APPENDIX - I

Details of partial data entry in different modules

(Reference : Paragraph 1.5.1.1,1.5.1.2, 1.5.1.3, 1.5.1.4 and 1.5.1.5; pages 10& 11)

Module	Office	Audit observation
Offence Information System	RO, Kulathupuzha	There were only 5 records as against 105 cases pending as on 31.12.2005.
	RO, Pathanapuram	Only data relating to 2003-2005 was seen entered.
	RO, Wadakkancherry	Data relating to only 31 out of 120 pending cases as per manual register was entered
Court Cases Monitoring System	DFO, Trivandrum	In all there were 26 records in the database, which tallied with the manual register. But date of next hearing was blank in all records and the reason for pendancy was not filled up in any case.
	RO, Wadakkancherry	There are 21 records, the completeness of which could not be ensured as manual registers were not maintained
	DFO, Punalur	Against 67 cases pending upto 2002, only 17 records were available in the database
Fire Protection System	RO, Pathanapuram	Only 14 records relating to December 2004-March 2005 were available. Details of estimates, past incidence of fire etc were not captured.
	RO. Wadakkancherry	The database contained only 11 records relating to 2003
Personnel Information System	CCF, Southern Region, Kollam	The database contained data in respect of three out of 22 staff in the Office. No attempt was made to collect data from the Circle and Division Offices under the Southern Region.
	DFO, Punalur	There are only 4 records though there were 103 staff under the Division including 73 staff in two ranges.
	ACF, Social Forestry, Kollam	The Division has 25 staff, but the details of only 9 staff are entered.
	TS Division, Palakkad	Though there are 30 employees in the Division, data in respect of only 11 employees was entered.
	CF, Wild Life Circle, Palakkad	The details of 11 staff in the Circle Office have been entered against 320 staff under the Divisions/Ranges
	CF, South Circle , Kollam	Though there were 35 staff in the Circle, the Module contained only 29 records including test data.
	DFO, Palakkad	Details of only 35 out of 124 staff including Ranges were entered.
	DFO, Thiruvananthapuram	There were only 16 records against 23 staff in Division office and another 91 in ranges.
	Central Circle office, Thrissur	There were only 25 records relating to staff in the Circle office.
	Forest HQ, Thiruvananthapuram	Details of only 130 out of 260 staff in HQ were available as against the details of all 6000 staff in the Department to be captured.
Progress Reports System	DFO(TS Division),Palakkad	Data could not be entered as activities like stacking of timber, poles are not displayed in the activity master.
	CF, South Circle, Kollam	There was no data in the module. Progress Reports are consolidated using MS Excel.
	CF, Central Circle, Thrissur	The module contained only data relating to physical progress in respect of Plan schemes implemented by the Circle Office. Division level data was not captured.
Sales	RO, Pathanapuram	The details of marking of trees are seen captured. But details of felling

Management System		were not entered.
Social Forestry Management System	Social Forestry Division, Kollam	Partial data entry in respect of 6 Nurseries, 85 Plantations, 6 SF Projects and 11 Forestry clubs.
Stores Tools and Plants (STP) System	CCF(South region), Kollam	There were 53 records of 2004-05. No data relating to 2005-06 was entered as OB could not be correctly generated due to absence of data/value of old stock
	CF(SC), Kollam	139 records relating to 2004-05 only were available. CB was not worked out for want of cost in most of the records
	DFO, Trivandrum.	There were only 6 records. As manual register was not up to date, the completeness could not be verified.
	CF(CC), Thrissur	Only data relating to 2004-05 was entered. CB not arrived at for want of OB/cost in respect of all items

Appendix II

Erratic results generated by the software

(Reference : Paragraph 2.6.8; page 25)

▪ In the case of a consumer in Kowdiar section, though water supply was disconnected on 20 April 2004, the system generated a demand (for Rs 255) on 11 April 2005 which included water charge (Rs 149). This showed that the system did not prevent generation of water charge after disconnection.

▪ A scrutiny of CPL in Pongummoodu section revealed that in six cases the system failed to exhibit details of consumer. In one case the system wrongly identified a new consumer as an existing consumer based on Key ID and hence the demand of the new consumer could not be generated. Government stated that CPL can be generated online only if adequate data was furnished and non generation of ledger was due to inadequate data.

▪ The first bill in respect of a consumer in Pongummoodu section was raised for an average consumption of 16.6 KL of water for the period from December 2004 to April 2005. But the system failed to print the actual demand (Rs 209) and instead printed zeros against water charge. Government stated that the demand was as per data available at the time of billing. The reply is not acceptable as consumption had been correctly worked out and displayed in the CPL.

▪ Adjustment charges (Rs 715) towards excess consumption added to the water charges of a consumer in Pongummoodu Section for the month of December 2003-January 2004 was again included in the demand for the period February-March 2004 due to absence of process control. Government stated that these were individual cases which were not consistent with the normal billing. But steps taken to avoid inconsistencies in data have not been specified.

▪ Though Consumer Personal Ledgers are designed to be updated online, in respect of six consumers in Pongummoodu Section up to date demand details were not displayed in the Ledger. For example, the ledger in respect of a consumer displayed demand details only up to April 2004 though a demand for Rs 1,20,734 was generated on 12 January 2005.

▪ A consumer in Pongummoodu section, who was given connection on 11 March 2004, had made only one remittance of Rs 86 towards water charges (October 2004). But the ledger displayed (10 February 2005) a credit balance of Rs 266 indicating excess payment, which had no relation to the actual remittance. Government stated that this was due to procedural error.

▪ Out of 36 bulk consumers under Route 900 in Pongummoodu section, the system was generating demands in respect of only 26 consumers. The demands in respect of the remaining 10 consumers were being prepared manually. Government stated that this was due to absence of data in mandatory fields.