

**Annexure I**  
(refer to para 2.3)

**Statement showing the funding pattern for release of APDRP funds as per the Guidelines issued by Ministry of Power**

<b>As per guidelines issued on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2003</b>			
<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Conditionality</b>	<b>Percentage of APDRP funds to be released by GoI</b>	
		<b>Non-Special Category States</b>	<b>Special Category States</b>
1	Up front on approval of project under APDRP and on tie up of Central Plan Fund from financial institutions.	25 per cent	50 per cent
2	Release of matching fund by financial institutions (FIs)	-	-
3	After spending 25% of the project cost* (i.e. 25% APDRP + 25% of counterpart fund from FIs)	50 per cent	50 per cent
4	Progressive release of 50 per cent of the project cost by FIs/ own resources	-	-
5	After spending 75% of the project cost (i.e. 75% APDRP + 75% of counterpart fund from FIs )	25 per cent	-
6	Progressive release of the balance 25% of the counterpart fund by FIs	-	-
<b>As per guidelines issued on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2005 (effective from 2005-06)</b>			
1	Up front on approval of Project under APDRP	10 per cent	30 per cent
2	Release of 30% Project cost by Financial Institutions (FIs)/ own resources	-	-
3	After spending 40% of the project cost <sup>13</sup> (i.e. 10% of the project cost as APDRP grant + 30% of loan component from FIs/own resources),	10 per cent	40 per cent

\* 50 per cent in case of Special Category States

<sup>13</sup> 30 per cent for Special Category States

4	Progressive release of the 30% <sup>14</sup> of the Project cost by FIs/own resources.	-	-
5	After spending 80% of the Project Cost <sup>15</sup> (i.e. 20% of the project cost as APDRP grant +60% of loan component from FIs/own resources) balance APDRP amount i.e. 5% of the project cost would be released.	5 per cent	20 per cent
6	Progressive release of the balance 15% of the Project cost by FIs/own resources	-	-

---

<sup>14</sup> 10 per cent for Special Category States

<sup>15</sup> 70 per cent + 10 per cent of GoI share for Special Category States

**Annexure II**  
(refer to para 2.6)

**Statement showing State-wise Project Outlay, Releases by Government of India,  
Counterpart Funds Sanctioned/ Drawn and Percentage of Utilisation vis-à-vis  
Project outlay as of 31st March 2006\***

**Rs in Crore**

S. No..	STATE	Project outlay	Revised APDRP Component			Release			C/Part Fund		Utilisation	
			Grant	Loan	Total	Grant	Loan	Total	Sanctioned	Drawn	Total	%
1	Andhra Pradesh	1458.49	364.62	283.38	648.00	283.38	283.38	566.76	744.78	436.53	967.52	66.34
2	Bihar	854.05	213.51	156.59	370.10	156.59	156.59	313.18	377.75	121.48	309.72	36.26
3	Chhattisgarh	407.70	101.93	79.61	181.53	79.61	79.61	159.21	65.99	65.99	133.28	32.69
4	Delhi#	922.61	230.65	52.76	283.41	52.76	52.76	105.51	767.72	767.72	863.23	93.56
5	Goa	294.01	73.50	56.70	130.20	56.70	56.70	113.40	62.70	44.87	129.09	43.91
6	Gujarat	1083.22	270.81	200.13	470.94	200.13	200.13	400.26	480.54	372.44	818.12	75.53
7	Haryana	431.95	107.99	84.50	192.48	84.50	84.50	168.99	225.34	104.56	210.79	48.80
8	Jharkhand	423.65	105.91	76.94	182.85	76.94	76.94	153.87	222.42	65.54	146.26	34.52
9	Karnataka	1186.31	296.58	217.73	514.30	230.25	217.73	447.97	668.97	496.41	798.69	67.33
10	Kerala	863.63	215.91	115.28	331.18	115.28	115.28	230.55	175.18	142.55	294.03	34.05
11	Madhya Pradesh	663.20	165.80	64.94	230.74	64.94	64.94	129.87	339.54	127.37	184.90	27.88
12	Maharashtra	2231.58	557.90	134.12	692.01	214.90	134.12	349.01	713.64	265.37	891.32	39.94
13	Orissa	592.22	148.06	37.01	185.07	37.01	37.01	74.02	296.11	35.52	59.47	10.04
14	Punjab	715.57	178.89	89.37	268.26	89.37	89.37	178.74	353.19	148.73	278.43	38.91
15	Rajasthan	1193.25	298.31	192.92	491.23	192.92	192.92	385.83	417.92	188.13	710.79	59.57
16	Tamil Nadu	948.12	237.03	220.91	457.94	220.91	220.91	441.82	484.09	392.77	724.14	76.38
17	Uttar Pradesh	1091.30	272.83	67.26	340.09	106.75	67.26	174.01	438.17	245.91	491.99	45.08
18	West Bengal	442.20	110.55	20.09	130.64	72.84	20.09	92.92	210.29	65.15	225.63	51.02
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>15803.06</b>	<b>3950.77</b>	<b>2150.19</b>	<b>6100.96</b>	<b>2335.73</b>	<b>2150.19</b>	<b>4485.92</b>	<b>7044.34</b>	<b>4087.04</b>	<b>8237.40</b>	<b>52.13</b>
19	Arunachal Pradesh	82.69	74.42	3.67	78.09	33.01	3.67	36.68	NIL	NIL	12.49	15.10
20	Assam	650.73	585.66	15.89	601.54	262.63	15.89	278.51	NIL	NIL	237.91	36.56
21	Himachal Pradesh	322.78	290.50	16.39	306.89	225.94	16.39	242.33	NIL	NIL	214.71	66.52
22	Jammu & Kashmir	1100.13	990.12	31.50	1021.61	377.00	31.50	408.50	NIL	NIL	308.88	28.08

S. No..	STATE	Project outlay	Revised APDRP Component			Release			C/Part Fund		Utilisation	
			Grant	Loan	Total	Grant	Loan	Total	Sanctioned	Drawn	Total	%
23	Manipur	141.62	127.46	0.27	127.73	2.40	0.27	2.67	NIL	NIL	2.67	1.89
24	Meghalaya	227.43	204.69	5.84	210.52	52.54	5.84	58.38	NIL	NIL	41.46	18.23
25	Mizoram	108.74	97.87	2.90	100.76	75.11	2.90	78.01	NIL	NIL	28.96	26.63
26	Nagaland	122.27	110.04	4.28	114.33	64.30	4.28	68.58	NIL	NIL	42.84	35.04
27	Sikkim	164.19	147.77	15.47	163.24	139.26	15.47	154.73	NIL	NIL	134.83	82.12
28	Tripura	146.74	132.07	3.76	135.83	33.88	3.76	37.64	NIL	NIL	24.58	16.75
29	Uttaranchal	310.08	279.07	24.08	303.15	255.68	24.08	279.76	NIL	NIL	220.47	71.10
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>3377.40</b>	<b>3039.66</b>	<b>124.04</b>	<b>3163.7</b>	<b>1521.74</b>	<b>124.04</b>	<b>1645.78</b>	<b>NIL</b>	<b>NIL</b>	<b>1269.80</b>	<b>37.60</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19180.46</b>	<b>6990.43</b>	<b>2274.23</b>	<b>9264.65</b>	<b>3857.47</b>	<b>2274.23</b>	<b>6131.70</b>	<b>7044.34</b>	<b>4087.04</b>	<b>9507.20</b>	<b>49.57</b>

\* Source - Ministry of Finance

# Funds to Delhi are released by Ministry of Home Affairs

### **Details of sampling procedure**

#### **Selection of Units**

- a) All the relevant records of the MoP / MoF and SEBs / Utilities / SEDs, Distribution Companies (Discoms), at the centre and State level were audited.
- b) In every State, 25% of the Circles were to be selected on the basis of Probability Proportion to Size with Replacement (PPSWR) method of statistical sampling with size measure as total number of projects in each Circle. However, in case of those States where the total number of projects required to be selected were not covered in the 25 per cent selected circles, then the number of circles selected was to be increased to cover the sufficient number of projects, even if the percentage of thus selected circles crossed 25 per cent.

#### **Selection of Projects**

583 numbers of projects were being implemented in 29 States. Out of which a sample size of 236 numbers of projects was found to be reasonable with 5 per cent margin of error, 95 per cent confidence level and 50 per cent occurrence rate of non-completion of Projects in the population. This sample size had been allocated proportionately over the states.

Once the projects had been selected from the circles selected by the State AsG, these **projects were divided into two categories / strata** namely (a) projects which have been evaluated by external agencies like ASCI, TCS, TERI etc and (b) projects which had not been evaluated by such external agencies. 25 per cent of the projects were to be selected from stratum (a) and the remaining 75 per cent of the projects, subject to a minimum of 2, from stratum (b).

#### **Selection of Towns**

In addition to selection of Circles and Projects, Best/ Worst Performing Towns were also to be selected, for detailed examination, as under:

- **Best performing towns** – Out of 15 numbers of town indicated by Ministry of Power as best towns in respect of AT&C losses, during 2003-04, which ranged between 7.52 to 10.68 per cent, towns namely Chennai in Tamil Nadu and Uppal, Malkajigiri and Nizamabad in Andhra Pradesh, were selected using Simple Random Sampling Without Replacement Technique for detailed examination.
- **Worst performing towns** – All the 15 worst performing towns, where AT&C loss ranged between 59.85 per cent to 80.35 per cent during 2003-04 as indicated in the records of Ministry, namely Jamtara, Garwha, Latehar, Daltonganj, Sahibganj, Dumka and Pakur in Jharkhand, Naharlagun in Arunachal Pradesh, Osmanabad in Maharashtra, Darbhanga, Pesu (west) and Gaya in Bihar, Chhatarpur in Madhya Pradesh, Roorkee in Uttaranchal and Aizawl in Mizoram, were selected for examination in detail.

## Statement showing the details of sampling

S. No.	Name of State	Total Number of Projects	Reasonable sample size of projects	Number of projects to be taken up for detailed examination	Number of projects actually taken up for detailed examination
1.	Andhra Pradesh	101	40.88	15	101
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	4	1.62	4	4
3.	Assam	15	6.07	6	6
4.	Bihar	15	6.07	6	6
5.	Chhattisgarh	7	2.83	4	4
6.	Delhi	6	2.42	4	4
7.	Goa	7	2.83	4	4
8.	Gujarat	13	5.26	5	5
9.	Haryana	18	7.28	7	7
10.	Himachal Pradesh	12	4.86	5	5
11.	Jammu & Kashmir	6	2.43	4	4
12.	Jharkhand	8	3.23	4	4
13.	Karnataka	35	14.17	14	14
14.	Kerala	52	21.05	15	13
15.	Madhya Pradesh	48	19.43	15	16
16.	Maharashtra	35	14.17	14	14
17.	Manipur	5	2.02	4	4
18.	Meghalaya	9	3.64	4	4
19.	Mizoram	7	2.83	4	4
20.	Nagaland	3	1.21	3	2
21.	Orissa	7	2.83	4	4

S. No.	Name of State	Total Number of Projects	Reasonable sample size of projects	Number of projects to be taken up for detailed examination	Number of projects actually taken up for detailed examination
22.	Punjab	26	10.52	11	13
23.	Rajasthan	29	11.74	11	11
24.	Sikkim	4	1.62	4	4
25.	Tamil Nadu	41	16.60	15	7
26.	Tripura	7	2.83	4	4
27.	Uttar Pradesh	36	14.57	14	14
28.	Uttaranchal	6	2.43	4	4
29.	West Bengal	21	8.50	8	8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>235.94</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>294</b>

**Annexure IV**  
(refer to para 6.1.1)

**Statement showing AT&C Losses for the year 2001-02 and 2005-06**

S. No.	Name of the State	AT&C Losses (in percentage) <sup>¥</sup>		Basis of Average in case of Percentage of AT &C losses calculated on the basis of average of circle / towns
		2001-02	2005-06	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	22.74 #	18.06#	Average of 3 Model Circles # T&D Losses
2.	Arunachal Pradesh*	68	54.76	State as a whole
3.	Assam*	41.48 (2002-03)	42.10	Average of total 14 projects
4.	Bihar	65.74*	55.68**	* Average of 4 Circles ** Average of 6 Circles
5.	Chhattisgarh	34.07	34.87	Average of 6 test checked Circles
6.	Delhi	DNA	59 *	Average of 8 districts under BYPL & BRPL.
7.	Goa	29.41	15.86	State as a whole
8.	Gujarat	17.63(2002-03)*	21.21*	Average of 3 Circles and 2 cities (test checked)
9.	Haryana	38.35(2002-03)	40.52	*Average of 2 companies
10.	Himachal Pradesh*	48.46(2002-03)	30.98	State as a whole
11.	Jammu & Kashmir*	46(2002-03) #	45#	# T&D Losses AT&C Losses in 7 circles ranged between 47 % & 72 % in 2005-06.

<sup>¥</sup> Figures based on audit scrutiny at the State Level, except Assam where the figures have been taken from the Monthly Progress Report of Powergrid as of March 2006.



S. No.	Name of the State	AT&C Losses (in percentage) <sup>¥</sup>		Basis of Average in case of Percentage of AT &C losses calculated on the basis of average of circle / towns
		2001-02	2005-06	
12.	Jharkhand	63.24	62.39	State as a whole
13.	Karnataka	42.39	37.81	State as a whole
14.	Kerala	NA	32.79*	* Average of 9 Projects
15.	Madhya Pradesh	45.49 (2003-04)*	43.77*	* Average of 36 towns under APDRP
16.	Maharashtra	44.11(2003-04)	35.70	State as a whole
17.	Manipur*	80.69	85.41	State as a whole
18.	Meghalaya*	35.37	42.96	State as a whole
19.	Mizoram*	84.94	72.74	State as a whole
20.	Nagaland*	61	59	State as a whole
21.	Orissa	55.50(2000-01)	44.75	State as a whole
22.	Punjab	26.86	24.02	State as a whole
23.	Rajasthan	42.27 (2003-04)	41.56	Average of 3 Discoms
24.	Sikkim*	64.93	41.19	State as a whole
25.	Tamil Nadu	18.87	16.33	Average of 25 circles
26.	Tripura*	40.63 (2002-03)	32.40	State as a whole
27.	Uttar Pradesh	44.50* (2003-04)	43.38**	* Average of 3 Circles ** Average of 11 Circles
28.	Uttaranchal*	45.07	38.80	State as a whole
29.	West Bengal	45.41	35.28**	** Average of 2 Circles and 6 towns test checked

\* Special category states

**Annexure V (a)**  
*(refer to para 6.2.1)*

**Status of Consumer Metering for the Years 2001-02 and 2005-06\***

S.No.	STATE	Consumer Metering (In Lakhs)					
		2001-02			2005-06		
		Numbers	Metered	Percentage	Numbers	Metered	Percentage
1	Andhra Pradesh	113.20	90.50	80	157.46	150.47	96
2	Arunachal Pradesh	1.30	0.70	54	1.13	0.52	46
3	Assam	9.50	6.50	68	11.77	10.56	90
4	Bihar	23.76	17.16	72	12.50	6.23	50
5	Chhattisgarh	18.70	11.20	60	22.91	15.81	69
6	Delhi	27.10	26.26	97	26.65	26.65	<b>100</b>
7	Goa	4.00	3.80	95	3.96	3.86	97
8	Gujarat (GEB)	69.21	63.55	92	74.77	69.57	93
9	Haryana	35.11	32.65	93	39.17	36.12	92
10	Himachal Pradesh	16.50	15.10	92	16.97	16.97	<b>100</b>
11	Jammu & Kashmir	10.00	4.00	40	10.00	4.00	40
12	Jharkhand				6.53	4.90	75
13	Karnataka	85.00	48.40	57	128.89	105.68	82
14	Kerala	62.50	58.00	93	77.99	77.99	<b>100</b>
15	Madhya Pradesh	63.29	35.46	56	64.92	46.50	72
16	Maharashtra (MSEB)	129.00	109.00	84	135.32	118.12	87
17	Manipur	1.70	1.40	82	1.70	1.40	82
18	Meghalaya	1.40	0.90	64	1.68	0.84	50
19	Mizoram	1.04	0.48	46	1.28	1.27	99
20	Nagaland	1.50	1.10	73	1.88	1.14	61
21	Orissa	14.50	11.50	79	21.49	17.45	81
22	Punjab	52.71	44.68	85	58.94	50.39	85

S.No.	STATE	Consumer Metering (In Lakhs)					
		2001-02			2005-06		
		Numbers	Metered	Percentage	Numbers	Metered	Percentage
23	Rajasthan	53.05	43.25	82	58.45	54.78	94
24	Sikkim	0.70	0.30	43	0.65	0.60	92
25	Tamil Nadu	147.68	117.42	80	170.33	148.13	87
26	Tripura	1.80	1.20	67	2.28	1.84	81
27	Uttar Pradesh	78.10	46.03	59	88.06	80.38	91
28	Uttaranchal	8.54	7.09	83	9.87	7.73	78
29	West Bengal	38.00	32.00	84	47.27	45.89	97
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1068.89</b>	<b>829.63</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1254.82</b>	<b>1105.79</b>	<b>88</b>

\* Source - Ministry of Power Status Report for March 2006

**Annexure V (b)**  
(refer to para 6.2.1)

**Statement showing status of Feeder and Distribution Transformer Metering for the years 2001-02 and 2005-06\***

S.No.	STATE	11kV Feeders						Distribution Transformer					
		2001-02			2005-06			2004-05			2005-06		
		Numbers	Metered	%age	Numbers	Metered	%age	Numbers	Metered	%age	Numbers	Metered	%age
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4907	4907	<b>100</b>	9239	8674	<b>94</b>	262,000	55,000	21	351,751	38,729	11
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	168	33	20	201	1	0	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
3.	Assam	777	777	<b>100</b>	708	708	<b>100</b>	18,288	DNA	DNA	18,288	DNA	DNA
4.	Bihar	1517	600	40	1125	465	41	15,000	DNA	DNA	15,000	DNA	DNA
5.	Chhattisgarh	767	100	13	1574	1511	96	38,424	DNA	DNA	38,424	DNA	DNA
6.	Delhi	1400	1400	<b>100</b>	1850	1850	<b>100</b>	8,000	3,500	44	8,000	3,500	44
7.	Goa	170	170	<b>100</b>	179	179	<b>100</b>	3,562	1,781	50	3,562	1,781	50
8.	Gujarat (GEB)	5939	5939	<b>100</b>	5307	5307	<b>100</b>	236,362	1,500	1	236,362	1,500	1
9.	Haryana	2557	2557	<b>100</b>	3888	3888	<b>100</b>	133,364	DNA	DNA	133,364	DNA	DNA
10.	Himachal Pradesh	375	350	93	762	727	95	15,802	14,099	89	15,802	14,099	89
11.	Jammu & Kashmir	1214	1214	<b>100</b>	1558	1480	95	30,015	DNA	DNA	30,015	DNA	DNA
12.	Jharkhand				461	396	86	16,500	15,000	91	16,500	15,000	91
13.	Karnataka	3518	3518	<b>100</b>	4570	4570	<b>100</b>	144,000	34,500	24	144,000	34,500	24
14.	Kerala	1047	1047	<b>100</b>	1334	1334	<b>100</b>	80,000	5,000	6	35,442	5,506	16
15.	Madhya Pradesh	5498	2943	54	5660	5660	<b>100</b>	160,000	3,000	2	160,000	3,000	2

Report No. 16 of 2007

S.No.	STATE	11kV Feeders						Distribution Transformer					
		2001-02			2005-06			2004-05			2005-06		
		Numbers	Metered	%age	Numbers	Metered	%age	Numbers	Metered	%age	Numbers	Metered	%age
16.	Maharashtra (MSEB)	7558	7558	100	6148	6148	100	186,000	50,000	27	215,241	52,923	25
17.	Manipur	193	40	21	193	40	21	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
18.	Meghalaya	314	96	31	175	175	100	2,515	650	DNA	2,515	650	26
19.	Mizoram	106	98	92	129	93	72	DNA	DNA	DNA	916	20	2
20.	Nagaland	93	32	34	164	140	85	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
21.	Orissa	1858	500	27	1792	1699	95	22,000	20,500	93	22,000	20,500	93
22.	Punjab	4563	4360	96	5928	5928	100	280,000	30,000	11	217,000	11,660	5
23.	Rajasthan	7321	3321	45	8411	8411	100	188,170	DNA	DNA	188,170	DNA	DNA
24.	Sikkim	124	124	100	113	113	100	DNA	DNA	DNA	1357	531	39
25.	Tamil Nadu	3684	3684	100	3777	3777	100	210,000	40,000	19	161,092	4,703	3
26.	Tripura	118	118	100	197	197	100	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA	DNA
27.	Uttar Pradesh	8124	8124	100	8507	8507	100	330,000	6,652	2	330,000	6,652	2
28.	Uttaranchal	348	330	95	1008	1008	100	15,000	15,000	100	24,412	989	4
29.	West Bengal	2800	615	22	2347	2347	100	53,420	13,500	25	53,420	13,500	25
<b>1.</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>67058</b>	<b>54555</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>77305</b>	<b>75333</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>2448422</b>	<b>309682</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2422633</b>	<b>229743</b>	<b>9</b>

**DNA- Data Not Available**

**Source: Ministry of Power Status report for March 2006**

**Annexure VI**  
(refer to para 6.5)

**Statement showing Average Cost of Sales (ACS), Average Revenue Realisation (ARR) and Revenue Gap (ACS-ARR)  
for the years 2001-02 to 2004-05**

S.No.	Name of State	2001-02			2002-03			2003-04			2004-05		
		ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2.29	1.64	<b>0.65</b>	2.37	1.99	<b>0.38</b>	2.37	1.99	<b>0.38</b>	2.30	2.01	<b>0.29</b>
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	6.78	0.75	<b>6.03</b>	5.97	0.76	<b>5.21</b>	4.40	0.91	<b>3.49</b>	2.49	1.21	<b>1.28</b>
3.	<i>Assam</i>	<i>4.25</i>	<i>2.05</i>	<i>2.20</i>	<i>4.76</i>	<i>2.35</i>	<i>2.41</i>	<i>4.68</i>	<i>2.69</i>	<i>1.99</i>	<i>6.13</i>	<i>2.86</i>	<i>3.27</i>
4.	<i>Bihar</i>	<i>3.57</i>	<i>2.13</i>	<i>1.44</i>	<i>3.21</i>	<i>1.64</i>	<i>1.57</i>	<i>3.40</i>	<i>1.77</i>	<i>1.63</i>	<i>3.44</i>	<i>1.73</i>	<i>1.71</i>
5.	Chhattisgarh	2.12	2.35	<b>0.23 S</b>	1.72	2.38	<b>0.66 S</b>	1.91	2.43	<b>0.52 S</b>	1.99	2.41	<b>0.42 S</b>
6.	Delhi	-	-	-	1.58	1.87	<b>0.29 S</b>	2.05	2.03	<b>0.02</b>	2.34	2.49	<b>0.15 S</b>
7.	Goa	2.12	2.08	<b>0.03</b>	1.57	2.06	<b>0.49 S</b>	1.51	2.04	<b>0.53 S</b>	1.61	2.15	<b>0.54 S</b>
8.	Gujarat	2.60	1.82	<b>0.77</b>	2.38	1.87	<b>0.51</b>	2.76	2.06	<b>0.69</b>	2.49	2.03	<b>0.46</b>

S.No.	Name of State	2001-02			2002-03			2003-04			2004-05		
		ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP
9.	Haryana	2.47	1.89	<b>0.58</b>	2.26	1.82	<b>0.44</b>	2.31	1.82	<b>0.49</b>	2.58	1.86	<b>0.72</b>
10.	Himachal Pradesh	2.08	1.79	<b>0.29</b>	2.10	1.97	<b>0.13</b>	2.08	1.99	<b>0.09</b>	2.36	2.29	<b>0.07</b>
11.	Jammu & Kashmir	-	-	-	2.48	0.71	<b>1.76</b>	2.24	0.77	<b>1.47</b>	2.29	0.75	<b>1.54</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Jharkhand</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>4.52</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>1.94</b>
13.	Karnataka	2.32	1.59	<b>0.73</b>	2.51	1.84	<b>0.67</b>	2.60	1.95	<b>0.65</b>	2.65	1.98	<b>0.67</b>
14.	Kerala	2.58	1.60	<b>0.98</b>	2.86	2.12	<b>0.73</b>	3.19	2.46	<b>0.73</b>	2.75	2.56	<b>0.19</b>
15.	Madhya Pradesh	2.33	1.81	<b>0.52</b>	2.08	1.77	<b>0.31</b>	2.23	2.00	<b>0.23</b>	2.21	1.96	<b>0.25</b>
<b>16.</b>	<b>Maharashtra</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>2.04</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>0.12</b>
17.	Manipur	3.33	0.46	<b>2.87</b>	3.30	0.72	<b>2.59</b>	3.22	0.64	<b>2.58</b>	2.86	0.89	<b>1.97</b>
18.	Meghalaya	1.99	1.51	<b>0.48</b>	2.25	1.71	<b>0.55</b>	1.24	1.83	<b>0.59 S</b>	1.84	1.78	<b>0.06</b>
<b>19.</b>	<b>Mizoram</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>1.23</b>

S.No.	Name of State	2001-02			2002-03			2003-04			2004-05		
		ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP	ACS	ARR	GAP
20.	<i>Nagaland</i>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>7.15</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>5.86</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>2.58</b>
21.	Orissa	2.06	1.59	<b>0.47</b>	2.17	1.73	<b>0.44</b>	2.05	1.69	<b>0.36</b>	2.03	1.75	<b>0.28</b>
22.	Punjab	2.44	1.77	<b>0.68</b>	2.41	1.92	<b>0.49</b>	2.25	2.04	<b>0.22</b>	2.52	2.03	<b>0.49</b>
23.	<i>Rajasthan</i>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.04</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>0.68</b>
24.	Sikkim	1.47	0.79	<b>0.68</b>	2.69	0.83	<b>1.86</b>	0.48	1.40	<b>0.92 S</b>	0.61	1.67	<b>1.06 S</b>
25.	Tamil Nadu	3.18	1.95	<b>1.23</b>	2.62	2.15	<b>0.47</b>	2.73	2.44	<b>0.29</b>	2.76	2.36	<b>0.40</b>
26.	Tripura	2.44	0.81	<b>1.63</b>	2.26	0.88	<b>1.38</b>	1.92	1.81	<b>0.10</b>	3.56	3.13	<b>0.43</b>
27.	<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>	<b>2.17</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>1.17</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>1.84</b>	<b>0.88</b>
28.	Uttaranchal	-	-	-	2.72	2.75	<b>0.03 S</b>	2.77	2.64	<b>0.13</b>	1.82	1.50	<b>0.33</b>
29.	West Bengal	2.78	1.62	<b>1.15</b>	2.54	1.90	<b>0.64</b>	2.45	2.29	<b>0.16</b>	2.43	2.28	<b>0.15</b>

**S- Surplus**

Figures taken upto two decimal places.



**Annexure VII**  
(refer to para 7.2.6)

**Details of delay by State Governments in release of funds released by Government of India during the period 2002-03 to 2005-06**

(Rs. in crore)

S. No.	Name of the State	Total amount released by Government of India till 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2006	Delay in release of funds by State Government to SEB / Utility against various releases (In days)		Total amount released by State Government till 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2006	Amount held by State Government as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2006
			Minimum	Maximum		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	265.10 (Incentive)		30 Month	NIL	265.10
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	36.68	-	5 month	21.55	15.13
3.	Assam	278.51	15	374	263.51	15.00
4.	Bihar	313.18	24	346	313.18	NIL
5.	Chhattisgarh	169.47	45	365	128.48	40.99 <sup>¥</sup>
6.	Delhi	105.51	-	5 month	105.51	NIL
7.	Gujarat	519.08 - incentive + loan	21	504	519.08	NIL
8.	Haryana	168.99	17	71	168.99	NIL
9.	Himachal Pradesh	242.32	51	637	242.32	NIL
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	408.50*	-	12 month	408.50	NIL
11.	Jharkhand	175.84	92	1095	175.84	NIL
12.	Karnataka	447.97	21	258	435.45	12.52

<sup>¥</sup> Chhattisgarh : Amount adjusted by State Government, while releasing the funds, towards dues payable by the SEB.

\* Delay was in respect of Rs.168.58 crore

S. No.	Name of the State	Total amount released by Government of India till 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2006	Delay in release of funds by State Government to SEB / Utility against various releases (In days)		Total amount released by State Government till 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2006	Amount held by State Government as on 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2006
			Minimum	Maximum		
13.	Kerala	295.49	20	295	295.49	0.00
14.	Madhya Pradesh	129.87	16	516	129.87	NIL
15.	Maharashtra	349.01 (as per release orders in the MoP)	90	450	273.04	75.97
16.	Meghalaya	58.37	4 month	10 month	58.37	--
17.	Mizoram	78.01		6 month	70.91	7.10
18.	Nagaland	68.58	2 month	14 month	52.59	15.99*
19.	Punjab	244.02	33	342	244.02	NIL
20.	Rajasthan	430.83	7	300	430.83	NIL
21.	Sikkim	154.72	1 month	10 month	149.50	5.22
22.	Tamil Nadu	441.82	31	178	441.82	NIL
23.	Tripura	37.64	43	138	37.64	NIL
24.	Uttar Pradesh	174.01	21	283	174.01	NIL
25.	Uttaranchal	279.76	1 month	9 month	279.76	NIL
26.	West Bengal	502.18	28	833	502.18	NIL

\* Nagaland: This amount includes Rs. 15.75 crore not released by State Government and Rs. 0.24 crore deducted as departmental charges while releasing the APDRP funds.

**Annexure VIII**  
(refer to paras 9.4 & 12.5)

**Statement showing details of constitution of state level Distribution Reforms Committee (DRC) and the number of review meetings held.**

S. No.	Name of the State	Date of Memorandum of Agreement	Stipulated date of constitution of DRC	Actual Date of constitution of DRC	Delay in days/ month	Number of meetings required to be held till the Month	Number of Meetings actually held	Shortfall in number of meetings actually held (Percentage)
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	07/2002	08/2002	06/2003	10 month	17 – 3/2006	4	13 (76)
2.	Assam	7/2002	08/2002	08/2002	--	22 – 3/2006	4	18 (82 )
3.	Chhattisgarh	10/2002	12/2002	06/2003	210 days	17 – 3/2006	1	16 (94 )
4.	Goa	10/2001	11/2001	7/2003	19 month	16 – 3/2006	3	13 (81)
5.	Haryana	4/12/2003	04.01.2003	29.9.2003	209 days	15 – 3/2006	1	14 (93 )
6.	Himachal Pradesh	7.12.2002	7.1.2003	2/2003	1 month	13 – 9/2006	4	09 (69)
7.	Jammu and Kashmir	4/2002	5/2002	Not yet constituted	54 month	27	Nil	27 (100)
8.	Karnataka	22.05.2002	22.03.2002	05/2003	13 month	20 – 08/2006	7	13 (65 )
9.	Kerala	25.10.2002	25.11.2002	17.03.2003	112 days	20 – 8/2006	4	16 (80 )
10.	Maharashtra	05/2002	06/2002	02/2003	240 days	19 – 3/2006	Nil	19 (100 )
11.	Punjab	08/2002	09/2002	06/2003	9 month	17 – 03/2006	1	16 (94 )
12.	Rajasthan	06/2002	07/2002	15.01.2003	5 month	19 – 03/2006	7	12 (63 )
13.	Sikkim	12/2002	1/2003	10/2003	9 month	15 – 3/2006	Not Available	Not Available
14.	Tripura	28/8/2003	28/9/2003	9/2003	--	15-3/2006	2	13 (87)
15.	Uttar Pradesh	9/2002	10/2002	10/2002	--	24 – 9/2006	7	17 (71)
16.	Uttaranchal	12.12.2002	12.01.2003	01.01.2005	731 days	07 – 03/2006	1	06 (86 )
17.	West Bengal	9/2002	10/2002	12/2002	2 month	13 – 3/2006	2	11 (85)

**Annexure IX**  
(refer to para 9.5)

**Statement showing details regarding Theft Cases during the period 2000-01 to 2005-06**

S. No.	Name of the State	Number of Theft Cases		Number of cases convicted	Percentage of conviction	Amount involved (Rs.in crore)	Amount realized (Rs.in crore)
		Detected	Registered (percentage)				
1.	<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>						
	APEPDCL	11225	N/A	41	0.37	N/A	6.41
	APCPDCL	262024	N/A	106	0.04	N/A	37.16
	APSPDCL	125511	N/A	121	0.10	N/A	28.98
	APNPDCL	147856	147856 (100%)	143	0.09	N/A	9.88
2.	<b>Assam*</b>	--	3696	123	3.33	--	--
3.	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	317485	889 (0.28%)	Nil	0.00	N/A	52.06
4.	<b>Haryana</b>						
	UHBVN	114190	23148 (20%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	48.72
	DHBVN	123724	7165 (5.79%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.69
5.	<b>Jharkhand</b>	5113	3301 (64.56%)	N/A	N/A	<b>17.66</b>	<b>1.38</b>
6.	<b>Karnataka</b>						
	BESCOM	27788	N/A	2	0.017	N/A	5.55
	CSES	2341	N/A	1959	83.68	N/A	5.79
	MESCOM	1741	N/A	2	0.17	N/A	1.80
	HESCOM	9619	N/A	27	0.28	N/A	13.11
7.	<b>Kerala</b>	1854	261 (14.08%)	Nil	0.00	N/A	32.95
8.	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b> (Bhopal region)	26735	N/A	1254	4.70	N/A	674.57
9.	<b>Maharashtra</b>	7878	4599 (58.38%)	31	0.67	N/A	68.12

<b>10.</b>	<b>Punjab</b>	1658073	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	756.52
<b>11.</b>	<b>Rajasthan</b>						
	Jaipur DISCOM	123542	2503	N/A	N/A	93.09	49.45
	Ajmer DISCOM	147368	N/A	N/A	N/A	117.41	58.49
	Jodhpur DISCOM	343	343 (100%)	167	46.68	91.71	54.13
<b>12.</b>	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	12501	N/A	163 (1.70%)	1.70	73.41	36.22
<b>13.</b>	<b>Tripura*</b>	33197	558 (1.68)	45	8.06	N/A	82.05
<b>14.</b>	<b>Uttaranchal</b>	147	132	N/A	10.61	N/A	191.22

\* For the years 2004-05 and 2005-06

**Annexure X**  
(refer to para 10.1.1)

**Details of the projects sanctioned during various Monitoring / Steering Committee meetings**

S.No.	Name of the Committee	Date of Meeting	No. of Projects Sanctioned	Total cost of the Projects Sanctioned (Rs. in Crore) (including 5% consultancy charges)	Total cost of the Projects Sanctioned (Rs. in Crore) (excluding 5% consultancy charges)	Total Project Cost as per Status Report (Rs. in Crore)
1	Monitoring Committee	16.07.2002	63 Circles	4214.20	4013.52	4214.39
2	1 <sup>st</sup> Steering Committee	25.09.2002	69	3983.90	3784.71	4064.35
3	2 <sup>nd</sup> Steering Committee	20.11.2002	204	5209.14	4948.68	4780.38
4	3 <sup>rd</sup> Steering Committee	20.05.2003	63	1938.55	1841.57	2003.44
5	4 <sup>th</sup> Steering Committee	19.09.2003	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
6	5 <sup>th</sup> Steering Committee	28.11.2003	15	968.47	788.10	767.40
7	6 <sup>th</sup> Steering Committee	13.04.2004	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
8	7 <sup>th</sup> Steering Committee	20.09.2004	99	1437.22	1365.36	1365.59
9	8 <sup>th</sup> Steering Committee	23.03.2005	72	1876.50	1782.68	1688.04
10	9 <sup>th</sup> Steering Committee	3.08.2005	15	296.87	N/A	296.87
11	10 <sup>th</sup> Steering Committee	21.11.2006	90	1587.20	N/A	

## Annexure XI

(refer to para 10.1.3)

## Cases of deficiencies noticed in individual DPRs

S.No	Name of State	Deficiencies noticed during Audit
1.	Haryana	In the DPR of Faridabad Circle the financial benefit from the investment of Rs. 30.83 crore earmarked for 'balance works', was not envisaged. Further, the envisaged financial benefits of Rs. 37.93 crore for works worth Rs. 87.63 crore were inflated by Rs. 2.83 crore.
2.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In three test checked circles, the Board awarded 12 contracts for construction of sub-stations, lines and express feeders at a cost of Rs. 16.68 crore against the provision of Rs. 9.26 crore in the DPR.</li> <li>• In Kullu, Bilaspur and Rohru circles, excess replacement of 4042 LT and 178 HT Poles resulted in excess expenditure of Rs. 3.73 crore.</li> <li>• In Hamirpur circle, the Board purchased 477 three / single phase transformers against provision of 405 transformers at a cost of Rs. 4.88 crore against the provision of Rs. 3.69 crore.</li> </ul>
3.	Madhya Pradesh	Against the requirement of 237 feeder meters, the SEB made provision of 1085 feeder meters in 9 towns in the DPRs approved during 2002-03.
4.	Maharashtra	The cost of replacing the three phase electronic meters, considered in Amravati, Latur, Malegaon, Sindhudurg projects was Rs. 4000 per meter, while in Nashik, the cost of single phase electronic meter was taken at Rs. 2500 per meter as against Rs. 2250 for three phase meter and Rs. 1000 for single phase electronic meter, considered in projects for other circles.
5.	Punjab	Excess material over and above the provisions made in the approved DPRs (12 projects) was used, resulting in unauthorized expenditure of Rs. 16.77 crore (March 2006), which was indicative of defective DPR.
6.	Punjab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Mohali, the targets fixed for T&amp;D losses in DPRs were higher than the prevailing level of T&amp;D losses.</li> <li>• The minimum target of T&amp;D losses to be achieved was five per cent in DPRs, which meant that in no case could the metering efficiency be more than 95 per cent. However, the targets of metering efficiency in the DPRs of Amritsar City, Bathinda, Tarn Taran, Muktsar, Barnala &amp; Malerkotla were</li> </ul>

S.No	Name of State	Deficiencies noticed during Audit
		fixed at 100 per cent, which cannot be achieved even if the minimum targets of T&D losses were achieved.
7.	Rajasthan	For the work of reactive compensation, the actual quantity was 11768 numbers costing Rs.194.55 lakh as against the projected quantity of 1500 numbers costing Rs.752 lakh, indicating that the per unit cost indicated in the DPRs was more than 30 times the actual cost.
8.	Rajasthan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost of new 33 KV line included in various DPR ranged between Rs1.58 lakhs per KM in case of Jhunjhunu to Rs 8.90 lakh in case of Sri Ganganager.</li> <li>• The cost of new 11 KV lines ranged between Rs 0.72 lakh per KM in case of Jodhpur district to Rs. 8.51 lakh per KM in case of Ajmer city.</li> <li>• The cost of 11KV, 1.2MVAR capacitor Bank ranged between Rs.4.47 lakh in case of Bikaner city to Rs 15.87 lakh in case of Jaipur District</li> </ul>
9.	Sikkim	The Energy and Research Institute (TERI) – an independent evaluator –observed (July 2005) that the project reports were prepared in a hurry, without making any system studies to avoid changes in the scope of works.
10.	Tripura	The requirement projected as per the approved DPRs and the actual procurement made on re-assessment revealed that the DPR estimates of 79930 meters were grossly inadequate; only 2,45,994 electronic meters (68.68 per cent of the requirement) were procured as of July 2006, leaving a gap of 1,12,199 consumer connections without electronic tamper proof meters.



**Annexure XII**  
(refer to para 10.2.2)

**Cases of Non adoption of Turnkey Contracting/ Distorted Turnkey Packaging**

S.No	Name of State	Cases noticed in Audit
1.	Assam	14 projects were split into 23 packages comprising of system improvement, consumer metering, computerization of billing, new-sub-station, feeder augmentation etc. For every package, two separate contracts were entered into, one for supply of equipments and the other for erection, which negated the purpose of turnkey contracting – identification of single point responsibility for adherence to a rigid time schedule.
2.	Chhattisgarh	The value of total turnkey contracts out of the completed works up to end of March 2006 was a meagre 17 per cent. Total turnkey contracts were adopted for laying 33 KV lines only.
3.	Gujarat	None of the 10 projects were awarded on turnkey basis.
4.	Jammu and Kashmir	Barring a few works, most of the programmes were being executed departmentally.
5.	Meghalaya	Nine out of 20 packages in five circles valuing Rs. 14.22 crore were not being executed on turnkey basis.
6.	Orissa	None of the projects were implemented on turnkey basis.
7.	Uttar Pradesh	Out of 14 projects, UPPCL/Discoms finalised only three projects on turnkey basis.
8.	Uttar Pradesh	11 projects were split into five packages for each project and awarded to individual contractor. However, as all the packages were of interconnecting nature, the delay in one work resulted in delay of other works. Further, in five towns, the agreements for carrying out civil works for construction of Sub-stations were executed after the scheduled date of completion of works relating to erection/ installation of the Sub-station

**Annexure XIII**  
(refer to para 10.2.3)

**Cases of abnormal delays in award and execution of works after approval of DPRs**

S.No	Name of State	Deficiencies noticed during Audit
1.	Madhya Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were delays ranging between 10 and 17 months in the award of turnkey contracts, and works valuing Rs.272.12 crore were not awarded as of 31 March 2006.</li> <li>• Laying of 33/11 KV lines in 11 towns, with scheduled dates of completion between January 2005 and August 2005, did not commence even after a lapse of 23 to 24 months from the date of award.</li> <li>• The renovation and modernization work of 16167 DTs pertaining to 29 towns did not commence even after the expiry of 17 months from the date of award of work.</li> </ul>
2.	Maharashtra	The works of DT renovation and modernization, tower ladder mobile vehicle, energy accounting and computerized billing centre etc. valuing Rs.22.04 crore included in the DPRs of Jalgoan, Pune town, Pimpri-Chinchwad, Nashik town and Nashik rural sanctioned in 2002-03 and 2003-04, had not been taken up by MSEDCL (Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited) as of March 2006.
3.	Uttar Pradesh	Out of 14 projects test checked in 11 towns, delay in award of contracts ranged between 5 and 36 months.

**Annexure XIV**  
(refer to para 10.2.4)

**Cases of Execution of Works/ items of Works outside the scope of APDRP**

S.No	Name of State	Execution of works not under the ambit of APDRP
1.	Himachal Pradesh	Two sets of overhead transmission line fault locating analyzers were purchased at a cost of Rs. 0.36 crore and installed at 220 KV sub-station at Hamirpur, though there was no provision in the scheme for their installation at this sub-station.
2.	Jammu and Kashmir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key material valued at Rs.1.25 crore procured for execution of the APDRP works was diverted for restoration of system damages caused to distribution system due to heavy snowfall during 2004-05 and 2005-06 and was not recouped to the programme from the State plan.</li> <li>• Sub-Transmission Division No.-I, Jammu advanced (December 2004) Rs.13 lakh to Jammu Development Authority for acquiring land neither covered in the programme guidelines nor in the individual project reports.</li> </ul>
3.	Jharkhand	A sum of Rs. 19.93 crore was spent during 2005-06 toward projects of underground cable system, erection, testing and commission for power supply in Ranchi.
4.	Kerala	The SEB replaced all the electromechanical meters of consumers with electro-static meters in three circles and seven towns at a cost of Rs. 45.96 crore. However, APDRP does not envisage replacement of functioning consumer meters.
5.	Maharashtra	11 project reports submitted by Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (MSECL), which were sanctioned by the GoI, provided for replacement of 14,68,014 meters with static meters valuing Rs. 161.65 crore, though the APDRP does not provide for replacement of existing functional meters.
6.	Orissa	Rs. 0.52 crore were spent on repair of spot billing machines and mobile phone charges.
7.	Punjab	An expenditure of Rs 5.27 crore was incurred on works of 132 KV and 220 KV sub-stations (instead of 33 / 66 KV sub-stations), which did not form part of the sub-transmission and distribution network.
8.	Tamil Nadu	The Board had included new / improvement works of 10 Sub Stations of 110 / 33 KV and 110/11 KV at a total value of Rs. 89.85 Crore in Chennai Metro Projects for the stated reason of improving the upstream network. The AcC (NTPC) had failed to properly scrutinize and eliminate these works as any improvement work in the upstream network was a part of the Board's own works.

**Annexure XV**  
(refer to para 10.2.5)

**Cases of execution of works/ items of works not covered/ included in approved DPRs**

S.No	Name of State	Deficiencies noticed during Audit
1.	Assam	Rs. 3.26 crore was incurred on works/ items of work which were not covered under the projects approved by GoI.
2.	Haryana	In Karnal circle, Rs. 8.89 crore was spent on items not covered under approved DPRs.
3.	Himachal Pradesh	In Hamirpur Circle, one HT shunt capacitor at 33 KV sub station at Jawalamukhi was installed at the cost of Rs. 12.30 lakh and LT switched capacitors to be installed on the distribution transformers, at a cost of Rs. 41.57 lakh as per DPR, were not installed ; consequently, the achievement of the desired improvement in the power factor remains doubtful.  The scope of the scheme of construction of sub-station at Tahliwala in Una circle was changed due to increase in load demand at extra cost of Rs. 0.93 crore, which was to be recovered from the industrial consumers but was charged to APDRP instead.
4.	Jammu and Kashmir	In 6 utility divisions, Rs. 22.19 crore was spent on items of work not covered in DPRs viz. laying of new 33/ 11 KV lines, laying of LT lines for pump sets, electrification of villages etc.
5.	Mizoram	The Thermal Power Division spent Rs. 0.61 crore on labour payments, repair of vehicles, purchase of battery bank etc. which were not covered in the DPRs.
6.	Orissa	Works amounting to Rs. 3.12 crore were executed over and above the scope of approved DPR.
7.	Punjab	An expenditure of Rs. 2.27 crore was incurred on providing general service connections (GSC), deposit works, meter cup boxes and pillar boxes, which were not included in the approved DPRs
8.	Uttar Pradesh	The UPPCL/ Discoms used APDRP funds amounting to Rs.1.83 crore for procurement of four movable trailer mounted cable fault locating systems, construction of committee room etc. which were not included in the DPRs

**Annexure XVI**  
(refer to para 10.2.6)

**Instances where economy in procurement and execution was not exercised, resulting in avoidable expenditure**

S.No	Name of State	Instances noticed during Audit
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Execution of three works was awarded to the lowest contractor, on overall comparison, on semi turnkey basis, at a cost of Rs. 2.76 crore. During the execution, additional quantities were included and certain items of works deleted altogether and the total cost of the three works was revised to Rs. 4.04 crore, showing that the contract was finalized without proper field survey as certain items of work were increased in quantum by more than 20 times. As the lowest quoted items of work were cancelled and highest quoted items of work were increased abnormally, the additional expenditure in all the three contracts worked out to Rs. 64.42 lakh being the difference in rates on additional quantities compared with the rates offered by other contractors.
2.	Assam	In order to undertake the work in 14 circles under APDRP, the Board entered into contracts with different parties for supply of electrical materials, which included inter alia PSC Poles of different specifications. In eight test checked circles the Board procured PSC poles of different specifications at rates much higher than the Government approved rates from suppliers outside the State, thereby incurring an avoidable expenditure of Rs.3.10 crore on purchase of poles.
3.	Maharashtra	The lowest offer of Rs. 17.43 crore, which was 28.3 per cent above the estimated cost of Rs. 13.59 crore, was received in Nasik town for supply, erection, testing and commissioning of HT / LT lines, establishment and augmentation of transformer etc for which tenders were invited in June 2004. However, as the same was not accepted without any justification, and on re tendering the lowest offer was higher by 39.8 per cent over the estimated cost, the work could not be commenced till September 2006, when it was decided to be carried out departmentally at an estimated cost of Rs. 21.62 crore i.e. higher by Rs. 4.19 crore over the originally lowest offer.
4.	Sikkim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement of materials and calling of tenders for the works through the STCS led to avoidable payment of commission amounting to Rs.34.21 lakh out of APDRP funds.</li> <li>• Against the requirement of 63,917 consumer meters, 70230 meters were purchased, resulting in excess purchase of 6313 meters of Rs.</li> </ul>

S.No	Name of State	Instances noticed during Audit
		<p>1.14 crore.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7232 meters valuing Rs. 1.31 crore were found defective after their installation, which were not replaced/ repaired till September 2006, although they were guaranteed for 5/ 10 years.</li> <li>• In departure from the established practice, the department in one case incorporated the item 'supply, bending and binding of steel' totaling 35.65 metric tones valued Rs. 17.32 lakh in construction of the base of the towers, over and above the cement concrete works (ratio 1:2:4 &amp; 1:3:6) and protective works (1:4:8 mix), resulting in unnecessary excess expenditure to that extent.</li> <li>• In 3 works involving 24.1 Km of transmission lines, the requirement of towers as per the norm was 73 against which the Department used 84 towers, resulting in excess expenditure of Rs. 30.14 lakh.</li> </ul>

**Annexure XVII**  
(refer to para 10.2.7)

**Cases of excess payment to contractors**

S.No	Name of State	Deficiencies noticed during Audit
1.	Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPDCL accepted 100 defective DTs worth Rs.31.16 lakh despite rejection by the authorised inspection agency (RITES).</li> <li>• NPDCL awarded (12 March 2004) two separate works for conversion of low voltage distribution system (LVDS) to high voltage distribution system (HVDS) in two divisions of Warangal Model circle to a contractor. Though the works involved were of similar nature the contractor quoted different rates with the difference ranging between Rs.2 and Rs.2520. Acceptance of the quoted rates, without making negotiations for acceptance of the lower rates of other contractors, resulted in extra expenditure of Rs.53 lakh.</li> </ul>
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquidated damages of Rs. 1.21 crore were not recovered for delay in completion of work.</li> <li>• Defective meters valued at Rs. 29.11 lakh could not be got replaced.</li> </ul>
3.	Assam	Defective consumer meters valued at Rs. 0.99 crore were not got replaced.
4.	Bihar	The SEB paid Rs. 12 crore to PowerGrid, as initial advance, to execute APDRP works in eight circles in March 2003, even before it entered into an agreement with PowerGrid, which was done in December 2003.
5.	Goa	The SED paid 50 percent of the estimated cost amounting to Rs 87.75 crore as interest-free advance without any security, in violation of CVC guidelines, to PowerGrid.
6.	Himachal Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substandard cables valuing Rs. 0.33 crore was not got replaced.</li> <li>• Out of the total penalty of Rs. 81.83 lakh for delayed completion of work ranging between 2 to 44 weeks, HPSEB could recover only Rs. 9.45 lakh resulting in short recovery of Rs. 72.38 lakh.</li> </ul>
7.	Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defective meters valued at Rs.12.53 lakh could not be got replaced.</li> <li>• Champhai Power Division (CPD) paid Rs. 47.71 lakh to Power Stores Division for material like conductor, transformer etc., however evidence of receipt of these materials was not on record.</li> </ul>

S.No	Name of State	Deficiencies noticed during Audit
8.	Orissa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neither did CESCO claim Rs. 23.06 lakh for defective supply of material ,nor did the supplier firm refund the amount.</li> <li>• SOUTHCO &amp; NESCO incurred an extra expenditure of Rs. 0.38 crore due to purchase of AB cable instead of ACL cable, which was recommended by the central procurement group and was available at a lower rate.</li> </ul>
9.	Sikkim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rs. 1.75 crore was transferred to State Trading Corporation of Sikkim on the last day of the financial year 2002-03, though orders to the STCS to release payments to the supplier were made in May 2003 / June 2003.</li> <li>• Interest free mobilization advances of Rs.16.74 crore were paid to 30 contractors in 30 works without any specific authorization.</li> <li>• Excess quantities of 14323 bags of cement consumption ranging from 5 to 12 per cent (2 works) and 33 to 40 per cent (7 works) of the quantities actually prescribed by the Schedule of Rates (SOR) resulted in excess payment of Rs. 35.81 lakh</li> <li>• In 3 works, the contractors used less cement than the requirement as per the SOR, which rendered works of value Rs. 99.05 lakh substandard.</li> <li>• Extra charges @ 25 per cent of the cost of items of works over and above the contractual rates was allowed to two contractors in two works towards erection, commissioning, testing and transportation, resulting in undue extra payment of Rs.2.07 crore to the contractors.</li> </ul>
10.	Tripura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In two test checked sub divisions in Agartala, 21005 meters were purchased /installed during 2003-04 to 2005-06, out of which 3832 meters became defective within 12 months of installation, indicating purchase of substandard meters.</li> <li>• Rs. 6.82 crore was paid in advance to PowerGrid for two projects.</li> </ul>
11.	West Bengal	<p>The Tender Evaluation Committee failed to analyse the ex-work prices of similar materials quoted for three circles and towns therein. Consequently, the price schedule issued to the successful contractors were higher for 27 items by 2 to 2910 per cent in comparison to the lowest price for the same items for other towns, resulting in undue benefit of Rs. 3.54 crore to the contractors. Similarly, non-evaluation of the separate bids for Circle vis-à-vis the aggregate of the lowest bids in respect of each town covered in that Circle resulted in undue benefit of Rs. 0.44 crore to the contractors.</p>



**Annexure XVIII**  
(refer to para 10.2.8)

**Other cases of Inefficient / ineffective execution**

S.No	Name of State	Instances noticed during Audit
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Though the works relating to LT line capacitors, meter calibrations and consumer indexing valuing Rs. 27.22 crore were not taken up at all by SPDCL, it furnished physical progress on these works to DRC.
2.	Assam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the selection of the highest bidder, in respect of feeder augmentation for Jorhat, Dibrugarh and Guwahati Electrical Circle-II work, the Board suffered an extra liability of Rs.42.08 lakh. In two cases (Consumer metering in three circles*and Consumer metering in six circles**) though one bidder against each package was found to be technically disqualified, their price bids were opened and selected as lowest bidder on the basis of price bid on the ground that competition would otherwise be limited to a single bid.</li> <li>• System Improvement (SI) work of Cachar Electrical Circle of which the Technical and Commercial Evaluation Committee selected Techno Electric and Engineering Company Limited (TEEC) as the only technically qualified bidder, despite the fact TEEC failed to fulfil the criterion of past supplies /performance of transformers of stipulated class and, BHEL and L&amp;T were disqualified for non fulfilment of minimum qualifying requirement and non submission of type test reports of equipments respectively. As per documents furnished by BHEL it had fulfilled all the qualifying requirements and L&amp;T had committed to furnish type test report after the award of work and this was in conformity with clause 1.2 of the bid document.</li> </ul>
3.	Bihar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEB indicated reconductoring of 33KV lines of 47 km between Aurangabad ,Uchauli and Daudnagar as completed. Audit, however, observed that reconductoring had been done only upto 38.50 km.</li> <li>• One power sub station – Pachayti Akhara in Gaya was shown as completed despite the fact that clearance report of the</li> </ul>

---

\* Jorhat, Dibrugarh and Guwahati Electrical Circle-II

\*\* Nagaon, Bongaigaon, Tezpur, Rangia, Sibsagar and Guwahati Electrical Circle-I.

S.No	Name of State	Instances noticed during Audit
		<p>Electrical Inspector and completion certificate were yet to be submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 PSS were shown as completed by POWERGRID in their progress report though no work was found to be completed by Audit.</li> </ul>
4.	Chhattisgarh	The SEB installed 1605 old/repared transformers (1583 DTs and 22 Power Transformers) initially and had taken up replacement of these old DTs/PTs subsequently, which is still under progress. This resulted in additional commitment of Rs 0.91 crore towards labour and transportation and delayed the completion of works.
5.	Himachal Pradesh	Three dismantled transformers and one old HT Shunt capacitor valuing Rs. 38.77 lakh against sanctioned amount of Rs. 48.50 lakh for new equipments were installed at three substations.
6.	Jammu & Kashmir	Supply order for purchase of an automatic meter reading system (AMR) comprising of ten components at a cost of Rs.1.50 crore was placed (October 2001) with a firm. However, only six components of the system, costing Rs.1.07 crore were supplied by the firm in 2002-03. Remaining four components were awaited as of March 2006. Further, the system could not be installed as permission for construction of towers for the same was not granted by SACFA <sup>^</sup> which rendered the expenditure of Rs.1.07 crore unfruitful. The utilities were required to execute APDRP projects according to the unit rate fixed for each component of the programme. Cross check of Physical and Financial progress achieved (March 2006), revealed that actual expenditure far exceeded the expenditure at unit rates approved for each item of work and Rs.29.84 crore was spent in excess in seven EM&RE circles.
7.	Jharkhand	Material supplied for erection work in 4 sampled projects, to the tune of Rs. 38.38 crore remained unutilised due to non execution of erection work.
8.	Madhya Pradesh	In Indore City Circle though a three member committee was constituted in July 2005 and entrusted with the task of assuring the quality control, no report had been submitted by them.
9.	Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contract for Rs.8.25 crore for supply, erection, testing and commissioning of 11KV and LT lines, establishment and augmentation of transformers in Malegaon town, which was to</li> </ul>

<sup>^</sup> Standing Advisory Committee for Radio Frequency Allocation

S.No	Name of State	Instances noticed during Audit
		<p>be completed by November 2004 remained incomplete even after a time over run of 21 months till August 2006 due to late survey and site identification by MSEDCL, delay in issue of vendor list etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work of laying new overhead and underground lines, etc. in Pune town was delayed by 15 months due to delayed issue of requisite form for labour license, delayed finalization of vendor list, and belated preparation of estimates for various works.</li> <li>• There was a time over run of 21 months in the work of replacement of single / three phase mechanical meters with electronic meters in Pune town and Pimpri-Chinchwad town (awarded in November 2003) and was completed to the extent of 40.51 per cent and 38.14 per cent in Pune town and Pimpri-Chinchwad respectively, till August 2006. It was observed that as against the installation of 3.85 lakh meters in Pune town within a period of one year only 2800 meters were provided by MSEDCL whereas in Pimpri-Chinchwad no meters were supplied till six months after award of work due to non-availability of meters in stock. The inordinate delay in supply of meters hampered the progress of work.</li> </ul>
10.	Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Khawzawl Power Division (KDP) under Champhai Circle stated the work of upgradation of 33KV bay as completed at a cost of Rs. 0.93 crore. But, KDP executed sub-standard work by installing 2.5 MVA transformer (Rs. 7.32 lakh) instead of 6 MVA transformer (Rs. 10 lakh) and had purchased 21 sets of lighting arrestors instead of 4 sets and also had not executed the Civil works .</li> <li>• Though the Material at Site Account (MAS) for March 2006 of the Revenue Division indicated that the Division had utilised 1982 consumer meters out of 3770 meters received, audit scrutiny, however, revealed that only 352 meters were actually issued to consumers</li> </ul>
11.	Uttar Pradesh	<p>In three works, the management had to extend the scheduled completion period by 14 months due to delay in finalization of BoQ, approval of Guaranteed Technical Parameters (GTPs), non-availability of Form 31, delay in purchase of land, delay in completion of civil works at the site and non availability of shut downs etc.</p>

**Annexure XIX-A**  
(refer to para 12.1)

**Financial Performance in respect of Projects sanctioned during 2002-03**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Name of the State</b>	<b>Project Cost (Rs. in crore)</b>	<b>Total Funds utilised upto March 2006 (including counterpart funds) (Rs. in crore)</b>	<b>Percentage of utilised funds with respect to project cost</b>
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1423.59	957.90	67.29
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	63.99	9.67	15.11
3.	Assam	481.56	200.78	41.70
4.	Bihar	770.21	306	39.73
5.	Chhattisgarh	404.37	133.23	32.96
6.	Delhi	922.61	863.23	93.56
7.	Goa	236.21	118.62	50.22
8.	Gujarat	1052.84	813.66	77.28
9.	Haryana	429.20	208.04	48.47
10.	Himachal Pradesh	68.00	52.11	76.63
11.	Jammu & Kashmir	-	-	-
12.	Jharkhand	423.65	146.26	34.52
13.	Karnataka	1114.03	797.61	71.60
14.	Kerala	308.97	256.22	82.93
15.	Madhya Pradesh	570.44	176.98	31.03
16.	Maharashtra	1038.41	556.05	53.55
17.	Manipur	10.13	2.67	26.36
18.	Meghalaya	24.99	16.81	67.27
19.	Mizoram	9.77	8.48	86.80
20.	Nagaland	45.39	42.84	94.38
21.	Orissa	-	-	-
22.	Punjab	635.66	257.76	40.55

S. No.	Name of the State	Project Cost (Rs. in crore)	Total Funds utilised upto March 2006 (including counterpart funds) (Rs. in crore)	Percentage of utilised funds with respect to project cost
23.	Rajasthan	1115.39	684.49	61.37
24.	Sikkim	144.03	126.77	88.02
25.	Tamil Nadu	929.21	724.14	77.93
26.	Tripura	13.27	7.51	56.60
27.	Uttar Pradesh	386.71	238.09	61.57
28.	Uttaranchal	310.08	220.47	71.10
29.	West Bengal	126.41	124.12	98.20
<b>Total</b>		<b>13059.12</b>	<b>8050.56</b>	<b>61.65</b>

**Annexure XIX-B**  
(refer to para 12.1)

**Financial Performance in respect of Projects sanctioned during 2003-04**

S. No.	Name of the State	Project Cost (Rs. in crore)	Total Funds utilised upto March 2006 (including counterpart funds) (Rs. in crore)	Percentage of utilised funds with respect to project cost
1.	Andhra Pradesh	34.90	9.62	27.56
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	18.70	2.82	15.08
3.	Assam	65.79	28.82	43.81
4.	Bihar	20.40	3.72	18.24
5.	Haryana	2.57	2.57	100
6.	Himachal Pradesh	254.78	163.96	64.35
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	401.10	178.91	44.60
8.	Madhya Pradesh	80.10	7.85	9.80
9.	Maharashtra	790.74	253.93	32.11
10.	Meghalaya	15.97	7.24	45.34
11.	Mizoram	48.14	20.48	42.54
12.	Nagaland	76.88	0.00	0
13.	Orissa	592.22	59.47	10.04
14.	Punjab	38.92	16.57	42.57
15.	Sikkim	8.06	8.06	100
16.	Tripura	14.27	8.43	59.07
17.	Uttar Pradesh	95.79	66.44	69.36
18.	West Bengal	288.21	104.26	36.18
<b>Total</b>		<b>2847.54</b>	<b>943.15</b>	<b>33.12</b>

Annexure XIX-C  
(refer to para 12.1)**Financial Performance in respect of Projects sanctioned during 2004-05**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Name of the State</b>	<b>Project Cost (Rs. in crore)</b>	<b>Total Funds utilised upto March 2006 (including counterpart funds) (Rs. in crore)</b>	<b>Percentage of utilised funds with respect to project cost</b>
1.	Assam	103.38	8.31	8.04
2.	Bihar	63.44	0.00	0
3.	Goa	57.80	10.47	18.11
4.	Gujarat	30.38	11.28	37.13
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	699.03	129.97	18.59
6.	Karnataka	46.09	0.00	0
7.	Kerala	554.66	37.81	6.82
8.	Madhya Pradesh	8.32	0.07	0.84
9.	Maharashtra	203.06	81.34	40.06
10.	Manipur	131.49	0.00	0
11.	Meghalaya	186.47	17.41	9.34
12.	Mizoram	50.83	0.00	0
13.	Punjab	34.80	4.00	11.49
14.	Rajasthan	77.86	26.30	33.78
15.	Tamil Nadu	18.91	0.00	0
16.	Tripura	119.20	8.64	7.25
17.	Uttar Pradesh	563.45	187.46	33.27
18.	West Bengal	27.58	0.00	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>2976.75</b>	<b>523.06</b>	<b>17.57</b>

**Annexure XIX-D**  
(refer to para 12.1)

**Financial Performance in respect of Projects sanctioned during 2005-06**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Name of the State</b>	<b>Project Cost (Rs. in crore)</b>	<b>Total Funds utilised upto March 2006 (including counterpart funds) (Rs. in crore)</b>	<b>Percentage of utilised funds with respect to project cost</b>
1.	Chhattisgarh	3.33	0.00	0
2.	Karnataka	26.19	1.08	4.12
3.	Madhya Pradesh	4.34	0.00	0
4.	Maharashtra	199.37	0.00	0
5.	Punjab	6.19	0.10	1.61
6.	Sikkim	12.10	0.00	0
7.	Uttar Pradesh	45.35	0.00	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>296.87</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>0.40</b>