

Details of PSCs covered in Audit Sample

S. No.	Name of block/field	Operator	Brief description
1	MB-OSN-97/3	RIL	MB-OSN-97/3 was a shallow water block located in Mumbai offshore. It was awarded under NELP-I round. The PSC, which was signed on 12 April 2000 with RIL and Niko with 90 and 10 percent Participating Interest respectively, was made effective from 7 June 2000. From July 2003, RIL held 100 percent PI. The total area of the block was 5740 sq. kms. The operator could not complete the Minimum Work Programme relating to drilling of two wells and relinquished the block at the end of Phase-I after availing two extensions of 12 months each. No discovery was made in the block.
2	NEC-DWN-2002/1	RIL	NEC-DWN-2002/1, an offshore deep water block located in North East Coast, was awarded to the Joint venture of RIL and HEPI under NELP-IV round. The PSC was signed on 6 February 2004 with RIL (with 90 percent PI) and HEPI (with 10 percent PI). The effective date of the PEL is 18 March 2004. HEPI transferred its PI to RIL, which was approved by MoPNG in July 2008. The total original area of the block was 25,565 sq. km. The block is under Exploration Phase-II and 25 percent area i.e. 6391 sq. km. has been relinquished by the operator at the end of Phase-I. No discovery has been made in the block.
3	MN-DWN-2004/3	RIL	MN-DWN2004/3, an offshore deep water block located in Mahanadi basin, was awarded to RIL under NELP-VI round. The PSC for the block was signed on 2 March 2007 with RIL. The effective date of the PEL is 15 May 2007. The total original area of the block is 11,316 sq. km. The block is under Exploration Phase-I. No discovery has been made in the block.
4	KG-OSN-2001/02	RIL	KG-OSN-2001/02 is a shallow water block located in Krishna Godawari basin, which was awarded under NELP-III round to the consortium of RIL and HEPI with 90 and 10 percent PI respectively. The PSC was signed on 4 February 2003. The effective date of the PEL is 3 April 2003. Presently, RIL holds 100 percent PI. The total original area of the block was 210 sq. km. Two discoveries have been made in the block. The operator opted not to enter Phase-II at the end of Phase-I, and had retained the whole area to carry out Appraisal Programme after availing two extensions - 6 and 5 ½ months.
5	KK-DWN-2003/1	RIL	KK-DWN-2003/1, a deep water block located in the Kerala Konkan basin, was awarded to RIL under NELP-V round. The PSC for the

S. No.	Name of block/field	Operator	Brief description
			block was signed on 23 September 2005. The effective date of the PEL is 23 January 2006. The total original area of the block is 18,245 sq. km. The block is under Exploration Phase. No discovery has been made in the block.
6	CB-ON/1	RIL	The PSC for CB-ON/1, a pre-NELP (7 th round) onshore block located at Cambay basin, was signed with M/s Okland International with 100 percent on 16 July 1998. With effect from 31 March 2005, M/s Okland assigned 50 percent PI to Tullow India Op. Ltd. (TIOL), 40 percent PI to RIL and remaining 10 percent PI to Okland Offshore Holding Ltd. (OOHL). ONGC is the licensee and has 30 percent pre-emptive right in case of commercial discovery. Presently, RIL is the operator. PEL for the block is effective from 5 September 2003. The block is under Exploration Phase-III and there is no discovery. In the third phase, the operator has retained 1533 sq. km. i.e. 25 percent of the total 6133 sq. km. original area.
7	KK-DWN-2000/2	ONGC	KK-DWN-2000/2, an offshore deep water block located in the Kerala Konkan basin was awarded under NELP-II round to a consortium of ONGC and GAIL with 85 and 15 percent PI respectively. Total area of the block measured 20,998 sq. km. The PSC was signed on 17 July 2001 and made effective from the date of issue of PEL i.e. 16 August 2001. After completing the committed MWP, ONGC relinquished the whole block at the end of Phase-I.
8	RJ-ONN-2002/1	OIL	RJ-ONN-2002/1 is an onshore block located in Rajasthan, which was awarded under NELP-IV round to a consortium of OIL and ONGC with 60 and 40 percent PI respectively. The PSC was signed on 6 February 2004. The effective date of the contract is 22 June 2004. The block was under Exploration Phase-II. An extension of 6 months was granted to the contractor at the end of Phase-I. After relinquishing 2475 sq. km. i.e. 25 percent of the original 9900 sq. km. area, the consortium had retained 7425 sq. km. area in the 2 nd phase.
9	MB-OSN-2004/2	Petrogas	MB-OSN-2004/2 is a shallow water block located in Mumbai offshore, which was awarded under NELP-VI round to a consortium of Petrogas, GAIL, IOC, GSPC and HPCL each having 20 percent PI. The PSC was signed on 2 March 2007. The effective date of the contract is 21 May 2007. Total area of the block is 741 sq. km. The block is under Exploration Phase-I, and no discovery has been made.
10	CB-OS-2 Lakshmi	CEIL	CB-OS-2, a pre-NELP exploration offshore block, is located in the Gulf of Khambat on the West coast of India. The PSC for the block

S. No.	Name of block/field	Operator	Brief description
11	CB-OS-2 Gauri	CEIL	was signed with the Joint Venture of ONGC (Licensee), Tata Petrodyne Limited (TPL) and Cairn Energy India Pty Ltd (CEIL-Operator) in June 1998 with initial PI of 10, 45 and 45 percent respectively. The total contract area of the block was 3534 sq. kms. There are two major discoveries i.e. Lakshmi Gas and Gauri Gas. Oil was also discovered subsequently in both the fields. Lakshmi and Gauri fields are producing gas since November 2003 and April 2004 respectively. Gauri field is producing oil from October 2006, and Lakshmi from July 2007.
12	CB-ONN-2000/1	GSPC	CB-ONN-2000/1, an onland block located at Cambay basin was awarded under NELP-II round to a consortium of GSPC, GAIL and JTI with 40, 40 and 20 percent PI respectively. The PSC was signed in July 2001 and the effective date was 7 January 2002. Presently, GSPC and GAIL hold 50 percent PI each. Two discoveries have been made in the block. Out of the original total contract area of 1424 sq. km., the operator has retained 14.1 sq. km. as development area.
13	Hazira	Niko Resources	Hazira is a small size producing field located in Cambay basin. The field was already discovered in 1969. The PSC for the field was signed on 23 September 1994 with Niko Resources (having 33.33 percent PI) and GSPCL (with 66.67 percent PI). Out of the total 50 sq. km area of the field, 22.7102 sq. km falls offshore and 27.0214 sq km falls onshore. Mining lease for the field was granted in October 2005.
14	PG-ONN-2001/1	ONGC	PG-ONN-2001/1 exploratory block under NELP-III round awarded to ONGC with 100% PI. It is an onland block located in KG-PG basin. The PSC was signed on 4.2.2003 and PEL was granted on 4.7.2003. The block is in exploration phase (June 2008).
15	CY-OSN-2000/1	ONGC	CY-OSN-2000/1 exploratory block under NELP-II round was awarded to ONGC with 100% PI. It is an offshore block located in Cauvery basin. The PSC was signed on 17.7.2001 and PEL was issued on 16.8.2001. The block was relinquished in Phase-II on 15.2.2007 without completing the committed one well. The cost for unfinished work programme of one well was paid to the Government.
16	MB-DWN-2000/1	ONGC	MB-DWN-2000/1 exploratory deep water block in Mumbai Offshore Basin under NELP-II round was awarded to consortium of ONGC (85%) and IOC (15%). The PSC was signed on 17.7.2001. The block was relinquished in Phase-I without drilling the committed three wells. The cost for unfinished work programme of one well was paid to the Government.

S. No.	Name of block/ field	Operator	Brief description
17	Ratna series	Premier Oil, UK	Ratna-R Series fields located in Western Offshore under second round of development bidding awarded (1993) to a consortium of M/s Essar Oil Limited and M/s Premier Oil Pacific Limited, UK (designed Operator) with a participating interest of 50% and 10% respectively in March 1996. ONGC is having participating interest of 40% in the Joint Venture. The Production Sharing Contract is yet to be signed between GOI and Joint Venture. The field still remains with ONGC and is at present lying in abandoned condition.

Summary of blocks selected for supplementary scrutiny of operators' records

S. No.	Name of block/ field	Operator	Brief description
1	KG-DWN-98/3	RIL	The KG-DWN-98/3 Block (also referred to as KG-D6) was awarded in NELP-I in 2000 to the RIL-Niko consortium.
2	Panna-Mukta	BGEPIIL (primary operator)	The fields Panna-Mukta and Tapti were discovered and operated by Oil and Natural Gas commission under nomination basis till 1994. In January 1994, the Government of India awarded the fields to a consortium of Enron Oil and Gas India Ltd (30 per cent), Reliance India Limited. (RIL) (30 per cent) and ONGC as Govt. nominee (40 per cent). The PSC was signed on 22 December 1994. In 2002, the PI of Enron was taken over by British Gas Exploration and Production India Limited (BGEPIIL).
3	Mid and South Tapti		
4	RJ-ON-90/1	CEIL	The PSC for this Rajasthan block was signed between GOI, Shell India Production Development B.V. (SIPD) and ONGC in May 1995. Subsequently, SIPD assigned its 100 percent PI to Cairn Energy India Limited (CEIL) between September 1998 to June 2003.

Status of Discoveries (KG-DWN-98/3)

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Declaration of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
				As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC		As per PSC		
1	D-1	-	29.10.02	28.10.03	-	28.10.05	May 2003	02.04.03	01.04.04	22.12.04	Operator had submitted a combined FDP with D-3 discovery.
				Not submitted		Nov. 2002 Exact date not available, as the	24.03.03		26.5.04	05.11.04	
				Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual		Actual	Actual	

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to the Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Declaration of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
				As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC		As per PSC		
				Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual		Actual		
				28.10.03	-	28.10.05	17.11.03	17.03.04	16.03.05	09.02.09	
2	D-2	-	29.10.02	Not submitted		21.05.03	07.01.04		14.07.08	Awaited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a delay of 1 ½ month in review of the DoC proposal. There was a delay of more than three years in submission of the FDP of this discovery. FDP awaits approval since February 2009.
3	D-3	-	29.10.02	28.10.03	-	28.10.05	17.11.03	17.03.04	16.03.05	22.12.04	There was a delay of 1 ½

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to the Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Declaration of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
				As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC		As per PSC	As per PSC	
				Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual		Actual	Actual	
				Not submitted		21.05.03	07.01.04		26.05.04	05.11.04	month in review of the DoC proposal.
4	D-4	-	24.01.03	23.01.04	-	23.01.06	22.06.06	21.01.08	20.01.09	09.02.09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MC reviewed DoC proposal in respect of eight satellite gas discoveries viz. Dhirubhai-4, 6, 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 and 23 after two years of submission of the DoC proposal.
				Not submitted		24.12.05	04.01.08		14.07.08	Awaited	Initially, operator submitted (July 2008) a combined FDP for nine discoveries as satellite discoveries viz. D-2, D-4, D-6, D-7, D-8, D-16, D-19,

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Dedclaration of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
				As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC		As per PSC	As per PSC	
				Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual		Actual	Actual	D-22 and D-23. As the proposal was found to be non-viable from the technological point of view, DGH informed (March 2009) the operator to convene a meeting and address the issue. Subsequently, after holding of meetings and correspondence, RIL submitted (December 2009) an optimized FDP in respect of four discoveries viz. D-2, D-6, D-19 and D-22, which awaited approval.

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to the Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Dedation of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
5	D-5	-	10.07.03	09.07.04	-	09.07.06	-	-	-	-	Appraisal Programme awaited since 09.07.04
				Not submitted		-					
6	D-6	-	10.07.03	09.07.04	-	09.07.06	22.06.06	21.01.08	20.01.09	09.02.09	Same remarks as at S.No. 4 above.
				Not submitted		24.12.05	04.01.08		14.07.08		
7	D-7	-	08.05.04	07.05.05	-	07.05.07	22.06.06	21.01.08	20.01.09	09.02.09	
				Not submitted		24.12.05	04.01.08		14.07.08		
8	D-8	-	10.05.04	09.05.05	-	09.05.07	22.06.06	21.01.08	20.01.09	09.02.09	
				Not		24.12.05	04.01.08		14.07.08		

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to the Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Declaration of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
				As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC		As per PSC	Actual	
				Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual		Actual	Actual	
9	D-16	-	14.08.04	submitted 13.08.05	-	13.08.07	22.06.06	21.01.08	20.01.09	09.02.09	
				Not submitted		24.12.05	04.01.08		14.07.08		
10	D-18	-	14.04.05	13.04.06	-	13.04.08	-	-	-	-	Appraisal Programme awaited since 13.04.06
				Not submitted		-					
11	D-19	-	14.04.05	13.04.06	-	13.04.08	22.06.06	21.01.08	20.01.09	09.02.09	Same remarks as at Sl. No. 4 above.
				Not submitted		24.12.05	04.01.08		14.07.08		

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to the Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Declaration of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
12	D-22	-	01.08.05	31.07.06	-	31.07.08	22.06.06	21.01.08	20.01.09	09.02.09	
				Not submitted		24.12.05	04.01.08		14.07.08		
				23.10.06	-	23.10.08	22.06.06	21.01.08	20.01.09	09.02.09	
13	D-23	-	24.10.05	Not submitted		24.12.05	04.01.08		14.07.08		
14	D-26	24.06.06	26.06.06	25.10.06	-	25.12.08	17.02.07	09.02.07	28.08.07	February 2008	FDP was approved after a delay of two months.
				Not submitted		20.10.06	02.02.07		18.08.07	17.04.08	

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to the Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Declaration of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
15	D-29	23.02.07	20.04.07	19.04.08	06.11.07	19.04.10	18.08.10	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appraisal programme was reviewed after a delay of 5 ½ months Review of DoC was pending since August 2010
				09.07.07	24.04.08	19.02.10	Not yet reviewed				
				19.04.08	06.11.07	19.04.10	18.08.10	-	-	-	
16	D-30	23.02.07	20.04.07	09.07.07	24.04.08	19.02.10	Not yet reviewed				
				07.05.08	06.11.07	07.05.10	18.08.10	-	-	-	
17	D-31	09.03.07	08.05.07	09.07.07	24.04.08	19.02.10	Not yet reviewed				

S. No	Name of discovery	Date of furnishing of particulars of the discovery, in writing, by the Contractor to the MC and to the Government	Date of notification as Discovery of potential commercial interest and submission of report by the contractor to the MC, containing test data and its analysis	Date of submission of appraisal programme	Review of appraisal programme by MC	Date of submission of Commerciality proposal	Review of DoC proposal by MC	Declaration of commerciality by Contractor	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP	Remarks
				As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC	As per PSC		As per PSC	As per PSC	
				Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual		Actual	Actual	
18	D-34	14.05.07	09.07.07	08.07.08	06.11.07	08.07.10	06.01.10	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appraisal programme was reviewed after a delay of 5 ½ months Review of DoC was pending since January 2010.
				09.07.07	24.04.08	10.07.09	Not yet reviewed				
19	D-42	07.07.08	11.07.08	10.07.09	11.11.08	10.07.11		-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appraisal programme was reviewed after a delay of 1 ½ months
				14.07.08	30.12.08	-					

Non-compliance to PSC provisions regarding notification of discovery and submission of test reports

S.No.	Name of discovery	Date of written intimation of discovery	Date of notification regarding potential commerciality
1	Dhirubhai 1	-	29.10.2002
2	Dhirubhai 2	-	29.10.2002
3	Dhirubhai 3	-	29.10.2002
4	Dhirubhai 4	-	24.01.2003
5	Dhirubhai 5	-	10.07.2003
6	Dhirubhai 6	-	10.07.2003
7	Dhirubhai 7	-	08.05.2004
8	Dhirubhai 8	-	10.05.2004
9	Dhirubhai 16	-	14.08.2004
10	Dhirubhai 18	-	14.04.2005
11	Dhirubhai 19	-	14.04.2005
12	Dhirubhai 22	-	01.08.2005
13	Dhirubhai 23	-	24.10.2005
14	Dhirubhai 26	24.06.2006	26.06.2006
15	Dhirubhai 29	23.02.2007	20.04.2007
16	Dhirubhai 30	23.02.2007	20.04.2007
17	Dhirubhai 31	09.03.2007	08.05.2007
18	Dhirubhai 34	14.05.2007	09.07.2007
19	Dhirubhai 42	07.07.2008	11.07.2008

Annexure 4.3

Delays in submission /review or approval of Appraisal Programme / Declaration of Commerciality/ Development Plan

Issues	Audit Observations	Reply of MoPNG (July 2011)	Audit Remarks
Appraisal Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a delay in review of Appraisal programme and work programme and budget in respect of Dhirubhai- 42 gas discovery (1½ month) and Dhirubhai- 29, 30, 31 and 34 gas discoveries (5½ months). Timeline prescribed in Article 21.5.3 of PSC was not adhered to in this case. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoPNG stated that reviews of the discoveries were delayed as the contractor submitted the required data on piece meal basis. However, since the contractor had to carryout appraisal programme as per PSC timeline, the delayed review may not affect the timeline for submission of DOC. However, MoPNG stated that they had noted the audit observations for future course of action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reply is not satisfactory. The timeline for submission of DOC is linked to the date of notification of a discovery and not to the date of review. The delayed review may affect the timeline for submission of DOC. Therefore, it does affect the objective of doing prompt exploration work.
Commercial Discovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Management Committee reviewed (January 2008) the DoC proposal (December 2005) in respect of eight satellite gas discoveries viz. Dhirubhai-4, 6, 7, 8, 16, 19, 22 and 23 after two years of submission of the DoC proposal. DoC proposals in respect of Dhirubhai-2 and 3 discoveries were reviewed (January 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While giving reasons for delays in review of DoC in respect of the discoveries, MoPNG stated that evaluation of DoCs took more time due to incomplete / partial / piecemeal submission of data by the contractor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reply is not satisfactory, as non-adherence to the prescribed timelines indicates lack of coordination between DGH and contractor and also in view of the fact that such delays defeat the objective of achieving timely development/ production of petroleum resources of the country.

	<p>2004) after a delay of 1½ month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews of DoC were awaiting in respect of Dhirubhai- 29, 30 and 31 (since August 2010) and Dhirubhai- 34 (since January 2010). • Timelines prescribed in Article 21.5.5 of PSC was not adhered to in these cases. 		
Submission /approval of FDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The operator submitted (July 2008) a combined FDP for nine discoveries as satellite discoveries viz. D-2 (submitted three years after the due date of March 2005) D-4, D-6, D-7, D-8, D-16, D-19, D-22 and D-23. Since FDP proposal was found to be non-viable from the techno-economic point of view, DGH informed (March 2009) the operator to convene a meeting and address the issue. Subsequently, after holding of meetings/correspondences between RIL and DGH, RIL submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoPNG stated (July 2011) that the satellite discoveries were of small pools located in different water depth and scattered across the block. Due to sheer small size of the discoveries and considerable inter discovery distances it required a detailed technical and financial evaluation. After detailed in-house evaluation and series of deliberation, technical meetings with contractor besides engaging reputed consultant, the FDP had been finally evaluated at DGH. Evaluation of FDP took more time due to incomplete/partial/piecemeal submission of data by the contractor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The delays are not in consonance with PSC provisions. Further, the delay in submission of FDP in respect of D-2 discovery had not been explained by MoPNG.

	<p>(December 2009) an optimized FDP in respect of four discoveries viz. D-2, D-6, D-19 and D-22, which awaited approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FDP of Dhirubhai-26 discovery was approved (April 2008) after 2 months of the due date on account of delay in submission of clarification by contractor and signing of Resolution by MC. • Timelines prescribed in Articles 21.5.6, 21.5.7 and 10.8 of PSC were not followed in these cases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As regards approval of FDP of Dhirubhai 26 discovery, MoPNG stated that evaluation of FDP was completed at DGH on 20.12.07 and the same day they communicated to the operator to convene MC Meeting on 28.02.08. After series of clarification / communication for finalisation of draft MC Resolution, MC Resolution was signed on 17.04.08. From this, it could be seen that evaluation of FDP at DGH, MC meeting to deliberate/approve the FDP was convened within PSC timeline but the MC Resolution was signed on 17.04.08. 	
--	--	--	--

Details of activities showing delay in taking action as per time line approved in the IDP for D-1 & D-3 Gas Fields

Major development related aspects to be completed as per approved plan and were as under:-

- Drilling of 14 wells in the initial phase till commencement of production to reach the plateau production of 40 millions cubic meter per day (MMSCMD).
- Installation of all subsea facilities, including well flow-lines, Subsea manifolds, Deepwater Pipelines End Manifold (DWPLEMS), Shallow Water Pipelines End Manifold (SWPLEMS), Gas Evacuation pipelines from DWPLEMS to SWPLEMS, Gas Evacuation pipelines SWPLEMS to onshore Terminal, infield Pipelines from manifold to Deepwater Pipelines End Manifold (DWPLEMS), MEG (Methanol E Glycols) lines.
- Onshore Terminal (OT) and Processing Trains.

Audit observed that major activities carried out by the contractor after approval of Development plan till October 2006 which were not in-line with the time schedule of the approved plan were as follows:

Concept and FEED

- Work for concept and FEED was completed in February 2004. However, instead of starting the work as per FEED and the approved development plan in November 2004, contractor initiated FEED up-dation in January 2006.

Project Consultancy

- RFQs for appointment of Project Management Consultant was issued in December 2005 and work awarded in January 2006.

Drilling of development wells

- Well proposal for drilling two development wells D6-A10 and D6-B7, was submitted to MC on 2nd April 2005, which was approved on 17th May 2005. Drilling of two development wells D6 A-10A and D6-B7 was completed on 25th October 2005 and 11th December 2005 respectively.
- Well proposals for drilling of four wells D6-A9, D6-A16, D6-A13 and D6-B13 was submitted to the MC and approved by the MC on 16th August 2006.
- Casings and Tubulars for Development drilling ordered in April 2006.

- Work for Design of Well Completions was awarded in April 2006 and design freeze for well completions was done in October 2006.

Onshore Terminal and Associated Facilities

- Work for dredging for extraction of fill material at Onshore Terminal (OT) site was awarded on 24th October 2005 and work commenced at the site on 30th March 2006 and major work was completed on 28th August 2006.
- RFQs for detailed engineering for OT were issued on 20th December 2005 and work for construction of On shore facilities and associated work was awarded on 29th May 2006.
- RFQs for MEG Regeneration/Reclamation and Slug Catchers were issued in May 2006 and work awarded in August 2006.
- RFQs Gas Dehydration and TEG Regeneration issued in June 2006 and work awarded in September 2006
- RFQs for Turbine generators were issued in July 2006.

Offshore Production Facilities

- RFQs for long lead packages 1& 2 and package 3 (line pipes) were issued in January 2006 and work awarded in April 2006 and May 2006 respectively.
- RFQs for offshore installations were issued in March 2006 and work awarded in September 2006.
- Work for Reservoir Monitoring system was awarded in September 2006.
- Xmas Trees ordered in June 2006 with expected deliveries in October 2007-February 2008.
- Subsea control system, Umbilicals ordered in June 2006 with expected delivery in November 2007.
- Subsea structures and Tie-in including manifolds, valves and structures ordered with expected deliveries in end 2007 and early 2008.

D1-D3- IDP vs. AIDP: Development Cost Comparison of major elements

(Total cost and Spend figures in Million US\$)

Sl. No	Descriptions	Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per IDP submitted by the Operator in May 2004				Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per Addendum to IDP submitted by the Operator in Oct'2006				Spend up to Mar'08	Spend Up to Mar'09	Spend Up to Jun'09	Cost Impact w.r.t. Quantity Revisions, Rate Revisions, Time Over Run, Tendering Process Deficiencies, Post Contract Award Revisions
		Unit Cost	No. of Units	UO M	Cost	Total cost	Unit Cost	No. of Units	UOM	Cost	Total cost		
1	G&G Studies					24.5				19.63	24.57	25.53	
2	Reservoir and completion studies					10.9				9.27	12.98	13.75	
3	Development Wells					944.25				423.45	978.89	1022.4	There was reduction in the number of wells from 34 to 22 in the revised FDP, but cost per well was increased from US\$ 27.78 million to US\$ 52.94 million. Further, 18 wells were actually drilled till Jun'09 with average cost per well US\$ 56.8 million, i.e. actual cost more than double from FDP cost levels. Audit identified that one of the factors responsible for higher cost was non-finalisation of tenders, after bids invitation, for charter hire of deep drilling rig at lower day rates and also piece-meal hiring. Details of cost increases for other elements called for by Audit were not provided.

Sl. No	Descriptions	Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per IDP submitted by the Operator in May 2004					Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per Addendum to IDP submitted by the Operator in Oct'2006				Spend up to Mar'08	Spend Up to Mar'09	Spend Up to Jun'09	Cost Impact w.r.t. Quantity Revisions, Rate Revisions, Time Over Run, Tendering Process Deficiencies, Post Contract Award Revisions
		Unit Cost	No. of Units	UO M	Cost	Total cost	Unit Cost	No. of Units	UOM	Cost	Total cost			
4	Production Facilities					1348.79					2047.32	3664.17	3890.03	Abnormal upward revision in cost from US\$ 1.349 Billion (FDP level) to US\$ 3.735 Billion (Revised FDP level) and also actual spend till Jun'09 further increased by US\$ 155 million. Basis of estimations for each cost element with supporting documents used at FDP stage and the revised FDP stage were not provided to Audit. However, Audit observed issues relating to tendering, award and execution of contracts for Engineering, Design, EPIC, CRP, Sub-sea Control System, X-Mas Trees, Umbilicals, MEG Plant, Pipelines, On-Shore Terminal, Jetty, etc.
a.	Surveys and environmental clearance					9.14					10.603	10.603	10.603	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actual spend increase by US\$ 1.46 million from FDP levels. Details of cost increase w.r.t. FDP levels called for by Audit were not provided. Geo-technical Investigations estimated Cost almost double w.r.t. FDP levels. Actual spend under this sub-head and details of cost increase requested for by Audit were not intimated.
b.	Manifolds		10			46.85		6	11.8		37.93	78.25	78.25	There was reduction in number of manifolds from 10 to 6, but cost per manifold increased from US\$ 4.7 million to US\$ 11.8 million. Also actual spend further increased to US\$ 13.04 million per manifold, i.e. cost almost triple than FDP levels. Details of cost increase were not provided to Audit.

Sl. No	Descriptions	Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per IDP submitted by the Operator in May 2004				Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per Addendum to IDP submitted by the Operator in Oct'2006				Spend up to Mar'08	Spend Up to Mar'09	Spend Up to Jun'09	Cost Impact w.r.t. Quantity Revisions, Rate Revisions, Time Over Run, Tendering Process Deficiencies, Post Contract Award Revisions
		Unit Cost	No. of Units	UO	Cost	Total cost	Unit Cost	No. of Units	UOM	Cost	Total cost	Up to Mar'09	
c.	Pipelines and PLEM's					232.5				386.19	703.47	819.65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Estimated Cost almost triple than cost as initially approved FDP. 24" pipelines: There was upward revision in the quantity of pipes, tonnage of pipes, time required for pipelines laying as well as rates for purchases as well as laying the lines. Overall, there was cost increase by more than triple, excluding the cost of third 24" pipeline. 6" MEG Pipelines - 1,2 & 3 : Cost increase by more than six times from FDP levels. Details of cost increase were not provided to Audit. 12" Effluent Pipelines: Cost increase by five times from FDP levels. Details of cost increase were not provided to Audit. Deepwater PLEM: Cost increase more than double from FDP level. Details of cost increase were not provided to Audit.
d.	Subsea Control System and Umbilical's					358.01				353.51	642.05	667.64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated cost increase by more than double from FDP level. Details of cost increase from FDP level were not provided to Audit. However, Audit observed post bid revisions and post-award cost escalation as one of the reasons for higher spend. Jumpers/Connections: Cost increase more than eight times from FDP level. Details of cost increase were not provided to Audit. Tooling: Cost increase more than double from FDP level. Details of cost increase were not provided to Audit.
e.	Deepwater Pipeline					142.14				85.67	298.535	310.691	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost increase by more than double from FDP levels. Details of quantity, rate, time and total spend for Deepwater pipelines were not provided to Audit. However, Audit observed that one of the reasons for cost increase was delay in placement of order for pipelines, after bids invitation and also purchase of pipes at higher cost.

Sl. No	Descriptions	Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per IDP submitted by the Operator in May 2004				Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per Addendum to IDP submitted by the Operator in Oct'2006				Spend up to Mar'08	Spend Up to Mar'09	Spend Up to Jun'09	Cost Impact w.r.t. Quantity Revisions, Rate Revisions, Time Over Run, Tendering Process Deficiencies, Post Contract Award Revisions
		Unit Cost	No. of Units	UO M	Cost	Total cost	Unit Cost	No. of Units	UOM	Cost	Total cost		
f.	Onshore Terminal including site grading					192.08							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost almost triple in the revised FDP in comparison to the FDP approved cost in Nov'04. Further, actual spend till June 2009 was more than four times the initial FDP approved cost. Audit observed that one of the reasons for cost increase was award of contracts for Onshore Terminal at non-competitive prices on the basis of single priced bid and also on cost plus basis. Audit also observed post contract award revisions/ change orders having cost as well as time impact. OT Equipments: Cost increase more than triple from FDP levels. Details of cost increase were not provided to Audit. Slug Catcher: Cost almost triple w.r.t. FDP levels. Audit observed non-placement of repeat order for a Slug catcher was one of the reasons for cost increase. Other Cost (including piping, instrumentation, spares, installation costs, OT compression facilities etc): Cost increase more than two and a half times. Details of quantity, rate, time and total spend for different cost elements under the sub-head were not provided to Audit.
g.	Compressions					196.46				0	0	0	Redesign at revised FDP stage.

Sl. No	Descriptions	Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per IDP submitted by the Operator in May 2004				Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per Addendum to IDP submitted by the Operator in Oct'2006				Spend up to Mar'08	Spend Up to Mar'09	Spend Up to Jun'09	Cost Impact w.r.t. Quantity Revisions, Rate Revisions, Time Over Run, Tendering Process Deficiencies, Post Contract Award Revisions
		Unit Cost	No. of Units	UO M	Cost	Total cost	Unit Cost	No. of Units	UOM	Cost	Total cost		
h.	Control cum riser platform					0				392.14	539,211	539,872	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New facility added. As per FDP approved in Nov'2004, there was no plan to create CRP and production was planned without the CRP facility. Further, actual spend till June 2009 increased by another 20% from the cost approved in the revised FDP. • Engineering: Audit observed that there were post award revisions/change orders, having impact of cost escalation. As against the price of US\$23.92 million indicated in the contract, actual billed amount till 1st March 2008 was US\$ 36.72 million, showing 53.51 percent increase. • Project management: Audit observed that there were post contract award revisions/change orders, having impact of cost escalation. Percentage increase noticed for man-hours spent till February 2008 for different project management activities w.r.t. the man-hours indicated there-against in the contract ranged from 15 percent upto 108 percent. • Procurement of steel and bulks for jacket/ Piles & Appurtenances/ Decks and Procurement of tagged items & equipments: Audit observed that there were post contract award revisions/change orders, having impact of cost escalation. Percentage increase noticed in the amount billed till 1st March 2008 for different procurement activities vis-à-vis the price indicated there-against in the contract ranged from 14 percent upto 97 percent. • Fabrication loadout and seafastening: Audit observed that there were post award revisions/change orders, having impact of cost escalation. As against the price of US\$ 46.70 million indicated in the contract, actual billed amount till 1st March 2008 was US\$ 94.02 million, showing 101 percent increase. <p>The Operator was asked to provide the details of quantity, rates, time and total spend under each cost element, which was, however, not provided.</p>

Sl. No	Descriptions	Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per IDP submitted by the Operator in May 2004				Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per Addendum to IDP submitted by the Operator in Oct'2006				Spend up to Mar'08	Spend Up to Mar'09	Spend Up to Jun'09	Cost Impact w.r.t. Quantity Revisions, Rate Revisions, Time Over Run, Tendering Process Deficiencies, Post Contract Award Revisions	
		Unit Cost	No. of Units	UO M	Cost	Total cost	Unit Cost	No. of Units	UOM					Cost
i.	Vent system					0				12.85	4.19	42.213	42.213	New element added, which was not required as per FDP approved in Nov'04.
j.	Vessel MOB-DEMOB					91.18				366.89	134.08	297.17	293.81	Cost increase more than four times. Details of quantity, rates, time and total spend under the cost element were not provided to Audit.
k.	Engineering cost					40.04				59.53	45.03	49.36	49.7	Actual spend till June 2009 increase by US\$ 9 million w.r.t. FDP approved cost in Nov'2004. Audit observed post award revisions having cost escalation impact.
l.	CVA cost					17.16				47.63	4.77	7.02	8.99	Reasons for lower spend under the cost element were not provided to Audit.
m.	Project Management cost					114.4				212.62	155.46	282.97	295.57	Increase in the cost approved in Dec'2006 by more than 85% w.r.t. FDP cost approved in Nov'2004. Further, actual spend was 39% more than the revised FDP cost.
5	Eco-protection					1.58				4.3	0.96	2.63	2.73	
6	G&A					13.5				20.5	19.71	79.06	80.07	Cost increase by more than five times from FDP level and more than three times from revised FDP levels. Basis of estimation at FDP and revised FDP levels and also details of abnormally higher spend were not provided to Audit.
7	Abandonment					0				0	0	0	0	
8	Information Technology					0				9.46	0.61	3.11	3.45	

Sl. No	Descriptions	Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per IDP submitted by the Operator in May 2004					Cost Break-up of Major Cost elements as per Addendum to IDP submitted by the Operator in Oct'2006				Spend up to Mar'08	Spend Up to Mar'09	Spend Up to Jun'09	Cost Impact w.r.t. Quantity Revisions, Rate Revisions, Time Over Run, Tendering Process Deficiencies, Post Contract Award Revisions
		Unit Cost	No. of Units	UO M	Cost	Total cost	Unit Cost	No. of Units	UOM	Cost	Total cost	Up to Mar'09	Up to Jun'09	
9	Kakinada Captive Berth					0					54.96	19.86	20.71	Details of cost approved in the revised FDP and reasons for lower spend were not provided to Audit.
10	Owned Support, Intervention Vessel and Helicopter					0					150	9.58	9.58	Details of cost approved in the revised FDP and details of US\$ 20.31 million spend upto March 2008 were not provided to Audit.
11	Overhead @ 2%					46.87					0	0	0	Details of FDP and revised FDP approved costs and actual spend under the sub-head were not provided to Audit.
12	Exchange Loss/Gain					0					0	-6.57	-2.79	
13	ML/Licence Fee/Dead Rent					0					0	0.14	0	
Grand Total						2390.38					5196.6	4788.42	5056.46	

Details of discoveries

S.No.	Name of the Discovery	Date of Discovery	Date of intimation (Article 9.1 b of PSC)		Date of completion of test to determine whether discovery is of potential commercial interest Article 9.1 c of PSC)	Date of drilling of last appraisal well (Article 9.3 of PSC)	Date of advice by operator in writing notice about commerciality of discovery to MC after completion of last appraisal well (Article 9.4 of PSC)	Date of DoC	Submission of FDP	Approval of FDP
			Due	Actual						
1	Guda	23.07.1999	22.08.1999	01.08.1999	10.09.1999	28.09.2005	Not available			
2	Saraswati	29.10.2001	28.11.2001	16.11.2001	21.11.2001	28.03.2004	11.01.2002	15.10.2004	30.12.2005	27.05.2006
3	Raageshwari Oil	25.12.2002	24.01.2003	04.02.2003	07.02.2003	02.04.2005	28.03.2003	15.10.2004	30.12.2005	27.05.2006
	GRF-1 (part of Guda)			01.11.2003	15.01.2004		06.02.2004			
4	Kameshwari	21.09.2003	21.10.2003	13.10.2003	14.11.2003	No appraisal well drilled	05.12.2003			
5	Mangala	20.01.2004	19.02.2004	23.01.2004	31.01.2004	06.01.2006	10.03.2004	15.10.2004	30.12.2005	27.05.2006
6	Aishwariya	05.03.2004	04.04.2004	09.03.2004	13.03.2004	15.04.2005	30.04.2004	15.10.2004	30.12.2005	27.05.2006
7	Vijaya	28.08.2004	27.09.2004	07.09.2004	23.09.2004	08.10.2005	17.10.2005			
8	Bhagyam	07.08.2004	06.09.2004	10.08.2004	25.08.2004	14.02.2006	21.10.2004	14.11.2006	11.10.2007	18.03.2008
9	Shakti	18.04.2004	18.05.2004	21.04.2004	22.04.2004	17.11.2004	04.06.2004	14.11.2006	Not submitted	-

10	Raag Deep gas	25.12.2002	24.01.2003	11.01.2005	07.02.2003	15.03.2006	28.03.2003	15.10.2004	30.12.2005	27.05.2006
11	Vandana	07.08.2004	06.09.2004	19.05.2005	24.11.2004	03.09.2005	21.06.2005			
12	N-I	18.05.2005	17.06.2005	16.06.2005	09.06.2005	21.08.2005	24.01.2006			
13	GSV	04.07.2005	03.08.2005	08.11.2005	20.10.2005	06.08.2006	24.01.2006			
14	N-C-West	04.07.2005	03.08.2005	08.11.2005	11.08.2005	No appraisal well drilled	24.01.2006			
15	Bhagyam South	03.12.2005	02.01.2006	27.12.2005	12.12.2006	No appraisal well drilled	22.02.2007			
16	N-E	09.01.2006	08.02.2006	19.01.2006	12.01.2006	31.01.2006	16.06.2006			
17	N-P	06.04.2006	06.05.2006	20.04.2006	22.04.2006	26.06.2006	06.02.2007			
18	Mangala Barmer Hill	20.01.2004	19.02.2004	20.04.2006	15.07.2006	20.01.2009	Not submitted			
19	Shakti-NE-1	21.10.2006	20.11.2006	13.11.2006	19.11.2006	No appraisal well drilled	22.01.2007			
20	K-W-2	21.11.2006	21.12.2006	16.12.2006	27.11.2006	26.06.2007	06.07.2007	24.12.2008	08.07.2009	Not approved
21	N-I-North	21.11.2005	21.12.2005	14.02.2007	04.12.2006	No appraisal well drilled	09.03.2007			
22	K-W-3	13.12.2006	12.01.2007	09.05.2007	24.12.2006	14.08.2007	06.07.2007	24.12.2008	08.07.2009	Not approved
23	Saraswati-Crest-1	05.05.2007	04.06.2007	17.05.2007	12.05.2007	No appraisal well drilled	13.07.2007			
24	K-W-6	20.07.2007	19.08.2007	10.08.2007	22.07.2007	No appraisal well drilled	13.09.2007	24.12.2008	08.07.2009	Not approved
25	Raageshwari-East-1z/Tukaram	24.11.2008	24.12.2008	16.12.2008	29.11.2008	19.03.2010	Not submitted			

Cost estimates as per original and revised FDP

(US\$ million)

Item No.	Description	Original FDP Approved	Revised approved FDP	Variance
DO1	Seismic	26.70	32.75	6.5
DO3	Development Studies	27.37	43.57	16.20
DO4	Well construction	433.08	698.80	265.72
DO5	Project management	67.25	167.52	100.27
DO7	Engineering	59.93	91.37	31.44
DO8	Surface facilities	513.40	1038.03	524.63
D10	Commissioning	15.80	13.51	-2.29
D12	Re-operations	18.53	76.30	57.77
D21	Land	4.81	5.47	0.66
D94	Insurance	3.67	5.28	1.61
D95	Base Office cost	14.11	18.41	4.30
D98	G&A	34.76	42.31	7.55
Sub total		1219.41	2233.31	1013.90
UAP	CONTINGENCY	22.20	111.67	89.47
Sub total		1241.61	2344.98	1103.37
D99	PCO	-	22.33	22.33
	Mangala field Dev.cost	-	2367.31	2367.31
	Mangala pipeline cost	-	941.05	941.05
	Mangala EOR pilot cost	-	35.61	35.61
Grand total		1241.61	3343.97	2102.36

Observations on award of contracts

Contracts awarded on nomination / single source basis

Sl No	Brief of observation	Amount Paid till 31.03.2008 (US\$ million)
1	The operator issued (May 2007) tenders for supply, erection and commissioning of steam system package (shop fabricated skid mounted integral package boilers) to seven parties shortlisted on the basis of expression of interest, to which ten parties had responded. Four of the seven bidders, however, declined with only three remaining in the fray. Bids were evaluated technically. Thermax emerged as the sole technically qualified bidder to undertake the scope of work. Operator awarded (October 2007) the contract (s) to Thermax at Rs 683,531,100 for supply and Rs 101,348,720 for erection and supervision services during commissioning. Amount paid till 31 March 2008 was US\$ 6,039,993.	6.04
2	The operator received only one bid from JP Kenny, against the tender issued to 8 bidders, for provision of Oil Export Pipeline Conceptual Design Study for Barmer Salaya Pipeline (BSPL) Project. The bid of JP Kenny was accepted and the contract was awarded for Pre-Front End Engineering Design (Pre-FEED)/BSPL Project. The expenditure incurred on pre-FEED was US\$ 1.30 million. Thereafter, two more contracts viz: (i) FEED+ (basically a detailed design development sufficient to prepare Long Lead Item procurement Packages); and (ii) for supply of Project Personnel to the proposed Pipeline Integrated Project Management Team were awarded to JP Kenny for US\$ 15.18 million and US\$ 10 million respectively, inter-alia, stating that the contractor was involved since early concept stages. The approval / review of OC/MC were required for contracts on single source/nomination basis for awards in excess of US\$ 0.50 million, which was not obtained. Further, by splitting work, the advantage of economies of scale was not availed.	14.50
3	Contract for Detailed Design & Engineering (DDE) for Mangala Oil & Raageshwari Gas Development Project was awarded to Mustang Engineering (Mustang) for US\$ 62.6 million for a three year period, Mustang being the only bidder. The operator sent a team to Mustang's location in America to assess their capability, and the team assessed that Mustang, with a very experienced Project Management Team, had a very clear view of how the project could be organized to complete it on a fast track basis. However, subsequently, due to slow progress of work (little more than 60%), the contract was terminated, as slippage in progress would have a detrimental impact on construction operations.	68.91
Total		89.45

Contract awarded without assessing reasonability of rates

Sl No	Brief of observation	Amount (US\$ million)
1.	The operator issued tenders for Supply of High Capacity Pump Packages to six bidders. Four parties declined, one did not respond and the remaining one (DMW) requested for extension of bid submission date, which was extended to 23 March 2007. However, no response was received from them also. Operator approached GE Oil & Gas-Kirloskar (GE) and DMW for their interest in submitting proposal. GE submitted (May 2007) their bid and award was made (September 2007) on them for US\$ 19.45 million (revised budgeted cost estimated at US\$ 9.00 million). Reasons for wide difference between the revised estimated cost and awarded cost were not available in the records.	1.94
Total		1.94

Extensions beyond contractual provisions/non-availing of economies of scale

Sl No	Brief of observation	Amount (US\$ million)
1	A contract for work over/service rigs was awarded (May 2004) to John Energy for a primary period of twelve months at a cost of US\$ 2.20 million. The contract was extended five times till 14 April 2007, in contravention of contractual provisions which provided for only two extensions of six months each.	7.12
2	Against tender for provision of drilling and completion fluids and solid control equipments and services, four bids were received and were found technically qualified. Price bids were opened, with Baker Hughes emerging the lowest bidder and contract at a cost of US\$ 5.72 million was awarded on 26 July 2004 for six months with option of three extensions of six months each. It was observed that the contract was extended eight times, besides 11 variations, till 25 January 2008. Total payment made to Baker was US\$ 13.51 million. Thus benefit of economies of scale, which were likely to accrue for a contract/extension of longer duration, remained to be availed. The total cost of contract including extensions and variations was US\$ 20.22 million.	13.51
Total		20.63
Grand Total		112.02

Deficiencies regarding submission of reports

S. No	Name of block	Deficiencies regarding submission of reports
1	KK-DWN-2003/1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Out of nine quarterly reports, which were due for submission during April 2006 to April 2008, only two reports were found on record. Annual local procurement statement for 2006-07 was not found on record.
2	MB-OSN-97/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one local procurement statement for 2002-03 was found on record, which was also submitted after a delay of one year. Only one End of Year statement was found on record, which was submitted after a delay of 23 days. Only a few quarterly reports pertaining to the block were found on record, some of which were also submitted after delays ranging between 1 ½ to 5 months.
3	KG-DWN-98/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were delays in submission of annual reports outlining contractor's achievement in utilizing Indian resources (3 and 4 months for 2004-05 and 2006-07 respectively).
4	KG-OSN-2001/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were delays in submission of annual reports outlining contractor's achievement in utilizing Indian resources (4 and 1 ½ months for 2006-07 and 2007-08 respectively).
5	MN-DWN-2004/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a delay in submission of annual reports outlining contractor's achievement in utilizing Indian resources (1 ½ month for 2007-08)
6	NEC-DWN-2002/1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were delays of 1 ½ to 4 months in submission of annual report outlining contractor's achievement in utilizing Indian resources. Due to non-production of cost recovery statements, statements of cost, expenditure/receipts etc. to audit timely submission thereof could not be verified.
7	CB-OS/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 2 to 15 percent of contracts were awarded to Indian Vendors during 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2004-05 (records for 2003-04 were not furnished). In August 2005, the contractor had reported that he would take necessary steps to improve its achievements, however, compliance in this regard could not be verified in audit, as no further reports were submitted by the contractor for the years 2005-06 and 2006-07 as on April 2008.
8	Hazira	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance regarding submission of annual local procurement statements could not be verified, as relevant records were not made available to audit.
9	CB-ONN-	

S. No	Name of block	Deficiencies regarding submission of reports
	2000/1	
10	CB-ON/1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely submission of quarterly and annual reports could not be verified in respect of these blocks, due to non-production of relevant records to audit.
11	KK-DWN-2000/2	
12	MB-OSN-2004/2	
13	RJ-ONN-2002/1	

Statement showing delays in submission of Annual Audited Accounts

Name o f the block	Year	Date of submission	Delay in submission
KG-OSN-2001/2	2004-05	12.07.05	42 days
	2006-07	16.07.07	45 days
	2007-08	23.06.08	23 days
KK-DWN-2003-1	2006-07	26.6.07	25 days
	2007-08	23.6.08	22 days
NEC-DWN-2002/1	2004-05	12.7.05	42days
	2005-06	23.6.06	23 days
	2006-07	19.7.07	49 days
	2007-08	23.6.08	23 days
MN-DWN-2004/3	2007-08	20.6.08	20 days

Statement showing Delays in approval of Audited Accounts

Name of the block	Year	Date of submission	Date of approval	Delay in approval
KG-OSN-2001/2	2003-04	25.05.04	6.08.05	1 ½ month
	2004-05	12.07.05	8.12.05	4 months
	2006-07	16.07.07	3.06.08	9 ½ months
KK-DWN-2003-1	2005-06	30.5.06	7.9.06	2 months
	2006-07	26.6.07	24.9.07	2 months
NEC-DWN-2002/1	2004-05	12.7.05	18.11.05	3 months
	2006-07	19.7.07	15.10.07	2 months
MN-DWN-2004/3	2007-08	20.6.08	20.8.08	1 month
KG-DWN-98/3	2000-01	21.9.02	29.12.03	14 months
	2001-02	21.9.02	29.12.03	14 months
	2002-03	28.5.03	17.3.05	20 ½ months
	2003-04	25.5.04	7.1.06	18 months
	2004-05	12.7.05	10.4.06	8 months
	2006-07	16.7.07	14.11.08	15 months

Delays in submission of Annual Work Programmes and Budget

Name of the block	Exploration/ Appraisal/ Development/Production Budget	Year	Date of submission	Delay in submission
KG-DWN-98/3	Exploration	2004-05	5.2.04	1 month
		2005-06	14.2.05	1 ½ month
		2006-07	31.3.06	3 months
	Development	2005-06	27.10.05	10 months
2007-08		23.2.07	2 months	
Hazira	Development/ Production	2003-04	6.5.03	4 months
		2004-05	27.7.04	7 months
		2005-06	17.2.05	1 ½ months
		2006-07	31.3.06	3 months
CB-OS-2	Development/ Production	2004-05	4.3.04	2 months
		2005-06	8.4.05	3 months
		2006-07	9.3.06	2 months
		2007-08	9.3.07	2 months
KG-OSN-2001/2	Exploration	2004-05	26.2.04	2 months
		2005-06	1.3.05	2 months
		2006-07	18.2.06	1 ½ months
MB-OSN-97/3	Exploration	2005-06	14.2.05	1 ½ months
NEC-DWN-2002/1	Exploration	2005-06	31.1.05	1 month
		2006-07	17.5.06	4 ½ months
CB-ONN-2000/1	Exploration	2003-04	15.04.03	3 ½ months
		2004-05	21.06.04	5 ½ months
		2005-06	01.04.05	3 months
		2006-07	24.07.06	6 ½ months
CB-ON/1	Exploration	2004-05	4.03.04	2 months
		2005-06	8.06.05	5 months

KK-DWN-2000/2		2006-07	14.06.06	5 ½ months
		2007-08	13.03.07	2 ½ months
	Exploration	2002-03	11.02.02	1 ½ month
RJ-ON-90/1	Development	2006	5.4.06	6 months
		2007	8.12.06	2 months
		(In these cases, due date of submission was 30 September)		
Panna-Mukta	Production Operations	2006-07	21.02.06	2 months
RJ-ONN-2002/1	Exploration	2007-08	28.2.07	2 months

Delays in review/approval of Annual Work Programme and Budget

Name of block	Nature of WP&B	Year	Delay in review/approval
KG-OSN-2001/2	Exploration	2004-05 (RE)	6.8.05 (reviewed after closure of the financial year)
		2005-06 (RE)	5.5.06 (reviewed after closure of the financial year)
KG-DWN-98/3	Exploration	2004-05 (RE)	25.5.05 (reviewed after closure of the financial year)
		2006-07 (RE)	23.7.07 (reviewed after closure of the financial year)
	Development	2006-07 (RE)	23.7.07 (approved after closure of the financial year)
CB-ONN-2000/1	Exploration	2003-04 (BE)	21.06.04 (reviewed after closure of the financial year)
		2004-05 (BE)	02.06.05 (reviewed after closure of the financial year)
		2005-06 (BE)	22.3.06 (reviewed in the last month of financial year)
		2006-07 (BE)	Not reviewed as of July 2008