

Annexes

Annex-2.1

Audit Sampling-Selection of Districts

(Refer to paragraph 2.1.5)

Sl. No.	State	District		Packages		Sanctioned cost of selected packages (₹ in crore)	Expenditure upto March 2015 on selected packages (₹ in crore)
		Total	Selected	Total	Selected		
1	Andhra Pradesh	13	3	278	68	97.46	33.37
2	Arunachal Pradesh	16	4	101	29	194.07	130.81
3	Assam	27	8	992	247	995.38	575.09
4	Bihar	38	10	4,054	1,034	2,069.23	1,159.14
5	Chhattisgarh	18	5	444	112	539.27	286.65
6	Goa ¹	2	2	0	0	0	0
7	Gujarat	26	7	264	70	374.01	238.07
8	Haryana	21	7	56	32	279.12	157.62
9	Himachal Pradesh	12	4	263	66	97.26	61.17
10	Jammu & Kashmir	22	6	500	138	477.49	280.66
11	Jharkhand	24	6	1,184	467	654.29	364.82
12	Karnataka	29	8	312	88	259.22	213.95
13	Kerala	14	4	241	62	108.27	66.80
14	Madhya Pradesh	51	13	1,145	316	1,192.08	966.47
15	Maharashtra	35	8	312	88	362.61	287.75
16	Manipur	9	4	333	64	178.31	103.33
17	Meghalaya	11	6	273	68	180.50	31.23
18	Mizoram	8	2	41	18	73.72	52.65
19	Nagaland	11	3	27	15	78.36	61.14
20	Odisha	30	9	2,192	551	1,037.28	779.70
21	Punjab	22	8	170	44	203.52	173.12
22	Rajasthan	33	8	612	168	412.94	296.21
23	Sikkim	4	2	102	27	114.45	94.55
24	Tamil Nadu	31	8	256	69	109.27	94.32
25	Telangana	10	2	136	38	46.96	42.34
26	Tripura	4	2	319	82	311.47	158.84
27	Uttar Pradesh	72	18	550	180	576.81	447.08
28	Uttarakhand	13	4	319	94	468.95	298.18
29	West Bengal	18	5	641	182	470.00	279.87
Total		624	176	16,117	4,417	11,962.30	7,734.93

¹ No road works were executed in Goa during the period covered under performance audit.

Annex-2.2
Details of Sampled Districts
(Refer to paragraph 2.1.5)

Sl. No.	State	Number of Selected Districts	Name of Selected Districts
1.	Andhra Pradesh	03	Anantapur, Nellore, Vizianagaram
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	04	Papum Pare, Anjaw, Lohit, West Siang
3.	Assam	08	Lakhimpur, Golaghat, Dhubri, Chirang, Nagaon, Cachar, Karimganj, Baksa
4.	Bihar	10	Bhagalpur, Gaya, Gopalganj, Katihar, Madhubani, Nawada, Purnea, Samastipur, Vaishali, West-Champaran
5.	Chhattisgarh	05	Raipur, Bilaspur, Rajnandgaon, Jashpur, Kanker
6.	Goa	02	North Goa, South Goa
7.	Gujarat	07	Banaskantha, Dahod, Jamnagar, Kutch, Panchmahals, Vadodara, Valsad
8.	Haryana	07	Panipat, Kaithal, Hisar, Sirsa, Jhajjar, Gurgaon, Yamunanagar
9.	Himachal Pradesh	04	Hamirpur, Kangra, Lahaul & Spiti, Kinnaur
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	06	Anantnag, Rajouri, Kishtwar, Kulgam, Kathua, Leh
11.	Jharkhand	06	Deoghar, Garhwa, Hazaribag, Jamtara, Simdega, West Singhbhum
12.	Karnataka	08 ²	Kolar, Ballari, Tumakuru, Kalaburagi, Gokak, Sira, Udupi, Hassan, Havari, Belagavi
13.	Kerala	04	Kannur, Malappuram, Ernakulam, Idukki
14.	Madhya Pradesh	13	Ashok Nagar, Betul, Balaghat, Chhindwara, Datia, Jhabua, Khargone, Ratlam, Rewa, Shajapur, Sagar, Vidisha, Umariya
15.	Maharashtra	08	Akola, Jalna, Hingoli, Dhule, Satara, Ratnagiri, Thane, Amravati
16.	Manipur	04	Imphal East, Thoubal, Senapati, Ukhrul
17.	Meghalaya	06	East Khasi Hills, Ri-Bhoi, West Garo Hills, East Garo Hills, North Garo Hills, South West Garo Hills
18.	Mizoram	02	Aizawl, Champhai
19.	Nagaland	03	Kiphire, Peren, Zunheboto

² 10 PIU

Sl. No.	State	Number of Selected Districts	Name of Selected Districts
20.	Odisha	09	Balangir, Balasore, Dhenkanal, Jajpur, Kalahandi, Koraput, Mayurbhanj, Rayagada and Sundargarh.
21.	Punjab	08	Amritsar, Bathinda, Hoshiarpur, Jalandhar, Mansa, Mukatsar, Pathankot, Sangrur
22.	Rajasthan	08	Bhilwara, Bundi, Churu, Dausa, Dungarpur, Kota, Nagaur, Udaipur
23.	Sikkim	02	East, South
24.	Tamil Nadu	08	Kancheepuram, Tiruvannamalai, Ariyalur, Pudukottai, The Nilagiri, Krishnagiri, Dindigul, Kanyakumari
25.	Telangana	02	Khammam, Mahbubnagar
26.	Tripura	02	Dhalai, West Tripura
27.	Uttar Pradesh	18	Agra, Allahabad, Basti, Chandauli, Deoria, Etawah, Faizabad, Fatehpur, Jalaun, Jhansi, Kannauj, Kashganj, Kushinagar , Maharajganj, Mathura, Moradabad, Sitapur, Shahjahanpur
28.	Uttarakhand	04	Almora, Chamoli, Nainital, Pauri
29.	West Bengal	05	North 24 PGS, Hooghly, Malda, Purba Medinipur, Uttar Dinajpur
	Total	176	

Annex-3.1
Deficiencies in Core Network
(Refer to paragraph 3.3.1)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4,380 unconnected habitations were shown as connected whereas 26 eligible unconnected habitations were not included in CNW (June 2014).
		In district Anantapur, discrepancies such as non-indication of the details of connected habitations, missing of sequential order while assigning road numbers to through/link routes, giving same road numbers to different through/link routes, showing emerging and termination point as one and the same were observed.
2.	Assam	In district Nagaon, in violation of programme guidelines, two Major District Roads (MDRs), Kampur to Jamunamukh and Sonaigaon to Dhing were sanctioned and constructed at a cost of ₹ 6.48 crore.
		In district Karimganj, a Through Route (TR) "Poamara to Cheragi Bazar" having length 31.95 km, eligible for upgradation, was proposed as new connectivity after dividing into five different roads in the CNW. Expenditure of ₹ 7.35 crore was incurred on construction of road.
3.	Bihar	6,551 eligible habitations were not included in the CNW due to absence of reliable data of unconnected habitations.
4.	Gujarat	278 habitations had incorrectly been shown as connected in CNW.
5.	Himachal Pradesh	Variations were noticed in data of habitations maintained by the Engineer-in-Chief, test checked districts and OMMAS.
6.	Jammu & Kashmir	Six habitations in two test checked districts were wrongly shown as connected in the CNW.
		1,171 habitations with population of 250 and above were not included in the CNW whereas an area inhabited by nomads (migrants) was included in CNW.
7.	Jharkhand	In three districts (Deoghar, Simdega and West Singhbhum), number of habitations provided connectivity, as of March 2010, exceeded the eligible habitations mentioned in the CNW.
		In contravention of the Operations Manual, in four districts, Deoghar, Garhwa, Hazaribagh and West Singhbhum, in respect of 203 ¹ roads, same identification number was allotted to more than one road within a block.
		In district Deoghar, 199 habitations (proposed by the Block Development Officers) were not included in the revised CNW.
		Six habitations having population of less than 500 were selected for connectivity though these districts did not belong to Schedule-V area.
		In two districts (Hazaribagh and Garhwa), in 27 roads, name and population of habitations appearing in DRRP, CNW and DPR did not match with each other.
8.	Karnataka	28 works were got sanctioned during 2013-14 under 'New Connectivity' as left out habitations. The state government replied that certain roads were left out from CNW due to misclassification of records earlier.
9.	Kerala	In district Idukki, habitation 'Edamalakudi' with population of 2,236, lying 12 km away from a motorable road, was wrongly reported as connected in the CNW.

¹Deoghar (08), Garhwa(88), Hazaribagh (40) and West Singhbhum (67)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
10.	Manipur	In three districts, Senapati, Imphal East and Ukhrul, eight habitations were categorised in incorrect population size. In district Thoubal, one eligible habitation (Khoidum) with a population of 488 persons (Census 2001), was not included in the CNW due to taking of incorrect population figure (205).
11.	Meghalaya	In districts RiBhoi and East Khasi Hills, 13 eligible unconnected habitations with population of more than 250 persons were not taken into CNWs.
12.	Odisha	4,035 eligible habitations were not included in DRRP as well as CNW. In district Dhenkanal, in violation of the provisions of programme guidelines, eight Major District Roads were upgraded at a cost of ₹ 17.50 crore.
13.	Rajasthan	In test checked districts, there were variations in data of habitations maintained by the SRRDA, NRRDA and OMMAS. In district Bhilwara, a road 'Chabaria to Bhuwana-Tej-ki-Jhopariya' was proposed for connecting two habitations ² under cluster approach despite having distance of more than 500 metres. In district Nagaur, a road 'Harsola to Rayco-ki-Dhani' with length 4.5 km was proposed. However, as per Linear Chart and Transect walk attached with the DPR, the distance between Harsola and Rayco-ki-Dhani was only 900 metres.
14.	Sikkim	There were discrepancies in the number of unconnected habitations and population.
15.	Telangana	In district Khammam, 140 unconnected habitations were projected as connected in the CNW. In district Mahbubnagar, CNW did not maintain sequential order while assigning road numbers to through/link routes. 15 eligible habitations pertaining to district Khammam (two habitations under Left Wing Effected (LWE) with population 250-499), and two habitations (Pallechelka Thanda and Gurranguda) with population 500+ in district Mahbubnagar were not included in the CNW.
16.	Tripura	17 eligible unconnected habitations were not included in the CNW.
17.	Uttar Pradesh	6,221 habitations with population 500-999 were not included in the CNW.
18.	Uttarakhand	Six eligible habitations with population of 250 and above in the selected districts were not included in the CNW. 190 unconnected habitations were wrongly shown as connected. The Ministry stated (April 2016) that the state had reconciled the unconnected eligible habitations both on paper and OMMAS. The reply of the Ministry was not acceptable as these 190 unconnected habitations are still depicted as connected in the CNW.
19.	West Bengal	In test checked districts, 86 habitations though unconnected were shown as connected in CNW.

²Bhuwana-Tej-ka-Jhoparia and Bhuwana-Teja-ka-Barda

Annex-3.2
Variation in Road Length
(Refer to paragraph 3.3.2)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Assam	In three districts, 16 roads had variation (excess 41.71 km) in length on actual execution compared to length mentioned in CNW.
2.	Jammu & Kashmir	In five out of six test checked districts, in eight roads, actual length was found to be in excess by a total of 19.27 km when compared to the length mentioned in CNW, whereas, in 23 roads, the length was found to be short by 57.76 km.
3.	Jharkhand	In test checked districts, the actual length of road mentioned in DPRs were in excess by a total of 284.75 km in 239 roads when compared to the length mentioned in CNW, whereas the actual length was short by 284.26 km in 180 roads.
4.	Kerala	In three test checked districts, 17 roads had variation (exceeded by 31 km) in length on actual execution compared to length mentioned in CNW.
5.	Madhya Pradesh	Out of 640 roads analysed under completed packages, 594 roads had variation in length on actual execution compared to road length mentioned in CNW. In 427 works, variations ranged from 10 to 339 <i>per cent</i> . In 184 roads, length exceeded by 258.44 km whereas in 243 roads, length was reduced by 496.54 km.
6.	Odisha	In eight test checked districts, during 2010-15, contracts for 112 roads were awarded for length of 433.63 km against the length of 307.55 km as per CNW.
7.	Punjab	In three out of eight test checked districts, length of road mentioned in DPRs were exceeded by 15.76 km in six roads whereas reduced by 1.93 km in two roads when compared to length mentioned in CNW.
8.	Tamil Nadu	In district Udhamandalam, actual execution of a road length exceeded by 0.45 km when compared with CNW.
9.	Uttarakhand	In three out of four test checked districts, length of road mentioned in DPRs were exceeded by 33.36 km in five roads when compared to length mentioned in CNW.

Annex-3.3
Selection of inadmissible road projects
(Refer to paragraph 3.3.5)

Sl. No	State	Observations
1.	Bihar	In block Patepur of district Vaishali, a road L032 to Paswan Tola, (package no- BR-36R-171) having length 457 metre as against the required minimum length of 500 metre under the programme was sanctioned and expenditure of ₹ 0.14 crore was incurred up to March 2015.
2.	Gujarat	In district Panchmahal, habitation (Tadgam Falia), located on Through Route (Gothib-Batkwada-Simalia), was provided road connectivity (Simalia to Tadgamfalia) in July 2009 at a cost of ₹ 0.45 crore.
		In district Panchmahal, in violation of the programme guidelines, construction of internal road (JunaKheda Bhedi Falia) of village in taluka Santrampur was completed in April 2013 at a cost of ₹ 1.26 crore.
3.	Himachal Pradesh	Expenditure of ₹ 0.51 crore was incurred on two packages (HP0464 and HP04115) against the provisions of the guidelines as their path distance was less than 1.5 km from an all-weather road.
4.	Jammu & Kashmir	In two selected districts, seven road works being less than 1.5 km from all-weather road were constructed at a cost of ₹ 6.97 crore.
5.	Madhya Pradesh	In district Shajapur, a road from Shujalpur Mandi Kalapipal to Bhugor (package no. 3942) with length less than 500 metre was constructed at a cost of ₹ 0.05 crore.
6.	Meghalaya	In two selected districts, 22 habitations having path distance less than 1.5 km from all weather roads provided connectivity at a cost of ₹ 1.79 crore.
7.	Odisha	15 road projects (5.883 km) located within 500 metre from an all-weather road/connected habitation were taken up during 2008-13 and expenditure of ₹ 5.94 crore was incurred.
		In district Kalahandi, a road work from "Chichiguda to Shantipur" (package no. OR-15-200/XII) was taken up to connect Shantipur as a targeted habitation despite the fact that it was located only at a distance of 450 metres from PWD road to Chichiguda.
8.	Sikkim	25 road works at a cost of ₹ 13.20 crore were taken up despite within 1.5 km from all-weather road or connected habitations. The department replied that roads were sanctioned on the basis of urgent public demand.
9.	Tamil Nadu	Upgradation of a road "Anandanar- Gnanadasapuram 0/0 km to 1/0 km" was taken up and executed at a cost of ₹ 0.41 crore, whereas Anandanar is a channel with road existing along the channel bank and Gnanadasapuram was approximately 200 metre away from the channel road and balance 800 metre goes beyond the village. The execution of the work at a cost of ₹ 0.41 crore was against the guidelines. The Ministry replied (April 2016) that execution of the work was not against the guidelines but did not specify the criteria for its eligibility under the programme.
10.	Uttarakhand	In district Pauri, two roads were included in the CNW despite having path distance less than 1.5 km.

Annex-3.4
Deficiency in preparation of CNCPL/CUPL
(Refer to paragraph 3.5)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1	Arunachal Pradesh	In selected districts, 107 roads for connecting 160 habitations with a population below 250 persons were included in the block level CNCPL. As a result, four ineligible habitations were provided connectivity by incurring an expenditure of ₹ 9.78 crore.
2	Bihar	In selected districts, 110 roads of CNW, eligible for upgradation only, were included both in CNCPL and CUPL.
3	Himachal Pradesh	CUPL was prepared without conducting PCI survey.
4	Jharkhand	In the selected districts, 616 roads were found included in both CNCPL and CUPL. In four districts, 32 habitations with population less than 250 were included in CNCPL. In district Hazaribagh, seven roads were taken up for up-gradation though the habitations were shown unconnected in CNW.
5	Manipur	In district Thoubal, the CUPL was prepared on the basis of population of habitations. Prioritisation of roads based on PCI index and other factors viz., road type, Average Annual Daily Traffic, etc., were not found in CUPL. Five roads were found included in the CNCPL for those habitations which were shown as connected in the CNW.
6	Meghalaya	In four selected districts, 354 habitations of population size less than 250 were included in the CNCPL. In four selected districts, 161 roads had been reflected in both CNCPL and CUPL.
7	Nagaland	The CNCPL had figured more eligible habitation in comparison to CNW.
8	Sikkim	CUPL was prepared without conducting PCI survey. The State Nodal Agency replied that PCI survey report was being maintained, however, neither the reports were furnished nor copies of reports supplied with the reply.
9	Tripura	CUPL was prepared without conducting PCI survey.
10	Uttar Pradesh	In sampled districts, CUPL was prepared arbitrarily for each phase as each time new entries of roads were made while uncovered roads from the earlier list were ignored. No prioritisation exercise was done while drawing CUPL and roads were arranged in the order of PCI. Factors viz., population and traffic density for selecting the roads for up-gradation was not considered in any of the sampled districts.
11	Uttarakhand	14 roads were found included in the CNCPL of respective blocks for those habitations which were either already shown as connected or the roads were proposed for ineligible habitations in the CNW. 141 roads of new connectivity were also found included in the CUPL of the concerned block/ district. 40 roads of new connectivity as per the CNW were not given any priority/excluded from the CNCPL of the concerned block/district. Four Through Routes of district Nainital and Pauri were found included in the CNCPL of the concerned block despite the fact that only single side connectivity (link route) is permissible under new connectivity.

Annex-4.1
Incorrect technical specifications
(Refer to paragraph 4.3.1)

Sl. No.	State	No. of Works	Observations
1	Bihar	146	146 road works were executed with incorrect specifications such as use of excess bitumen, use of excess granular sub-base materials.
		198	In 198 roads, provision of side drains in cement concrete pavement portion (village portion) was not made in DPRs.
2	Himachal Pradesh	2	In Jaisinghpur and Palampur divisions, two roads works (from Majheen to Sialkhar and construction of link road to village Baluhi) were executed between July 2013 and August 2013 by laying WBM grade III of 75 mm thickness instead of the required compacted thickness of 150 mm.
3	Tripura	2	In West district, in two road works {Madhupur Hospital Chowmuhani to Fultali {DPR 152(U)} and Jamardepha to Laxmandhepa Road {DRP 90(U)}, DPRs were prepared with extra thickness of sub-base course resulting in extra liability of ₹ 1.03 crore.
4	Uttar Pradesh	111	In 111 road works sanctioned (December 2012) under Phase X in the sampled districts, thickness of base course was remained short by 4 to 35 <i>per cent</i> of the designed crust affecting the sustainability of these roads for the designed life.
5	Uttarakhand	21	In 21 projects/packages of Stage-II (out of total 44 selected packages of Stage-II works) of the test checked districts, pavement thickness for sub-base/base courses was kept on the higher side resulted in extra use of material for these works costing to ₹ 4.09 crore which was avoidable.
		2	In district Chamoli, in two cases {Lwani to Ghuni MR (L-034) and Kakul Talla to Gwar MR (L-030)}, the traffic data adopted for design of pavement of carriageway was taken on the basis of a road of district Dehradun instead of actual factor of traffic and soil of the road.
		6	In district Almora, Chamoli, Nanital and Pauri, in six DPRs, the pavement width of layers of base course and sub-base course were designed/laid in a width more than the prescribed specification resulting in excessive use of material costing ₹ 0.22 crore.
		2	In two works ¹ ₹ 0.53 crore could have been saved if the items of work, which NRRDA did not find as per PMGSY specifications, had not been executed.
Total		490	

¹ { Tallakote-Seam (Stage-II) MR of Betalghat Block (package/phase no.UT-07-03/VIII) and Jhajar-Aksora (Stage-II) MR of Dhari Block (package/phase no.UT-07-01/VIII)}

Annex-4.2
Deviation from approved technical specification
(Refer to paragraph 4.4.4)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1	Maharashtra	In district Amravati, items which were put to tender for upgradation of Karajkheda to Pipalia road (package no.-MH-0338) were altered and deviated from approved technical specification in executing the work as Concrete Cement was reduced and Black Topped was increased. This deviation was not got approved by STA or NRRDA.
2	Rajasthan	In SE PWD Circle, Nagaur, thickness of Granule-Sub-Base (GSB) of road from Deh to Goga-Magra-ki-Dhani was taken as 100 mm in the stretch from km 0/0 to 3/600 whereas as per technical sanction crust thickness of road should be 150 mm.
3	Telangana	In district Khammam, the work 'Kothakotturu to Appalanarsimhapuram' borrow pits were put close to the toe of the road embankment which was against the provisions of para 6.9.3 of the OM read with Ministry's specifications (301.3.4.1).
4	Tripura	The upgradation of road work from Kamalpur to Kachucherra (Part-I) {package no. TR-04-35(UG)} was taken up with higher specification despite low traffic density. This involved extra expenditure of ₹ 1.57 crore. For construction of six road works under four ² selected packages, use of costlier and richer specification resulted in extra expenditure of ₹ 0.99 crore.
5	Uttarakhand	Six road works of districts Almora and Nainital showed that the material prescribed in the approved DPRs for Granular-Soil-Aggregate base course valued at ₹ 5.14 crore had been changed from GSB-I and II to Water Bound Macadam (WBM)-I and II costing ₹ 6.50 crore, without taking NRRDA approval. The higher cost of material was adjusted by curtailing either the quantities to be used or by savings accruing due to non-execution of some other items/quantities of the said works. In 19 cases of nine PIUs, the approved scope/quantities of works amounting to ₹ 7.54 crore were reduced while floating tenders for these works without approval of the NRRDA.
6	West Bengal	In four districts (North 24 Parganas, Purba Medinipur and Uttar Dinajpur), in nine packages, the California Bearing Ratio ³ (CBR) test report of earth indicated in DPR did not match with the test result during execution. Consequently, in five cases, thickness of the road indicated in DPR had to be changed depending on the soil test results during execution. However, the approval of changes made was not obtained from State Technical Agency (STA).

²TR-04-04, TR-04-05, TR-04-13 and TR-04-15

³For the pavement design of new roads, the sub-grade strength needs to be evaluated in terms of CBR.

Annex-4.3
Non-construction of cross drainages and bridges
 (Refer to paragraph 4.4.5)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Out of 157 bridge works sanctioned (2010-11), 115 works were completed as of July 2015. 12 bridge works were proposed for dropping due to increase in cost as per site condition.
2.	Assam	In Dhubri RR Division, the construction of road from Madaikhali to Beguntoli at an estimated cost of ₹ 2.91 crore was approved with the provisions of five HPCs and a RCC Bridge. Records and joint physical verification of the road showed that against five HPCs, the PIU had constructed only two HPCs and bridge length was reduced from 58.20 metres to 39.00 metres. This indicated that DPRs were not prepared as per the site conditions.
3.	Bihar	In three districts (Gaya, Gopalganj and Nawada), in 20 roads costing ₹ 29.61 crore, against 131 required CD, 14 were constructed.
4.	Chhattisgarh	In five districts (Bilaspur, Jashpur, Kanker, Raipur and Rajnandgaon), in seven roads works, CD ranging from two to three were less constructed.
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	In 10 roads, against 269 bridges/CD, 170 were constructed.
6.	Karnataka	In three PIUs (Haveri, Kalaburagi and Udupi), against 187, 115 CDs/bridges/culverts were constructed.
7.	Rajasthan	In three districts (Dausa, Dungarpur and Nagaur), in 24 roads, 50 to 100 per cent CDs were not constructed.
8.	Telangana	In 'PWD road to Turkagudem', cross drainage works were executed at the chainages other than those specified by the inspection committee thereby exposing them to vulnerability.

Annex-4.4
Delay in execution of works
 (Refer to paragraph 4.4.8)

Sl. No.	State	No. of works	Period of delay (Months)	Reasons attributed by Implementing Agency
1	Andhra Pradesh	22	1 to 12	Non-availability of land/forest clearance, etc.
2	Arunachal Pradesh	29	5 to 72	-
3	Assam	233	1 to 97	Non-availability of forest material, flood, rain, labour problem, non-accessibility to site, strike, etc.
4	Bihar	1243	24 to 60	Paucity of funds, non-availability of material
5	Chhattisgarh	12	1 to 84	Delay attributed to contactors
6	Gujarat	74	3 to 12	Difficult terrain, Local resistance, forest clearance, shortage of fund and Monsoon, etc.
7	Haryana	14	1 to 29	Non-obtaining of forest clearances, shifting of electricity poles, ban on mining, etc.
8	Himachal Pradesh	32	1 to 129	Involving forest land, contractor's fault
9	Jammu & Kashmir	52	3 to 75	Public interference, land dispute, non-payment of compensation for structure, forest clearance, etc.
10	Jharkhand	114	Up to 42	Paucity of funds, Naxal problems, non availability of stone materials, etc.
11	Karnataka	197	12 to 51	Land disputes, unseasonal rain, shifting of utilities.
12	Kerala	33	1 to 95	Shifting of utilities
13	Madhya Pradesh	205	6 to more than 24	Delay in mining permission, non-availability/difficulty in transportation of material Land dispute, forest clearance, shortage of labour, water,

Sl. No.	State	No. of works	Period of delay (Months)	Reasons attributed by Implementing Agency
				etc.
14	Maharashtra	19	3 to 60	Paucity of fund, land disputes, non-receipt of permission from Tiger Project
15	Manipur	61	24 to 60	-
16	Mizoram	30	24 to above 60	-
17	Odisha	572	1 to 60	
18	Punjab	91	1 to 68	Shortage of labour, unavoidable circumstances, delay in testing the plastic waste for use in construction, forest clearance and mining policy of state.
19	Rajasthan	378	24 to 46	Land dispute, heavy rain, non-availability of sufficient fund, etc.
20	Sikkim	311	12 to more than 84	Forest clearance, change in alignment, contractor's fault
21	Tamil Nadu	1	13	Due to delay in supply of coir mat (innovative/alternative technology for construction of road) by the Kerala Coir Board.
22	Telangana	29	1 to 29	Issue relating to land, forest clearance, other administrative reasons, etc.
23	Tripura	55	2 to 53	Land clearance, construction of extra cross drains and roadside drain.
24	Uttar Pradesh	367	3 to 36	--
25	Uttarakhand	85	2 to over 24	--
26	West Bengal	237	Up to 24 months to over 60 months	Land disputes
	Total	4496		

Annex-4.5
Excess expenditure due to cost overrun
(Refer to paragraph 4.4.10)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	State	Observations	No. of Works	Amount of cost escalation
1.	Chhattisgarh	In Bilaspur, Raipur and Jashpur under five packages (CG-0251, 0246, 0266, 1429 and 0729), the work was rescinded as the contractor did not complete the work in time. The balance works amounting to ₹ 27.88 crore were awarded at a contract amount of ₹ 49.15 crore.	5	21.27
2.	Gujarat	In district Panchmahals, during 2007-08, two works {Khedapa Kakradungar road (₹ 0.32 crore) and Talav Dedki Fairkuva Sarsav (₹ 0.87 crore)} were retendered in 2011-12 due to non-availability of land and got completed at a cost of ₹ 0.72 crore and ₹ 1.04 crore respectively.	2	0.57
3.	Himachal Pradesh	In Kaza divisions, package no. HP-07-05, sanctioned for ₹ 1.93 crore was completed (September 2011) with expenditure of ₹ 2.19 crore	1	0.26
4.	Jammu & Kashmir	Five road projects were completed at ₹ 12.93 crore against the sanctioned cost of ₹ 10.99 crore.	5	1.94
5.	Jharkhand	In West Singhbhum (NPCC), the original estimated cost of construction and maintenance of 12 roads was ₹ 31.06 crore which was revised to ₹ 38.85 crore with an increase of ₹ 7.79 crore.	12	7.79
		Road works from Bhagwanbagi to Mahugainkala (district Hazaribag) and Rubbai to Paro via Ramjal Suminbora (district Simdega) were rescinded in February 2014 and August 2014 after execution of earth and GBS works of ₹ 0.24 crore and ₹ 0.14 crore. These works were again got sanction from NRRDA against the provisions of the programme guidelines in March 2013 and February 2014 at a cost of ₹ 2.05 crore and ₹ 2.18 crore.	2	2.27
6.	Karnataka	In Haveri, the work of 'Improvements to road from Malanayakanahalli to T-08' (19.50 km) was abandoned after incurring 2.78 crore. Remaining work estimated at	1	0.61

Sl. No.	State	Observations	No. of Works	Amount of cost escalation
		a cost of ₹ 3.54 crore (revised to ₹ 4.90 crore as per CSR) was awarded to another contractor at a cost of ₹ 4.15.		
7.	Kerala	In package no. KR 0213 B 1, cost over-run due to termination and rearrangement of contract amounting to ₹ 0.11 crore was observed.	1	0.11
		Package no. KR 0501 was terminated twice at the risk and cost of the contractor. ₹ 4.25 crore due from contractors was yet to be recovered.	1	4.25
8.	Mizoram	The work of construction of Sakawrdai-Zohmun road was terminated due to unsatisfactory performance of the contractor. The estimate of the remaining work (estimated cost of ₹ 1.13 crore) was revised at ₹ 2.76 crore.	1	1.63
9.	Odisha	Under three packages (package no.OR-02-ADB-45, OR-02-ADB-08, OR-02-253 under RW Division of Jaleswar in costal district Balasore) cement concrete pavement was constructed up to 97 <i>per cent</i> instead of restricting it to 20 <i>per cent</i> of the total road length.	3	1.71
		In two districts Kalahandi and Sundargarh, four works costing ₹ 8.47 crore were terminated after lapse of nine to 36 months from schedule dates of completion. Balance works worth ₹ 7.15 crore were recast to ₹ 10.51 crore as per current schedule of rate.	4	3.36
10.	Tripura	In three selected packages ⁴ , the works were awarded in September 2008. The works were rescinded in June 2012 due to slow progress of work. Subsequently, balance works were awarded at higher rate resulted in excess expenditure of ₹ 0.73 crore.	3	0.73
		Due to change in alignment of road work from Gandacherra to Kalajhari (Extension Part-II), extra earth work for erosion control and drainage was carried out at a cost of ₹ 0.97 crore.	1	0.97

⁴TR 04 63, TR-04-126, TR-04-12

Report No. 23 of 2016

Sl. No.	State	Observations	No. of Works	Amount of cost escalation
		In district Dhalai, construction of road work from Mendi to Malakarbasti (L 04), did not commence due to non-handing over clear site to the contractor (March 2011). The work was again awarded at three <i>per cent</i> above the estimated cost and completed in December 2013 at a cost of ₹ 1.33 crore. Besides this, ₹ 0.28 crore was incurred extra as bridge alignment was changed due to land dispute.	1	0.40
11.	Uttarakhand	In districts Almora and Chamoli, contracts of three road works were terminated after 22 to 52 months. The cost of left over works as per new SoR escalated by ₹ 8.62 crore.	3	8.62
		In district Almora, in work of Maniyagar to Kola (package no. UT-01-05) a proposal for replacement/execution of WBM, in place of sanctioned item of GSB in the DPR/TS, costing ₹ 1.11 crore was accepted in March 2015 after a delay of 21 months resulting in cost escalation of ₹ 0.38 crore for extra items of work.	1	0.38
	Total		47	56.87

Annex-4.6(a)
Incomplete works
(Refer to paragraph 4.4.12)

Sl. No.	State	Observations	No. of Works	Expenditure incurred so far (₹ in crore)
1	Assam	In district Dhubri, work of construction of road from Sukchar to Gotabari including cross drainage works (package no. AS 05-36) was lying abandoned since April 2010 after incurring expenditure of ₹ 1.74 crore for want of alternate route to carry construction material to work site.	1	1.74
		In district Dhubir, construction of a road from Nayer alga Gaurang Ghat to Gutipara IV (package no. AS 05-41), was lying abandoned since September 2013 after executing work of ₹ 11.32 crore as the project area was submerged for a week causing extensive damage to the road including the constructed RCC Bridges. PIU terminated the package in January 2014.	1	11.32
		In district Dhubri, in seven road works (package no. AS 05-46 of Phase-VII 2007-08), the contractor, after execution of works valued at ₹ 1.57 crore (October 2011), expressed his inability to complete the package due to non-accessibility to the site caused by flood. The work executing agency terminated the package in June 2013.	7	1.57
		Construction of bridge, {package no, AS-05-75 (2012-13)} on road from old NH-31 via Uttar Tokerechora was jeopardised as 700 metres of road along with STP bridge was washed away in June 2013 by the flood in the river Gangadhar.	1	0.17
		The original DPR of road works from Katamoni Piplapunj Road (package no. AS 13-23) was found non-functional as the bridge across the river Logai, presumed to be there as per DPR to transport construction material, was not raised (September 2015). A cause way constructed at a cost of ₹ 0.29 crore to carry construction material constructed was damaged due to flood and became useless for carrying material. Till April 2010, road work worth ₹ 1.10 crore was only executed and lying abandoned since May 2010.	1	1.39
2	Himachal Pradesh	Work of construction of road (package no. HP-05-15- 2005-06) from Wangtoo to Panvi, after executed to the extent of ₹ 3.07 crore, was lying abandoned since October 2007 due to involvement of private and forest land on the alignment of road.	1	3.07

Report No. 23 of 2016

Sl. No.	State	Observations	No. of Works	Expenditure incurred so far (₹ in crore)
		Three packages (HP 04172, HP04171 and HP03107) taken up for execution at agreement cost of ₹ 3.03 crore during 2010-12 without ensuring transfer of private land, were lying incomplete.	3	2.31
3	Jammu & Kashmir	In six districts 44 road projects, were not completed even after a delay of over five years and incurring expenditure of ₹ 102.34 crore (March 2015) due to land dispute, non-clearance of road projects from forest department, non-availability of take off points for roads, etc.	44	102.34
4	Jharkhand	In four districts (Deoghar, Hazaribagh, Simdega and West Singhbhum), seven roads and one bridge remained incomplete after incurring expenditure of ₹ 7.06 crore due to non-availability of forest land of about 6,885 meter.	8	7.06
5	Madhya Pradesh	Construction of MDR to Chakpipla road (12.90 km) was approved for providing connectivity to four villages. However, the road was completed only up to village Suna (4.20 km) leaving the other three un-connected for want of clearance from forest department.	1	1.23
			68	132.20

Annex-4.6(b)
Incomplete works
(Due to contractors' fault)
(Refer to paragraph 4.4.12)

Sl. No.	State	Observations	No. of Works	Amount (₹ in crore)
1	Assam	Road work viz. Katamoni to Piplapunj Road (package no. AS 13-40, PIU, Karimganj RR Div., Karimganj) was terminated (January 2015) for breach of contractual obligations as no work was done by the contractor since August 2011 after executing work of ₹ 0.49 crore.	1	0.49
		In district Silchar, 23 road works under 12 packages ⁵ including six bridges, after lapse of a periods ranging from two to over four years from the stipulated date of completion, were terminated due to breach of contractual obligation by the contractors. Executing agency spent ₹ 27.24 crore on abandoned works. Terminated packages were not reallocated to complete the balance work (August 2015)	21	27.24
		In district Silchar, in two road works (Ganiram II to Dodpur-I and Telitikar to Jagdishpur) under package no. AS 03-26, work executing agency terminated the work in April 2014 for breach of contractual obligations by the contractor. Before termination, the contractor was paid ₹ 1.02 crore. The partially executed work was lying abandoned.	2	1.02
2	Jharkhand	In district Chaibasa, work of construction and maintenance of road from PWD Lokesai to Jitia (Package JH 2211) was rescinded in May 2015 after an expenditure of ₹ 1.27 crore due to dispute between contractor and division.	1	1.27
3	Mizoram	In division Champhai, under package no. MZ-02-WB-01, road work (Khuangleng-Bungzung road) was executed up to ₹ 3.96 crore against the sanctioned cost of ₹ 5.87 crore. The NQM graded (December 2013) the work as unsatisfactory. Thereafter, the contractor abandoned the work in December 2014.	1	3.96
4	Tripura	The work of construction of AA Road to Khadaban para for coverage of two habitations Satya Ram Para and Surendra Reang Para was rescinded in June 2013 at risk and cost of the contractor and contractor was paid ₹ 2.96 crore. Balance work was yet to be re-awarded (June 2015).	1	2.96
			27	36.94

⁵ 1. AS 03-26; 2. AS 03-55; 3. AS 03-56; 4. AS 03-59; 5. AS 03-65; 6. AS 03-67; 7. AS 03-68; 8. 03-90; 9. AS 03-93; 10. AS 03-98; 11. AS 03-116 (B) and 12. AS 03-121.

Annex-4.7

Variation in figures of release and utilisation of maintenance fund

(Refer to paragraph 4.5.1)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	State	Figures as per NRRDA		Figures furnished by State Governments	
		Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure
1	Andhra Pradesh	104.25	47.48	68.76	49.07
2	Arunachal Pradesh	30.95	38.63	35.45	56
3	Bihar	210.48	291.1	230.25	293
4	Haryana	16.68	13.70	19.12	12.25
5	Himachal Pradesh	129.44	62.83	204.3	134.97
6	J&K	17.6	3.72	20.66	3.62
7	Jharkhand	179.48	12.14	179.48	108.46
8	Manipur	17.64	14.68	14.00	14.23
9	Meghalaya	22.85	15.02	25.75	9.95
10	Punjab	23.01	65.07	29.13	28.76
11	Rajasthan	158.34	125.87	158.35	126.56
12	Sikkim	29.59	23.37	29.11	23.36
13	Tamil Nadu	29.2	22.04	36.69	28.49
14	Tripura	67.65	30.107	67.65	29.55
15	Uttar Pradesh	277.79	272.07	263.34	263.78
16	Uttarakhand	76.12	70.55	50.73	52.29
17	West Bengal	175.92	122.05	525.01	94.43

Annex-4.8
Release and utilisation of maintenance fund
(Refer to paragraph 4.5.1)

State	Maintenance fund required/release/expenditure				Maintenance of completed roads as per NQM report					
	Maintenance funds required (as per contracts)	Actual release to SRRDA	Expenditure by SRRDA during the financial year	Percentage of expenditure	No. of roads inspected by NQM	Maintained	Poorly maintained		Not maintained	
							No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Andhra Pradesh	126.43	104.25	47.48	37.55	330	107	174	52.73	49	14.85
Arunachal Pradesh	23.65	30.95	38.63	163.34	53	21	23	43.40	9	16.98
Assam	91.99	87.11	45.71	49.69	415	129	198	47.71	88	21.20
Bihar	463.66	210.48	291.10	62.78	354	137	110	31.07	107	30.23
Chhattisgarh	129.68	106.88	79.18	61.06	406	134	197	48.52	75	18.47
Gujarat	48.88	82.38	47.67	97.52	158	68	70	44.30	20	12.66
Haryana	40.46	16.68	14.43	35.66	70	31	29	41.43	10	14.29
Himachal Pradesh	152.99	129.44	62.83	41.07	156	56	42	26.92	58	37.18
Jammu & Kashmir	24.137	17.60	3.72	15.41	71	25	32	45.07	14	19.72
Jharkhand	133.88	179.48	12.14	9.07	282	51	132	46.81	99	35.11
Karnataka	149.06	120.83	112.93	75.76	235	108	82	34.89	45	19.15
Kerala	35.83	35.48	28.13	78.51	99	43	38	38.38	18	18.18
Madhya Pradesh	438.36	586.42	298.04	67.99	1035	585	351	33.91	99	9.57

Report No. 23 of 2016

State	Maintenance fund required/release/expenditure				Maintenance of completed roads as per NQM report					
	Maintenance funds required (as per contracts)	Actual release to SRRDA	Expenditure by SRRDA during the financial year	Percentage of expenditure	No. of roads inspected by NQM	Maintained	Poorly maintained		Not maintained	
							No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Maharashtra	175.40	230.10	176.42	100.58	406	134	202	49.75	70	17.24
Manipur	11.88	17.64	14.68	123.57	55	17	26	47.27	12	21.82
Meghalaya	26.30	22.85	15.02	57.11	40	7	20	50.00	13	32.50
Mizoram	1.74	1.74	1.273	73.16	15	6	4	26.67	5	33.33
Nagaland	19.00	15.77	12.72	66.95	34	10	14	41.18	10	29.41
Odisha	218.06	184.40	156.27	71.66	556	227	237	42.63	92	16.55
Punjab	42.23	23.01	27.48	65.07	196	116	66	33.67	14	7.14
Rajasthan	185.08	158.34	125.87	68.01	475	205	217	45.68	53	11.16
Sikkim	24.42	29.59	23.37	95.70	31	11	8	25.81	12	38.71
Tamil Nadu	38.83	29.20	22.04	56.76	258	40	120	46.51	98	37.98
Tripura	63.11	67.65	30.11	43.68	87	36	33	37.93	18	20.69
Uttar Pradesh	352.58	277.79	272.07	77.17	862	272	428	49.65	162	18.79
Uttarakhand	87.74	76.12	70.55	80.41	72	16	36	50.00	20	27.78
West Bengal	174.59	175.92	122.05	69.91	393	87	206	52.42	100	25.45
Total	3279.97	3018.10	2151.91	65.61	7144	2679	3095	43.32	1370	19.18

Annex-5.1

State and Year-wise Central Release and Utilisation

(Refer to paragraph 5.3.1)

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	State	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
		Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure
1.	Andhra Pradesh	672.15	473.94	607.48	291.75	0.00	205.66	5.00	152.56	33.86	330.25
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	371.87	348.85	214.27	173.37	455.18	310.54	8.00	249.36	345.92	362.58
3.	Assam	1900.67	1300.79	1682.84	1312.18	154.27	522.78	240.49	699.01	316.07	538.22
4.	Bihar	3477.06	2694.91	3374.25	2847.08	1326.57	1992.21	850.83	1844.95	1548.16	2259.30
5.	Chhattisgarh	678.58	304.16	801.51	244.35	0.00	281.41	0.00	713.58	270.75	925.18
6.	Goa	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Gujarat	322.43	243.84	66.59	150.55	125.74	99.54	519.24	477.40	418.77	685.91
8.	Haryana	157.75	108.03	60.00	60.80	0.00	36.53	0.00	8.19	218.96	383.83
9.	Himachal Pradesh	199.30	142.67	310.30	119.17	0.00	55.19	0.00	148.13	99.40	215.04
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	366.09	297.40	762.10	508.43	266.33	459.69	523.24	534.01	416.60	422.73
11.	Jharkhand	843.81	538.44	860.74	323.23	105.96	325.61	21.86	539.55	249.48	785.02
12.	Karnataka	927.68	634.80	0.00	256.62	24.60	16.63	5.00	7.68	237.00	411.23
13.	Kerala	146.27	146.14	200.00	58.07	1.50	57.30	1.50	121.15	151.41	190.59
14.	Madhya Pradesh	1966.12	1409.49	1138.05	894.17	242.88	741.11	615.00	1393.07	708.00	1667.32

Report No. 23 of 2016

Sl. No.	State	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
		Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure	Release	Expenditure
15.	Maharashtra	1242.55	1012.48	796.01	546.05	0.00	153.40	0.00	383.50	212.53	540.37
16.	Manipur	144.98	122.34	177.53	166.52	186.14	92.66	4.03	139.67	100.00	173.94
17.	Meghalaya	64.55	36.39	38.00	27.68	50.00	32.46	0.00	37.70	62.56	83.24
18.	Mizoram	95.59	82.24	93.63	85.47	71.82	41.95	0.00	26.60	54.74	72.35
19.	Nagaland	25.13	29.67	11.00	12.26	194.88	109.83	0.00	77.45	58.99	50.47
20.	Odisha	2477.36	1924.25	1969.95	1235.78	87.25	1188.92	758.92	1605.72	1051.50	1666.10
21.	Punjab	196.43	155.34	164.61	61.49	169.66	238.16	117.68	295.61	310.21	285.03
22.	Rajasthan	886.22	686.39	667.76	247.63	151.90	573.85	427.06	718.35	425.66	649.97
23.	Sikkim	79.38	85.53	80.00	13.93	193.62	86.73	1.97	90.57	94.59	94.50
24.	Tamil Nadu	469.54	304.81	160.00	211.36	77.72	21.13	343.48	383.39	239.65	580.72
25.	Tripura	285.76	237.51	229.79	230.22	338.59	189.79	98.83	232.76	187.36	322.83
26.	Uttar Pradesh	1308.83	868.54	213.77	194.84	10.00	98.00	511.93	824.25	638.70	1002.26
27.	Uttarakhand	240.26	191.74	300.32	255.48	151.24	32.39	0.00	260.64	314.92	425.17
28.	West Bengal	819.68	530.29	828.90	417.93	3.08	423.28	306.17	1130.44	1193.80	1414.20
	Total	20366.04	14910.98	15809.40	10946.41	4388.93	8386.75	5360.23	13095.29	9959.59	16538.35

Fund was not released to Goa during 2010-15

Annex-5.2
Achievement during last five years
State and Year-wise Physical Target and Achievement
(Refer to paragraph 5.3.2)

Sl. No.	State	2010-11				2011-12				2012-13				2013-14				2014-15			
		Target		Achievement		Target		Achievement		Target		Achievement		Target		Achievement		Target		Achievement	
		H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L
1.	Andhra Pradesh	200	2150	291	2121.48	75	1189	119	932.14	27	400	32	400.35	34	475	0	191.58	20	514	394	595.13
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	10	178	38	366.87	20	196	40	419.21	7	325	24	393.67	4	340	16	489.04	14	450	1	546.58
3.	Assam	400	2008	696	2057.11	500	1224	444	2131.43	237	1175	356	1456.16	160	650	257	957.96	228	720	284	869.81
4.	Bihar	910	4644	1551	2515.13	1350	6000	2447	7539.82	1287	6420	2616	6341.62	930	3840	1225	3163.86	1590	2900	2158	3631.94
5.	Chhattisgarh	124	906	335	1570.66	40	1500	291	1053.69	282	2370	221	1024.08	235	1900	896	1292.05	165	620	975	2648.14
6.	Goa	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
7.	Gujarat	100	596	242	605.97	50	425	173	431.44	16	140	68	180.47	42	200	375	896.29	52	990	82	1892.16
8.	Haryana	0	200	0	389.24	0	292	0	188.31	0	30	0	69.26	0	30	0	3.28	0	355	0	633.39
9.	Himachal Pradesh	75	693	35	661.82	25	750	46	761.09	70	980	0	0.00	40	550	0	134.49	35	260	85	484.97
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	75	367	108	474.00	25	750	201	999.62	104	1335	178	1411.10	100	1285	143	891.79	50	750	108	934.66
11.	Jharkhand	400	1482	1059	1599.25	300	1005	459	1123.03	397	2010	759	1236.74	340	1880	362	1030.73	330	703	769	1750.32
12.	Karnataka	0	1000	0	1848.93	0	1204	0	1858.64	0	205	0	386.02	0	90	0	211.43	0	650	6	627.68
13.	Kerala	6	156	7	245.87	20	446	8	214.14	10	390	3	108.71	6	240	5	192.46	7	348	5	345.75
14.	Madhya Pradesh	400	4488	618	9163.26	400	3719	776	2926.66	241	2760	645	2754.18	400	3350	411	3006.27	495	2100	1278	5180.92
15.	Maharashtra	15	1292	0	3718.27	20	1700	48	2592.46	11	680	58	649.54	15	440	0	448.88	10	550	33	499.97
16.	Manipur	40	335	35	487.42	20	150	63	374.61	20	60	52	424.48	15	160	67	533.12	10	236	32	300.01
17.	Meghalaya	15	64	8	83.31	10	100	6	44.67	9	60	9	22.77	5	40	14	23.68	15	105	11	47.20

Report No. 23 of 2016

Sl. No.	State	2010-11				2011-12				2012-13				2013-14				2014-15			
		Target		Achievement		Target		Achievement		Target		Achievement		Target		Achievement		Target		Achievement	
		H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L
18.	Mizoram	25	150	35	252.13	10	100	4	130.90	4	120	5	93.20	2	50	18	77.28	5	115	1	48.60
19.	Nagaland	10	150	9	86.00	5	200	6	24.89	0	310	0	93.50	1	190	0	293.20	1	160	0	215.30
20.	Odisha	450	3800	971	4941.90	400	2400	574	3167.06	490	4170	435	2401.26	400	3460	700	3063.22	542	2400	1287	3842.69
21.	Punjab	0	500	0	622.72	5	593	0	71.76	2	165	1	325.54	2	340	6	730.38	0	650	0	737.46
22.	Rajasthan	25	1700	35	3019.47	75	400	20	450.78	195	1975	607	2140.00	184	1580	579	2290.31	302	1550	1254	3233.34
23.	Sikkim	25	147	18	85.72	40	154	24	74.98	17	270	25	48.44	10	175	19	99.36	5	100	13	120.92
24.	Tamil Nadu	10	1020	2	2229.01	10	1058	9	814.10	1	80	0	42.39	5	685	0	747.94	0	379	14	1965.28
25.	Tripura	75	400	260	432.11	75	314	201	352.17	46	340	110	241.92	20	170	85	291.46	50	250	78	239.42
26.	Uttar Pradesh	150	3207	228	3593.79	75	3000	55	522.53	102	1230	0	269.78	130	2320	0	1109.79	120	1445	0	2000.34
27.	Uttarakhand	60	320	120	551.88	50	350	68	639.58	50	560	24	474.43	30	500	26	405.16	42	625	71	714.62
28.	West Bengal	400	2137	883	1385.20	400	1347	455	1154.79	375	1440	636	1171.67	390	2010	1356	2741.38	600	1850	1860	2232.88
	Total	4000	34090	7584	45108.52	4000	30566	6537	30994.50	4000	30000	6864	24161.28	3500	26950	6560	25316.39	4688	21775	10799	36339.48

H- Habitation, L- Length in kilometer

Annex-5.3.1

Financial position furnished by the States (2010-11)

(Refer to paragraph 5.4)

(₹ in crore)

State	Opening balance	Central share	State share	Misc. receipt	Total	Expenditure	Closing balance
Andhra Pradesh	94.68	696.09*	0	-16.70	774.07	534.19	239.88
Arunachal Pradesh	18.39	377.16	0	2.14	397.69	332.74	64.95
Assam	180.57	1900.73	0.00	8.64	2089.94	1386.02	703.92
Bihar	430.74	3253.41	73.50	19.82	3777.47	2656.88	1120.59
Chhattisgarh	149.97	678.58	0.00	27.59	856.14	309.05	547.09
Goa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gujarat	9.29	322.43	30.00	1.57	363.29	274.90	88.39
Haryana	9.57	157.75	5.42	0.64	173.38	111.47	61.91
Himachal Pradesh	43.71	199.30	0.00	8.22	251.23	149.55	101.68
Jammu & Kashmir	34.01	366.09	0.00	1.91	402.01	296.25	105.76
Jharkhand	22.26	838.81	4.00	2.69	867.76	564.27	303.49
Karnataka	93.41	917.67	187.00	5.12	1203.20	670.29	532.91
Kerala	1.61	144.27	25.00	0.76	171.64	166.57	5.07
Madhya Pradesh	698.81	1966.11	201.53	68.91	2935.36	1421.75	1513.61
Maharashtra	151.68	1242.55	31.50	176.20	1601.93	1072.25	529.68
Manipur	22.87	88.83	2.50	23.64	137.84	135.84	2.00
Meghalaya	16.65	64.55	0.19	0.77	82.16	41.80	40.36
Mizoram	-0.75	95.59	0.00	0.14	94.98	88.61	6.37
Nagaland	27.06	25.13	0.00	1.42	53.61	34.85	18.76
Odisha	83.34	2245.10	98.30	12.20	2438.94	1930.18	508.76
Punjab	59.07	194.43	0	0.31	253.81	155.25	98.56
Rajasthan	350.85	886.22	0	9.67	1246.74	686.37	560.37
Sikkim	2.61	79.38	0	0.59	82.58	68.45	14.13
Tamil Nadu	32.86	322.12	1.39	1.32	357.69	365.74	-8.05
Tripura	-1.45	257.91	0.00	1.70	258.16	279.70	-21.54
Uttar Pradesh	251.83	1308.83	2.18	28.87	1591.71	958.43	633.28
Uttarakhand	66.82	237.96	4.60	3.79	313.17	200.73	112.44
West Bengal	134.27	819.67	15.26	39.12	1008.32	537.69	470.63
Total	2984.73	19686.67	682.37	431.05	23784.82	15429.82	8355.00

* ₹ 23.93 crore was released by the Ministry in March 2010 and credited in April 2010.

Annex-5.3.2

Financial position furnished by the States (2011-12)

(Refer to paragraph 5.4)

(₹ in crore)

State	Opening balance	Central share	State share	Misc. receipt	Total	Expenditure	Closing balance
Andhra Pradesh	239.88	607.48	0.00	33.77	881.13	281.51	599.62
Arunachal Pradesh	64.95	231.98	0.00	4.12	301.05	198.34	102.71
Assam	703.92	1682.84	32.84	18.33	2437.93	1160.64	1277.29
Bihar	1120.59	3475.41	30.00	81.07	4707.07	2885.43	1821.64
Chhattisgarh	547.09	801.52	11.04	27.14	1386.79	230.22	1156.57
Goa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gujarat	88.39	66.59	0.00	-6.15	148.83	94.46	52.37
Haryana	61.91	60.00	17.14	4.46	143.51	62.99	80.52
Himachal Pradesh	101.68	305.30	0.94	23.68	431.60	117.16	314.44
Jammu & Kashmir	105.76	762.10	0.00	16.33	884.19	512.62	371.57
Jharkhand	303.49	843.08	0.00	33.75	1180.32	355.89	824.43
Karnataka	532.91	0.00	87.00	23.53	643.44	437.99	205.45
Kerala	5.07	200.00	20.05	0.67	225.79	41.42	184.37
Madhya Pradesh	1513.61	1138.05	169.62	76.93	2898.21	880.99	2017.22
Maharashtra	529.68	791.01	31.25	16.68	1368.62	583.87	784.75
Manipur	2.00	233.68	2.75	2.79	241.22	164.87	76.35
Meghalaya	40.36	38.00	0.64	4.48	83.48	23.95	59.53
Mizoram	6.37	93.62	0.00	3.43	103.42	78.73	24.69
Nagaland	18.76	10.00	0.00	1.34	30.10	15.09	15.01
Odisha	508.76	2187.22	135.00	104.13	2935.11	1235.02	1700.09
Punjab	98.56	164.61	2.00	2.63	267.80	62.33	205.47
Rajasthan	560.37	667.76	0	32.31	1260.44	247.44	1013.00
Sikkim	14.13	80.00	0	4.90	99.03	64.09	34.94
Tamil Nadu	-8.05	307.41	0	5.15	304.51	159.62	144.89
Tripura	-21.54	206.39	0.00	0.42	185.27	198.52	-13.25
Uttar Pradesh	633.28	213.77	2.11	38.36	887.52	249.94	637.58
Uttarakhand	112.44	295.32	2.21	5.89	415.86	201.57	214.29
West Bengal	470.63	828.90	35.61	19.23	1354.37	433.49	920.88
Total	8355.00	16292.04	580.20	579.37	25806.61	10978.19	14826.42

Annex-5.3.3

Financial position furnished by the States (2012-13)

(Refer to paragraph 5.4)

(₹ in crore)

State	Opening balance	Central share	State share	Misc. receipt	Total	Expenditure	Closing balance
Andhra Pradesh	599.62	0.00	0.00	14.33	613.95	199.57	414.38
Arunachal Pradesh	102.71	453.18	0.70	1.47	558.06	270.36	287.70
Assam	1277.29	154.33	110.00	51.89	1593.51	656.54	936.97
Bihar	1821.64	1294.45	150.00	144.11	3410.20	2063.41	1346.79
Chhattisgarh	1156.57	0.00	26.23	110.31	1293.11	277.03	1016.08
Goa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gujarat	52.37	125.74	0.00	7.57	185.68	155.95	29.73
Haryana	80.52	1.40	0	7.08	89.00	30.65	58.35
Himachal Pradesh	314.44	0.00	4.07	28.20	346.71	126.33	220.38
Jammu & Kashmir	371.57	266.33	0.00	25.98	663.88	463.78	200.10
Jharkhand	824.43	100.96	45.00	88.39	1058.78	375.00	683.78
Karnataka	205.45	14.60	48.72	14.50	283.27	132.27	151.00
Kerala	184.37	0.00	5.00	14.13	203.50	59.35	144.15
Madhya Pradesh	2017.22	237.88	1.97	273.43	2530.50	735.46	1795.04
Maharashtra	784.75	0.00	28.00	53.07	865.82	231.35	634.47
Manipur	76.35	186.14	3.10	4.73	270.32	90.58	179.74
Meghalaya	59.53	50.10	0.00	2.05	111.68	32.41	79.27
Mizoram	24.69	71.82	0.00	2.20	98.71	36.87	61.84
Nagaland	15.01	194.88	0.00	2.93	212.82	104.21	108.61
Odisha	1700.09	82.25	90.00	130.28	2002.62	1249.82	752.80
Punjab	205.47	169.66	0	13.74	388.87	228.19	160.68
Rajasthan	1013.00	146.90	0	84.63	1244.53	574.05	670.48
Sikkim	34.94	193.71	0	1.59	230.24	70.24	160.00
Tamil Nadu	144.89	73.60	0	15.74	234.23	23.24	210.99
Tripura	-13.25	323.16	0.00	86.56	396.47	205.86	190.61
Uttar Pradesh	637.58	10.00	1.95	7.85	657.38	173.88	483.50
Uttarakhand	214.29	149.24	1.60	30.03	395.16	108.44	286.72
West Bengal	920.88	3.08	15.31	81.87	1021.14	431.90	589.24
Total	14826.42	4303.41	531.65	1298.66	20960.14	9106.74	11853.40

Annex-5.3.4

Financial position furnished by the States (2013-14)

(Refer to paragraph 5.4)

(₹ in crore)

State	Opening balance	Central share	State share	Misc. receipt	Total	Expenditure	Closing balance
Andhra Pradesh	414.38	5.00	39.23	52.01	510.62	220.29	290.33
Arunachal Pradesh	287.70	0.00	1.00	16.86	305.56	278.75	26.81
Assam	936.97	240.49	97.99	57.45	1332.90	749.84	583.06
Bihar	1346.79	812.68	159.33	114.02	2432.82	2067.37	365.45
Chhattisgarh	1016.08	0.00	66.00	102.69	1184.77	655.93	528.84
Goa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gujarat	29.73	519.24	7.50	16.57	573.04	511.36	61.68
Haryana	58.35	0.00	0	5.36	63.71	12.16	51.55
Himachal Pradesh	220.38	0.00	3.04	16.46	239.88	140.10	99.78
Jammu & Kashmir	200.10	523.24	0.00	29.19	752.53	537.26	215.27
Jharkhand	683.78	17.66	0.00	60.34	761.78	498.84	262.94
Karnataka	151.00	0.00	42.40	13.85	207.25	48.38	158.87
Kerala	144.15	0.00	0.00	10.88	155.03	122.74	32.29
Madhya Pradesh	1795.04	600.00	2.00	157.32	2554.36	1402.89	1151.47
Maharashtra	634.47	0.00	51.20	59.67	745.34	437.34	308.00
Manipur	179.74	4.03	4.80	2.10	190.67	138.43	52.24
Meghalaya	79.27	2.87	0.00	2.48	84.62	47.70	36.92
Mizoram	61.84	0.06	0.23	2.87	65.00	38.45	26.55
Nagaland	108.61	0.00	0.00	2.85	111.46	75.10	36.36
Odisha	752.80	748.91	560.36	-351.55	1710.52	1654.96	55.56
Punjab	160.68	117.68	0	9.44	287.80	286.91	0.89
Rajasthan	670.48	416.69	0	69.20	1156.37	718.36	438.01
Sikkim	157.02*	2.07	0	5.33	164.42	113.88	50.54
Tamil Nadu	210.99	343.48	65.37	27.67	647.51	343.76	303.75
Tripura	190.61	73.83	20.00	49.53	333.97	269.51	64.46
Uttar Pradesh	483.50	513.58	0.00	121.69	1118.77	951.71	167.06
Uttarakhand	286.72	0.00	0.00	19.40	306.12	297.74	8.38
West Bengal	589.24	306.17	256.29	34.06	1185.76	1077.93	107.83
Total	11850.42	5247.68	1376.74	707.74	19182.58	13697.69	5484.89

* ₹ 2.98 crore transferred to separate Account

Annex-5.3.5

Financial position furnished by the States (2014-15)

(Refer to paragraph 5.4)

(₹ in crore)

State	Opening balance	Central share	State share	Misc. receipt	Total	Expenditure	Closing balance
Andhra Pradesh#	290.33	32.98	95.55	4.55	423.41	363.06	60.35
Arunachal Pradesh	26.81	342.25	0.00	1.83	370.89	359.50	11.39
Assam	583.06	317.09	0.00	46.03	946.18	561.92	384.26
Bihar	365.45	1530.71	300.00	48.92	2245.08	2394.41	-149.33
Chhattisgarh	528.84	270.75	71.56	38.55	909.70	911.80	-2.10
Goa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gujarat	61.68	391.25	151.00	31.21	635.14	625.01	10.13
Haryana	51.55	245.75	81.42	10.53	389.25	408.78	-19.53
Himachal Pradesh	99.78	84.40	2.56	4.10	190.84	197.88	-7.04
Jammu & Kashmir	215.27	416.60	0.00	15.55	647.42	424.61	222.81
Jharkhand	262.94	112.00	10.00	2.87	387.81	707.51	-319.70
Karnataka	158.87	235.22	84.32	9.50	487.91	433.20	54.71
Kerala	32.29	150.00	8.00	3.61	193.90	182.89	11.01
Madhya Pradesh	1151.47	708.00	324.93	157.24	2341.64	1887.52	454.12
Maharashtra	308.00	207.66	87.37	37.65	640.68	578.30	62.38
Manipur	52.24	100.92	4.79	24.80	182.75	172.56	10.19
Meghalaya	36.92	64.80	1.39	5.01	108.12	96.02	12.10
Mizoram	26.55	55.55	0.00	0.79	82.89	74.40	8.49
Nagaland	36.36	58.65	0.37	4.10	99.48	48.10	51.38
Odisha	55.56	1209.93	0.00	42.52	1308.01	1677.23	-369.22
Punjab	0.89	286.90	0	0	287.79	286.32	1.47
Rajasthan	438.01	405.66	0	23.28	866.95	649.56	217.39
Sikkim	50.54	95.48	0	5.67	151.69	109.11	42.58
Tamil Nadu	303.75	221.89	36.54	15.50	577.68	572.63	5.05
Tripura	64.46	185.73	20.00	65.53	335.72	449.38	-113.66
Uttar Pradesh	167.06	839.27	0.00	10.60	1016.93	959.51	57.42
Uttarakhand	8.38	313.13	37.41	6.60	365.52	458.94	-93.42
West Bengal	107.83	1193.80	9.40	1.57	1312.60	1192.56	120.04
Total	5484.89	10076.37	1326.61	618.11	17505.98	16782.71	723.27

including financial target and achievement of Telangana

Annex-5.4.1

Variation between details of releases as per records of the Ministry and States

(Refer to paragraph 5.4)

(₹ in crore)

State	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13			2013-14			2014-15			Total		
	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.
Andhra Pradesh	672.15	696.09*	-23.94	607.48	607.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	33.86	32.98	0.88	1318.49	1341.55	-23.06
Arunachal Pradesh	371.87	377.16	-5.29	214.27	231.98	-17.71	455.18	453.18	2.00	8.00	0.00	8.00	345.92	342.25	3.67	1395.24	1404.57	-9.33
Assam	1900.67	1900.73	-0.06	1682.84	1682.84	0.00	154.27	154.33	-0.06	240.49	240.49	0.00	316.07	317.09	-1.02	4294.34	4295.48	-1.14
Bihar	3477.06	3253.41	223.65	3374.25	3475.41	-101.16	1326.57	1294.45	32.12	850.83	812.68	38.15	1548.16	1530.71	17.45	10576.87	10366.66	210.21
Chhattisgarh	678.58	678.58	0.00	801.51	801.52	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	270.75	270.75	0.00	1750.84	1750.85	-0.01
Goa	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gujarat	322.43	322.43	0.00	66.59	66.59	0.00	125.74	125.74	0.00	519.24	519.24	0.00	418.77	391.25	27.52	1452.77	1425.25	27.52
Haryana	157.75	157.75	0.00	60.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	1.40	-1.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	218.96	245.75	-26.79	436.71	464.90	-28.19
Himachal Pradesh	199.30	199.30	0.00	310.30	305.30	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	99.40	84.40	15.00	609.00	589.00	20.00
Jammu & Kashmir	366.09	366.09	0.00	762.10	762.10	0.00	266.33	266.33	0.00	523.24	523.24	0.00	416.60	416.60	0.00	2334.36	2334.36	0.00
Jharkhand	843.81	838.81	5.00	860.74	843.08	17.66	105.96	100.96	5.00	21.86	17.66	4.20	249.48	112.00	137.48	2081.85	1912.51	169.34
Karnataka	927.68	917.67	10.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.60	14.60	10.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	237.00	235.22	1.78	1194.28	1167.49	26.79
Kerala	146.27	144.27	2.00	200.00	200.00	0.00	1.50	0.00	1.50	1.50	0.00	1.50	151.41	150.00	1.41	500.68	494.27	6.41
Madhya Pradesh	1966.12	1966.11	0.01	1138.05	1138.05	0.00	242.88	237.88	5.00	615.00	600.00	15.00	708.00	708.00	0.00	4670.05	4650.04	20.01
Maharashtra	1242.55	1242.55	0.00	796.01	791.01	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	212.53	207.66	4.87	2251.09	2241.22	9.87
Manipur	144.98	88.83	56.15	177.53	233.68	-56.15	186.14	186.14	0.00	4.03	4.03	0.00	100.00	100.92	-0.92	612.68	613.60	-0.92
Meghalaya	64.55	64.55	0.00	38.00	38.00	0.00	50.00	50.10	-0.10	0.00	2.87	-2.87	62.56	64.80	-2.24	215.11	220.32	-5.21
Mizoram	95.59	95.59	0.00	93.63	93.62	0.01	71.82	71.82	0.00	0.00	0.06	-0.06	54.74	55.55	-0.81	315.78	316.64	-0.86
Nagaland	25.13	25.13	0.00	11.00	10.00	1.00	194.88	194.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	58.99	58.65	0.34	290.00	288.66	1.34
Odisha	2477.36	2245.10	232.26	1969.95	2187.22	-217.27	87.25	82.25	5.00	758.92	748.91	10.01	1051.50	1209.93	-158.43	6344.98	6473.41	-128.43

State	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13			2013-14			2014-15			Total		
	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.
Punjab	196.43	194.43	2.00	164.61	164.61	0.00	169.66	169.66	0.00	117.68	117.68	0.00	310.21	286.90	23.31	958.59	933.28	25.31
Rajasthan	886.22	886.22	0.00	667.76	667.76	0.00	151.90	146.90	5.00	427.06	416.69	10.37	425.66	405.66	20.00	2558.60	2523.23	35.37
Sikkim	79.38	79.38	0.00	80.00	80.00	0.00	193.62	193.71	-0.09	1.97	2.07	-0.10	94.59	95.48	-0.89	449.56	450.64	-1.08
Tamil Nadu	469.54	322.12	147.42	160.00	307.41	-147.41	77.72	73.60	4.12	343.48	343.48	0.00	239.65	221.89	17.76	1290.39	1268.50	21.89
Tripura	285.76	257.91	27.85	229.79	206.39	23.40	338.59	323.16	15.43	98.83	73.83	25.00	187.36	185.73	1.63	1140.33	1047.02	93.31
Uttar Pradesh	1308.83	1308.83	0.00	213.77	213.77	0.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	511.93	513.58	-1.65	638.70	839.27	-200.57	2683.23	2885.45	-202.22
Uttarakhand	240.26	237.96	2.30	300.32	295.32	5.00	151.24	149.24	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	314.92	313.13	1.79	1006.74	995.65	11.09
West Bengal	819.68	819.67	0.01	828.90	828.90	0.00	3.08	3.08	0.00	306.17	306.17	0.00	1193.80	1193.80	0.00	3151.63	3151.62	0.01
Total	20366.04	19686.67	679.37	15809.40	16292.04	-482.64	4388.93	4303.41	85.52	5360.23	5247.68	112.55	9959.59	10076.37	-116.78	55884.19	55606.17	278.02

* ₹ 23.93 crore was released by the Ministry in March 2010 and credited to Bank in April 2010.

₹ 27.52 crore was released by the Ministry on 31 March 2015 and received by the state in April 2016.

Annex-5.4.2

Variation between details of expenditure as per records of the Ministry and States

(Refer to paragraph 5.4)

(₹ in crore)

State	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13			2013-14			2014-15			Total		
	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.
Andhra Pradesh	473.94	534.19	-60.25	291.75	281.51	10.24	205.66	199.57	6.09	152.56	220.29	-67.73	330.25	363.06	-32.81	1454.16	1598.62	-144.46
Arunachal Pradesh	348.85	332.74	16.11	173.37	198.34	-24.97	310.54	270.36	40.18	249.36	278.75	-29.39	362.58	359.50	3.08	1444.70	1439.69	5.01
Assam	1300.79	1386.02	-85.23	1312.18	1160.64	151.54	522.78	656.54	-133.76	699.01	749.84	-50.83	538.22	561.92	-23.7	4372.98	4514.96	-141.98
Bihar	2694.91	2656.88	38.03	2847.08	2885.43	-38.35	1992.21	2063.41	-71.20	1844.95	2067.37	-222.42	2259.30	2394.41	-135.11	11638.45	12067.50	-429.05
Chhattisgarh	304.16	309.05	-4.89	244.35	230.22	14.13	281.41	277.03	4.38	713.58	655.93	57.65	925.18	911.80	13.38	2468.68	2384.03	84.65
Goa	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gujarat	243.84	274.90	-31.06	150.55	94.46	56.09	99.54	155.95	-56.41	477.40	511.36	-33.96	685.91	625.01	60.90	1657.24	1661.68	-4.44
Haryana	108.03	111.47	-3.44	60.80	62.99	-2.19	36.53	30.65	5.88	8.19	12.16	-3.97	383.83	408.78	-24.95	597.38	626.05	-28.67
Himachal Pradesh	142.67	149.55	-6.88	119.17	117.16	2.01	55.19	126.33	-71.14	148.13	140.10	8.03	215.04	197.88	17.16	680.20	731.02	-50.82
Jammu & Kashmir	297.40	296.25	1.15	508.43	512.62	-4.19	459.69	463.78	-4.09	534.01	537.26	-3.25	422.73	424.61	-1.88	2222.26	2234.52	-12.26
Jharkhand	538.44	564.27	-25.83	323.23	355.89	-32.66	325.61	375	-49.39	539.55	498.84	40.71	785.02	707.51	77.51	2511.85	2501.51	10.34
Karnataka	634.8	670.29	-35.49	256.62	437.99	-181.37	16.63	132.27	-115.64	7.68	48.38	-40.70	411.23	433.20	-21.97	1326.96	1722.13	-395.17
Kerala	146.14	166.57	-20.43	58.07	41.42	16.65	57.30	59.35	-2.05	121.15	122.74	-1.59	190.59	182.89	7.70	573.25	572.97	0.28
Madhya Pradesh	1409.49	1421.75	-12.26	894.17	880.99	13.18	741.11	735.46	5.65	1393.07	1402.89	-9.82	1667.32	1887.52	-220.20	6105.16	6328.61	-223.45
Maharashtra	1012.48	1072.25	-59.77	546.05	583.87	-37.82	153.40	231.35	-77.95	383.50	437.34	-53.84	540.37	578.30	-37.93	2635.80	2903.11	-267.31
Manipur	122.34	135.84	-13.5	166.52	164.87	1.65	92.66	90.58	2.08	139.67	138.43	1.24	173.94	172.56	1.38	695.13	702.28	-7.15
Meghalaya	36.39	41.80	-5.41	27.68	23.95	3.73	32.46	32.41	0.05	37.70	47.70	-10.00	83.24	96.02	-12.78	217.47	241.88	-24.41
Mizoram	82.24	88.61	-6.37	85.47	78.73	6.74	41.95	36.87	5.08	26.60	38.45	-11.85	72.35	74.40	-2.05	308.61	317.06	-8.45
Nagaland	29.67	34.85	-5.18	12.26	15.09	-2.83	109.83	104.21	5.62	77.45	75.10	2.35	50.47	48.10	2.37	279.68	277.35	2.33

State	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13			2013-14			2014-15			Total		
	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.	Central	State	Diff.
Odisha	1924.25	1930.18	-5.93	1235.78	1235.02	0.76	1188.92	1249.82	-60.90	1605.72	1654.96	-49.24	1666.1	1677.23	-11.13	7620.77	7747.21	-126.44
Punjab	155.34	155.25	0.09	61.49	62.33	-0.84	238.16	228.19	9.97	295.61	286.91	8.70	285.03	286.32	-1.29	1035.63	1019	16.63
Rajasthan	686.39	686.37	0.02	247.63	247.44	0.19	573.85	574.05	-0.20	718.35	718.36	-0.01	649.97	649.56	0.41	2876.19	2875.78	0.41
Sikkim	85.53	68.45	17.08	13.93	64.09	-50.16	86.73	70.24	16.49	90.57	113.88	-23.31	94.50	109.11	-14.61	371.26	425.77	-54.51
Tamil Nadu	304.81	365.74	-60.93	211.36	159.62	51.74	21.13	23.24	-2.11	383.39	343.76	39.63	580.72	572.63	8.09	1501.41	1464.99	36.42
Tripura	237.51	279.70	-42.19	230.22	198.52	31.7	189.79	205.86	-16.07	232.76	269.51	-36.75	322.83	449.38	-126.55	1213.11	1402.97	-189.86
Uttar Pradesh	868.54	958.43	-89.89	194.84	249.94	-55.10	98.00	173.88	-75.88	824.25	951.71	-127.46	1002.26	959.51	42.75	2987.89	3293.47	-305.58
Uttarakhand	191.74	200.73	-8.99	255.48	201.57	53.91	32.39	108.44	-76.05	260.64	297.74	-37.1	425.17	458.94	-33.77	1165.42	1267.42	-102.00
West Bengal	530.29	537.69	-7.40	417.93	433.49	-15.56	423.28	431.90	-8.62	1130.44	1077.93	52.51	1414.20	1192.56	221.64	3916.14	3673.57	242.57
Total	14910.98	15429.82	-518.84	10946.41	10978.19	-31.78	8386.75	9106.74	-719.99	13095.29	13697.69	-602.40	16538.35	16782.71	-244.36	63877.78	65995.15	-2117.37

Annex-5.5
Shortcomings in release of funds to states
(Refer to paragraph 5.5)

Sl. No	State	Observations
1.	Andhra Pradesh	SRRDA received ₹ 189.37 crore (65 per cent of first instalment) in 2012-13 against ₹ 583.68 crore sanctioned for works under IAP-XI (Batch I & II). For works of ₹ 138.19 crore sanctioned during 2013-14 under Desert Development Programme (DDP) and bridge works of ₹ 566.95 crore under PMGSY- II, no fund was released to SRRDA as of August 2015. Funds for the project sanctioned during 2006-07 (₹ 134.82 crore of Phase VI), 2007-08 (₹ 579.58 crore of Phase VII) and 2008-09 (₹ 32.25 crore of Phase VIII) were released during 2010-15.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	For 44 road works valued at ₹ 462 crore sanctioned in October 2010, first release of ₹ 232 crore was made in January and March 2013, after more than two years of its sanction. For 78 road works valued at ₹ 611 crore sanctioned in February 2013, ₹ 63 crore was released in September 2014, after more than one and a half year of its sanction. Against 63 projects costing ₹ 880 crore cleared during June 2013 to February 2014, no fund was released as of March 2015.
3.	Bihar	Out of 7,535 works sanctioned during 2010-15, 6,116 works valuing ₹ 9,061.50 crore were awarded to the contractors. Against this, Central assistance of ₹ 3,225.51 crore only was released by March 2015. This was due to the fact that the state did not fulfil the condition of completion of 100 per cent of awarded works of previous years. The state government request for relaxation of condition for release of second instalment was not acceded to by the Ministry.
4.	Gujarat	Phase XIII projects of ₹ 981.29 crore was cleared in 2013-14 (₹ 970.40 crore in August 2013 and ₹ 10.89 crore in January 2014). First instalment of ₹ 490.65 crore was released in two parts in October 2013 (₹ 360 crore) and August 2014 (₹ 130.65 crore). Against second instalment of ₹ 490.65 crore, ₹ 63.91 crore was released in October 2014, ₹ 54.01 crore in January 2015 and ₹ 27.53 crore in March 2015. This was due to non- furnishing of requisite documents like action plan for road works and status of release of maintenance fund by the state.
5.	Haryana	Under PMGSY-II, 83 road works and 18 bridge works were sanctioned in May 2014 with Central share of ₹ 651.51 crore. Against this, ₹ 475.93 crore was released till February 2016.

Sl. No	State	Observations
6.	Jammu & Kashmir	Second instalment of ₹ 959.13 crore in respect of Phase VI to VIII and first instalment of Phase IX was not released due to poor progress in completion of road projects and non-fulfilment of the conditions laid down for release of second instalment.
7.	Karnataka	There was a short release of funds aggregating ₹ 628.77 crore under PMGSY.
8.	Kerala	<p>Under Phase VII, 420 projects valuing ₹ 486.74 crore were cleared in February 2009 (200 roads valuing ₹ 230.47 crore) and in September 2010 (220 works valuing ₹ 256.26 crore). Out of this, 128 projects valued at ₹ 127.65 crore were dropped in May 2013. Against these sanctioned projects, first instalment of ₹ 200 crore was released in December 2011 with a delay of more than one year and remaining ₹ 150 crore was released in April 2014.</p> <p>Under Phase VIII, 415 projects valuing ₹ 693.61 crore with Central share of ₹ 689.90 crore were cleared in April 2013 (320 projects valuing ₹ 457.04 crore) and in February 2014 (95 projects valuing ₹ 236.57 crore). However, part payments of first instalment was released in April 2015 (₹ 22 crore) and August 2015 (₹ 15.39 crore).</p>
9.	Madhya Pradesh	Against overall projects worth ₹ 19,146.92 crore with Centre share of ₹ 18,812.75 crore sanctioned under the programme, ₹ 13,204.13 crore was released till March 2015. The state government stated that the Ministry had been requested to increase the allotment of fund under the PMGSY.
10.	Maharashtra	<p>Against the projects worth ₹ 418.86 crore cleared in August 2012, ₹ 196.64 crore was released till March 2015.</p> <p>Funds were not released in respect of projects (Phase XII) cleared in October 2013 with Central share of ₹ 352.14 crore.</p> <p>In PMGSY-II, against the projects worth ₹ 1,265.53 crore cleared in 2013-14, fund had not been released as of March 2015.</p>
11.	Sikkim	<p>For the projects sanctioned during 2005-06, 2007-08 and 2008-09, only 33, 50 and 25 per cent of funds were released during 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2014-15 respectively.</p> <p>For the projects costing ₹ 206.04 crore sanctioned during 2011-12, balance 50 per cent of fund was not released as of March 2015.</p> <p>Fund for the projects worth ₹ 192.11 crore and ₹ 136.99 crore sanctioned during 2013-14 and 2014-15 respectively were not released as of March 2015.</p>
12.	Tamil Nadu	1,342 projects (Phase VIII) worth ₹ 1129.75 crore having Central share of ₹ 1,020.75 crore were cleared in December 2012. Of these 1,172 had been completed and 170 works are in advance stage of completion (April 2015). Against this, ₹ 580.37 crore (57 per cent) was released as of April 2015.

Report No. 23 of 2016

Sl. No	State	Observations
		<p>Funds were not released in 2013-14 and 2014-15 for 413 projects (Phase IX) worth ₹ 359.88 crore cleared in August 2013. In 2015-16, ₹ 119.25 crore was allocated for projects sanctioned under Phases VIII and IX.</p> <p>Due to delayed/non release, bills passed for ₹ 100.00 crore could not be paid in time and ₹ 300.00 crore was needed for payment to contractors (May 2015). Further, the SRRDA diverted a sum of ₹ 93.00 crore of performance security for payment to contractors.</p>
13.	Uttar Pradesh	<p>Out of the Central share of ₹ 179.95 crore for the projects(Phase VIII) cleared in September 2010, only ₹ 51.73 crore as part instalment was released in March 2015 with a delay of four years</p> <p>Out of Central share of ₹ 370.14 crore for the projects under World Bank Tranche- I, cleared in October 2011, first instalment of ₹ 184.07 crore was released in March 2012.</p> <p>For projects (Phase X) worth ₹ 579.93 crore cleared in November 2012, funds were not released till March 2015 due to non-furnishing of requisite documents by the state government.</p> <p>Under PMGSY-II, projects with Central share of ₹ 1134.54 crore cleared in January 2014, funds were not released till March 2015 due to non-furnishing of conditions imposed in clearance letter.</p>
14.	Uttarakhand	<p>In 12 Phases from 2000 to 2015, out of ₹ 2,806.28 crore (Central share)¹, ₹ 1,650.06 crore had been released to the state up to 2014-15. Audit observed that during 2010-11 to 2012-13, short release was due to slow absorption capacity of the state. However in 2013-14, the state had only ₹ 8.38 crore in their accounts and in 2014-15 state showed minus balance of ₹ 93.42 crore.</p>
15.	West Bengal	<p>Against the clearance of projects (Phase VIII) worth ₹ 71.41 crore in 2009-10, ₹ 251.29 crore was released in 2011-12. Fund against these projects was not released thereafter (March 2015).</p> <p>Against the projects (Phase-IX) worth ₹ 635.41 crore cleared in 2011-12, first instalment of ₹ 306.17 crore was released in 2014-15.</p> <p>In respect of projects worth ₹ 3,483.19 crore (Phase-X) and ₹ 523.61 crore (Phase-XI), cleared in 2011-12 and 2012-13 respectively, ₹ 752.84 crore (Phase-X) and ₹ 246.73 crore (Phase-XI) were released in 2014-15 .</p>

Annex-5.6
Delay in transfer of funds by state governments
(Refer to paragraph 5.6)

Sl. No.	State	Central Share (₹ in crore)	Delay beyond admissible three days	Interest liability @ 12 per cent (₹ in crore)	Observations
1.	Andhra Pradesh	154.69	30-106	3.54	As of September 2015, ₹ 50.43 crore of programme fund released during 2014-15 was yet to be transferred to SRRDA.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	342.25	30-150	8.84	₹ 3.67 crore released on account of administrative fund on 2 December 2014, was yet to be transferred to SRRDA as of May 2015.
3.	Assam	313.83	62-98	7.58	--
4.	Jammu & Kashmir	416.60	14-174	7.06	--
5.	Karnataka	235.22	55-133	5.55	₹ 35.22 crore out of ₹ 235.22 crore released in 4 March 2015, was yet to be transferred to SRRDA (May 2015).
6.	Manipur	100.00	61	2.00	--
7.	Meghalaya	62.56	27-147	1.05	--
8.	Mizoram	54.74	100-183	2.67	--
9.	Punjab	310.21	28-202	7.62	--
10.	Rajasthan	405.66	7 to 17	1.22	--
11.	Uttarakhand	298.13	11-38	3.24	---
Total		2693.89		50.37	

Annex-6.1

Deficiencies in first tier quality control mechanism

(Refer to paragraph 6.1.1)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Assam	District level laboratories were not established in two out of eight test checked districts.
2.	Himachal Pradesh	State Nodal Department had not prescribed any norms for conduct of inspections of PMGSY works by departmental officers at different levels during 2010-15.
3.	Jammu & Kashmir	In four sampled districts, tests were not conducted due to non-posting of technical persons despite availability of equipments. SQC stated that districts laboratories were not fully functional due to shortage of technicians/ technical staff required for conducting the tests in the Labs.
4.	Jharkhand	PIUs did not ensure the setting up field laboratory compulsorily on work sites. Further, during joint inspection of works, audit did not find field laboratories in any of the 18 work sites. PIUs replied that Mobile Laboratories are being used by the contractors at the sites. In the absence of records relating to machinery/equipment and technical persons, the reply of the PIU is not acceptable.
5.	Karnataka	Documentary evidence relating to establishment of field laboratory was not maintained properly. In the absence of the same, audit could not ensure whether the field labs were established by the contractors in respect of the works executed in the divisions.
6.	Mizoram	In four PIUs (EE-Hmuifang, NH-II, Aizawl Road North and Champhai PW Divisions) did not produce any record to show that the contractors under their jurisdiction had established the required Field Laboratories for the works executed by them.
7.	Rajasthan	In district level laboratories, trained staffs to check the quality of works and required equipment were not made available by the state government.
8.	Tamil Nadu	In several road works, the field laboratories (first tier monitoring) were not established.
9.	Telangana	Quality control laboratory was not established at site of work 'AP11 1201-T01- Peddarajmur to Baswapaur road in Devarakadra Mandal' and 'Providing BT on road from Kalwarala to Rangavaram' of district Mahbubnagar.
10.	Tripura	In two districts, separate field laboratory was not set up by the agencies. The samples were tested using the mobile labs and for detail analysis they were sent to the private registered laboratories.
11.	Uttarakhand	Centralised record or periodic return showing details of inspections carried out by the programme implementation units was not available. Correspondence files of the sampled works showed that field laboratories

Sl. No.	State	Observations
		were not set up by the contractors in three works even after lapse of one to three years from the date of start of work and in six road works even after the lapse of two to eight months. Further, field laboratories in two cases ¹ were not well equipped. Besides, information provided by the URRDA in this connection showed that field laboratories were not established by the contractors in seven works of four PIUs ² .
12.	West Bengal	In three districts, equipments were either not available or non-functional. The Department replied (October 2015) that necessary laboratory equipment would be procured within the year 2015. Laboratory in North 24 Parganas was non-functional since 2010 for want of necessary manpower.

¹ (i) Lakharkot- Mathkhani MR (Phase-VIII) of PIU-Salt (Almora), and (ii) Kandai to Pagna MR (Phase-XII) of PIU- PWD Karanprayag (Chamoli).

² PIU- Kapkot (Bageshwar) = 02 works, PIU- Charchula (Pithoragarh) = 03 works, PIU- Purola (Uttarkhashi) = 01 work, and PIU- Srinagar (Pauri) = 01 work.

Annex-6.2

Non/Improper maintenance of quality control registers

(Refer to paragraph 6.1.2)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Chhattisgarh	There was no section or format in the QCR for test of concrete work though the concrete roads are being constructed under the PMGSY. Further, there was no format in the QCR for quality check regarding bitumen content in seal coat.
2.	Himachal Pradesh	Part-II register was not maintained by the Assistant Engineers in two divisions (Kalpa and Kangra) which indicated that prescribed quality controls were not followed during 2010-15. Prescribed monthly returns were not submitted by the Assistant Engineers to the Executive Engineers in all test-checked divisions.
3.	Jharkhand	All test checked PIUs (except CPSUs) informed that Superintending Engineer and Chief Engineer though visits the sites but records relating to inspections were not being maintained. Inspection notes were also not issued by them.
4.	Manipur	Out of six PIUs in the four sampled districts, three PIUs produced eight QCRs in respect of eight packages of works executed during 2010-15. All requisite tests relating to GSB (density of compacted layer) and Bitumen work (binder content, thickness of layer) were not conducted in respect of two packages namely; package no. MNO 815, package no. MNO 855 (PIU, Thoubal).
5.	Mizoram	In three districts (Aizawl, Champhai and Lunglei), details of the records maintained in respect of three-tier Quality Management along with the reports and returns as per prescribed formats were either not maintained or not furnished.
6.	Telangana	The contractor did not maintain QCR at the work site of bridge constructed across 'Bollampally vagu on R/F Veldanda PWD road to Ankamanikunt. QCR was not maintained for the work 'Providing BT on road from Kalwarala to Rangavaram' as per NQM report (April 2013).
7.	Tripura	In two selected districts, test for drainage layer was not conducted. In 11 road works, abstracts of tests were partially maintained. Test for compaction of GSB layer was not conducted in three instances.
8.	Uttar Pradesh	In 26 sampled works, QCRs were not filled with the required information regarding 'date of commencement and completion of work'; details of laboratory staff who conducted the tests; details of frequencies of tests required and conducted there against, based on the quantum of works executed. In the absence of this vital information, the effectiveness of quality test in the site laboratories was not ascertainable.
9.	West Bengal	In Hooghly, documentation in respect of testing was not adequate. In 58 samples tested during 2010-15, name of the official conducted tests and dates thereof were not mentioned. Besides this, the laboratory register was not authenticated by any responsible officer.

Annex-6.3 Shortfall in Inspections by SQMs

(Refer to paragraph 6.2.1)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	Out of 703 schedules assigned to SQMs, 262 were inspected.
2.	Assam	In two PIUs (Lakhimpur, SR division, Ghilamara and Golaghat RR Division), two road works were not inspected even once by SQM as of March 2015. Under two PIUs (GRRD, Golaghat and LSRD, Ghilamara), 63 road works completed from February 2009 to February 2015 were not inspected by SQMs.
3.	Bihar	Out of 5,559 completed works inspected by SQMs, 2,968 works were inspected once and 1,562 works were inspected twice against three inspections required to be carried out by SQM for each work.
4.	Chhattisgarh	In 89 road works, against 267 inspections, 140 inspections were carried out by SQMs.
5.	Gujarat	Out of test checked 327 road works under PMGSY-I, against the prescribed three inspections, no inspection was carried out for 97 works, only one inspection was carried out for 134 works and two inspections were carried out for 51 works.
6.	Haryana	Out of 32 selected works, SQMs carried out inspections in 18 works. In 14 works, SQMs carried out 21 inspections against the required 42 inspections. Inspection was not carried out in one road work, one inspection was done in five road works and inspection of eight works were carried out twice against the required three inspections.
7.	Himachal Pradesh	SQMs conducted 1,277 inspections for 1,077 road works. 441 road works (41 per cent) were reported unsatisfactory. All the ATRs were pending (July 2015).
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	In test checked districts, against the required 192 inspections, SQMs conducted 100 inspections for 64 road works.
9.	Jharkhand	SQMs carried out 328 inspections for 186 completed road works against the required 558 inspections.
10.	Kerala	SQMs conducted 33 inspections for 29 road works against the required 87 inspections during 2010-11 to 2014-15. The required three inspections were conducted only in one work (KR 02-10) and in five works, inspection was not carried out. KSRRDA attributed the shortfall in inspection to engagement of lesser SQMs.
11.	Madhya Pradesh	350 completed roads pertaining to PIUs of seven districts ³ , three works were not inspected at all, 56 works were inspected only once, 120 works were inspected twice (Total-179 works). The state government stated that prior to November 2010 the system of online entry on OMMAS of SQMs inspections did not exist; hence entries prior to November 2010 were not appearing on OMMAS. Therefore, there was some difference between the actual inspection data as provided by the PIU and as available on OMMAS. The reply was not convincing as the data analysed were not of OMMAS but those maintained manually.
12.	Manipur	SQMs carried out 109 inspections for 222 road works against the required 666 inspections during 2010-11 to 2014-15.

³Ashoknagar, Balaghat, Datia, Jhabua, Khargone, Ratlam and Sagar

Sl. No.	State	Observations
13.	Meghalaya	Out of 69 selected works, five were completed; 43 were in progress and 21 were yet to be started (March 2015). Further, none of five completed works were inspected within one month of completion. Out of 43 ongoing works, 32 were not inspected even once, despite having physical progress ranging from 2 to 77.10 <i>per cent</i> .
14.	Mizoram	MiRRDA stated (October 2015) that inspections by the SQMs were carried out as per requirements only and there was no prescribed schedule for inspection. As such, in the absence of prescribed schedule, shortfall in achievement, if any, could not be ascertained.
15.	Odisha	In five districts ⁴ , inspection of SQM was not adequate as only 116 out of 308 works completed (37.66 <i>per cent</i>) during 2010-15 were inspected thrice. Of the remaining works, 139 works were inspected twice whereas 49 works were inspected only once and four works were not inspected at all.
16.	Punjab	In 44 works executed by 12 divisions (nine of PWD and three of PMB), 59 inspections against the requirement of 132 were carried out by SQM.
17.	Rajasthan	For 2,422 works completed during April 2011 to March 2015, 7,266 inspections were required to be carried out by SQM at three stages. Only 1,001 (41.33 <i>per cent</i>) inspections at first stage, 403 (16.64 <i>per cent</i>) at second stage and 142 (5.86 <i>per cent</i>) at third stage were carried out.
18.	Sikkim	Four completed works were inspected by the SQMs once or twice. The Department stated (November 2015) that earlier the inspection schedule of the SQM was infrequent and of late sincere efforts have been made to increase the frequency of inspection.
19.	Tamil Nadu	In the selected districts, SQMs inspected seven road works once at the end of completion period.
20.	Telangana	The SQMs inspected 289 works out of 351 completed works during April 2010 to March 2015. Inspections were not carried out in five ⁵ districts (2010-11), three ⁶ districts (2013-14) and in three ⁷ districts (2014-15). In test-checked works of district Khammam, although there were entries of SQMs inspections in measurement books, there were no records to confirm the minimum number of inspections carried out for each functionary/supervisory level.
21.	Tripura	SQMs carried out 614 inspections against the required 780 inspections for 260 road works during 2010-15.
22.	Uttar Pradesh	SQMs carried out inspections for 65 road works completed during 2010-15. Four road works were not inspected at all, six works once, 22 works twice and 28 works three times.
23.	Uttarakhand	Out of 27 works shown completed by 2013-14, 12 works were inspected once and 15 twice.
24.	West Bengal	Out of 468 completed roads in selected districts, 22 road works were not inspected at all and 159 were inspected once, 161 inspected twice.

⁴ Bolangir, Balasore, Dhenkanal, Mayurbhanj, Rayagada

⁵ Adilabad, Karimnagar, Nalgonda, Nizamabad and Ranga reddy

⁶ Karimnagar, Medak and Nalgonda

⁷ Medak, Nizamabad and Ranga reddy

Annex-6.4
Deficiencies in action taken reports

(Refer to paragraph 6.3.4)

State	No. of works inspected by NQM	No. of works rated unsatisfactory	Value of work (₹ in crore)	No. of cases where rectification report submitted by the PIU	No. of works re-inspected by SQM/NQM after submission of rectification report	No. of works rated unsatisfactory after re-inspection	Value of work (₹ in crore)
Andhra Pradesh	215	37	59.52	34	34	12	9.95
Arunachal Pradesh	44	9	19.99	7	5	3	8.65
Bihar	513	95	118.97	76	76	14	18.14
Gujarat	151	10	13.28	9	7	0	0
Haryana	21	1	1.9	1	1	1	1.9
Himachal Pradesh	443	51	61.47	51	15	4	4.57
Jammu & Kashmir	171	21	20.53	21	21	1	4.78
Jharkhand	191	37	NA	31	0	0	0
Karnataka	113	18	41.74	18	18	0	0
Kerala	76	14	23.56	14	6	0	0
Manipur	36	8	17.86	8	8	0	0
Meghalaya	92	27	45.58	32	6	0	0
Mizoram	43	18	173.36	18	10	6	45.79
Odisha	391	82	NA	46	46	0	0
Rajasthan	143	28	43.93	24	0	0	0
Sikkim	110	21	51.37	21	21	3	7.75
Telangana	115	13	22.08	11	11	2	1.42
Tripura	201	69	306.86	52	51	13	57.46
Uttar Pradesh	315	114	56.47	113	27	0	0
Uttarakhand	50	13	50.02	8	6	3	17.50
West Bengal	258	66	140.32	65	51	3	49.94
Total	3,692	752	1,268.81	660	420	65	227.85

Annex-6.5 District Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committee (DLVMC)

(Refer to paragraph 6.5)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Andhra Pradesh	SRRDA did not furnish the details of DLVMCs and their inspections during 2010-15.
2.	Haryana	DLVMC had not monitored the progress and exercise vigilance in any of the test-checked districts.
3.	Jammu & Kashmir	Monitoring reports of DLVMC were not seen in the test checked districts.
4.	Jharkhand	Meetings of DLVMC carried out during 2010-15 but records of minutes of meetings were not made available.
5.	Karnataka	DLVMC were constituted in all the selected districts for overseeing the implementation of Centrally sponsored schemes. However, the details of meetings held annually were not available with the PIUs.
6.	Manipur	In district Imphal East, two meetings were held during 2011-12 and 2012-13 against 20 meetings. The information for remaining three other sampled districts was not furnished.
7.	Mizoram	Meetings under the DLVMC were being conducted by the concerned district level Deputy Commissioners. Mizoram Rural Road Development Agency stated (October 2015) that they have no role in this aspect except attending the meeting. PIUs under two selected districts did not maintain any record.
8.	Odisha	DLVMC meetings were not held regularly. Against 120 meetings, DLVMCs met only 25 times. In district Koraput, DLVMC meetings were not held during 2010-13. In Balasore, DLVMC met eight times against 20 during 2010-15 and did not discuss about projects lying incomplete for a period ranging from 3 to 17 months. In districts Balangir, Dhenkanal and Kalahandi, records of DLVMC meetings were not produced. In districts Rayagada and Jajpur, DVVMCs met only once during 2010-15. The Department stated (November 2015) that District Administration would be apprised to conduct meetings as per guidelines.
9.	Sikkim	As per the records maintained in the RM&DD, against 80 meetings, 14 were held from April 2010 to March 2015.
10.	Uttar Pradesh	In none of the sampled districts, DLVMC performed required vigilance. PIUs accepted the audit observation.
11.	Uttarakhand	Active/effective role of the DLVMC in the PMGSY was not found in selected districts.
12.	West Bengal	Out of five districts, DLVMCs have not been formed in three districts (Malda, Purba Medinipur and Uttar Dinajpur) and in North 24 Parganas where it was formed, it had met only eight times against 20 during 2010-15. In Hooghly, records of meetings were not available. The Department stated (October 2015) that concerned District Magistrate will be advised to form V&MC.

Annex-7.1

Irregularities in providing connectivity to Habitations

(Refer to paragraph 7.3)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Andhra Pradesh	In district Anantapur, road 'Bandakadapalli to Rachinepalli' was extended to an ineligible habitation with a population of 129.
2.	Assam	In PIU, Karimganj and HPIU, Cachar Road Circle, Silchar, under the package AS 13-59, eight roads were constructed outside the CNW by spending ₹ 9.76 crore as of March 2015. In district Nagaon, in PIU Nagaon State Road Division, Nagaon, under package- AS 19-158, the construction of road 'Kampur-Jamunamukh' was taken under the programme despite being a Major District Road (MDR).
3.	Bihar	In district Nawada, road No.-BR-25R-165/11-12 [NH-31(Hurah) constructed under the programme provided connectivity to habitations Pipra Khurd which was already connected <i>via</i> Namdarganj to NH-31. In district Gaya, under package no.-BR-12R-208/11-12 (Gaya Sherghati Road to Dadubarma), multi-connectivity was being provided to habitation Itahari. In district Madhubani, under package no.-BR-21R-236 (Lurgama to Bhagwatipur), multiple connectivity was provided to habitation to Bhagwatipur. Road beyond CNW, (T01 Bathane to Khangaon road) under package no. BR-21R-390 of 2013-14, provided multi- connectivity to habitation Khangaon. In district Bhagalpur, Navtolia was connected by road from National Highway-31 was again connected by another road (package no. BR-06R-132/12-13, NH-31 Bihpur Chowk to Navtolia) after incurring expenditure ₹ 2.43 crore.
4.	Jharkhand	In district Hazaribag, road from GT Road to Dhurgargi constructed to connect targeted three habitations, Karimati, population- 553, Padirma, population-993 and Dhurgargi, population-162. However, joint physical verification showed that this road had provided connectivity to only one habitation, Dhurgargi having population of 162. In block Ichak of district Hazaribag, 'Kaladwar' was connected through Daria to Phuphundi and also a road from Manai to Kaladwar, constructed under state sponsored scheme during June 2014 to June 2015. However, the same habitation was again connected through a road from T01 to Kaladwar constructed under PMGSY. In district Jamtara, the road from Shyampur to Sildhawa (package no. JH12-004) was constructed (September 2014) for connecting the habitation 'Sildhawa' despite the fact that the habitation was already connected by a PCC road. In district Garhwa, the Parswanin Ramna situated at National Highway was selected for providing connectivity. Joint physical verification of the road 'Pandripani-Jaldega to Pandripani', showed that targeted habitation 'Pandripani' was situated at starting point of the road. The road ends at habitation 'Kupudega' which was already connected by a cement concrete road under another scheme.

		In district Simdega, joint physical verification of the road 'Kevgutu to Kodhipat' in block Bano, showed that the targeted habitation Kodhipat was already connected to an existing bituminous road connecting another habitation 'Kevgutu'.
5.	Mizoram	In districts Aizawl and Champhai, two roads (Zuangtui-Muthi, Sakawrdai-Vaitin) were provided multi-connectivity.
6.	Rajasthan	Joint physical verification of road from Chabaria to Buwana-Teja-ki-Jhopariya via Devpura constructed under cluster approach showed that the distance of one habitation, Bhuwana-Teja-ki-Jhoparia was more than 500 metres from the other habitation Bhuwana-Teja-ka-Barda. Hence, it did not qualify for cluster approach.
7.	Tamil Nadu	In district Tiruvanmalai, no habitation was found on the road Sanipoondi-Annagar, constructed at a cost of ₹ 0.30 crore under the programme.
8.	Uttarakhand	<p>In Chamoli, the road Tharali to Kuraad was found extended by 5.89 km beyond the targeted habitation Kurad up to habitation Partha which had already been connected by another PMGSY road (Sangwada-Parthakuni MR) sanctioned under Phase-X (Package UT-03-21).</p> <p>In district Nainital, the targeted habitation of Aksora (Jhajhar to Aksora) was situated at 5 km whereas the road was constructed up to nine km to provide connectivity to two ineligible habitations Quira and Banlekhi, which were not the part of the CNW.</p> <p>In district Almora, joint physical verification showed that in Bhujan-Chapar-Hidam-Billekh, the last targeted habitation Billekh situated at 27.49 km was already connected with an existing all-weather (Black Topped) link road coming from Richi-Bhujan.</p> <p>In district Chamoli, joint physical verification showed that road from Simli petrol pump to Semu road was extended up to eight km to connect a habitation Kanoth, which was not a part of the CNW.</p> <p>In district Naintal, road Nalena-Chopda constructed under the programme was extended to connect three habitations (Suadhar, Ropada and Basgaon) which were not the part of the CNW.</p>

Annex-7.2
Targeted habitation not connected
(Refer to paragraph 7.4)

Sl. No.	State	Observations
1.	Assam	<p>In district Nagaon, PIU Nagaon Road Circle, joint physical verification of road from 'Majpotani to Gereki' and 'Chanchaki to K.A. Road' showed that about 200 m of the road was not constructed to connect it to the associated Through Route. Further, the Through Route was also in deplorable condition. No habitations were found around the road.</p> <p>From 'Chanchaki to K.A. Road', 500m road length towards dead end of the road was not constructed.</p>
2.	Bihar	<p>In district Bhagalpur, road constructed under package no- BR06R-148 (NH 80 to Bhuwalpur) did not provide connectivity to intended habitation as there was railway track in the alignment of road and the road was blocked by cement concrete pillars on both edges of track.</p> <p>The Ministry stated that PMGSY does not permit construction of railway over-bridges or under-passes on the alignment of PMGSY roads. The state government pointed out that the targeted habitations have been provided connectivity because of an existing railway under-pass near the PMGSY road.</p> <p>The reply of the Ministry is not satisfactory as the objective of providing connectivity to targeted habitation was not achieved. Further, the underpass was not on the alignment of the constructed road..</p>
3.	Chhattisgarh	<p>In district Bilaspur, in road work 'T02 KULI KUKDA - BASAHA (package CG 0268)' connectivity to habitation Basaha was not provided due to non-execution of cross drainage work on <i>nallah</i>. The Department proposed long span bridge at this place after a lapse of four years from sanction of the road. The road was shown as completed (March 2014) even before construction of long span bridge.</p> <p>In district Jashpur, connectivity to habitation Kumhardhab by road from Kumhardhab to TR-02, completed in April 2015, was not provided as the required bridge on river passing through RD-275 was sanctioned in February 2016.</p>
4.	Jharkhand	<p>In district Deoghar, road from Rajsar to Raidih was completed at a cost of ₹ 1.10 crore in December 2014 for targeted habitations Rajsar. Joint Physical Verification showed that road was completed without providing connectivity to Rajsar. On enquiry it was seen that Rajsar habitation was 8 km. away from the end point of this road.</p> <p>Construction of road Ghorlas to Baranokhil was completed at a cost of ₹ 0.65 crore in September 2014 for targeted habitations Bhoktadih, Govindpur and Kokribank as per DPR. The construction of road was completed without connecting targeted habitation Kokribank, which was connected from other Road Rajsar to Raidih.</p> <p>In Garhwa, joint physical verification of two roads, L046 to Jala and Katkamsandi to Ulanj showed that full connectivity was not provided to targeted habitations Jala and Ulanj by more than 500 m.</p>
5.	Odisha	<p>In district Rayagada, PWD road to Balikhamba constructed (March 2015) at a cost of ₹ 0.63 crore, failed to provide connectivity to Balikhama as the road fell short of 700 metres from the targeted habitaiton.</p>

Annex-7.3
Incomplete/Poor construction of Road Works
(Refer to paragraph 7.5)

Sl. No	State	Observations
1	Arunachal Pradesh	In district Lohit, road from 1.5 km Tezu-Lohitpur to Mekhaliang was damaged due to erosion of bituminous layer, pothole at the road surface. Road from Lathau to Jona-III was poorly maintained after expiry of five-year maintenance period as many potholes were found on the road.
2	Assam	Under package AS 13-59 in PIU, Karimganj under the HPIU, Silchar, eight roads outside the CNW were taken up under the programme at a cost of ₹ 10.89 crore and as of March 2015, ₹ 9.76 crore was spent on this project. Condition of the completed segment of the road was deplorable as the road was full of mud and big potholes. Side berms were started disintegrating. Although the road was constructed under the PMGSY, it did not link any habitation. The condition of 'Kampur Jamunamukh road, (Circle Nagaon) was deplorable. Big potholes had developed and in some stretches bitumen work was gradually disintegrating. Side berms were also broken.
3	Chhattisgarh	In district Raipur, one side approach of Hume Pipe Culvert on road no. T 02 (Dhurrabandha) to Pousari was washed out due to heavy rains as proper assessment of discharge was not done.
4	Jammu & Kashmir	Joint physical verification of 10 road projects in three selected districts showed that against 269 bridges/cross drainages, 170 were constructed. Further, roads were damaged due to non- construction of adequate cross drainages and poor construction.
5	Jharkhand	In district Simdega, road 'Pandripani Jaldega to Pandripani' constructed in September 2015, a culvert at about 600 meter from the starting point was damaged, As a result, the road was badly damaged at that point and vehicles could not pass through this point. In district Deoghar, road T06 to Dunduadih constructed (January 2015) at a cost of ₹ 0.64 crore was damaged at several places. Records of Rural Works Division, Deoghar showed that contractor, due to Naxal problem, stopped (September 2013) construction of 96 meter long bridge over Darwha river. Joint physical verification showed that only three pillars were constructed so far. Girder of bridge was in bent condition. Due to non-construction of bridge, connectivity between Bodhania Bank and Manikpur was not provided. In district Simdega, joint physical verification of road 'L059-REO Main Road Kutmakachhar to Murambatoli via Jhimari', showed that after 2.070 km from the starting point, alignment was passing through forest area and had hard rock though, the DPR did not show the hard rock and mentioned forest areas after 3.5 km. No work was carried out between ch. (2.070 to 4.200 km) on this account.

Sl. No	State	Observations
6	Manipur	In district Ukhrul, the “Chingai-Huishu Road” could not provide motorable connectivity due to non-completion of the Bailey Bridge at “Chingai-Huishu Road (MN0943)” (situated at 7.5 km). One suspension bridge (footbridge) situated adjacent to under construction Bailey Bridge served as link to cross the river. Approach road was not completed on the Chingai side of approach of the bridge.
7	Sikkim	Road from Mintogang to Dhanbariroad was completed in August 2014 at a cost of ₹ 3.31 crore. Seven CDs and six culverts were found constructed of which two CDs were blocked by the land slide. The side drains of the roads were found damaged in various chainage due to land slide, blockage by sand and mud.
8	Uttarakhand	<p>In district Chamoli, joint physical verification of road Palsari-Bamiyala showed that defective cutting of hill side under Stage-I work was apparently visible at various places, which were not removed before the execution of the bituminous works of the road under Stage-II. The width in some part of the road found only 3-4 metres due to non-rectification of the defects. Further, maintenance work was not carried out by the contractor.</p> <p>Roadwork from Chopda to Nalai was an extension of Mailsain-Chopda road up to Nalai habitation but the quality of bituminous work was found poor at various places.</p> <p>In district Nainital, joint physical verification of road showed that Bhorsa-Pinro constructed as a through road though its sanction was obtained as a link route. Target habitation Pinro was halfway from both sides whereas another targeted habitation Pashtola (Population-350) was not found along the entire alignment of the road. Further, the road was not found maintained though its Stage-II works were completed in February 2014.</p> <p>In district Pauri, bituminous work of road Mailsain to Chopda was found damaged at various places.</p> <p>In district Almora, Other District Road-59 Lakharkot to Matkhani, the quality of bituminous work was found poor resulted in damage to the surface of the road at many places. 400 metre road was constructed beyond the last targeted habitation Mathkani. Maintenance work was not carried out by the contractor after completion of work in July 2012.</p>

Annex-7.4
Deficiencies in execution of works
(Refer to paragraph 7.6)

Sl. No	State	Observations
1.	Bihar	In district Madhubani, verification of road no.-BR-21R-224 (X-road T02 to Kukurdaura) showed that side drain was not constructed on both side of CC Pavement portion and two culverts at chainage 3920 m and at 3940 m were partially damaged.
		In district Vaishali, under package no- BR-36R-147 in road from Terasia to Ashpatpur Singhia urf Bariarpur, one hume pipe culvert was constructed against the provision of three. The required CD structures were also not constructed.
		In district Katihar, under package no. - BR-16R-127 (Simariya to Nakkipur), brick edge soling in 1198 meter on both side of road and angle drain were not constructed.
2	Himachal Pradesh	In district Kangra, construction of Rulehar-Lam link route to provide connectivity to habitations Har and Lal was completed in August 2014 at a cost of ₹ 2.98 crore. Joint physical verification showed that contractor had not executed the work completely ¹ whereas the Department had shown the work as completed. In many stretches, the side drains filled with debris and stones were not visible. At some stretches, the road looked like unpaved road.
3	Jharkhand	In district West Singhbhum, execution of work of Noamundi SH to Sosopi, was allotted to contractor by NPCC in December 2014 despite the fact that existing surface was PCC and in good condition.
		In district West Singhbhum, construction road Ichapi to Jwaribhanga in block Majhgaon was completed in May 2014 at a cost of ₹ 1.20 crore. Instead of construction of a small bridge, a culvert without any protection wall was constructed at that site with the result, road was nearly washed away by water that overflowed at that point.
		In district Jamtara, verification of road 'Purnighati to Borwa' constructed (October 2014), showed that due to non-provision of hill side drains and protection walls, road curve was cut and soil accumulated at road with rain water.
		In district West Singhbhum and Deoghar, joint physical verification of roads Chhotakudra to Patahatu, Sonua main road to Guikera chowk via Kumai and Baidynathpur to Bahadurpur showed that side drains were not constructed near habitations.
4	Sikkim	In district East, road Tsalamthang to Lower Tareythang was completed in January 2014. Out of sanctioned length of 7.88 km (stage-I), the length of 6.28 km fair weather road was constructed and remaining 1.60 km was constructed at another location at PWD Road to Amba which was about three km away from the actual sanctioned location.
5	Tamil Nadu	In district Dindigul, the habitations Komberipatti-Andikulam was not at the starting point (0/0) and end point (1/500) respectively and distance was 200/300 metre away from the road.
6	Tripura	In district West Tripura, the road Brahmacherra ward-1 to Kakracherra was completed in April 2011 with only two culverts against eight as per DPR .

¹ Formatting cutting: kms 3,880, cross drainage: 27 nos., side drain: 3,262 rmt, parapets: 150 nos., wearing : kms 3,746 and tarring: kms 3,435.

Annex-8.1
Examination of the Website
Balances as per State Balance Sheet (March 2015)
(Refer to paragraph 8.3)

State	Unreconciled Bank authorisations	Unreconciled Programme Fund
Andhra Pradesh	₹ -12,56,64,975.00	₹ -2,01,53,13,155.00
Assam	₹ -2,37,30,545.00	₹ -53987,04,337.00
Bihar CPWD	₹ -9,69,79,000.00	₹ -9,69,79,000.00
Bihar NHPC	₹ 24,25,722.00	₹ 0.00
Bihar RWD	₹ 2,93,04,77,252.73	₹ -22,30,05,30,330.00
Chhattisgarh	₹ 98,17,444.00	₹ 0.00
Haryana	₹ -49,35,908.00	₹ -3,49,94,10,411.00
Jammu & Kashmir	₹ -2,34,37,14,903.36	₹ -28,09,44,90,647.73
Jharkhand HSWC	₹ 50,76,52,810.00	₹ -4,78,24,31,186.00
Jharkhand NBCC	₹ 50,76,52,810.00	₹ -4,78,24,31,186.00
Jharkhand NPCC	₹ 50,76,52,810.00	₹ -4,78,24,31,186.00
Jharkhand RWD	₹ 50,76,52,810.00	₹ -4,78,24,31,186.00
Karnataka	₹ 2,22,78,318.00	₹ -37,28,27,41,527.66
Kerala	₹ -4,32,67,590.00	₹ -8,98,65,13,433.75
Maharashtra	₹ -12,11,65,34,148.86	₹ -14,25,80,80,346.18
Mizoram	₹ -2,31,76,715.00	₹ -18,92,14,779.00
Odissa	₹ -2,06,46,654.00	₹ 11,18,69,000.00
Tamil Nadu	₹ -7,45,32,57,724.69	₹ -6,92,37,88,564.86
Tenangana	₹ -2,20,13,664.00	₹ -4,20,69,55,798.00
Tripura	₹ -1,30,32,88,463.00	₹ -8,05,27,61,721.00
Uttarakhand	₹ -3,36,06,914.52	₹ -3,38,89,285.52
Total	₹ -18,61,52,07,228.70	₹ -1,54,95,85,24,743.70
Debit Balance	₹ -23,61,08,17,205.43	
Credit Balance	₹ 4,99,56,09,976.73	

Annex-8.2

Examination of the website: Tendering Agreement Details

(Refer to paragraph 8.3)

Sl. No.	State	Works Sanctioned	Works Agreement	Sanctioned Cost (₹ in lakh)	Agreement Value (₹ in lakh)
1	Andhra Pradesh	4,452	4,374	339,610.94	8,081,340,088.98
2	Arunachal Pradesh	976	879	377,033.54	788,331,242.17
3	Assam	5,660	5,368	1,020,893.11	1,628,479,046.34
4	Bihar	16,852	14,350	2,873,898.40	4,557,541,107.54
5	Chhattisgarh	6,813	6,695	846,945.30	96,746,565.20
6	Goa	84	0	1,535.27	0.00
7	Gujarat	4,420	4,418	280,526.84	329,820,397.75
8	Haryana	426	426	154,630.30	45,824,382.86
9	Himachal Pradesh	2,384	2,251	303,732.16	5,387,729,048.36
10	Jammu & Kashmir	1,982	1,638	527,650.71	129,798,589.16
11	Jharkhand	5,174	4,681	680,414.76	1,395,317,435.91
12	Karnataka	3,315	3,308	334,064.48	541,523,080.27
13	Kerala	1,430	1,351	151,285.45	557,385,405.21
14	Madhya Pradesh	16,218	16,060	1,868,927.41	671,852,109.65
15	Maharashtra	6,158	6,098	670,792.53	2,503,717,594.61
16	Manipur	1,544	1,300	233,119.63	148,300.26
17	Meghalaya	721	703	110,781.79	117,981.25
18	Mizoram	217	213	97,286.82	15,767,018.74
19	Nagaland	305	305	73,273.24	74,363.64
20	Odisha	11,941	10,911	1,781,298.61	4,803,721,017.60
21	Punjab	1,050	1,035	282,350.86	92,243,339.11
22	Rajasthan	15,550	15,330	1,217,719.90	1,374,010,492.15
	Sikkim	778	777	122,165.10	157,908.60
	Tamil Nadu	6,654	6,242	349,703.17	229,087,671.75
	Telangana	2,843	2,820	216,061.1	2,919.57
	Tripura	1,401	1,354	300,778.19	834,489.22
	Uttar Pradesh	17,649	17,462	1,354,473.27	7,758,338,048.01
	Uttarakhand	1,125	1,034	301,105.07	1,051,332,275.81
	West Bengal	4,981	4,750	1,106,489.66	333,285,504.79
	Total	1,43,103	1,36,133	1,79,78,547.62	42,37,45,27,424.51

Annex-8.3
IT Infrastructure in states
(Refer to paragraph 8.7)

Sl. No.	IT Audit issues	Findings
1.	Has the SRRDA appointed an officer of sufficient seniority and with adequate knowledge of information technology to function as State IT Nodal Officer during the review period?	In Gujarat, Karnataka, Nagaland and Tamil Nadu no ITNO was appointed. In Haryana the post is vacant since November 2014 and in Jammu & Kashmir , ITNO was not appointed since February 2013. In Bihar , Civil Engineer with working knowledge of computer was appointed as ITNO.
2.	Is sufficient computer hardware (Desktop machines, internet connectivity, printers, etc.) available for data entry/generation of MIS reports for OMMAS application?	Except Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh and Meghalaya , no state reported deficiency of computer hardware.
3.	Have Annual Maintenance Contracts (AMC) for computer hardware been awarded?	AMC for computer hardware was not awarded in Bihar, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Nagaland .
4.	Are sufficient staff viz., Data entry operators available for data entry?	Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur, Meghalaya, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh reported lack of availability of DEOs for data entry.
5.	Are the staff adequately trained by C-DAC/SRRDA for data entry?	Training was reported adequate by all states.
6.	Is there provision for verification/authentication of data entry by supervisory levels in the OMMAS application?	In Arunachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh , there was no provision to verify/authenticate data entry.
7.	What is the provision of supervising bulk data entry?	No such provision except in Haryana, J & K, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and West Bengal .
8.	Are persistent delay/failure to update data at PIU level reported to the CEO of SRRDA to effectively monitor the progress of data entry?	No such reporting except in Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh .
9.	Are periodical progress reports sent to SRRDA by the IT Nodal officer?	No such reporting except in Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, J & K, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Nagaland, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh .
10.	Are monthly MIS Reports are generated by the system and submitted to CEO, SRRDA?	In Chhattisgarh, Haryana, J & K, Jharkhand, Kerala, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Tripura and Uttar Pradesh , MIS reports were not generated by the system and submitted to CEO, SRRDA.
11.	Are quarterly MIS Reports generated at DPIUs and forwarded to IT Nodal Officer along with Executive Engineer/Head of PIU's comments on the reliability of the data?	In Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, J & K, Jharkhand, Kerala, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal , MIS reports were not generated at DIPUs and forwarded to ITNO.