

CHAPTER XIX : MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

19.1 Functioning of Directorate of Estates

There has been a perpetual shortage of accommodation for Government servants in Delhi. DoE did not have an accurate record of the housing stock available with it. Augmentation of housing stock in the various pools has been done in an inequitable manner. Licence Fee Collection and Monitoring System was not fully functional resulting in DoE not being able to monitor the receipt of the Licence Fee. Database of DoE and CPWD are not interlinked leading to delays in the reflection of vacancy position of houses in the GAMS database. DoE did not have accurate details of houses which are declared as unsafe or dangerous. The quality of data in the Government Accommodation Management System (GAMS) database was also found to be poor.

Introduction

One of the responsibilities of the Ministry of Urban Development (MoUD), Government of India (GoI) pertains to construction and maintenance of Central Government buildings, including residential accommodation, with the exception of those under the Ministry of Defence, Atomic Energy, Railways and Communication. MoUD performs these functions through the Directorate of Estates (DoE) and the Central Public Works Department (CPWD).

DoE is an attached office of the MoUD, GoI. DoE is responsible for administration and management of residential and office accommodation in the metropolitan cities of Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata and Chennai and five other cities/towns, namely, Shimla, Ghaziabad, Chandigarh, Faridabad and Nagpur. DoE is also responsible for administration and management of Holiday Homes in 11 stations, Touring Officers' Guest Houses in 43 stations, government hostels and Vigyan Bhawan in New Delhi and markets and shops in Government colonies in Delhi, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Mumbai and Nagpur.

As part of its duties for administration of residential accommodation, DoE is responsible for maintenance of housing stock, registration of applicants for allotment of houses, preparation of waiting lists, updating information in respect of occupied and vacant houses, allotment of houses, cancellation of allotment on retirement, resignation, dismissal/death, penal action in case of subletting, misuse, accounting of Licence Fee etc.

CPWD is a comprehensive Construction Management Agency of Government of India, which provides services from project concept to completion and maintenance management in the post construction stage. CPWD also provides maintenance services to the General Pool Residential Accommodation (GPRA) and Central Government Buildings.

MoUD introduced a computer software viz. Government Accommodation Management System (GAMS) in November 2001 with the aim of creating a transparent, corruption free and efficient allotment system for the housing stock units available with DoE. <http://estates.nic.in> is the website of DoE which provides all the information regarding government accommodation available for the applicants/allottees and public in addition to circulars, policy orders, compendium, information about booking of Vigyan Bhawan/Holiday Homes etc. gpra.nic.in is the frontend of GAMS database used by the applicants/allottees etc. to get information about the housing stock, vacancies, allotments and waiting list etc.

The portal www.eawas.nic.in was developed for internal work of DoE and online licence fee posting by Drawing and Disbursing Officers (DDOs). This portal has been interlinked with www.cpwdsewa.nic.in (e-Sewa), web based software developed by CPWD for management of maintenance, for online vacancy reporting etc.

Audit reviewed the functioning of DoE for the period from January 2008 to March 2015 and examined records available in the DoE, CPWD, NIC and MoUD. Audit also analysed electronic data in GAMS and on DoE website with reference to the allotment related transactions for the period from January 2011 to July 2014 since the Automated System of Allotment (ASA) was introduced progressively from May 2010 onwards for different types of houses and most of the higher type houses were covered by January 2011.

Audit findings

19.1.1 Demand and availability of houses

The demand for houses as well as the available housing stock in Delhi as on 31 December for the years 2008 to 2014, as published in the Annual Reports of MoUD, is given below:

Table 1 : Satisfaction level across pools (as on June 2014)

As on 31 December	(No. of houses)		
	Demand	Availability	Shortfall
2008 [#]	98789	63167	35622
2009	77506	63262	14244
2010	88578	63196	25382
2011	105773	63921	41852
2012	95475	63945	31530
2013 [@]	106317	61836	44481
2014	97984	61407	36577

Data as on 31 March 2009

@ Data as on 31 March 2014

It can be seen that the availability for GPRA in Delhi has varied from 61,407 to 63,945 and the shortage of government accommodation has ranged between 14,244 and 44,481 during the period from March 2009 to December 2014. MoUD has considered that acute shortage of Government housing, especially in the National Capital Region (NCR) in various categories, has created a long waiting list of Government officials for eligible housing.

19.1.2 Inaccuracies in housing stock figures

There were inaccuracies in the housing stock figures maintained by DoE on which MoUD had also expressed its concern in a note dated 26 December 2007 initiated by Additional Secretary (UD). While admitting inaccuracy in housing stock, DoE assured MoUD vide note dated 10 January 2008 that internal verification/corrections were being done vigorously and hopefully the housing stock directly managed by DoE would be made 100 *per cent* accurate before next periodical review by the Ministry.

Audit observed that the DoE's website, www.estates.nic.in, indicated that there are 64,239 houses (8 May 2013) whereas www.eawas.nic.in indicated a housing stock of 63,975 (10 May 2013). This showed that the problem of inaccuracy in the figures of housing stock was still persisting and an accurate figure of housing stock had not been reached as yet.

DoE replied (March 2015) that housing stock by nature is fluid. Houses declared unsafe, razed by CPWD for reconstruction/redevelopment, addition of new houses through new construction projects or from departmental pool are the factors that make the available houses vary from time to time. DoE further replied (August 2015) that display of different figures at same time is due to non-updation at one place. DoE added that the housing stock as entered in

GAMS is authentic figure and allotment made from it and that there is no way for such houses to remain vacant and being out of allotment cycle.

The details of the housing stock were again verified during October 2015. It was seen that www.eawas.nic.in which is for the internal use of DoE had indicated a housing stock of 68,471 on 28 October 2015 whereas www.gpra.nic.in indicated a housing stock of 68,584 on 29 October 2015 indicating discrepancy in the figures. Moreover, on clicking the “Recalculate” button in www.eawas.nic.in indicated a figure of 80,397 houses which also included a number of non – existent quarter types like 10, 11, 20, 30, 40, 70, 80 etc. raising questions on the integrity of the figure of houses.

Further, it was seen that the DoE’s website had indicated that there were 61,869 residential units in Delhi as on 31 March 2015. Moreover, DoE intimated in November 2015 that during April 2015 to October 2015, only 215 houses were added in the housing stock of GPRA. Thus, the number of residential units should have been only around 62,100 while it was around 68,000 as indicated in the preceding paragraph. From the above, it can be seen that discrepancies in the figures of housing stock are persisting.

Audit is of the view that the differences in the housing stock at different places can be utilised by unscrupulous elements to keep houses outside the allotment cycle and may be used by unlawful elements for illegal activities. Hence, DoE should ensure that the authentic housing stock is reconciled and updated at all locations at the earliest.

19.1.3 Physical verification of housing stock

Audit observed that in January 2008, Special Secretary (UD), MoUD had directed the CPWD to carry out physical verification of housing stock available in each of 137 Service Centres, so that DoE can update and ensure availability of accurate information about the housing stock. DoE, while apprising Secretary (UD), MoUD on 12 March 2008, stated that the information submitted by CPWD was not of much use to DoE as it was not submitted in the desired format with necessary details as required by DoE. CPWD was requested (July 2008) to re-check their housing stock and submit information in the format as required by DoE.

Audit did not find details of further developments in the matter of physical verification of housing stock in the records provided to audit. Audit is of the

view that being the manager of the housing stock, DoE should keep a record of the physical verification done.

DoE replied (March 2015) that physical verification of houses is conducted by CPWD through the Executive Engineers of the Service Centres. DoE further stated (August 2015) that the audit observation has been noted for compliance.

Recommendation No. 1: DoE should get the housing stock physically verified and keep an accurate record of the housing stock.

19.1.4 Level of Satisfaction in various house pools

Satisfaction level for each type of accommodation refers to availability position of residential accommodation for the Central Government Employees with reference to their demand. A Prioritization Committee¹ set up in the MoUD prescribed satisfaction levels of 50 *per cent* in cities other than Delhi and 70 *per cent* in Delhi. However, the details of all the meetings of the Prioritisation Committee and copies of the minutes thereof sought from DoE have not been made available to audit.

Scrutiny of data relating to the waiting list of applicants and housing stock figures from the GAMS database for the month of June in the years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 revealed wide variation in satisfaction levels across various pools (GP, TP, TN, LM and LS) for houses in types (4S, 5A, 5B and 6A)² as indicated in the table below.

Table 2 : Satisfaction level across pools (as on June 2014)

Pool \ Year	Availability of houses				Demand of houses				Satisfaction level (in per cent)			
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2011	2012	2013	2014	2011	2012	2013	2014
GP	2262	2262	2262	2262	5089	7585	6308	7311	44.45	29.82	35.86	30.94
LM	200	200	200	200	556	842	723	855	35.97	23.75	27.66	23.39
LS	84	84	84	84	121	171	153	162	69.42	49.12	54.90	51.85
TN	91	91	91	91	276	314	286	342	32.97	28.98	31.82	26.61
TP	1173	1173	1173	1173	1446	1441	1393	1450	81.12	81.40	84.21	80.90

It can be seen that while the satisfaction level for the four years from 2011 to 2014 remained at more than 80 *per cent* for TP, less than 45 *per cent* for GP, less than 36 *per cent* for LM, less than 70 *per cent* for LS and less than

¹ Files regarding the Committee and its composition were not made available by DoE / MoUD and as such date of setting up of the Committee, its composition or the date of its report could not be ascertained during audit.

² These are the type of houses where separate pools TP, TN, LM, LS exist.

33 per cent for TN pools. For the biggest pool GP, the satisfaction level further declined from 44 per cent in 2011 to 31 per cent in 2014 whereas for TN pool, it further declined from 33 per cent in 2011 to 27 per cent in 2014.

In 2014, it can be seen that the satisfaction level was more than that prescribed by Prioritisation Committee only in respect of TP while in respect of all other pools, it was much less than the prescribed average satisfaction level of 70 per cent. The wide variation in the satisfaction levels amongst various pools indicated imbalanced augmentation of different pools. The purpose of creation of pools appears to lessen the waiting time and to ensure easier availability of houses to identified categories of applicants. However, such creation of pools ought to be managed in a way so as to keep the satisfaction levels of all the pools at comparable levels. Further, the gaps in the satisfaction levels have been widening over time leading to longer waiting time for GP, TN, LM and LS pools. This position is not equitable and needs to be corrected timely.

DoE noted (August 2015) the audit observation for future compliance and stated that it is taking steps to increase the house stock like issuing more no objection certificates for construction of residential quarters to different departments/organizations, taking up construction of higher types of houses etc.

19.1.5 Analysis of waiting lists

The eligibility of the government servants to different types of government accommodation is determined by their emoluments. The highest type of house up to which a government servant can apply on the basis of their grade pay/pay in the pay band for grade pay from ₹ 6,600 is presented in the following table.

Table 3 : Eligibility for Higher types of houses

Entitlement upto Type	Grade Pay	Pay scale
4S	6600	
5A	7600	
5B	8700, 8900	
6A (C-II)	10000	
6B(C-I)	-	₹ 67000 to ₹ 74999
7	-	₹ 75000 to ₹ 79999
8	-	₹ 80000 and above

Audit analysed the details of persons waiting for allotment of houses as on 31 December of 2012 and 2013 and noticed that a number of persons have applied for a type of accommodation below their entitlement due to long waiting in type of house of their entitlement. The number of government servants applying for accommodation below their entitlement, pool – wise, is presented in the following table:

Table 4 : Number of persons applying for accommodation below entitlement

	GP		LM		LS		TN		TP	
Grade Pay	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
7600	439	656	51	89	7	7	20	22	3	4
8700	1220	1719	146	189	12	17	126	192	11	16
8900	195	272	12	14	1	1		1	7	11
10000	531	803	74	119		7	4	17	41	66
>10000	129	151	22	22	7	7			37	49
Total	2514	3601	305	433	27	39	150	232	99	146

From the above, it can be seen that 2,514 officers in GP had applied for accommodation below their entitlement in 2012 which increased to 3,601 in 2013. These figures for the other pools were 305 and 433 for LM, 27 and 39 for LS, 150 and 232 for TN and 99 and 146 for TP.

Further analysis indicates that 23 officers having grade pay of ₹ 10,000 were waiting for Type 4S houses in GP in 2012 which increased to 29 officers in 2013. However, there were no officers above grade pay ₹ 8,700 waiting for Type 4S houses in LS, TN and TP. In LM, two officers having grade pay of ₹ 10,000 and two officers having grade pay of ₹ 8,900 are waiting for Type 4S houses in 2012 which was three and two in 2013.

DoE stated (March 2015) that waiting list can only be reduced by supplementing the houses in GPRA through new construction and stated that new projects are decided by CPWD. DoE further replied (August 2015) that it raises these issues in the Standing Committee meetings of the CPWD of which DoE is also a member.

DoE has not furnished the minutes of the meetings of the Standing Committee, in the absence of which Audit is unable to substantiate the reply of DoE. However, DoE should take steps to ensure that the wide variation in satisfaction levels amongst pools is reduced through equitable distribution of available houses amongst pools.

19.1.6 Houses lying vacant

In reply to an audit query (May 2013), DoE stated (August 2013) that no higher type house has remained vacant for more than 3 months during the period from January 2009 to March 2013 with the introduction of ASA. However, Audit noticed that CPWD had sent letters to DoE informing about houses lying vacant for long time as detailed below:

Table 5 : Illustrative instances where CPWD intimation received in DoE for non-allotment of vacant houses

Sl. No.	Sub – division, Division of CPWD (Service Centre Number of CPWD)	House type and number of houses	Date of CPWD letter of forwarding to DoE list of houses lying vacant and requesting necessary action	Number of houses vacant for more than 3 months	Number of houses vacant for more than 6 months	Number of houses vacant for more than 12 months
1.	A, Timarpur (234)	1 – 69 2 – 60	September 11, 2012	8	9	90
2.	3/A, Mall Road (231)	1 – 23 2 – 7 3 – 11	September 11, 2012	2	3	29
3.	3/A, Mall Road (232)	2 – 8	September 11, 2012	-	2	1
4.	3/A, Timarpur (233)	2 – 15 3 – 2	September 11, 2012	-	2	6
5.	4/K, Tilak Lane (201)	5A – 3 6A – 3	June 3, 2013	1	1	-
6.	3/P Andrewsganj (416)	18	July 3, 2013	5	1	4
7.	5/K, Kaka Nagar (203)	5A – 10	July 12, 2013	1	2	1
8.	5/K, Bapa Nagar (202)	6A – 5 6B – 1	July 12, 2013	2	-	-
9.	4/K, Tilak Lane (201)	5A – 2 6A – 1	September 2, 2013	-	1	-
10.	5/K, Kaka Nagar (203)	5A – 5	September 4, 2013	-	2	-

It was seen in audit that in-spite of the above intimation from CPWD, 66 houses were lying vacant even at the end of November 2015. Non-allotment of houses fit to occupy resulted in lower satisfaction levels due to increase in shortage of houses.

DoE replied (January 2015/March 2015) that the vacancies were reported by CPWD when the allottee vacates the house. The delay was now being addressed by reporting of vacancies by all CPWD service centres. The earlier anomalies arose due to not-linking of the e-Awas and the e-Sewa software of the CPWD which has since been addressed and the two Softwares have been linked w.e.f. 15 September 2014. MoUD further stated (August 2015), that e-Sewa

application has option of generating vacation report as DoE houses or Non-DoE houses as CPWD caters to houses of different departments besides GPRA. All GPRA house IDs are linked with e-Sewa. Probably the CPWD enquiry (M.B. Road, Sec-5) was generating vacation report as Non-DoE house. But for last two months they are generating it online only and number of manual vacation reports have dropped. MoUD further stated that 139 houses of Mayapuri and 60 type 2H in Dev Nagar were not linked at e-Sewa otherwise almost all stocks of DoE and CPWD are linked. A detailed analysis of interlinking of DoE and CPWD databases is done in para 2.14.1 of this report.

The houses indicated by Audit are from various localities in Delhi and not only from MB Road as stated by DoE. Moreover, DoE has not furnished any documents in support of their claims in the reply. DoE should take steps to ensure that there is 100 *per cent* linking of the e-Awas and e-Sewa database and vacation reports are generated and transmitted online.

19.1.7 Regularisation of Accommodation after retirement, death etc.

As per SR 317 B-11 of Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, a residence can be retained up to 12 months on the death of the allottee and up to 8 months after retirement. Further, in terms of SR 317 B-25 - OM dated 20 May 1999, when a Government servant, who is an allottee of General Pool accommodation, retires from service, the ward/spouse will be eligible for regularization/allotment of alternate entitled type of accommodation provided he/she is a Government servant eligible for allotment of accommodation from General Pool and had been residing continuously with the retiring Government servant for at least three years immediately preceding the date of retirement. In case the ward/ spouse of the deceased Government servant is eligible for General Pool accommodation and has been residing with him for at least six months prior to the allottee's death, he/she will be eligible for regularization/allotment of entitled type of accommodation. Request for regularization/allotment of entitled type of accommodation may also be considered in case the dependent ward/spouse gets an employment in an eligible office even after the death of the officer, provided such an appointment is secured within a period of two years after the death of the allottee and the accommodation in occupation has not been vacated. Application for regularization /allotment may be submitted within a period of two months from the date of death/retirement of the allottee or from the date of appointment in Government service, whichever is later.

Audit observed that occupation of houses was regularised even after 19 years of the date of death/retirement.

In its reply (January 2015/March 2015) DoE intimated reasons for delay such as non-submission of required documents by the applicant, delay in rent clearance, court cases by the applicant, delayed application. In a number of cases, the deceased allottees family gains government employment in the 3rd year. Thereafter, the deposition of documents, processing of the case takes some time.

Audit is of the view that DoE should take steps to ensure that the cases of regularisation of accommodation after death/retirement should be done within a reasonable period of time so that families of deceased government servants do not face harassment and also to guard against possible unauthorised occupation of houses.

19.1.8 Overstayed in residence after cancellation of allotment/ unauthorized occupation of Government Accommodation

As per the allotment rules, in cases where the period of allotment approved by the competent authority has expired, immediate action should be taken for initiating eviction proceedings under the provisions of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 after allowing the permissible retention period. One week before the expiry of the allowable retention period, a reference is to be made by the Allotment Section to the Estates Officer with a request to issue notice under section 4 of the Public Premises Act on the first day of the commencement of unauthorized occupation. The allottee is charged Licence Fee at damage rates as fixed from time to time for the period of unauthorized occupation. Recovery proceedings are also initiated under the Act.

From the details provided to audit, it was seen that as of October 2015, 1032 houses of type 1 to type 4 (Type 1 - 255, Type 2 - 452, Type 3 -177, Type 4 - 148) had been unauthorizedly occupied by allottees of which 107 of Type 1, 111 of Type 2, 44 of Type 3 and 67 of Type 4 houses had been unauthorizedly occupied for more than two years. Further, it was observed that one type 2 house has been unauthorizedly occupied since 1985. It was seen that 604 cases were referred to litigation with a delay of more than one month. It was also observed that Licence Fee of ₹ 1.02 crore was due as on 31 July 2013, from 80 unauthorized occupants of Type 4 accommodation. The overall current position as of October 2015 of market/damage rate recovery and outstanding in respect of unauthorized government accommodation was not furnished by DoE stating

that no such data was maintained. DoE did not furnish the information regarding outstanding Licence Fee in respect of other types of accommodation on the pretext of shortage of staff. DoE intimated (March 2015) that as per policy, the unauthorized occupants/allottees were charged Licence Fee at damage rate. It further intimated that damages bills had been issued to the unauthorised occupants and DRC cases also filed against the defaulters. It was also indicated that DoE is in coordination with NIC for developing a programme for generation of damages bills online. MoUD provided (August 2015), a copy of damage bills and deposits made at the time of issue of NDC of one case only.

MoUD reply did not indicate the current status of outstanding dues and the amount recovered from the unauthorized occupants as reported by Audit. The reply is also silent on the unauthorized occupation of government accommodation for long period.

19.1.9 Licence Fee

19.1.9.1 Delay in revision of Licence Fee

Audit observed that in terms of the provisions of SR 324(4) for revising Licence Fee on expiry of 3 years from the date of last revision, the Licence Fee last revised with effect from 1 July 2007 became due for revision with effect from 1 July 2010. CPWD forwarded its proposal of revisions only in October 2010 and DoE notified the revised rates of Licence Fee only on 28 April 2011 with retrospective effect from 1 July 2010. Similarly, subsequent revision which should have taken effect from 1 July 2013 could not be notified till November 2013. Though revision of Licence Fee is a regular exercise to be taken up every three years, while requesting CPWD on 16 January 2013, DoE did not furnish necessary information required for such revision. The required details were provided by DoE on 19 July 2013 leading to the delay of five months in notifying the revised rates of licence fee.

DoE intimated (March 2015) that revision of Licence Fee involved analysis of data received from multiple agencies and required communication to multiple agencies and approval of IFD and Hon'ble UDM through Secretary (UD). Thus, the delay in notifying the revision of Licence Fee w.e.f. 1 July 2010 as well as 1 July 2013 was purely unavoidable procedural delays. DoE further intimated that the audit observations had been noted for future compliance.

MoUD noted (March /August 2015) the audit observation for compliance.

19.1.9.2 System of posting of Licence Fee

The manual system of collection of Licence Fee was in vogue till June, 1992. Under this system, the work of maintenance of the licence fee records was distributed office-wise, irrespective of the type of accommodation. The System also provided for preparation of single Licence Fee ledger maintained for entry of recoveries from occupants of all types working in a particular office. This system was reviewed in 1992 as DoE felt that the system presumed availability of adequate staff strength to do justice to the workload involved and Rent Division was faced with the problem of depletion of its staff to the extent of 50 per cent. It was also noted by DoE that the rent posting work had gone into arrears owing to the dealing hands being entrusted with more housing stock than they were able to handle.

With a view to rationalise the work and also to accelerate the computerisation activities of DoE, it was decided in 1992 to amalgamate the functions of Allotment of houses and Recovery of Licence Fee which was being dealt with by separate sections in the allotment sections. It was decided to restructure the Rent Sections according to type of houses and work of entry of licence fee recoveries was accordingly distributed type-wise and locality-wise in DoE from July 1992. The licence fee ledgers were accordingly created type-wise and locality-wise. The formats of licence fee recovery schedules being sent by various offices, however, remained unchanged despite DoE directions to them to reformat their schedules type-wise and locality-wise. The single copy of composite licence fee recovery schedule being sent by an office was found to be insufficient for rotation amongst all types/dealing hands. In the new system, the allotment sections were also to send Form J to the Accounts Compilation Section, indicating 'Cash Summary for the month' which includes 'Opening Balance', 'Assessment', 'Recovery' and 'Closing Balance'.

Computerisation of rent work, which was a prerequisite in the decision on the revised system brought into effect from July, 1992, could not make any major headway till 2003. Implementation of GAMS in 2003, with the overall guidance of NIC, could not achieve any significant success. As such, by March 2007, approximately 78 per cent of the records of past Licence Fee recoveries from July 1992 remained missing. As a result of this, the occupants of government accommodation were put to tremendous harassment due to inability of DoE to issue No Dues/No Demand Certificates promptly.

DoE stated (September 2014) that computerisation of rent wing was under process and would be completed very soon. DoE further intimated (March 2015) the current status of online recovery of Licence Fees from DDOs. DoE, further stated (August 2015) that as the data is so huge, 20 DEOs have been employed to complete this legacy data entry by December 2015. DoE further stated that even after this, there would be entries which were never received in the Department and would have to be updated by allottee.

19.1.9.3 Outstanding Licence Fee of ₹ 2.94 crore for the period up to June 1992

After the change of system of posting of licence fee recoveries from office – wise to type–wise, rent cards were to be opened and sorted out type wise/colony wise and sent to the concerned allotment section by 30 June 1992. The loose card in respect of property folio maintained in Allotment Section and the full details thereof were to be sent to the Arrear Clearance Section (ACS) for linking and charging the arrears up to 30 June 1992, if not already charged.

In order to achieve significant visible progress in the direction of implementation of GAMS, it was decided in 2003 that the Deputy Director (Computer)/Deputy Director (Rent) would prepare the list of allottees occupying houses before 30 June 1992 and continuing in the same. The list was to be passed on to the ACS to calculate the total dues outstanding against such occupants as on 30 June 1992 so that the same could be posted in the Rent Register under GAMS.

Audit observed that the above was not done and the ACS were working out the missing recoveries of Licence Fee up to June 1992 and adjusting them. Audit further noticed that the Director of Estates had noted on 23 March 2007 that *“Out of our total housing stock of 63,909 houses, approximately 78 per cent of the records of past Licence Fee recoveries from July, 1992 onwards are missing.”* He, further, noted that *“Occupants put to tremendous harassment due to non – posting resulting in inability of the DOE to issue No Dues/No Demand Certificates.”*

Scrutiny of records revealed that a recovery of ₹ 2.94 crore was outstanding, as of January 2013, for the period prior to July 1992. Further, it is seen that the ACS has not furnished Form J to the Accounts Compilation Section after January 2013 and hence the amount outstanding was not reflected in the consolidated Form J thereafter. Further, it is seen that the consolidated Form J

prepared by the Accounts Compilation Section was authenticated only upto December 2009 though the same appeared to have been prepared thereafter also.

MoUD/DoE replied (September 2014 and March 2015) that the dues as on 30 June 1992 were available in the records of ACS sections which were being taken in GAMS. MoUD /DoE intimated (August 2015), the current process of Licence Fee collection, online remittance of rent by DDOs, steps taken by DoE for streamlining the rent recovery system and efforts made by Rent Recovery Cell for updation of records. DoE also intimated that the department had been attempting its level best to update these licence fee recovery schedules but the data was so huge (60,000 allottees at any particular time and their deduction schedule for last 30 years—18 lakh entries).

The reply of MoUD/DoE does not indicate the present status of the recovery of Licence Fee for the period up to June 1992. Recovery of dues at the time of issuance of No Dues Certificate (NDC) not only results in avoidable delay in recovery of government revenues but also leaves scope for harassment of retired personnel applying for NDC.

DoE should monitor the progress of the work closely and ensure that the posting of the records of the Licence Fee recoveries are completed within the timelines.

19.1.9.4 Recovery of outstanding Licence Fee of ₹ 10.19 crore in respect of various types of accommodation

Audit noticed from the Form J submitted by various sections dealing with different types of accommodation, that an amount of ₹ 5.36 crore was outstanding against Members of Parliament (MPs)/Ex MPs as at December 2012, an amount of ₹ 3.77 crore was outstanding against allottees of Type 5 and higher houses as at March 2013, while an amount of ₹ 1.06 crore was outstanding (as at January 2012) in respect of Hostel and Type 4 special. The current position of the outstanding Licence Fee could not be ascertained as Form J indicating subsequent recoveries and latest outstanding recovery of rent had not been compiled in Accounts Compilation Section. During audit, the DoE was requested to provide the files/records of three months (April 2012, December 2012 and March 2013) in respect of assessment of Licence Fee, recovery thereof as well as outstanding Licence Fee with age wise break up. However, the age wise breakup of the total outstanding Licence Fee was not furnished to Audit.

DoE intimated (March 2015) that after merger of rent sections w. e. f. 01 July 1992, it was not possible to find out the data of defaulters in the manual system. As such instructions have been issued to the all DDOs to intimate the details of defaulter/transfer of allottees, so that DoE may take further necessary action in such cases. MoUD/DoE further intimated (August 2015), the process of Licence Fee collection, online remittance of rent by DDOs, steps taken by DoE for streamlining the rent recovery system, difficulties being faced in rent recovery/ updation of records and efforts made by Rent Recovery Cell for updation of records.

MoUD/DoE has not furnished the present status of the outstanding dues and recoveries, if any, in respect of various types of accommodation as pointed out by Audit.

19.1.9.5 No Dues Certificate (NDC)

As per S.R.-317-B-13 of the Allotment Of Government Residences (General Pool In Delhi) Rules, 1963 “the officer to whom a residence has been allotted shall be personally liable for the Licence Fee and for any damage beyond fair wear and tear caused thereto or to the furniture, fixture or fittings or services provided therein by Government during the period for which the residence has been and remains allotted to him, or where the allotment has been cancelled under any of the provisions in these rules, until the residence along with the out-houses appurtenant thereto have been vacated and full vacant possession thereof has been restored to Government”. The rules also provide for recovery of Government dues from the pay and allowances or from retirement gratuity and also withholding of upto 10 *per cent* of the retirement gratuity subject to a written intimation in this regard by the DoE. As stated in the previous paragraphs, DoE has not been able to maintain proper records of recovery of Licence Fee. This has become a big impediment for the allottees in obtaining NDC. On receipt of request to issue NDC in the section, the Rent Section calculates the Licence Fee due and amount recovered against the house last occupied by the allottee and also handover half margin to the allottee to obtain clearance from the Rent Section concerned of other type of house which the allottee was in occupation during his service period. The difference of dues of Licence Fee and amount recovered is recovered from the allottee through a Bank Challan. In case the recovery has already been made but missing in the records of DoE, allottee has to get a certificate duly signed by the concerned

DDO. Otherwise, he needs to deposit the outstanding dues so that the NDC is issued.

As per 'Citizen's Charter', DoE committed that 'No Objection Certificate' (implying NDC) would be given to all allottees who vacate Government accommodation, within one month of their application accompanied by Certificates from the DDOs about the Licence Fees paid by them from the date of occupation to date of vacation. During audit, 99 cases of issue of NDC, for which files were furnished by DoE, were test checked. The observations of audit in this regard are as under:

- The form for NDC may be submitted to the DoE two years before the anticipated date of superannuation. However, it was seen that the stipulation had not been disseminated to the allottees and resultantly allottees usually apply for NDC after the date of superannuation.
- The date of receipt of request for NDC was not found recorded in the records of DoE in respect of 81 of the 99 cases test checked. In absence of the date of receipt, adherence to the assurance in the Citizen's charter cannot be enforced.
- NDC was issued within one month in only 34 of the 99 cases with 4 cases taking more than a year.

DoE stated (March /August 2015) that now the application form is being filed online on the website of this Directorate and No Demand Certificate will be issued through computer generated programme very soon. Provisional dues position has been placed at the screen on the website of this Directorate and it may be seen by the allottees after login of their password. DoE further stated that the case-wise reply would be given after receiving the files from Audit.

The files referred to by DoE in their reply had already been returned to DoE in March/April 2015. However, the case-wise reply was awaited (October 2015) from DoE. DoE, did not comment on the deficient maintenance of records and delay in issue of NDC as observed by audit.

Recommendation No. 2: DoE should take steps to ensure that No Dues Certificates are issued to the retiring employees within one month as provided in the Citizen's charter.

19.1.10 Subletting

As per the Accommodation Rules (SR 317-B-20), “No officer shall share the residence allotted to him or any of the outhouses, garages and stables appurtenant thereto except with the employees of the Central Government eligible for allotment of residence under allotment rules. The servants houses, out-houses, garages and stable may be used only for the bonafide purposes including residence of the servants of the allottee or for such other purposes as may be permitted by the Director of Estates. No officer shall sublet the whole of his residence.”

In case, subletting charge is proved against an allottee, the deciding authority of the DoE has power either to cancel the allotment of the connived officials or debar him for future allotment or impose both the penalties simultaneously. The connived officials are liable for disciplinary action as per Department of Personnel and Training OM of December 1997. DoE intimates the details of the subletting case and action taken against the employee under the Allotment Rules to the administrative authority concerned and the concerned disciplinary authority after considering the facts of the case may take departmental action under the disciplinary rules for imposition of a suitable penalty on grounds of conduct unbecoming of the Government employees. Further, in case of subletting, the officer is also charged damages from the date of cancellation of allotment.

DoE stated that to deal with subletting, there had been a practice of nomination of officers of the rank of Assistant Director for a fixed period for conducting inspection, the houses to be inspected were selected on the basis of alleged subletting complaints and handed over to the nominated Officers for conducting inspection. Thus, it can be seen that inspections were not preventive measures for detecting subletting but were based on subletting complaints received in DoE.

It was further stated by DoE that the Assistant Directors were authorized to conduct inspection only on holidays and after or before the office hours leading to a number of problems. It was added that DoE had been receiving complaints of alleged malpractice against the nominated officers. In view of this, with the approval of Secretary (UD), the work of inspection was outsourced to M/s Eagle Vision Services Private Limited through an open tender with effect from March 2010.

Out of 5696 houses inspected during the period 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2013, show cause notice was given in 2,361 cases only. Out of these, allotment was cancelled in respect of 940 houses and 324 allottees were debarred from further allotment.

DoE in its reply (March 2015) intimated that outsourcing for subletting inspections had been stopped from the financial year 2013-14. Currently, subletting inspections were being done by officials /officers of DoE. As no staff has been earmarked for this work, inspections are not preventive but based on complaints received. DoE also intimated reply that damage rent was charged at the time of issuance of clearance certificate/Final No Demand Certificates.

MoUD /DoE further replied (August 2015) that during the year 2014, 477 houses were inspected on receipt of complaints of alleged subletting. Allotment was cancelled in 173 cases and in 89 cases, allottees were debarred for future allotment. In 50 cases, after hearing, the subletting charge was dropped. During year 2014-15, 1905 eviction cases were filed by the Directorate of Estates before the Estate Officer against unauthorized occupants under the provision of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971. In 1131 cases, Eviction Order was passed. In 834 cases, quarters have been got evicted/vacated by the Eviction Squad.

Reply of MoUD/DoE is silent about recovery of amount of damages from the allottees. It also does not indicate whether the DDOs of the defaulting employees were intimated regarding non – payment of HRA.

19.1.10.1 Unauthorized construction/illegal use

DoE is responsible for the administration of Government Estates. As per S.R. 317-B-21, if an officer to whom a residence has been allotted, unauthorisedly sublets the residence or charges (Licence Fee) from the sharer at a rate which the DoE considers excessive, or erects any unauthorized structure in any part of the residence or uses the residence, or any portion thereof for any purposes other than that for which it is meant, or premises to be used for any purpose which the Director of Estates considers to be improper, the Director of Estates may without prejudice to any other disciplinary action that may be taken against him, cancel the allotment of the residence.

CPWD is responsible for detecting, reporting and removal of unauthorised construction inside a residential house/shop allotted by DoE in addition to

lawn/space attached to a specific residential house/shop. CPWD is also required to send a report to DoE in case the building activity is within the premises allotted by DoE or in the area appurtenant to the premises allotted by them. DoE, upon receiving such intimation of unauthorized encroachment within premises allotted by it, cancels the allotment and take action to evict the allottee. Further, in case unauthorized constructions/encroachment is not stopped/removed by the encroacher, the Estates Officer issues a notice to him under Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971. Simultaneously, FIR may be lodged with the police against the defaulter/encroacher.

In its reply, DoE however, intimated (March 2015) that they issue show cause notice to the allottees to remove unauthorized construction within a period of 15 days of receiving intimation from CPWD. It was also stated that they cancel the allotment of the house if the construction is not removed by the allottee. However, DoE added that very few cases of unauthorised construction are reported by CPWD on their own. DoE reiterated the responsibilities of authorities with regard to unauthorized construction/encroachment in their further reply (August 2015). However, the reply did not indicate the details of cases of unauthorized construction/illegal use brought to the notice of DoE by the CPWD.

In response to an audit requisition, DoE intimated (October 2015) that it had been receiving copies of notices issued by CPWD to the allottees directing them to remove unauthorized construction but did not provide the number of such reports received from 2008 to 2014 as sought. DoE had enclosed notices issued to 40 allottees, scrutiny of which revealed that CPWD had intimated that some allottees had not removed unauthorized construction after notice period and requested DoE to take further action. It was seen that photographs were also attached in one case.

From the records furnished to Audit subsequently in October/November 2015, it was seen that in June 2015, Assistant Engineer intimated Executive Engineer, Q Division CPWD with a copy to DoE that there were unauthorized constructions in 560 cases (giving full details) under the jurisdiction of Moti Bagh Service Centre (318) resulting in a number of problems, like difficulty in opening blocked sewer line, disposal of complaints regarding water supply, difficulty in attending to repair works in upper floors requiring use of ladder, problems in opening rain water pipes etc. In response, DoE had, in July 2015, requested the

Executive Engineer, Q Division, CPWD to take appropriate action as per the OM dated 26 April 2005. In reply, the Executive Engineer intimated (July 2015) DoE that as per the paragraph 4 of the said OM, as the unauthorized construction was inside a residential quarter, CPWD had intimated and DoE was expected to take action regarding cancellation of allotment and eviction. However, DoE on 27 July 2015 giving reference to the above OM of April 2005 intimated the Superintending Engineers of CPWD that Executive Engineers concerned had been appointed and notified as Estates Officers³ for the purposes of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971 and the responsibility for removal of such unauthorized construction/encroachment would vest with the CPWD. DoE, further intimated the SEs that only after CPWD is unable to remove unauthorized construction/encroachment on account of non-cooperation by the allottee or other factors, cancellation/eviction proceedings would be resorted to by DoE. As such it was intimated that DoE would consider cancellation/eviction proceedings only in those cases where detailed report of CPWD is received clearly indicating steps taken by them for removal of unauthorized construction/encroachment.

The above facts show that while the CPWD detected and intimated DoE regarding unauthorized construction, they did not take action to remove it while the DoE did not cancel allotment or evict the defaulters. Both DoE and CPWD exchanged correspondence to decide on their responsibilities.

19.1.10.2 Increasing pendency of eviction cases filed against unauthorized occupants

In case of unauthorized occupation of government accommodation allotted, DoE takes action to initiate eviction proceedings under the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971 and also for recovery of rent or damages, as the case may be. DoE has a separate 'Litigation Section' to deal with cases relating to eviction of unauthorized occupants. From the Annual Reports of MoUD for the years 2007-08 to 2014-15, an increasing trend in pendency of eviction cases is noticed as shown below:

³ "Estate Officer" means an officer appointed by the Central Government under section 3 of Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971.

Table 6 : Eviction cases filed against unauthorized occupants before the Estate Officers, Cases disposed and pendency

Sl. No.	Year	Cases filed against unauthorized occupants	Cases disposed during the year	Cases not disposed during the year
1.	2007	1666*	1144	522
2.	2008#	1610**	1525	85
3.	2009	2143***	1449	694
4.	2010	915	624	291
5.	2011	903	464	439
6.	2012	1258	931	327
7.	2013##	1496	374^	1122
8.	2014###	1905	1638>	267
		11896	8149	

Notes: * Includes 212 cases of recovery of outstanding arrears/damages.

** Includes 134 cases of recovery of outstanding arrears/damages.

For the period January 2008 to March 2009

*** Includes 171 cases of recovery of outstanding arrears/damages.

For the period 2013-14 (Upto 31/03/2014)

For the year 2014-15

^ In 374 cases, Eviction Orders were passed. 243 cases were disposed of by way of eviction/ vacation of premises.

> Includes 507 cases closed before eviction order passed

From the above it is seen that the number of cases disposed remained lesser than the number of cases filed every year. The pendency in eviction leads to continued occupation of houses by ineligible persons leading to a shortage of houses for eligible applicants.

DoE in its reply (March 2015) stated that eviction cases were heard by Estate Officers. The posts of Estate Officers were encadred posts of Ministry of Law wherein DoE did not have a say in assessing the performance of these officers by way of APAR or even leave sanction. MoUD/DoE further stated (August 2015) that the provisions of Allotment Rules have been made more stringent to deal with the menace of subletting by providing that in proven cases of subletting, the allottee shall be debarred for allotment for the remaining period of his service. The allottee shall be charged damages (market rent). Disciplinary proceedings for major penalty shall also be initiated against the allottee under the relevant Rules by the concerned Department/Ministry.

Audit is of the view that the provisions in the allotment rules indicated in the reply are in vogue since long. DoE should enforce strict implementation of rules to curb unauthorised occupation of houses.

19.1.11 Non-residential accommodation

19.1.11.1 Demand and availability in Delhi

The office space is to be provided by DoE to various Government Departments. The shortage of office space increased from 21.92 lakh square feet (July 2013) to 23.81 lakh square feet (March 2015). DoE issues “Non-availability Certificate (NAC)” to various Government Departments to facilitate hiring of office accommodation from open market. It was stated by DoE in a presentation (July 2013) that during 2012–13, NAC has been issued to 13 offices for hiring 2.30 lakh square feet of office space and that the Government of India is paying a sum of ₹ 19 crore (approximately) annually for hiring office accommodation due to shortage of office accommodation. MoUD further stated (August 2015) that it remains in constant touch with CPWD and raised the issues of shortage of office space in Standing Committee of the CPWD of which DoE is also a Member.

MoUD/DoE has not furnished copies of the minutes of the meetings of the Standing Committee. DoE has also not indicated any steps initiated to overcome the shortage.

19.1.11.2 Demand and availability of General Pool Office Accommodation at regional stations

Audit observed discrepancies in the figures of demand and availability of General Pool Office Accommodation (GPOA) at regional stations, while comparing the data given in Annual Report of MoUD (31 December 2012), information furnished to Audit in June 2014 and in September/October 2014.

DoE replied (September/October 2014) that some offices furnished vacant space as availability while some showed entire space of GPOA as availability, some cases as built up/plinth area including and in some case typographical errors also occurred. In its reply (March 2015), DoE stated that the demand of office space increases and decreases after receipt of fresh demand and allotment of vacant office space respectively. Similarly, availability of office space for allotment increases and decreases after vacation and occupation/allotment of office space respectively.

19.1.12 Allotments of Office space to ineligible offices and outstanding Licence Fee there against

In the course of scrutiny of the files provided to audit, it was seen that DoE had allotted office space to ineligible offices. Some of the cases are presented below:

19.1.12.1 Institute of Urban Transport (IUT)

IUT, a non-profit making organization registered under the Societies Registration Act was allotted 1,259 sq. feet at market rate of ₹ 81,107 per month with effect from 28 March 2001 at the disposal of Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development for use of IUT. IUT did not make any payments till 30 June 2005. DoE cancelled the allotment in the name of IUT with effect from 1 July 2005 and the Deputy Secretary (UT), MoUD was asked to advise IUT to clear the outstanding arrears of Licence Fee amounting to ₹ 41.47 lakh. However, the outstanding amount was neither cleared by the IUT or UT Division of MoUD as yet.

DoE stated (March 2015) that an amount of ₹ 41.47 lakh was still due from IUT. DoE should take steps for the recovery of the outstanding Licence Fee at the earliest.

19.1.12.2 Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI)

TRAI was allotted 5,542 sq. feet of office space in New Delhi on the payment of special Licence Fee by the Authority. However, the rates of Special Licence Fee were not determined by DoE till vacation of office accommodation by TRAI on 10 August 2007. Subsequently, DoE raised a demand (11 September 2007) of ₹ 82.53 lakh at an ad-hoc market rate of ₹ 44 per sq. feet per month provisionally. The demand was still pending.

DoE stated (March 2015) that the amount of ₹ 82.53 lakh was still due from TRAI and after fixation of rates of special Licence Fee the same will be recovered from TRAI.

DoE should determine the special Licence Fee to be charged from TRAI and recover the outstanding Licence free from TRAI at the earliest.

19.1.13 Undue delay in initiation of recovery proceedings for recovery of rent of office accommodation

In the para 15.2 of the audit report no. 9 of 2010-11, Audit brought to the notice of DoE, the accumulation of outstanding rent of ₹ 4.83 crore between March 1999 and March 2008, and interest of ₹ 0.39 crore thereon in 21 cases out of 70 cases in Central, South and other zones. In their ATN, DoE intimated (April 2011) that it has recovered an amount of ₹ 1.76 crore, from 12 allottees in full and ₹ 0.90 crore partially from another four allottees. Rent recovery cases were filed under PPE Act against four allottees. The balance amount of ₹ 2.17 crore against nine allottees was yet to be recovered as of April 2011.

On pursuance by Audit, DoE intimated (01 May 2014) that a cumulative recovery of ₹ 1.57 crore (including recovery of ₹ 0.90 crore referred to above) was effected in respect of these nine allottees and ₹ 1.50 crore was still to be recovered from six allottees. However, DoE had filed rent recovery case under Public Premises Act (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) 1971 in respect of two allottees only which were pending with Estate Officer as of May 2014.

DoE in its reply (March 2015) intimated a sum of ₹ 1.50 crore was due including due from TRAI and IUT.

DoE should take steps to ensure that the outstanding Licence Fee is recovered from the allottees at the earliest.

19.1.14 Analysis of Government Accommodation Management System

Government Accommodation Management System (GAMS) is a Government to Employee (G2E) e-Governance tool. It was introduced with the aim of creating a transparent, corruption free and efficient allotment system for the housing stock units available with DoE. The objective of GAMS is to ensure fair and just allotment of government accommodation to government servants and optimum satisfaction of applicants.

The development of the GAMS was approved in 2001. It sought to automate the activities starting from the submission of application to the vacation of residential unit by the allottee. This system was designed and developed by the National Informatics Centre (NIC). The system was started in May 2003. The program is running in Delhi and 8 other regional offices of DoE, namely,

Kolkata, Mumbai, Chennai, Nagpur, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Shimla and Chandigarh.

The entire process of registration for allotment of all kinds, acceptances, retentions, regularizations, cancellations, subletting enquiries etc related to residential government accommodation have been computerized under the system. Under the GAMS, the Automated System of Allotment (ASA) was introduced progressively from May 2010 for different types of houses. The portal www.eawas.nic.in was developed for internal work of DoE, online Licence Fee posting for DDOs, and interlinked with www.cpwdsewa.nic.in for online Vacancy Reporting. The officers of the DoE have also been provided a username and password for monitoring the allotments, vacancy position, rent recovery, litigation, subletting cases etc. in www.eawas.nic.in. The website of DoE www.estates.nic.in provided information to and for interaction by the applicants/ allottees and Public.

19.1.15 Non interlinking of DoE and CPWD databases

In its application for the National Award for e – Governance submitted by DoE on 10 August 2011, DoE had asserted that every house had been given House Identity Number (HID) which has been interlinked with CPWD through its website. It was further stated that as soon as the occupant vacates the house, the operator at CPWD enquiry enters the HID to retrieve the allottee's details and the vacancy comes to GAMS on real time basis. DoE staff at Information Facilitation Centre (IFC) matches the vacancy created by CPWD which, if matched, goes in the Vacancy Register of concerned type. Audit, however, found a number of manual vacation reports in the IFC. Therefore, records relating to manual vacation reports were sought from DoE. In response to the requisition, two folders of manual vacation reports were received from the DoE. Audit scrutiny of the manual vacation reports revealed that in 52 cases, the house number and the HID were not interlinked.

It was further observed that there was no record of receipt of manual vacation reports in IFC before their entry into GAMS. As the receipt and disposal of manual vacation reports are not being recorded, the possibility of vacant houses remaining vacant without being updated in the GAMS database cannot be ruled out. Moreover, non-recording of vacant houses leaves scope for misuse/unauthorised use of vacant houses and also possibility of allotment of those vacant houses to non-entitled persons.

DoE in its reply (September 2014 & January/March 2015) stated that that they were in process of interlinking all the missing HID of GPRA with the CPWD house ID and the delay was being addressed by reporting of vacancies by all CPWD Centres. It intimated that the earlier anomalies arose due to not linking of the e-Awas and e-Sewa software of the CPWD. This had been addressed and the two had been linked with effect from 15 September 2014.

In its reply, DoE did not intimate as to whether all vacation reports were being received online in real time and 'Occupation Report for DoE' was generated through CPWD e-Sewa system. Further, the reply of DoE is not specific and it did not state whether all DoE HID are linked with house number given by CPWD for full automation of reporting of online vacancy by e-Sewa.

To verify as to whether all vacation reports were being received online in real time and not manually, the audit team visited IFC of DoE which managed the task of receipt of vacation reports from CPWD, on 21 April 2015. From the folder labelled as 'Manual Vacancy December-2014', it was observed that large number of vacation reports were still being received manually in hard copy. The folder contained 93 vacation reports, for the period upto April 2015, received in hard copy printed electronically from CPWD e-Sewa which did not have HID of DoE indicating that either it was not interlinked with CPWD House ID or DoE HID had not been used. Folder also contained eight vacation reports which were filled in manually and not through CPWD e-Sewa. One vacation report of hostel accommodation was also manual. Four cases (HIDs -305911, 324564, 275714 and 317026) selected randomly were test checked in GAMS and it was seen that the remarks against the cases were 'Received Manually', 'Received on 15/01/2015', 'Received on 18/02/2015' and 'Vacation received manually on 19/02/2015' respectively. From the manual vacations reports, it was seen that there were delays of up to 6 months from the date of vacation to the entry of the vacation in the GAMS.

In the course of a discussion, Audit observed that the master table which stores the link between the CPWD and DoE HIDs was part of the e-Sewa system of CPWD. Softcopy containing a table was provided to Audit on 27 April 2015 intimating that it contained HIDs which had been interlinked with e-Sewa and was used for online vacation/occupation. Audit tried to trace the HIDs noted manually on the 102 manual vacation reports received at IFC and observed that HIDs of only 73 manual vacation reports were there in the table provided by NIC. Apparently, all the HIDs of housing stock in DoE had not been

interlinked. Further, even where the HIDs are interlinked, manual vacation reports are being sent which are not in real time.

In its reply (August 2015), DoE stated that most of the manually vacated houses were of M.B. Road sector-V. DoE further stated that e-Sewa application has option of generating vacation report as DoE houses or Non-DoE houses as CPWD caters to houses of different departments besides GPRA. All GPRA house IDs are linked with e-Sewa. Probably the said CPWD enquiry (M.B. Road, Sec-5) was generating vacation report as Non-DoE house. But for last two month they are generating it online only and number of manual vacation reports have dropped. DoE further stated that there were 139 houses of Mayapuri and 60 type 2 Houses in Dev Nagar which were not linked at e-Sewa which have again been sent to them to update it.

The reply of DoE is not acceptable as houses for which manual vacation reports were received were from different localities of Delhi though around 40 per cent of them were from M. B. Road. DoE reply is silent on the status of the rest of the cases. DoE has admitted that there are houses still to be interlinked with CPWD e-Sewa and stated that their interlinking is underway. Further, though DoE stated that the number of manual vacation reports has dropped, it did not indicate the percentage of manual vacation reports received in the past two months. Moreover, the reply is silent on the audit point that even where the HIDs are interlinked, manual vacation reports are being sent.

Recommendation No. 3: The DoE and CPWD databases should be interlinked properly to ensure real time communication between the two systems.

19.1.16 Accepting applications of debarred applicants before expiry of stipulated period of three months

The applicants have to accept the house allotted as per his/her option in the bidding system within 8 days of the date of allotment. In the event of non-acceptance, the applicants are to be debarred from further allotment for a period of three months. However, data analysis revealed that during the period from January 2011 to July 2014, 3296 applicants who had rejected the allotment were allowed to re-apply within the prescribed time limit of 3 months for a number of reasons viz. allotment based on wrong date of priority, allotment based on wrong pool, allotment not as per choice, allotment letter not received in time, occupied house, temporary repairs, declared unsafe, electricity dues, debarred,

under demolition, ASA cases approved by DE/AS, special cases approved by AD & above, rejection of allotment through ASA.

Audit brought this to the notice of DoE but DoE did not respond. Audit observed that houses which were occupied/under demolition/ had electricity dues/temporary repairs were also offered for bidding to the applicants. Further, allotment of houses to debarred applicants, allotment on the basis of wrong date of priority/wrong pool and allotment not as per choice raises questions on the reliability of the system. Such inconsistencies in the system would create scope for misuse of the system by unscrupulous operators, thereby defeating the objective of bringing about transparency in the system of allotment.

DoE replied (January 2015 and March 2015) that in some cases where there were genuine grounds given by the applicant such as he being on official tour, delay in forwarding of acceptance by the officer concerned, house allotted already occupied or being dangerous, no-clearance of electricity/PNG dues by the previous allottee, the applicant was being allowed to bid even before three months period. MoUD/DoE further stated (August 2015) that the said allotments happened due to data regarding dangerous house/electricity due etc. not entered in GAMS and also wrong reporting of vacancies. Such discrepancies would reduce with linkage of e-Awas with e-Sewa.

MoUD/DoE did not clarify the circumstances under which houses which were already occupied or were dangerous or electricity dues were not cleared by the previous allottee were allotted. DoE also did not provide any reasons for allotment of houses not as per the choice, allotment of houses to debarred applicants, allotment of houses on the basis of wrong date of priority etc. Hence, the possibility of misuse of the system by unscrupulous operators cannot be ruled out.

DoE should ensure completing interlinking of e-Awas with e-Sewa within fixed timelines so that allotment of occupied houses, dangerous houses etc. do not happen in the future.

19.1.17 Proposal for allotments without corresponding entries in the proposal table in GAMS database

In GAMS, proposal table records the details of the proposal for allotment based on the vacant houses and the respective bidding preferences of the registered allottees before finalization of allotments. During analysis of the GAMS database for the period January 2011 to July 2014, 81 cases of allotment were

noticed wherein a corresponding proposal was not recorded in the GAMS database. Though creation of proposal is only procedural, the non-following of the laid down procedure opens up the possibility of unscrupulous use of the system in circumventing just and fair allotment of houses.

In response, DoE intimated (March 2015) that the cases pointed out by Audit were related to regularisation of Government accommodations in the name of the spouses on transfer/retirement/death of the allottee. Such cases were dealt on case to case basis in their individual files. After approval of the competent authority, the said regularisation was made manually and thereafter updated in the GAMS. Hence, such allotments were made without a corresponding proposal being recorded in the system. It was further stated that the matter was being taken up with NIC to facilitate such allotments through system.

DoE should take steps to ensure that all allotments are covered through the system to ensure transparent, just and fair allotment of houses.

19.1.18 Inconsistency in vacancies being offered for bidding under ASA

Analysis of database for the period January 2011 to July 2014 revealed that in four cases, houses had already been allotted though these houses were kept open for bidding and in six cases, houses were allotted on out of turn/discretionary basis while bidding period was open and vacant houses were available to be opted for allotment. Such out of turn allotment of houses offered for bidding would result in the applicants not getting the houses they had opted for, though shown as available, denting the confidence of the allottees in the system.

In reply to audit observation, DoE intimated (September 2014) that all the vacancies sent by CPWD Enquiries for which the vacancies created by DoE are placed for allotment under ASA. In some instances, CPWD erroneously sent wrong vacancies for the houses which were already occupied. These houses were not allotted to anyone when these were identified. It further intimated that there was no provision in the system to intimate all the bidders/applicants for withdrawal of houses for allotment under ASA. DoE subsequently intimated (March 2015) that earlier, inconsistencies in vacancies were due to faulty vacancy updation. As of now, houses available for bidding in ASA are not brought out for out of turn allotments. DoE further stated (August 2015) that allotment under SR-317-8A are made on immediate basis, such instance could happen but are rarely used.

Audit is of the view that DoE should ensure that such instances do not happen even rarely as such instances would hurt the confidence of the allottees in the system.

19.1.19 Discrepancy in dates of acceptance mentioned in two tables of GAMS

Audit observed that, in 978 cases of allotments, there was a difference between the 'dates of acceptance' in two relevant tables viz. 'ALT_TRANS and OCCUPANT'.

DoE replied (April 2015) that date of acceptance in OCCUPANT table was irrelevant and that of ALT_TRANS table was authentic.

Audit is of the view that storing same data in two different tables, out of which one is stated to be irrelevant, indicates improper validation of data resulting in data inconsistency which raises doubts on the validity and reliability of the data.

DoE in its reply (August 2015), stated that on acceptance of allotment, 'Date of Acceptance' in 'ALT_TRANS' table is updated with status on 'ACC_STATUS' column updating from 'ALLOTTED' state to 'ACCEPTED'. As the database has evolved over a period of time with inclusion of different procedures at different intervals, there are irrelevant columns in some tables.

DoE should take steps to ensure that the database is reviewed to remove irrelevant fields to guard against inadvertent errors in data entry.

19.1.20 Delay in updating vacancies

The position of vacant houses occurring up to the last day of particular month is consolidated category-wise and enlisted on the website of the DoE. Analysis of GAMS database for the period from 1 January 2011 to 31 July 2014 revealed that there were delays in recording vacation of house as shown below.

Table 7 : Time taken to record vacancy in GAMS and subsequent allotment in respect of higher types⁴ and lower types⁵

Sl. No.	Time taken to record vacancy	Higher types	Lower types
		No. of cases	No. of cases
1.	Same day	3261	26040
2.	Within 2 days	697	4038
3.	Between 3 and 10 days	450	2215
4.	Between 11 and 31 days	127	793

⁴ Type 4S, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7 and 8

⁵ Type 1, 2, 3 and 4

5.	Between 1 month and 2 months	40	291
6.	Between 2 months and 6 months	42	173
7.	Between 6 months and 1 year	18	57
8.	More than 1 year	12	51
	Total	4647	33658

From the above table, it can be seen that around 4.19 *per cent* of the vacated houses are recorded in the GAMS database only after 10 days from the date of vacation. Further, in 19 cases, errors in dates were noticed like date of recording the vacancy being before the date of vacation leading to the conclusion that the data validation is not robust. This delay in recording of vacancies is likely to impact the availability of houses for the Government servants.

DoE in its reply (March 2015) intimated that the vacancies are reported by CPWD when the allottee vacates the house. It further stated that the delay was now being addressed by reporting of vacancies by all CPWD Centres. The earlier anomalies arose due to not linking of the e-Awas and e-Sewa software of the CPWD. This had been stated to be addressed and two had been linked with effect from 15 September 2014.

However, DoE did not intimate as to whether all vacation reports were being received online in real time and ‘Occupation Report for DoE’ was generated through CPWD System – ‘CPWD e-Sewa’. Further, the reply of DoE is not specific and it did not state whether all DoE HIDs are linked with house numbers given by CPWD for full automation of reporting of online vacancy by e-Sewa. Verification of manual records relating to vacation reports and GAMS database revealed that still vacation reports were being received in DoE manually in hard copy and there were still HIDs which had not been linked as brought out in para 4.1.4 of the Audit Report.

To verify the contention of DoE that the delay was now being addressed to, Audit examined the data furnished by NIC on 27 May 2015 regarding entries made in database for vacation. Time taken for entry in GAMS in respect of 2,032 cases during the period 15 September 2014 to 27 May 2015 is shown in subsequent table.

Table 8 : Time taken for entry in GAMS during the period 15 September 2014 to 27 May 2015

Sl. No.	Time taken to record vacancy	No. of cases
1.	Same day	619
2.	Within 2 days	531
3.	Between 3 and 10 days	511
4.	Between 11 and 31 days	126
5.	Between 1 month and 2 months	50
6.	Between 2 months and 6 months	56
7.	Between 6 months and 1 year	37
8.	More than 1 year	102
	Total	2032

In order to assess the time taken for updating vacancy into GAMS database, Audit test checked manual vacation reports in GAMS on the basis of HID noted manually on these reports and observed as under:

- Out of 102 cases of manual vacation reports, only 92 cases could be traced.
- 88 cases were such where accommodation had been vacated after 15 September 2014, i.e., the date on which interlinking has been stated to have been done. In these 88 cases, time taken to enter the GAMS database was up to 160 days.
- In other four cases, where vacation was prior to the stated date of interlinking, time taken to update the vacancy position in GAMS ranged from 148 days to 1353 days.
- Out of 92 cases, there were 29 cases which could have been taken into the next bidding cycle for allotment had they been entered in GAMS as vacant in real time.⁶

Thus, not taking vacant houses for bidding and allotment kept applicants deprived of accommodation and also resulted in loss of revenue on account of non-recovery of Licence Fee and payment of HRA.

DoE replied (August 2015) that most of the manually vacated houses were of M.B. Road sector-V. DoE further stated that e-Sewa application has option of

⁶ Cases where vacation was on the last or second last day immediately prior to start of bidding cycle have been excluded from the cases which would have gone for bidding had the vacancy updated in GAMS in real time.

generating vacation report as DoE houses or Non-DoE houses as CPWD caters to houses of different departments besides GPRA. All GPRA house IDs are linked with e-Sewa. Probably the said CPWD enquiry (M.B. Road, Sec-5) was generating vacation report as Non-DoE house. But for last two months they are generating it online only and number of manual vacation reports have dropped. DoE further stated that there were 139 houses of Mayapuri and 60 type 2 Houses in Dev Nagar which were not linked at e-Sewa which have been sent again to them to update it.

The reply of DoE is not acceptable as houses for which manual vacation reports were received were from different localities of Delhi though around 40 *per cent* of them were from M. B. Road. DoE reply is silent on the status of the rest of the cases. DoE has admitted that there are houses still to be interlinked with CPWD e-Sewa and stated that their interlinking is underway.

19.1.21 Inordinate delay in taking possession of habitable houses

As per letter of allotment of accommodation in GPRA, allottees are requested to send their acceptance within 8 days from the date of issue of the allotment letter and obtain an authority slip from DoE and take possession of the allotted residence from the CPWD/NBCC Enquiry Office concerned by the date mentioned in the authority slip. Failure to take possession within the time specified in the authority slip would result in the vacant house being returned to concerned allotment section for cancellation of allotment.

A test check of houses shown as habitable in the vacation table of GAMS database, for the period January 2011 to September 2013, revealed delays ranging from 90 days to more than two years in occupation of the 579 houses by the allottees as shown in the table below:

Table 9 : Delay in occupation of houses beyond 90 days

Occupation of house	Number of cases
90 days - 120 days	260
121 days - 180 days	218
181 days to 1 year	86
1 year to 2 years	12
More than 2 years	3
TOTAL	579

DoE in its reply (March 2015) stated that the time taken in handing over a house to an allottee was dependent upon the condition of the house.

DoE did not give specific reasons for delays of one to two years and even delays of more than two years in a number of cases pointed out by Audit.

19.1.22 Multiple occupation of houses by the allottees

Analysis of GAMS database provided to audit for the period January 2011 to July 2014 revealed that 536 allottees were occupying more than one accommodation (in two instances the allottees were occupying three houses). Thus total 1074 residential units appeared to have been occupied by these 536 allottees.

DoE furnished (March 2015) possible factors for double occupation as (i) a number of allottees in double occupation are from Kidwai Nagar (East) who were under compulsory shifting. These allottees have been given alternate accommodation. However, because they neither took possession of the alternate accommodation nor did they surrender the original allotment at Kidwai Nagar East, they are being reflected as occupants of 2 flats simultaneously; (ii) in certain cases, where the allottee has either not deposited the authority slip or in cases where the vacant possessions have not been reflected in the system even though the allottee may have vacated the house, in such cases too, double occupation is reflected; (iii) in cases where allottee is already residing in a Government accommodation and is to shift in an alternate accommodation, due to non-handing over of house for any particular period of time, both houses, i.e., one in which the allottee will move in and the house currently occupied by the allottee will be reflected as double occupation; (iv) however, in this case where double occupation actually be there, the DoE is already in process of taking corrective action.

Subsequently, in April 2015, DoE contended that the allottees may not be in physical occupation of the houses (the change house in repair) or availing 15 days time that is provided to the allottee to vacate the previous house after occupation of new one and beyond which damage rent is charged.

In order to verify the contention of DoE that double occupancy might be due to availing 15 days time to vacate the previous house, Audit randomly checked 12 registration numbers from DoE website on 19 May 2015 (10000210, 10000358, 10000895, 10001029, 10002403, 10003648, 10003883, 10004792, 10005279, 10005774, 10021978 and 10032364 at serial number 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 71 and 101 respectively). Result is tabulated below:

Table 10 : Cases of double occupation as observed from the DoE website

Sl. No.	Serial number of Annexure	Registration Number	Accommodation one		Accommodation two	
			HID	Date of occupation	HID	Date of occupation
1.	1	10000210	295746		Single occupation	
2.	2	10000358	335364	17/07/2012	335155	02/11/2007
3.	5	10000895	339601	06/07/2010	318629	09/12/1994
4.	6	10001029	299849		306224	Details could not be obtained in GAMS
5.	7	10002403	295413	02/02/2011	281324	21/02/1991
6.	8	10003648	309648	24/07/2010	317216	24/02/2005
7.	9	10003883	300898		Single occupation	
8.	11	10004792	348479	18/08/2010	283634	14/03/2005
9.	12	10005279	329330	30/12/2005	331275	30/12/2005
10.	14	10005774	263191	08/06/2010	281180	30/06/1986
11.	71	10021978	263775	06/05/2011	283624	05/06/2000
12.	101	10032364	393261		244967	Details could not be obtained in GAMS

From the above it may be seen that in 10 out of 12 cases, double occupation is indicated even after lapse of years since the later occupation. As such, the contention of DoE, that double occupation might be because of availing 15 days time given to vacate house, does not hold good.

In its further reply (August 2015), DoE stated that the 15 day period is calculated from date of physical occupation of new house and not allotment date. Hence longer delay would happen if house is under repair. Further, DoE provided specific replies in respect of 3 of the 12 cases pointed out by Audit. As regards the other cases, DoE stated that they are old cases and could have happened due to the non – linking of those houses.

It is seen from the reply that the system has a provision of stopping applicants from accepting only the third house. Hence, the possibility of an applicant occupying two houses cannot be ruled out.

19.1.23 Unauthorised occupation beyond the date of retirement

As per sub rule 2 of S.R. 317-B-11, residential accommodation can be retained in case of retirement or terminal leave for a period of 2 months on normal Licence Fee, another 2 months on double the normal Licence Fee. As per Para 3 of SR 317-B-22, additional retention of accommodation is allowed for a period of two months on payment of four times of the normal Licence Fee and a further two months on the payment of six times of normal Licence Fee for special reasons involving medical/educational grounds, subject to appropriate certification by the authorities concerned. Likewise, in case of death of

allottee, the accommodation can be retained for a period of 12 months. As per para 4 of SR 317-B-22, in the event of death of the allottee, his/her family can retain the Government accommodation for a further period of one year on payment of normal Licence Fee. Thereafter, the allotment is deemed to be cancelled and recovery of Licence Fee would be done at damage/market rate.

Analysis of the date of retirement values in the OCCUPANT table of GAMS database revealed 1,262 cases of retention of accommodation beyond the date of retirement as shown in the table below:

Table 11 : Retention of accommodation beyond the date of retirement

Occupancy beyond date of retirement as on 30 July 2014	Number of Cases
Less than 1 Month	50
Between 1 and 2 Months	1
Between 2 and 6 Months	167
Between 6 Months and 1 Year	174
Between 1 Year and 2 Years	169
Between 2 Years and 3 Years	128
Between 3 Years and 4 Years	86
Between 4 Years and 5 Years	99
Between 5 Years and 10 Years	254
Between 10 Years and 20 Years	127
More than 20 Years	7
Total	1262

However, the reasons for allowing the retention of accommodation had not been provided to Audit. Retention of accommodation by government servants beyond their date of retirement accentuates the shortage of houses and leads to lower satisfaction levels.

Further, a comparison of the date of retirement value in OCCUPANT table and REGISTRATION table shows discrepancies indicated in the following table which raises doubts on the reliability of the data.

Table 12 : Discrepancies in date of retirement in different tables of GAMS database

REGNO	Date of Retirement in Occupant Table	Date of Retirement in Registration Table
10034203	31-May-12	31-May-14
99995476	30-Nov-12	30-Nov-14
99999876	31-May-13	31-May-15
99974985	31-Jul-08	16-Jul-13
99968404	30-Nov-12	24-Nov-12

99962489	30-Apr-07	30-Apr-05
99936182	30-Jun-13	30-Jun-11
10151915	31-May-10	02-Mar-13
10158559	31-May-13	31-May-15

DoE in its reply (March 2015) has not furnished specific reasons for the cases pointed out by audit and intimated only possible reasons as under:

- In death cases, the factual information is received in DoE after a considerable delay and till such time action to evict the premises was not taken. Therefore, DoE initiates action for vacation of house only after the date of retirement of the allottee as per their record. It is only after such action is initiated, the relative of the employee approaches DoE for regularization of house. At that time there may be delay in regularisation till completion of all formalities by the applicant.
- In some cases, date of retirement was not actual.
- In some cases, retirement age was mentioned on the basis of retirement at 58 years and the data was not updated.
- There might be court cases pending in respect of the said house.
- In 22 cases referred by audit, it is mentioned that date of retirement not updated in occupation tables as per registration. Hence, they may be different.
- In some cases, date of retirement might have changed due to extension.

DoE further indicated that in death cases, as the information is not received in time, the action for regularisation of houses is taken only after the date of retirement. Further, DoE stated that in some cases, the date of retirement is not actual or might not have been updated. This indicates laxity on the part of the DoE in maintaining accurate and reliable data. This also indicates non-existence of any mechanism to obtain information about death of allottees.

DoE should take measures to improve the systems to ensure information pertaining to death cases and also ensure that the information in the system is properly validated and updated to maintain its authenticity.

DoE accepted the suggestion and replied (August 2015) that validation would be introduced in software like period of service linking date of retirement with date of birth etc. which could be done with available information.

19.1.24 Dangerous and unsafe houses

As per normal practice, once a residential house is declared unsafe, it cannot be allotted to any person until it has been declared safe by the competent authority. However, analysis of GAMS database revealed 2,035 allotments made under category AACC (UNSAFE). Further, analysis of these cases revealed 106 cases wherein houses declared unsafe were allotted within 50 days.

DoE replied (March 2015) that initially the houses reported dangerous by CPWD for allotment of alternative accommodation on unsafe ground could not be entered in GAMS as there was no provision for that. DoE further stated that the position was expected to improve further as e-Sewa and e-Awas software's have now been connected w.e.f. 15 September 2014. DoE further stated (August 2015) that once the house is entered unsafe in GAMS, it does not go for bidding. With linking of e-Awas and e-Sewa such houses once declared unsafe by CPWD would automatically go out of bidding.

DoE has not furnished specific reply to the cases brought out in Audit. The reply also did not indicate the steps taken by DoE to ensure that an unsafe and dangerous house is not allotted to any of the allottees. DoE needs to ensure that the data entry in such cases is done accurately to eliminate the possibility of unsafe houses being allotted to unsuspecting allottees.

Recommendation No. 4: DoE should take steps to properly identify houses which are declared as unsafe or dangerous and take steps to make them habitable.

19.1.25 Non development of software for assessment of Licence Fee in GAMS

As per Annual Action Plan of DoE for the year 2012-13, 'Software for assessment of Licence Fee in GAMS' was to be developed by NIC by 30 June 2012. As per the status report of April 2013, the system was ready and training to the staff of Rent Wing of DoE was to be conducted. Audit scrutiny, however, revealed that it was not implemented as of April 2014.

DoE intimated in March 2015 that the Software for assessment of Licence Fee was still being developed by NIC. Further reply of DoE (August 2015) gives a

description of the system in vogue without intimating the present status of the development of the software.

The non-development of the software has deprived DoE of its intended benefits.

19.1.26 Monitoring of receipt of Licence Fee

An online 'Licence Fee Collection and Monitoring System' was developed as part of GAMS (April 2007) to facilitate the Drawing & Disbursing Officers to communicate their Licence Fee recoveries, both past and future in respect of occupants of GPRA to DoE. The online 'Licence Fee Collection and Monitoring System' was implemented with effect from 1 August 2007. DDOs were to post Licence Fee recoveries through GAMS. In case of failure to send schedules of monthly Licence Fee recoveries through the new system, action against the allottees as per Allotment Rules was contemplated.

DoE informed (March 2015) Audit that the intimation of recovery of Licence Fee from DDOs is being received in 70 *per cent* cases. Training for feeding the recovery of Licence Fee through online has already been given to 80 *per cent* DDOs. DoE has set a programme for on-line recovery of Licence Fee from DDOs in 100 *per cent* cases. Now intimation of recovery of Licence Fee through manual/CD/floppy has been stopped and result of online transmission of Licence Fee is more satisfactory than manual recovery of Licence Fee.

Fact remains that even after lapse of more than seven years from the date of its implementation, the Licence Fee collection and monitoring system could not be utilized to its full extent. In its reply (August 2015), DoE gave a description of the system in vogue without indicating the present status of the development of the system.

Recommendation No. 5: The online system for monitoring of Licence Fees should be completed quickly ensuring complete participation of all the DDOs to enable accurate monitoring of the receipt of Licence Fee.

19.1.27 Registration for applying in multiple incompatible pools

'Tenure Pool' of accommodation is maintained for All India Services Officers of the Indian Administrative Service, the Indian Forest Service and the Indian Police Service on duty with the Central Government or the Delhi Administration on tenure basis. All India Service Officers are to be considered

for allotment only against the Tenure Pool accommodation. Similarly, 'Lady Officers Pool' is maintained separately for married lady officers (LM Pool) and for single lady officers (LS Pool). Specified numbers of residential units have been earmarked in the 'Lady officers Pool' which are determined from time to time. The Lady Officers are also eligible for allotment of accommodation from General Pool on maturity of their turn.

Analysis of database for the period January 2011 to July 2014 revealed that there were instances where applicants had been registered for applying in multiple incompatible pools. There were 31 such cases where applicants had been registered for both GP and TP and 13 cases where lady officers had been registered for both LM Pool and LS Pool.

In response to audit observation (20 March 2014), DoE intimated (September 2014) that the required checks were being enabled in the 'Application Module' of the system to minimize these types of mismatching. It was further stated that the required checks were also being enabled in the system to restrict an applicant of Ladies Married pool or Ladies Single pool to apply for only one pool (LS or LM) as per marital status.

In its reply (August 2015), DoE stated that validations have been further spruced up and an applicant can no longer select his pools. Pools are automatically selected on the basis of Category (General, SC, ST), service category (AIS, Non-AIS, OTHERS), Marital Status (Married, Unmarried), Sex (Male, Female) and Pay Scale/Grade Pay.

DoE needs to review periodically the validation checks to ensure that no cases of registration of incompatible pools occur in future.

19.1.28 Non occupation of houses due to outstanding dues of electricity, water and gas

DoE furnished (March 2014) details of unoccupied houses due to electricity dues, under repairs etc. in which 127 houses were indicated vacant due to electricity dues. Audit, however, noticed that DoE had reported in April 2014 to the Secretary, MoUD, 104 houses as unoccupied due to pending electricity bills. Further, analysis of GAMS database (July 2014) indicated 142 houses with status as "ELECTRICITY DUES". This indicates discrepancy in the figures provided to audit and that available in GAMS database.

Though DoE did not furnish the details sought by Audit in respect of all cases, audit scrutiny of the records made available to audit revealed that an amount of ₹ 29.62 lakh was outstanding against 89 allottees (as on March 2010).

DoE replied (March 2015) that NDMC and BSES had agreed to give connections to new allottees where dues were not cleared by the previous allottees. DoE further stated (August 2015) that no house is kept out of bidding due to electricity dues.

The reply of DoE is silent on the steps taken to recover unpaid dues from the previous allottees. DoE, has also not intimated the progress/status of allotment of houses having electricity dues.

19.1.29 Poor quality of data

19.1.29.1 Gaps in various fields

The unique IDs which are system generated viz. HID, REGNO and ALT_ID and AAN used in the tables HOUSE, REGISTRATION, ALT_TRANS and AAN respectively in the GAMS database should normally be serially numbered and without gaps. However, scrutiny of these unique ID columns of the tables mentioned above revealed gaps as noted below which indicates lack of effective data validation within the system:

- In 656 cases, the HID though serially numbered, had gaps/ missing HID
- In 5,293 cases, the ALT_ID though serially numbered, had data gaps/ missing ALT_ID.
- In 10,000 cases, the REGNO though serially numbered, had data gaps/ missing REGNO.
- In 4,806 cases, the Allottee Account Number (AAN), though serial numbered, had gaps/ missing AAN.

DoE replied (March 2015) that certain number of houses had been physically verified and the discrepancies in the system were being addressed to. DoE also intimated that discrepancies like houses not being given identification number and hence missing from the stock, date of retirement were being corrected. It further stated that in a large number of cases, date of retirement had been rectified as the date of birth now had been made mandatory in DE-II Form for

applying for accommodation. DoE further stated (August 2015) that there may be cases of data entry error of DOR as all these occupants' DE-2 form were registered before April 2009.

DoE needs to expedite the process for identification and removal of discrepancies and filling of gaps to ensure accuracy and reliability of data. Further, DoE should take effective measures to ensure more stringent data validation to assure continued reliability of the data.

19.1.29.2 Blank/invalid data

In the system, basic data captured in the 'Registration Table' is transferred to the 'Allotment Transaction Table' and 'Occupation History Table' respectively after an allotment is made. Thus, any wrong or invalid data in the 'Registration Table' will automatically be transferred to the 'Allotment Transaction Table' and 'Occupation History Table'. On scrutiny of the GAMS database (data up to 30 September 2013), audit observed the following:

- 'Registration Table' has 3,125 blank fields in 'date of retirement' column. However, in the column 'FORM_REJ' the status of registration has been recorded as accepted. Resultantly, 3,456 cases in the 'Allotment Transaction Table' and 2,513 cases in the 'Occupation Table' had blank fields in the 'date of retirement' column. Out of these 2,513 cases where DOR field has not been filled, there were 1,030 rows where the occupancy status viz. OCC_STATUS was shown as occupied.
- The date of retirement in the 'Registration Table' did not match the date of retirement in the 'Occupation History Table'/'Allotment transaction table' in 12,063 cases. (Cases in which the difference in dates was exactly 24 months have been ignored for coming to this number assuming that difference was due to increase in the age of retirement by two years). This indicates that the date of retirement was not being accessed from the 'Registration Table' leading to a possibility of entering wrong retirement dates either inadvertently and/or deliberately.
- The 'Date of birth' field in the Registration Table' had been left blank in 49,782 cases. However, the applications are shown as accepted with blank fields in the 'Date of Birth' column and the form status was recorded as accepted. This shows that the 'Date of Birth' field is not a mandatory field and leaves the possibility of occupants overstaying in the houses beyond the date of retirement in the absence of control.

- The date of allotment of the government accommodation is recorded in the column DOA (Date of Allotment) in the Table ALT_TRANS. There were 29 cases in which the DOA was recorded as future dates. This shows that the data in the date of allotment field is not validated leaving a scope for manipulating the data.

In reply to audit observation, DoE stated (September 2014) the data in the 'Occupation History Table' was not transferred as per changes made in the 'Registration Table'. 'Occupation History Table' reflects data as per entries made at the time of acceptance. It further stated that the cases where 'Date of Birth' column is blank might be prior to implementation of ASA when it was not a mandatory field. Regarding date of allotment it intimated that these were old records and were typing mistakes. DoE further stated (August 2015) that there may be cases of data entry error of DOR as all these occupants DE-2 form were registered before April 2009. However, steps taken for correction of these errors not intimated to Audit.

DoE needs to take steps to ensure that the mandatory data is captured without fail and properly validated to ensure its correctness and reliability.

Recommendation No. 6: GAMS database needs to be thoroughly validated to ensure that the incorrect data is removed to ensure accuracy and reliability of data.

Conclusions

- There has been a perpetual shortage of accommodation for Government servants in Delhi which was also acknowledged by the MoUD in its files. DoE did not have an accurate record of the housing stock available with it. The figures of the housing stock are varying from one source to another. DoE does not have any record of physical verification of the housing stock.
- Residential accommodation has been earmarked to various pools like General Pool, Tenure Pool, Tenure Pool (Non-AIS), Lady Officers Pool. Augmentation of housing stock in the various pools has been done in an inequitable manner. Moreover, the satisfaction levels of the houses are varying widely pool – wise.
- Licence Fee Collection and Monitoring System is still not fully functional resulting in DoE not being able to monitor the receipt of the Licence Fee as only around 70 per cent of the DDOs are communicating their Licence Fee recoveries through the online system. There are also instances of

outstanding Licence Fee not yet recovered from the allottees. There were delays in the revision of the Licence Fee for houses.

- There are delays in issue of NDC to the retiring personnel on vacation of the house leading to hardship to them.
- Database of DoE and CPWD are not interlinked leading to delays in the reflection of vacancy position of houses in the GAMS database even though DoE has claimed that both the databases have been interlinked with effect from September 2014.
- From the analysis of GAMS database, instances of accepting applications of debarred applicants, proposal for allotment without corresponding entries in the proposal table of GAMS database, inconsistencies in vacancies being offered for bidding under ASA, delay in taking possession of habitable houses, delays in updating vacancies and registration for applying in multiple incompatible pools were noticed. It was also seen that DoE does not have accurate details of houses which are declared as unsafe or dangerous. The quality of data in the database was also found to be poor.

Recommendations

- DoE should get the housing stock physically verified and keep an accurate record of the housing stock.
- DoE should take steps to ensure that No Dues Certificates are issued to the retiring employees within one month as provided in the Citizen's charter.
- The DoE and CPWD databases should be interlinked properly to ensure real time communication between the two systems.
- DoE should take steps to properly identify houses which are declared as unsafe or dangerous and take steps to make them habitable.
- The online system for monitoring of Licence Fees should be completed quickly ensuring complete participation of all the DDOs to enable accurate monitoring of the receipt of Licence Fee.
- GAMS database needs to be thoroughly validated to ensure that the incorrect data is removed to ensure accuracy and reliability of data.

Ministry of Urban Development has accepted (August 2015) all the recommendations.