rubberised bitumen, delay in obtaining forest clearance. LD not imposed |
| Madhya Pradesh | Jhabua, Dhar, Sagar, Shahdol, Chhindwara, Bhopal | 12 | 2000-02 | I and II | 12 | 7 | 257.61 | Amount of LD short levied on the contractor. |
| Maharashtra | Parbhani, Hingoli, Jalgaon, Raigad, Amravati, Bhandara, Nandurbar, Ratnagiri | | 2001-03 | II | 151 | - | 523.72 | LD not recovered for delayed completion of works. |
| Manipur | (i) Bishnupur | 4 [MN0101 MN0102 MN0103 MN0104] | 2001-03 | II | - | 17 | | No action taken against the defaulting contractors. |
| | (ii) Churachandpur | 6 | | - | - | 12 and 14 | | No action taken against the defaulting contractors. |
| Meghalaya | Ri Bhoi, West Garo Hills | 3 12 | 2001-02, 2001-02 | II | | 9 and 24 | | Non imposition of LD of Rs. 13.77 lakh in 2 works in Ri Bhoi. |
| Mizoram | State | 55 | 2000-01 to 2004-05 | I,II,III and IV, | 57 | 1 and 24 | | LD was not recovered for delayed period from the contractors. |
| Nagaland | Peren, Wokha, Phek | - | 2000-01, 2001-02 | - | 10 | 1 and 13 | - | Compensation to extent of Rs. 115.62 lakh was not levied. |
| Orissa | Cuttack, Khurda, Kendrapada, Raygada, Nayagarh, Puri, Koraput, Jajpur | 139 | 2001-03 | I, II and III | 391 | 1 and 24 | 1942.00 | Delayed execution of work but liquidated damages not recovered from the contractor for the delay in completion . |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|----|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|---|
| Punjab | Amritsar, Gurdaspur, Jalandhar, Kapurthala, Mansa | 17 | | I, II and III | | 3 and 19 | | The delay was attributed to non-availability of clear sites, standing crops and alignment dispute, etc. |
| Rajasthan | (i) Udaipur, Nagaur | 5 | 2000-01, 2001-02, 2003-04 | I, II and III | 4 1 | 1 and above 6 | 41.77 | Penalty imposed but recovery awaited. |
| | (ii) Sikar, Jhalawar | 2 | 2000-01 | I | 2 | Above 6 | 6.06 | Out of Rs. 14.51 lakh levied only Rs. 8.45 lakh was recovered balance of penalty to the recovered. |
| Sikkim | (i) West, South, East | 6 | 2001-02 | II | 6 | 18 and 24 | | Delayed the commencement of work due to non availability of land. |
| | (ii) West, East, North and South | 14 | 2001-02 | II | 17 | 18 and 24 | | Penalty of Rs. 71.45 lakh not levied on the payment made for Rs. 9.68 crore as against the value of Rs. 14.29 crore . |
| Tamil Nadu | Namakkal, Thanjavur, Madurai, Sivagangai, Virudhunagar, Tirunelveli | | 2000-04 | I, II and III | 23 | One and 15 | | Delay was attributed to the reasons like slow execution of work by contractor, execution in hilly areas, election, non availability of material, etc. |
| Uttaranchal | | 19 | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | | 4 and 26 | | Delay in completion of packages. |
| Uttar Pradesh | 22 PIUs | 88 | 2001-02, 2003-04 | II and III | 505 | One and more than 24 | | LD aggregating to Rs. 17.81 crore was not imposed on contractor by 22 PIUs. |
| West Bengal | Bankura, Darjeeling, Uttar Dinajpur, Malda, Bardhaman | 58 | 2001-02, 2003-04 | II and III | 78 | 4 and 12 | | Delay was due to land problem. |
| Total | | | | | 1653 | | 3526.86 | |

Undue aid to the contractor

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|--------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|--|
| Arunachal Pradesh | Papumpare | 2 [AR 0704 RWD, AR 1204 RWD] | | | 3.39 | Measurement of slip clearance was recorded after completion of works as such the expenditure incurred on this work remained doubtful. |
| Assam | (i) Bongaigaon, Barpeta, Morigaon | 8 [AS 0202, AS 0201, AS 0101, AS 0102, AS 0103, AS 0104, AS 1702, AS 1701] | | | 29.33 | Refunded subsequently and added extra on the last bill value resulting in overpayment. |
| | (ii) Bongaigaon | 1[AS 0205] | 2003-04 | | 12.65 | Higher rates were allowed to contractor on earthwork, turfing etc. |
| Himachal Pradesh | Shimla, Mandi | NA | 2003-04, 2004-05 | III and IV | 11.68 | Non recovery of 8046.820 cu.m. useful stone worth Rs. 11.68 lakh from the 8 contractors as per terms of contract. |
| Jharkhand | Giridih | 1[JH-0802] | 2000-01 | I | 20.34 | Payment made on excess rates for seven items. |
| Madhya Pradesh | (i) Ujjain, Sagar | 3[MP-5901 MP-4801 MP-4802] | 2000-01 | I | 39.15 | Extra expenditure incurred on additional work within 25% of the contract value got done at higher rate. |
| | (ii) Ujjain, Guna, Chhindwara, Seoni,Sagar, Dhar, Jhabua, Mandla, Panna | 36 | 2000-03 | I, II and III | 30.16 | Non recovery of cost of excavated rock @ Rs. 200/- and 100/- per cum. from the contractor. |
| | (iii) Seoni, Narsinghpur, Vidisha, Sagar, Jhabua, Guna, Shivpuri, Chhindwara, Shahdol, Umaria | 33 | 2000-04 | I, II and III | 377.12 | Excess payment Rs 108.25 lakh made to contractors due to incorrect mode of measurement non deduction of utilized earth, wrong application of rates, double payment and non deduction on account of previous paid quantity etc. |
| Manipur | Bishnupur | | 2004-05 | IV | 34.97 | Bitumen issued but not recorded nor cost recovered from contractor. |
| Nagaland | (i) Phek | 2[NG 0501 NG 0502] | - | - | 97.84 | Item of work not carried out at the time of payment made to contractor. Payment made to contractor without execution of works. |
| | (ii) Phek | 1[NG 0401] | - | - | 20.13 | Payment made to contractor without execution of some items of work. |
| | (iii) Peren, Phek | 2[NG 0101 NG 0401] | 2000-01 | I | 7.50 | Amount of recovery not effected from the contractor for bitumen procured departmentally. |
| Orissa | (i) Cuttack, Khurda, Kendrapada, Nayagarh, Puri, Koraput, Jajpur, Rayagada | 162 | 2000-01, 2001-03 and 2003-04 | I,II and III | 978.00 | Excess payment due to wrong computation of Granular Sub Base (GSB) item rate. |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------|------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--|
| | (ii) Cuttack, Khurda, Kendrapada, Nayagarh, Puri, Koraput, Jajpur, Rayagada | 157 | 2000-01, 2001-03 and 2003-04 | I,II and III | 1038.00 | Overpayment due to wrong computation of WBM item rate. |
| | (iii) Cuttack, Khurda, Kendrapada, Nayagarh, Puri, Koraput, Jajpur, Rayagada | 157 | 2000-01, 2001-03 and 2003-04 | I,II and III | 519.00 | Payment of stacking made to contractor though stacking was not carried out. |
| | (iv) Cuttack, Khurda, Kendrapada, Nayagarh, Puri, Koraput, Jajpur, Rayagada | 157 | 2000-01, 2001-03 and 2003-04 | I,II and III | 24.61 | Excess payment allowed to contractor without deduction of voids for the stone aggregate collected without recording measurement. |
| | (v) Kendrapada | 1 [OR 1606] | 2000-01 | I | 42.54 | Works awarded at extra cost on cancellation of the contract. |
| Sikkim | (i) East, West, North, South | 17 | 2001-02 | II | 2.94 | Though rates allowed in SOR 2001 were inclusive of 10% towards contractors profit, another 10% was added in the estimate as contractors profit (stone soling and healing by enhancing) at Rs.18per cum for both. |
| | (ii) East | 13 | 2001-03, 2003-04 | II and III | 65.10 | Department did not deduct cost of available stones while making payment in 16 works to contractor. |
| | (iii) South | 2[SK-0306, 0314] | - | - | 27.00 | Expenditure incurred towards damages and other compensation by the Deptt. in the absence of provision for risk coverage towards loss or damages to the work. |
| West Bengal | Bardhaman | 1 [WB0508] | 2001-02 | II | 17.47 | Loss on account of non-imposing of any penalty on the contractor against terminated contract though stipulated in the agreement. |
| Total | | | | | 3398.92 | |

Annexure 13
(Referred to Para 4.8.1)

Quality

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | No. of works | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|----------|--------------|----------------------|--|
| Arunachal Pradesh | West Siang, Upper Siang | 3 [AR 1204 PWD, AR 1203 PWD, AR 1301 PWD] | | | 3 | 290.33 | Expenditure incurred on construction of roads with one layer of WBM as against the two layers provided in the sanctioned estimate. |
| Gujarat | (i) Amreli, Dahod Gandhinagar, Panchmahal, Vadodara, Surat | | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 131 | 799.55 | The use of low quality of coarse aggregates and non provision of screening as per specification of MoRTH resulted in sub standard work. |
| | (ii) Amreli, Dahod Gandhinagar, Panchmahal, Vadodara, Surat | | 2000-01, 2001-03 | I and II | 169 | 542.91 | Amount incurred on use of low quality bituminous macadam (BM) over WBM resulted in poor quality of work. |
| | (iii) Amreli, Dahod Gandhinagar, Panchmahal, Vadodara, Surat | | | | 169 | 312.04 | Adoption of less density for mix seal surfacing work resulted in less thickness than prescribed in estimates. |
| Haryana | Sonepat, Karnal | 3 [HR1801 HR1001 HR1002] | 2001-03 | II | 4 | 100.89 | Expenditure incurred on roads in built up area of habitations without providing side drains. |
| Himachal Pradesh | Shimla, Mandi, Kangra | - | 2000-01 to 2002-03 | I and II | 49 | 885.00 | Expenditure incurred on execution of substandard roads with only one layer of WBM grade II instead of prescribed two layers. |
| Jharkhand | (i) Lohardaga | 1 [JH 1301] | 2000-01 | I | 5 | 249.23 | Road constructed with 19 cross drainages (CDs) as against 35 CDs provided in the estimate. |
| | (ii) Palamu | 1 [JH 1501] | 2000-01 | I | 1 | 43.21 | Against provision of 4 CDs works , no CD works were constructed while in progress reports it was shown as constructed. |
| | (iii) Palamu | 1 [JH 1503] | 2000-01 | I | 1 | 100.51 | Against 24140.62 sqm. to be covered with bituminous surface only 21157 sqm. was executed and shown as completed for the entire length in the state's progress report. |
| | (iv) Palamu | 1 [JH 1501] | 2000-01 | I | 1 | 40.23 | Against the provision of 7 CD works only 2 CD works were constructed but reported as 7 CD works . |
| Karnataka | Koppal | 1 (KN 2006) | 2001-03 | II | 6 | 106.00 | Works executed with sub-base/ base thickness varying from 150 m.m to 300 m.m as against the prescribed standard of 280 m.m to 450 m.m. |
| Meghalaya | West Garo Hills | 2 [MG 0625, MG 0612] | 2004-05 | IV | 2 | 37.59 | To adjust the expenditure (Rs. 37.59 lakh) on excess execution of earth work, the scope of work was revised. Against 10 culverts only 4 culverts for cross drainage structure (CDS) work were shown in RE. Similarly Metalling and Black Topping (MBT) revised to WBM. This change would lead to substandard work. |
| Tamil Nadu | State | - | 2000-02 | I and II | 234 | - | Road works executed with lower grade bitumen (80/100) against the provisions of IRC. |
| Total | | | | | 775 | 3507.49 | |

Annexure 14
(Referred to Para 4.8.2)

Faulty preparation of DPR

| State | District | No. of Packages | Year | Phase | No. of works | Amount (Rs. in lakh) | Remarks |
|--------------------|---|---|--------------------|----------|--------------|----------------------|---|
| Bihar | (i) Nawada, Chapara, Buxar, Patna, Begusarai, Samastipur, Jamui, Dharbhanga, Purnea | 45 | 2000-01 to 2001-02 | I and II | 132 | 6326.00 | DPRs did not incorporate provision of side drain, Highest Flood Level, construction of cemented/stone-paved road in habitated area. |
| | (ii) Jamui, Begusarai, Chapra | 9 [BR-1504, BR-1506, BR-0408, BR-0903, BR-0907, BR-0908] | 2001-02 | II | 13 | 4241.00 | DPRs prepared without considering applicable CBR value |
| | (iii) Jamui, Nawada, Samastipur | 5[BR-1501, BR-1502, BR-2504, BR-2505, BR-3003] | | | 12 | 466.02 | DPRs were prepared without taking into account the applicable CBR value. |
| Gujarat | Amreli, Gandhinagar, Dahod, Panchmahal, Surat, Vadodara | | 2000-01, 2001-02 | I and II | 174 | 2899.96 | Estimates were prepared ignoring CBR and traffic intensity of each road. |
| Sikkim | State | | 2001-02 | II | 17 | | DPRs prepared with pavement thickness of sub base as 150 mm. and base as 75 mm. as against 70 mm. sub base and 150 mm. base as prescribed in the RRM. |
| West Bengal | Bankura, Darjeeling, Malda , Uttar Dinajpur, Bardhaman | 39 | 2003-04 | III | 40 | 3702.74 | DPRs prepared without provision of CD works retaining wall, curved design, Bell Mouth etc. |
| Total | | | | | 388 | 17635.72 | |

