

FOURTEENTH KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**COMMITTEE
ON
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
(2019-2021)**

FORTY THIRD REPORT
(Presented on 7th February, 2019)



**SECRETARIAT OF THE KERALA LEGISLATURE
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

2019

FOURTEENTH KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**COMMITTEE
ON
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
(2019-2021)**

FORTY THIRD REPORT

On

**Action Taken by Government on the Recommendations
contained in the 23rd Report of the Committee on
Public Accounts (2001-2004)**

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Composition of the Committee	.. v
Introduction	.. vii
Report	.. 1
Appendix :	.. 18

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

(2016-2019)

Chairman :

Shri V. D. Satheesan.

Members :

Smt. P. Aisha Potty

Shri A. M. Ariff

Shri P. K. Basheer

Shri James Mathew

Shri K. Kunhiraman

Shri Mathew T. Thomas

Shri K. Muraleedharan

Shri A. Pradeepkumar

Shri Mullakkara Retnakaran

Shri Roshy Augustine.

Legislature Secretariat :

Shri V. K. Babu Prakash, Secretary

Smt. S. Shahina, Joint Secretary

Shri P. P. Shahnawas, Deputy Secretary

Shri A. Jafar Khan, Under Secretary.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on Public Accounts, having been authorised by the Committee to present this Report, on their behalf present the 43rd Report on Action Taken by Government on the Recommendations contained in the 23rd Report of the Committee on Public Accounts (2001-2004).

The Committee considered and finalised this Report at the meeting held on 5-2-2019.

Thiruvananthapuram,
5th February, 2019.

V. D. SATHEESAN,
Chairman,
Committee on Public Accounts.

REPORT

This Report deals with the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 23rd Report of the Committee on Public Accounts (2001-2004).

The 23rd Report of the Committee on Public Accounts (2001-2004) was presented to the House on 13th June, 2002. The Report contained 17 recommendations relating to Water Resources Department. The Government was addressed on 26-6-2002 to furnish the Statements of Action Taken on the recommendations contained in the Report and final reply was received on 10-8-2018.

The Committee examined the Statements of Action Taken at its meetings held on 28-1-2015, 17-10-2017, 19-4-2018 and 31-10-2018. The Committee decided to pursue further action on the recommendations No 17, 28 and 33 as the replies were not satisfactory. The recommendations and its replies were incorporated in Chapter I of this Report.

The Committee decided not to pursue further action on the remaining recommendations in the light of the replies furnished by Government. These recommendations and the replies furnished by the Government are included in Chapter II of this Report.

CHAPTER I

Recommendation in Respect of which Action Taken by Government are not satisfactory and which require reiteration

WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Recommendation

(SI No. 6, Para No. 17)

1.1 The Committee express concern over the huge expenditure incurred by the department on establishment to sustain the excess staff without any notable contribution. It is observed that the establishment expenditure has reached above 50% of the work expenditure. The Committee regret to note that the required

details regarding the establishment and work expenditure have not yet been furnished. The Committee are of the view that heavy expenditure on a large contingent of staff stationed at the project site heavily affects the progress of work. The Committee urges to regulate the staff strength retaining only the minimum required staff so as to reduce to avoidable extra establishment charges.

Action Taken

1.2 According to Chief Engineer Projects-II the Accountant General's observation is based on the review of the project covering the period from 1986 to 1993-94. It was pointed out that around 55% of the expenditure incurred up to March 1995 was on land acquisition, share cost of Ennakal Dam paid to KSEB and direction and administration. During the initial stages of the project, the work expenditure will be proportionately much less than the expenditure on land acquisition and direction and administration as works can be arranged only after acquisition of land for the extend required.

During initial stage of the Project it is natural that work expenditure will be less compared to establishment expenditure. The present percentage is 11.40. The details of staff redeployed is Clerk: 7, Peon : 1, Typist : 1.

Further Recommendation

1.3 The Committee express strong discontent on not submitting the statements and directs the department to furnish a detailed report regarding the technical staff working for the project and the action taken to redeploy the excess staff.

Recommendation

(SI No. 15, Para No. 28)

1.4 The Committee note with serious concern that defective investigation consequent on findings of Departmental trial pits and wrong estimation resulted in avoidable expenditure of Rs.12.65 lakhs on slope correction and additional expenditure of Rs. 60.61 lakhs for removal of silt accumulation due to slippage, in the construction of main canal of Idamalyar Irrigation Project from ch.300m to 625m. The Committee understand that the investigation wing of the Irrigation

Department has no facilities to take trial pit for full depth of the canal. The Committee feel that had the factors like site conditions, depth of the rock surface based on trial pits for full depth etc., been taken into consideration before executing the work and proper investigation been conducted by experts, the extra expenditure incurred for this work could have been avoided to a great extent. The Committee underline the need for re-organizing the investigation wing of the Irrigation Department of scientific lines with fully equipped laboratories and experts.

Action Taken

1.5 Investigation for the canal is being done by the Investigation Wing and it is now under the control of the Chief Engineer IDR B TVPM. Necessary directions have been issued to the Chief Engineer IDR B for reorganizing the investigation wing on scientific lines with fully equipped laboratories and experts, taking into account the availability of resources. The Chief Engineer IDR B has furnished a report on the reorganization of the IDR B and it is under examination.

Orders have been issued in G.O.(Ms.) No. 54/2008/WRD dated 28-11-2008 and G.O. (Rt.) No. 113/2008/WRD, dated 28-1-2008 to abolish the Investigation Divisions and deployed most of the Technical and Non technical Posts attached to office of the Chief Engineer, Investigation Wing to LSGD. Hence the investigation wing is at a dismantling stage. Hence now there is not relevance in reorganizing the Investigation Wing.

Further Recommendation

1.6 The Committee strongly criticized the department for not submitting the reply and directs to furnish a detailed report regarding the duties & responsibilities and the strength of employees working in IDR B and also about the details of employees redeployed to LSGD.

Recommendation

(SI No. 17, Para No. 33)

1.7 The Committee are distressed at the lack of prudence on the part of the superior officers in allowing a higher payment for an extra item to one contractor.

while another contractor has carried out the same work in the adjacent reaches in identical conditions at a lower rate. The Committee were convinced that in the Report of the Superintending Engineer to the Chief Engineer, there was no justification for allowing higher rate considering the site condition. The Committee note that higher rate leading to the extra expenditure of Rs. 13.81 lakhs was proposed by the Superintending Engineer, considering the request of the contractor to avoid dispute. No convincing explanation justifying the extra expenditure is seen in the additional information subsequently furnished to the Committee (appendix III). The Committee urge to initiate action against the officers who have failed to protect the interest of Government and thereby responsible for heavy loss to the exchequer.

Action Taken

1.8 Disciplinary action has already been initiated against the delinquent officers. Charge Memo issued to the delinquents.

Additional Information Sought

1.9 The Committee sought the details of action taken against the delinquent officials to whom charge memos were issued.

Action Taken

1.10 The audit recommendation in para 33 refers to the two irregularities in a work "IIP-LLC constructing an aqueduct from Ch.4260.75M to 4280M (ie, Extra expenditure on market rate & tender excess). Audit recommended to recover 13.81 lakh from the responsible officers.

Show Cause Notice was issued on 7-10-2013 and served to the following 8 accused officers:

SI. No.	Name & Designation.
1.	Sri V. P. Arumughan, Former Chief Engineer, Project II, Thiruvananthapuram
2.	Sri Chandramohan R., Former Executive Engineer, O/o the Chief Engineer, Project II, Thiruvananthapuram

3.	Smt. Susan Salkalathan, Former Assistant Executive Engineer, TA O/o the Chief Engineer, Project II, Thiruvananthapuram
4.	Smt. Chinnamma Thomas, Former Assistant Engineer, HD O/o the Chief Engineer, Project II, Thiruvananthapuram
5.	Sri P. A. Mohammed Salih, Former Superintending Executive Engineer, Project Circle, Piravam
6.	Sri E. C. Paul, Former Executive Engineer, IIP Division No. 1, Angamaly
7.	Sri Kurian George, Former Assistant Executive Engineer, IIP Division No.1, Angamaly
8.	Sri Baby Mathew, Former Assistant Engineer, IIP Division No.1, Angamaly

They were heard in person on 18-4-2017, 19-4-2017 & 20-4-2017. The Chief Engineer (I &A) has clarified that an amount of Rs. 5,72,675 has already been recovered from the contractor. From this amount, an amount of Rs. 1,24,493 only can be deducted from the amount of Rs. 13,81,036.

Statement showing deduction of Rs. 1,24,493 from the total liability of Rs.13.81 lakhs is as follows:

Item	Chainage	Rate
Cost of bentonite	From 4260.75m to 4280m	75/m
Cost of bentonite	3694.46m to 4260.75m	112.5/m

Difference in rate = 37.5/m (112.5-75)

Total quantity = 5533m

Tender Excess =60%

Excess amount = 37.5x5533x60/100

= Rs. 1,24,493

Thus the total amount of liability becomes Rs.12,56,543 and the share of liability of the delinquent officers will be refixed accordingly and action will be taken to make good the loss from concerned officers. The reply may be accepted and the recommendation may be dropped.

Further Recommendation

1.11 The Committee recommends to furnish report regarding the present position of the steps taken to realise the liability amount from the delinquent officers.

CHAPTER II

Recommendation in Respect of which the Committee does not desire to pursue Action in the light of the Replies received from the Government

WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Recommendation

(SI No. 1, Para No.12)

2.1 The Committee observe that the Idamalyar Irrigation Project taken up for construction in 1978 with an estimated cost of Rs 17.86 crores and scheduled for completion during 1993-94 based on action plan, remained incomplete even after a lapse of two decades. An expenditure of Rs. 3622.16 lakhs had been incurred up to March 1995. It was reported that the time lag in construction of project was due to delay in getting forest land, delay in getting sanction from Central Water Commission, lack of sufficient funds etc. The Department informed that the project would be commissioned in 2002. The revised estimate was Rs. 170 crores. It is not certain whether the project could be fully commissioned even at this estimated cost.

Action Taken

2.2 The delay in getting forest land, insufficiency of funds and delay in getting sanction from Central Water Commission are the reasons for the delay in completing the project to a great extent. By transferring the required forest land to the department, the main obstruction in the progress of the work has been cleared of. Percentage of Works completed is noted below:

Total Length	Completed	% of length
Main Canal 32.278	31.678km	98.14%

LLC 27.25	12.26km	45.02%
Link Canal 7.575	2.79km	36.65%

Total expenditure of work up to 31-3-2013 is 372.60 crore including establishment cost. Total expenditure upto 30-9-2013 is Rs. 381.107 crore. The trial run of main canal was conducted on 27-3-2013. Urgent rectification work noticed during trail run have already been carried out. It is expected that the project will be partially commissioned during December 2014.

Recommendation

(SI No. 2, Para No.13)

2.3 The Committee notice that during the period of five years from 1994 to 2000, the Department could complete only one km of main canal and acquire only 26 hectares of forest land needed for main canal. The reason for the steep increase in the estimated cost as intimated by the Secretary, Irrigation Department was escalation due to delay caused by the changes in design and alignments and the delay in land acquisition during the course of execution of work. The Committee found that despite the claim of achieving the development and beautification of 'Manappatuchira' (Malayattoor Lake), one of the components of the project the objective of the scheme had not been materilaised due to non-completion of main canals. The Committee strongly feel that had the department approved the design and alignment after proper investigation and planning with due earnestness in land acquisition, it could have avoided the time and cost over run considerably.

Action Taken

2.4 The Department has made earnest efforts to achieve the objectives of the scheme but could not complete the project within the time stipulated due to factors, which are beyond the control of the department. Forest land required for the project could not be acquired due to the long and complex formalities to be observed. This is the main reason for not completing the main canal. The Chief Engineer reported that certain changes in design and alignment are found necessary at the time of execution which are made with intention to increase the

efficiency of the project. According to him even though thorough investigation and planning has been made in advance certain changes in design and alignment are found inevitable during the time of execution to increase the efficiency of the project. The total length of main canal, completed in kms is noted below:

SI No.	Canal	Total length of Kms	Completed in Kms
1	Main	32.278	31.678
2	Low level	27.25	12.269
3	Link	7.58	2.793

Comment

2.5 The Committee criticizes the department for furnishing lame excuses for the lack of planning and proper investigation and opines that the department had not learned any lesson from the previous projects which caused time lapse and cost over run.

Recommendation

(SI No. 3, Para No.14)

2.6 The total extent of forest land required for the project was estimated to 115.047 hectares. The Committee view with serious concern the considerable delay in getting the forest land transferred due to negligence on the part of the officers of Irrigation Department even though an equal extent of non forest land to be handed over to Forest Department for compensatory afforestation had been identified and part of it had already been transferred to that department. The Committee also came to know that the Irrigation Department has also failed to provide Rs. 1.5 crores to the Forest Department for removing the cut wood from the project site. The Committee observe that though an amount of Rs. 681.15 lakhs had been provided in the estimate for land acquisition, the area of land acquired was only 26 hectares. The Committee recommend that earnest action should be taken to accelerate the process of acquisition of forest, revenue as well as private lands for main canals, branch canals and distributaries.

Action Taken

2.7 Total area of Forest Land, private land, Revenue land acquired so far is as follows:

Forest land	:	115.047 Ha
Private Land	:	49.7609 Ha
Revenue Land	:	32.1275 Ha

Recommendation

(SI No. 4, Para No.15)

2.8 The Committee desire to know whether an amount of Rs 1.5 crore has since been paid to the Forest Department for removing the wood from the project site.

Action Taken

2.9 The amount for removing cut-wood from the project site and towards afforestation and seignorage was paid to Forest Department.

(a) Afforestation charges:-

- 65 Ha of Karapuzha @ 15000/Ha : Rs 9.75 lakhs Chalan No. 452
- 50 Ha Muttom @ Rs. 31770/Ha : Rs. 15.89 lakhs D.D. No. 310366
dated 28-9-1996

- Canal Bank Average 20 Ha.@ Rs: 15000/Ha: Rs. 3.00 lakhs

(b) Seignorage charges

SI No.	Chalan No	Amount	Date
1	899	11575.99	23-3-1981
2	668	44563.31	26-3-1981
3	1187	130565.45	22-9-1981
4	1166	638786.74	30-10-1981

5	1879	245915.40	30-11-1981
6	314	149269.83	20-1-1982
7	372	71648.48	23-1-1982
8	350	205207.63	4-3-1982
9	DD No. 596680	12080558.00	22-5-2003
Total		13578090.83	

Total amount paid to the Forest Department towards afforestation and seignorage: Rs. 164.42 lakh.

Recommendation

(SI No. 5, Para No.16)

2.10 The Committee notice that the injudicious apportioning of the cost of Idamalayar Hydro electric Project and the excess share of the cost of dam borne by the Irrigation Department badly affects the benefit- cost ratio of the project. The Committee observe that the department has not so far been able to assess the impact of these payments on the cost benefit ratio of the project. The Committee consider these setbacks as a great blow to the viability of the project.

Action Taken

2.11 An amount of Rs. 14 crore has been paid to the KSEB as share of cost of Ennackal Dam. Considering the present cost of Project share of cost paid to KSEB forms only a small part of the total cost (i.e. about 2.4%). This does not make a serious impact on the cost/Benefit ratio.

Recommendation

(SI No. 7, Para No.18)

2.12 The Committee believe that the 'Manappattuchira' (Malayattoor lake) has ample scope for development of tourism which is the secondary objective of the project. It is ideally located with closeness to Kurisumudi Hill and the ancient church. The Committee are of the view that if modern facilities available in other lakes of tourist centers are provided, this lake will also become an excellent

Centre of tourist attraction and it would considerably help the development of tourism. The Committee urge the Govt to examine the feasibility of re-introducing boating facilities in Malayattoor Lake for tourism promotion. The Committee also urge the Government for the advantageous use of the canal house constructed at a cost of Rs. 11.57 lakhs for conducting conferences and discussions.

Action Taken

2.13 Scarcity of water is experienced during summer in Manappattuchira. To overcome this difficulty water can be pumped to the lake from Pampa river or applying sluise valve from Edamalayar, when the Edamalayar project is commissioned.

The construction of Tourist Facilitation centre using tourism fund through the Grama Panchayat has not been completed. After it is commissioning, it will be helpful to the tourists and pilgrims who visit Kurishumudi. Boating can also be arranged under Kayal tourism.

Recommendation

(SI No. 8, Para No.19)

2.14 It is a matter of grave concern that 6 boats costing of Rs. 1.01 lakhs and construction of boat yard and boat jetty costing Rs. 5.07 lakhs turned out to be of no use and remained idle for want of sufficient water. Utilisation/disposal of this is the responsibility of the Department and Committee may be informed of the present stage of action taken in this regard.

Action Taken

2.15 All the six boats which were in a dilapidated condition and beyond the scope of repairs were disposed of in public auction. Auction for disposal of boats conducted on 25-11-2004 and the amount fetched come to Rs. 36,673

Recommendation

(SI No. 9, Para No.20)

2.16 The Committee note that in the case of work of constructing a causeway across Perumthodu forming part of the project, the liabilities of the

contractor who abandoned the work had not been fixed due to departmental lapses in specifying the authority competent for terminating the contract. The Committee were informed that the final verdict of the High Court is awaited in this case. The Committee desire to be informed of the outcome of the case.

Action Taken

2.17 Against the Revenue recovery initiated, the defaulter filed WP @ 7447/13 before the Hon'ble High Court and is pending. Meanwhile as per the direction of the court in granting stay, the defaulter has already remitted an amount of Rs. 5,56,497 before the Tahsildar (RR). As per Government Letter No. 20865/MP2/13/WRD dated 22-2-2014 an impleading petition has been forwarded to Advocate General office to implead-Government as a party in the case in view of the far reaching consequences involved especially the right of the State to claim interest on amounts due to it.

Recommendation

(SI No. 10, Para No.21)

2.18 In this case the liability of the contractor assessed at Rs. 3.33 lakhs could not be recovered from the contractor as the conditions of the contract were wrongly printed in the tender form. The Committee observe that a wrong entry in the tender documents, which was favorable to the contractor, resulted in litigation. If this important condition was included in the tender form correctly or the department was cautious enough to make timely correction, the interest of Government would have been safeguarded. The Committee recommend that appropriate action should be taken against the officers responsible for the lapses in this regard.

Action Taken

2.19 The loss sustained to Government can be recovered from the Contractor in view of the judgment in AS 98/96 and the Superintending Engineer, Project Circle Piravom has already initiated Revenue Recovery proceedings for the loss sustained to Government along with interest @ 12%. The defaulter has already remitted an amount of Rs. 5,56,497 before Tahasildar (RR). The officers in execution of work retired from service. In future as already reported ultra vigil and prudence will be taken in avoiding such wrong entries in Agreements.

The committee conducted witness examination on the above reply and decided to drop further action as the ACS, Water Resources informed that the loss sustained to the Government along with the Interest amount was remitted by the contractors and assured that the lapse would completely be rectified by taking appropriate action against the officers concerned.

Recommendation

(SI No. 11, Para No.22)

2.20 The Committee understand that as per agreement, the Irrigation Department was not liable to pay Rs. 1.33 lakhs to the contractor as additional amount for providing protective measures before blasting operations since the Chief Technical Examiner (Finance Inspection Wing) proved beyond doubt that the contractor had done only ordinary blasting. The Committee find that the Irrigation Department has failed to produce the documentary evidence before the court or the CTE was not cited as a defense witness. The failure in defending the case properly in the court resulted in a loss of Rs. 48057 by way of interest and court expenses in addition to the loss of Rs 1.33 lakhs. The Committee feel that unfavorable disposal of the case despite having strong evidence was solely due to the careless handling of cases by Government Departments, Law officers and the failure to supervise them effectively. The Committee urge that effective steps should be taken to avoid such lapses.

Action Taken

2.21 The recommendation of the Committee is noted for future guidance.

Recommendation

(SI No. 12, Para No.23)

2.22 The Committee note that the accumulation of excavated soil, ordinary rock, hard rock etc.during excavation works and making provision for suitable dump yard for each reach were not foseen or estimated earlier while making the detailed investigation of the works. The Committee opine that improper investigation in a hasty manner without assessing the capacity of the place selected as dump yard leads to extra expenditure in project works as in the case of

work in ch. 21001M to 21246m. The Committee believe that had the departmental officers rose to the occasion to settle the issue by pointing out convenient dump yards within each reach rather than allowing a place of contractor's choice, the infructuous expenditure of Rs. 97619 towards conveyance charges could have been avoided.

Action Taken

2.23 As reported by the Chief Engineer considering the cost of land acquisition for dumping yard, provision of conveyance to contractor's own land is more beneficial to the department. This was the reason for not acquiring land for dumping the excess soil.

Recommendation

(SI No. 13, Para No. 24)

2.24 The Committee feel that the works on the incomplete major projects should be given priority and taken up immediately. Dates may be fixed for their completion. The Committee desire that list of all incomplete Major Irrigation Projects with the targeted dates for their completion may be furnished to the Committee.

Action Taken

2.25 1. Karappuzha Project:—The progress of works of Karappuzha projects are as follows:-

(1) The works of head works earthen Dam and concrete spill way have been completed 100%

(2) The left bank main canal have been completed for a total length of 16.74km and right bank main canal for a length of 8.805km have been completed. 100% works completed.

(3) The branch canal for a length of 19.541 km out of 43.24km (45.19%) have been completed. And for the distributories a total length of 2.12 km (3.52%) out of 60.145km have been formed.

The Project has been commissioned partially in the year 2010. Distribution of water partially through the completed canal have been done. And an ayacut area of 601 Ha have been achieved. The project is proposed to be completed in 2019-2020.

2. Banasura Sagar Project:—The Progress of the project is follows:—

Canal Woks:—84% completed. 2293 metre of main canal out of a total length of 2730 metre, 545 metres of distributory out of a total length of 56310 metre and branch canal of 770 metre out of a total length of 14420 metre are completed.

Aqueduct works of branch canal, piling of pillars, Aqueduct barrel works have been completed partially. For the balance works, 26 estimates have been prepared in DSR and technical sanction for the estimate of diversion chamber have been cleared and the tendered works have been started this financial year. The remaining estimates are being prepared in price software.

The project is proposed to be completed in the year 2021.

3. Idamalayar Irrigation Project (IIP):—Most of the works will be completed by 2020

Percentage of Completion:-

Main Canal	-	100%
Low Level Canal	-	47.17%
Link Canal	-	36.87%
Ayacut achieved	-	2291.66 Ha

4. Muvattupuzha Valley Irrigation Project (MVIP):—Proposed to be completed by March 2018

Percentage of Completion:—

Main Canal	-	100%
Branch Canal	-	98.12%

Distributory	-	87 %
Ayacut achieved	-	32,535 Ha

Recommendation

(SI No. 14, Para No. 26)

2.26 The Committee find that is neither the clarifications issued by the Chief Engineer (R&B) as to low conveyance charge of cut earths to be conveyed is to be calculated for the purpose of estimate of earthwork excavation had not been given effect by the Irrigation Department. The Committee observe that though estimates were prepared in violation of clarifications issued by Chief Engineer and the contractors were paid for the full quantity of loose soil because the officers were ready to act in tune with the contractors interest. The Committee believe that if the clarifications issued by Chief Engineer (R&B) in 1991 were implemented by the Irrigation Department for providing payment for compacted quantity, the excess payments to the tune of Rs 94.73 lakh in 14 agreements in respect of 4 works relating Karapuzha Irrigation Project could have been avoided. The Committee wanted to know whether Government have conducted any enquiry into the circumstances that led to avoidable excess payment of Rs. 94.73 lakhs.

Action Taken

2.27 In the schedule of rates, earth is classified among split stones, gravel sand etc. which are loose and not compact and hence it would appear that the rates of conveyance of earth is for the loose quantity including bulkage and not for compacted quantity. Nowhere in the schedule of rates earth is not allowed bulkage and to be conveyed consolidate quantity.

The Chief Engineer, Roads and Bridges made clarification in response to the request of Accountant General that the schedule of Rate for earth and its conveyance is for solid volume. On the basis of this clarification the Chief Engineer, Irrigation & Administration has instructed to allow the conveyance charge for the compact quantity in future.

It is found that conveyance charges for the loose quantity of earth is being given by some of the officers, for excavation and compact embankments involving huge quantity of conveyance of earth work and vice-versa.

The Chief Engineer, Roads and Bridges have clarified to the Accountant General that the conveyance rates provided in the Schedule of Rates for earth is for the consolidated compacted quantity and not for the loose quantity and the Accountant General also objected giving conveyance charges for this loose quantity of earth to be conveyed.

On the basis of clarification issued by the Chief Engineer, Roads and Bridges and the objection raised by the Accountant General in some cases it is derived after detailed deliberation that conveyance charges for loose quantity of earth is not to be considered for quantities and excavated earth and compacted embankments and only conveyance charges for the finished/compacted quantity need be provided in the date for future works. Government have not conducted any enquiry.

Recommendation

(SI No. 16, Para No.30)

2.28 It is a matter of concern to the Committee that allowing extra items by executing supplementary agreement without sanctioned estimates has become a regular feature in the project works. Absence of adequate investigation or soil test in the construction of LBMC from chainage 36350m to 37100m of Muvattupuzha Valley Irrigation Project resulted in the payment of Rs. 24.86 lakhs to the contractor for shoring, treating it as an extra item contrary contractors was bound to provide shoring without any extra cost. The Committee recommend that the provision should be made explicit as to avoid such irregular payments.

Action Taken

2.29 Strict instruction have been given to the subordinate officers for adherence of the recommendations.

Thiruvananthapuram,
5th February, 2019.

V. D. SATHEESAN,
Chairman,
Committee on Public Accounts.

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF MAIN CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No.	Department Concerned	Conclusion/Recommendations
1.	1.3	Water Resources	The Committee express strong discontent on not submitting the statements and directs the department to furnish a detailed report regarding the technical staff working for the project and the action taken to redeploy the excess staff.
2.	1.6	Water Resources	The Committee strongly criticized the department for not submitting the reply and directs to furnish a detailed report regarding the duties & responsibilities and the strength of employees working in IDRB and also about the details of employees redeployed to LSGD.
3.	1.11	Water Resources	The Committee recommends to furnish report regarding the present position of the steps taken to realise the liability amount from the delinquent officers.

©
Kerala Legislature Secretariat
2019

KERALA NIYAMASABHA PRINTING PRESS.