

73

**NEGLIGENT SCRUTINY OF CLAIMS
LEADING TO EXCESS PAYMENT**

[Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the
Committee contained in their Forty-first Report (15th Lok Sabha)]

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND
BROADCASTING**

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
COMMITTEE**

2012-2013

SEVENTY-THIRD REPORT

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

SEVENTY-THIRD REPORT
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2012-2013)

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

NEGLIGENT SCRUTINY OF CLAIMS LEADING
TO EXCESS PAYMENT
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

[Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the
Committee contained in their Forty-first Report (15th Lok Sabha)]

Presented to Lok Sabha on 21.3.2013

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 21.3.2013



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March, 2013/Phalguna, 1934 (Saka)

PAC No. 2000

Price: ₹ 25.00

© 2013 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eleventh Edition) and Printed by the General Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi 110 002.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2012-13)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government	5
CHAPTER III Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the replies received from the Government	10
CHAPTER IV Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration	11
CHAPTER V Observations/Recommendations in respect of which the Government have furnished interim replies	12
APPENDICES	
I. Minutes of the Twenty-seventh sitting of Public Accounts Committee (2012-13) held on 19th March, 2013	13
II. Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their Forty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha)	15

COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2012-2013)

Dr. Murlī Manohar Joshi — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
3. Dr. Baliram
4. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
5. Dr. M. Thambidurai
6. Shri T.K.S. Elangovan
7. Shri Anant Kumar Hegde
8. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
9. Shri Sanjay Nirupam
10. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
11. Shri Abhijit Mukherjee*
12. Shri Ashok Tanwar
13. Shri Takam Sanjoy†
14. Dr. Girija Vyas
15. Shri Dharmendra Yadav

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
17. Shri Prakash Javadekar
18. Shri Satish Chandra Misra
19. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy
20. Shri J.D. Seelam
21. Shri N.K. Singh
22. Prof. Saif-ud-Din Soz

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri Devender Singh | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri Abhijit Kumar | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 3. Smt. A. Jyothirmayi | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |

*Elected *w.e.f.* 6th December, 2012 *vice* Shri Sarvey Sathyanarayana appointed as Minister on 28th October, 2012.

†Elected *w.e.f.* 6th December, 2012 *vice* Dr. Shashi Tharoor appointed as Minister on 28th October, 2012.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Public Accounts Committee (2012-13), having been authorised by the Committee, do present this Seventy-third Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) on Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Forty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) on 'Negligent scrutiny of claims leading to excess payment'.

2. The Forty-first Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 19th December, 2011. Replies of the Government to the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Report were received on 5th November, 2012. The Public Accounts Committee considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 19th March, 2013. Minutes of the sitting are given at *Appendix I*.

3. For facility of reference and convenience, the Observations and Recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report.

4. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in the matter by the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

5. An analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Forty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) is given at *Appendix II*.

NEW DELHI;
19 March, 2013

28 Phalguna, 1934 (Saka)

DR. MURLIMANO HAR JOSHI
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Public Accounts Committee deals with the Action Taken by the Government on the Observations and Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Forty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) on '**Negligent scrutiny of claims leading to excess payment**' based on Paragraph No. 7.1, Chapter VII of Audit Report No. CA 2 of 2008 relating to the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.

2. The Forty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha), which was presented to Lok Sabha on 19th December, 2011, contained 6 Observations and Recommendations. Action Taken Notes in respect of all the Observations and Recommendations have been received from the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and are broadly categorized as under.

- (i) Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:

Para Nos. 1—5

Total: 5
Chapter-II

- (ii) Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the replies received from the Government:

—NIL—

Total: Nil
Chapter-III

- (iii) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:

—NIL—

Total: Nil
Chapter-IV

- (iv) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies:

Para No. 6

Total: 1
Chapter-V

3. Taking cognizance of the huge pendency, the Public Accounts Committee constituted a Sub-Committee during 2010-11 to examine the Ministries/Departments who defaulted in furnishing the Remedial/Corrective Action Taken Notes within the prescribed time-frame. The Committee thereafter decided to examine the position in respect of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting.

4. In the course of examination of pendency, the Committee found that in addition to pendency regarding submission of Remedial/Corrective Action Taken Notes, there was discrepancy with respect to pendency figures. Alongwith examination of this issue, the Committee had also taken up Para No. 7.1 of Chapter VII of Audit Report No. CA 2 of 2008 for detailed examination during the year 2010-11. Urging the Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure to reconcile the figures in consultation with the Audit and Ministry of Information & Broadcasting to ensure nil pendency, the Committee had made their observations on the detailed examination of Audit Para and had given their recommendations thereon, in the Forty-first Report (15th Lok Sabha).

5. The Action Taken Notes furnished by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting on the Observations and Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Forty-first Report (Fifteenth Lok Sabha) have been reproduced in the relevant Chapters of this Report. In the ensuing paragraphs, the Committee have dealt with the Action Taken by the Government on their Observations and Recommendations made in the Original Report which merit comments. **The Committee desire that Government should furnish final/conclusive action taken replies to the recommendation for which interim reply has been furnished.**

A. Recovery of excess money paid to BCCI

Recommendation (Sl. No. 4)

6. Audit Para No. 7.1 of Chapter-VII of Audit Report No. CA of 2008, relating to the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting had highlighted a case of loss of revenue to the tune of ₹ 3.39 crore due to an erroneous agreement signed between Prasar Bharati and Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI) on 30.11.2005 for the telecast of 12 One Day International (ODI) Matches during October-November, 2005. According to clause 11 of the Agreement, the Prasar Bharati was to pay ₹ 7.50 crore to BCCI for each of the Match played. The Agreement also contained a rider wherein it was provided that in case a Match was not played for full duration, which according to Audit and based on the Sport Section Schedule provided by the Prasar Bharati was 'seven hours', on any day the amount of money to be paid was to be calculated in terms of the number of hours played. Clause 11 of the Agreement also stated that 'in case of lesser number of matches being played for any reason whatsoever, the consideration shall be reduced on a *pro rata* basis'. According to the Agreement, 'In case a game is not played for the full duration on any day for any reason whatsoever, the consideration for that day shall be calculated in proportion to the number of hours played'. In the event of a match being cancelled altogether, 'no consideration shall be payable'. The Committee had noted that, on the contrary, the Agreement also provided that in terms of the stipulations of the International Cricket Council (ICC), a ball being bowled in a Match shall be deemed to be a Match having been played. Based on this analogy, the

Committee had found that Prasar Bharati had not reduced the payment for five Matches which were held for less than the full duration of seven hours except for one cancelled Match and one match played at Mohali. The Committee were perturbed to note that such a patently erroneous Agreement was described by the Secretary, Ministry of I&B simply as 'an unhappily drafted agreement'. The Committee had deplored that the Agreement, which caused pecuniary loss of ₹ 3.39 crore to the public exchequer, was not even vetted by legal authorities which was, infact, a reproduction of an earlier Agreement signed in 2004 for a five-day Match series. The Committee had thus demanded explanation for such patently erroneous drafting of agreement, recovery of the intentional loss caused to the public exchequer and stringent penal action against the officers involved with the finalization of the Agreement. The Committee had recommended that the process be commenced for the recovery of the amount overpaid to BCCI for the Matches which were played for less than seven hours duration as similar deduction was made for the Mohali Match. Further, the Ministry was exhorted to take foolproof measures to ensure that agreements were drafted with utmost care and foresight and duly vetted legally to avoid any fiduciary loss to the Government.

7. In this regard, the Ministry submitted the action taken as under:—

"Prasar Bharati has informed that the matter for recovery of excess amount has since been taken up by Prasar Bharati with the BCCI for refund. The BCCI has been asked to refund the excess amount of ₹ 3.39 core paid earlier. The officers who signed and approved the draft agreement have since retired. Utmost care is now being taken to ensure that all the agreements signed with third parties are duly vetted by our standing Legal counsel with particular reference to the need to ensure that ambiguity of the kind which arose in the instant case does not recur".

8. Pursuant to their recommendation, the Committee find that the Ministry has asked BCCI to refund the excess amount that has been paid by Prasar Bharati for the ODI Matches that were played during October-November 2005 and which were played for less than seven hours. From the Action Taken Notes it is seen that the BCCI has been asked to refund but the outcome of this request has not been made available to the Committee. The Committee would like to be apprised of the response of the BCCI in this regard and the payments made, if any. The plea of the Ministry that 'officers who signed and approved the draft agreement have since retired', is not acceptable and therefore, the Committee reiterate that the officers responsible for fiduciary loss to the Government must be made accountable.

B. Establishment of state-of-the-art filing and retrieval system

Recommendation (Sl. No. 5)

9. Prasar Bharati made a net gain of ₹ 26,81,47,402.00 for the said 11 Matches, yet the Ministry had failed to explain to the Committee as to what was the basis for fixing the rate of ₹ 7.5 crore paid of BCCI for each ODI Match. The Committee were shocked to learn that 'no records were traceable in Prasar Bharati which could give details of fixation of the rate'. The Committee had decried such an outrageous plea of missing

records and recommended that responsibility be fixed for the 'missing records' and all out efforts be made to reconstruct the records. The Committee had also recommended that state-of-the-art filing and retrieval system be put in place within the Ministry as well as Prasar Bharati so that instances of this nature would not recur and transparency was brought in their functioning.

10. Elaborating on the Action Taken in this regard, the Ministry has stated as under:—

"Prasar Bharati has informed that special efforts have been made to trace the relevant records. It has been noted that the Prasar Bharati Board approved a recommendation made by the Empowered Committee on Sports Rights (ECSR) in its meeting held on 21st October 2005 to submit a bid to the BCCI for acquiring telecasting and broadcasting rights. The decision was based on a detailed revenue evaluation exercise. Subsequently, the ECSR approved fixation of a consideration amount of rights fee of ₹ 7.5 crore per ODI in respect of the Cricket Series in question. Observations made by the Committee are noted for future guidance and inconvenience caused is regretted."

11. Deploring the instance of 'missing/untraceable records' related to fixing the rate of ₹ 7.5 crore paid to BCCI for each ODI Match, the Committee had recommended for a state-of-the-art filing and retrieval system in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and Prasar Bharati which would aid in good governance." Though the Ministry has taken cognizance of their observations for future guidance the Committee desire that they be intimated of concrete remedial measures initiated by the Ministry to prevent recurrence of such instances of missing/untraceable documents. The Committee further desire that responsibility be fixed for the failure to recover/retrace the relevant records.

CHAPTER II

OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Observation/Recommendation No. 1

The Public Accounts Committee in their 105th Report (10th Lok Sabha), which was presented to Parliament on 17-08-1995, devised a procedure whereby all the Ministries/Departments are required to furnish Remedial/Corrective Action Taken Notes to the Committee on the Audit Paragraphs not selected for detailed examination by the Committee. Subsequently, from March 1996 onwards furnishing of such Remedial Corrective Action Taken Notes was made time-bound and the same were required to be furnished within four months of the laying of the Audit Report in Parliament. The Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) has been entrusted with the duty of ensuring that action taken notes are vetted properly before submission to the Public Accounts Committee. These notes once received in the Public Accounts Committee Secretariat from the Department of Expenditure (Monitoring Cell) are then forwarded to the Audit for categorizing them into three broad heads *viz.* "accepted", "not accepted" and "partially accepted". After such categorization, these notes are circulated to the Members of the Public Accounts Committee for their scrutiny. Members may accept the categorization of ATNs or they may bring forward their concerns before the Committee. If necessary, the Committee may take oral evidence of the concerned Ministries. This is how the non-selected Audit Reports/Paras reach the stage of finality. Notwithstanding the fact that a remedial system was devised as early as 1995 and subsequently modified in 1996, a close scrutiny revealed that a large number of Audit paras on the Remedial/corrective Action Taken Notes are not furnished by the Ministries/Departments within the prescribed period of four months. Taking cognizance of the huge pendency, the Public Accounts Committee constituted a Sub-Committee during 2010-11 to examine the Ministries/Departments who defaulted in furnishing the Remedial/Corrective Action Taken Notes within the prescribed time-frame. Similar Sub-committee was also constituted by the Public Acctounts Committee during 2009-10. The Committee are distressed to note that even after constituting Sub-committees for two consecutive year *i.e.* 2009-10 and 2010-11, there still remained a high number of pending paras and surprisingly, the erring Ministries almost remain the same. As per the statistical information furnished by the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure), 4191 Remedial/Corrective Action Taken Notes were pending with various Ministries as on 25th June 2010. As per the figures supplied by the Audit, 3462 paragraphs were pending with different Ministries as of May 2010. Out of these, according to the Department of Expenditure Monitoring Cell, 19 paras were pending with the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting. The Audit stated this pendency to be 14, whereas the Ministry through a written note subsequently intimated that as on 18th April, 2011, 7 paras were pending with them and 2 paras were partially pending. While deploring such a discrepancy in figures, the Committee urge the Ministry of

Finance, Department of Expenditure to reconcile the figures in consultation with the Audit and the Ministry of I & B ensure nil pendency and apprise the Committee within a month of presentation of this Report.

[Para 1 of Part II, Forty-first Report of Public Accounts Committee
(15th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken by Government

Efforts are being made to ensure "Nil" pendency. For this purpose, meeting of Standing Audit Committee is held every quarter as per mandate of Ministry of Finance wherein it is emphasized that regular meeting of *ad-hoc* Committees should be held so as to monitor pending audit paras at Division level. In addition to this, ATN Adalats are also held under the Chairmanship of AS&FA periodically to monitor paras.

Audit Vetted Comments

No comments.

(Joint Secretary to Government of India)

[Ministry of Information & Broadcasting OM No. 3103/3/2012-BC-II
dated 19-09-2012]

Observation/Recommendation No. 2

The Committee note that despite a well established mechanism, as claimed, within the Ministry of I&B, the process of settling pending remedial/corrective Action Taken Notes is not yielding the desired results for want of proper coordination between the Directorate General: Doordarshan and the Prasar Bharati. The Committee take serious note of organizational and administrative deficiencies in the Prasar Bharati Secretariat. Admittedly, the Ministry has constituted a Standing Audit Committee for proper coordination between DG:DD and Prasar Bharati Secretariat, however, the Committee would also like to be apprised of the outcome of such measures on eliminating the pendency of Audit Observations within three months of the presentation of this Report to the Parliament.

[Para 2 of Part II, Forty-first Report of Public Accounts Committee
(15th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken by Government

Secretary (I&B) has been holding regular meetings of the Standing Audit Committee as a result of which out of 16 outstanding Audit paras as on April, 2012. ATN for the 10 audit paras alongwith replies to further audit/PAC observations have been furnished by Prasar Bharati.

Audit Vetted Comments

No comments.

(Joint Secretary to Government of India)

[Ministry of Information & Broadcasting OM No. 3103/3/2012-BC-II
dated 19-09-2012]

Observation/Recommendation No. 3

With regard to Para No. 7.1 of Chapter VII of Report No. CA 2 of 2008, it is apparent that against stipulated time of four months, *i.e.* 14th July, 2008, for submission of the ATN, the Ministry of I&B took, surprisingly, more than ten months to furnish the first ATN to the Audit. The Audit called a revised note on the para on 27th January, 2009 and the same was furnished to the Audit after about five and a half month. The Audit once again called final note on 10th August 2010 which was furnished by the Ministry on 25th August, 2010. The Committee deplore delay of more than two years in furnishing the final action taken note as against the prescribed time line of four month. Obviously, such an unconscionable delay is a sad reflection on the working of the Ministry. The Ministry owes explanation for such inordinate and unconscionable delay. The Committee also recommend that responsibility be fixed for delay and the Committee apprised within three months of the presentation of this Report.

[Para 3 of Part II, Forty-first Report of Public Accounts Committee
(15th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken by Government

Prasar Bharati has informed that the matter was reviewed and the sequence of events show that a large part of the delay took place on account of different interpretations given to the clauses of the agreement which resulted in the alleged excess payment to the BCCI. Accordingly, a revised ATN was sent to the Ministry *vide* Prasar Bharati letter No. PB/Sr. GM(F)/DP/Audit/DD Sports/2007 dated 26-10-2009. However, the issues of interpretation of the agreement clauses caused some delay in the preparation and submission of the final reply and this is regretted.

Audit Vetted Comments

Ministry has not replied to the specific recommendation of Committee regarding fixing of responsibility for delay in submission of ATN.

(Joint Secretary to Government of India)

[Ministry of Information & Broadcasting OM No. 3103/3/2012-BC-II
dated 19-09-2012]

Observation/Recommendation No. 4

Audit Report No. CA 2 of 2008, Chapter VII, Para 7.1 relating to Ministry of Information & Broadcasting highlights a case of loss of revenue of Rs. 3.39 crore due to an erroneous agreement signed between Prasar Bharati and Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI) on 30-11-2005. This agreement was signed for the telecast of 12 one-day international matches during October-November, 2005. According to clause 11 of the agreement, the Prasar Bharati was to pay Rs. 7.50 crore to BCCI for each of the match played. The agreement also contained a rider wherein it was provided that in case a match was not played for full duration on any day, the amount of money to be paid was to be calculated in terms of the number of hours played. The full duration of an ODI, according to Audit and based on the Sport Section Schedule provided by the Prasar Bharati was seven hours. Clause 11 of the Agreement also provided that "increase

a game is not played for the full duration of on any day for any reason whatsoever, the consideration shall be reduced on a *pro-rata* basis". In the event of a match being cancelled altogether, "no consideration shall be payable". On the contrary, the agreement also provided that in terms of the stipulations of the International Cricket Council (ICC), a ball being bowled in a match shall be deemed to be a match being played. Based on this analogy, the Committee find that Prasar Bharati did not reduce the payment for five matches which were held for less than the full duration of seven hours except for one cancelled match and one match played at Mohali. The Committee are perturbed to note such a patently erroneous Agreement was described by the Secretary, Ministry of I&B simply as an unhappily drafted agreement. The Committee deplore that the Agreement was not even vetted by legal authorities which was in fact, a mindless cut and paste reproduction of an earlier Agreement signed in 2004 for a five-day match series. In their considered view, such an erroneous agreement which caused pecuniary loss of ₹ 3.39 crore to the Government cannot be held a mere dereliction of duty or unhappy drafting. Obviously, there is more that meets the eye. The Committee demand explanation for such patently erroneous drafting, recovery of the international loss caused to the public exchequer and stringent penal action against the officers involved with the finalization of the agreement within six months under intimation to the Committee. The Committee also recommend that the process should be commenced for recovery of the monies overpaid to the BCCI for the matches which were played for less than seven hours duration as similar deduction was made for the Mohali match. Further, the Ministry must take foolproof measures to ensure that such agreements are drafted with utmost care and foresight and duly vetted legally so that no fiduciary loss is caused to the Government in future.

[Para 4 of Part II, Forty-first Report of Public Accounts Committee
(15th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken by Government

Prasar Bharati has informed that the matter for recovery of excess amount has since been taken up by Prasar Bharati with the BCCI for refund. The BCCI has been asked to refund the excess amount of ₹ 3.39 crores paid earlier. The officers who signed and approved the draft agreement have since retired. Utmost care is now being taken to ensure that all the agreements signed with third parties are duly vetted by our Standing Legal Counsel with particular reference to the need to ensure that ambiguity of the kind which arose in the instant case does not recur.

Audit Vetted Comments

The audit para was detected in the year 2006 and excess amount of ₹ 3.39 crore paid to BCCI has not been recovered till date. The final outcome of efforts made for recovery of ₹ 3.39 crore may be informed to PAC.

(Joint Secretary to Government of India)

[Ministry of Information & Broadcasting OM No. 3103/3/2012-BC-II
dated 19-09-2012]

Observation/Recommendation No. 5

The Committee note with serious concern that although the Prasar Bharati made a net gain of ₹ 26,81,47,402/- for the said 11 matches, yet the Ministry failed to explain to the Committee as to what was the basis of fixing the rate of ₹ 7.5 crore paid to BCCI for each ODI match. To their sheer disbelief, the Committee were informed that no records are traceable in Prasar Bharati which could give details of fixation of this rate. The issue of untraceable records or of missing files is a matter of far graver concern and evidently there is something rotten in the Ministry of I&B. The Committee decry such an outrageous plea of missing records and recommend that responsibility be fixed for the missing records and all out efforts be made to reconstruct the records. Further, the Committee would like to be apprised of the similar missing/lost records and the records retrieved during the last five years. The Committee also recommend that state-of-the-art filing and retrieval system should be put in place within the Ministry as well as Prasar Bharati within three months so that instances of this nature do not recur and transparency is brought in their functioning.

[Para 5 of Part II, Forty-first Report of Public Accounts Committee
(15th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken by Government

Prasar Bharati has informed that special efforts have been made to trace the relevant records. It has been noted that the Prasar Bharati Board approved a recommendation made by the Empowered Committee on Sports Rights in its meeting held on 21st October 2005 to submit a bid to the BCCI for acquiring telecasting and broadcasting rights. The decision was based on a detailed revenue evaluation exercise. Subsequently, the ECSR approved fixation of a consideration amount of rights fee of ₹ 7.5 crore per ODI in respect of the Cricket Series in question. Observations made by the Committee are noted for future guidance and inconvenience caused is regretted.

Audit Vetted Comments

- (i) The basis on which ECSR approved the fixation of rate of ₹ 7.5 crore per ODI may be provided to PAC.
- (ii) The calculation sheet by which detailed revenue evaluation was done and rate was fixed, may be provided to PAC.
- (iii) Action taken by Ministry for tracing missing records may be informed to PAC.
- (iv) The Ministry may inform PAC about the steps taken regarding Committee's recommendation for putting in place state of the art filing and retrieval system.

(Joint Secretary to Government of India)

[Ministry of Information & Broadcasting OM No. 3103/3/2012-BC-II
dated 19-09-2012]

CHAPTER III

OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT
DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE REPLIES RECEIVED FROM THE
GOVERNMENT

—NIL—

CHAPTER IV

OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF
GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND
WHICH REQUIRE REITERATION

—NIL—

CHAPTER V

OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH THE GOVERNMENT HAVE FURNISHED INTERIM REPLIES

Observation/Recommendation No. 6

The Committee have been given to understand that due efforts are being made to make Prasar Bharati more accountable and efficient without affecting its autonomy. A Group of Ministers (GoM) under Chairmanship of Home Minister has been constituted to examine various issues such as capital and financial restructuring, manpower and the demands of the employees relating to the functioning of Prasar Bharati. The Committee would like to be apprised of the remedial and corrective action taken by the Ministry on the directions of the GoM.

[Para 6 of Part II, Forty-first Report of Public Accounts Committee
(15th Lok Sabha)]

Action Taken by Government

The Cabinet Secretariat *vide* their communication dated 18th September, 2012 have forwarded the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 14-09-2012 where at item No. 7, the proposal for Financial Restructuring of Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India) and filling up of essential posts based on the recommendations of the Group of Ministers on Prasar Bharati was taken up and the Cabinet considered the note of the Ministry dated 28-08-2012 and approved the proposal contained in paragraph 15 thereof.

Audit Vetted Comments

Latest status of filling up of essential posts may be informed to PAC.

(Joint Secretary to Government of India)

[Ministry of Information & Broadcasting OM No. 3103/3/2012-BC-II
dated 19-09-2012]

NEW DELHI;
19 March, 2013

28 Phalgun, 1934 (Saka)

DR. MURLIMANO HAR JOSHI
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

APPENDIX I

MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH SITTING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2012-13) HELD ON 19TH MARCH, 2013

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 19th March, 2013 from 1500 hrs. to 1615 hrs.
in Room No. '62', Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
6. Shri Abhijit Mukherjee
7. Shri Ashok Tanwar
8. Dr. Girija Vyas

Rajya Sabha

9. Shri Prasanta Chatterjee
10. Shri Prakash Javadekar
11. Shri J.D. Seelam
12. Shri N.K. Singh

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri Devender Singh | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri Abhijit Kumar | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 3. Shri M.L.K. Raja | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 4. Shri D.R. Mohanty | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 5. Smt. A. Jyothirmayi | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 6. Shri S.L. Singh | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 7. Smt. Anju Kukreja | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

Representatives of the office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India

1. Ms. Shubha Kumar — Director General (Report Central)
2. Shri Venkatesh Mohan — Director General of Audit
3. Ms. Anim Cherian — Principal Director (ST)
4. Shri Rajiv Kumar Pandey — Principal Director of Audit

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members and the representatives of the Office of the C&AG of India to the sitting of the Committee. The Chairman, then, apprised that the meeting had been convened to consider the following Draft Reports of the Committee:

- | | | | |
|--------|---|-----|-----|
| (i) | *** | *** | *** |
| (ii) | *** | *** | *** |
| (iii) | *** | *** | *** |
| (iv) | Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Forty-first Report (15th Lok Sabha) on 'Negligent Scrutiny of claims leading to Excess Payment' ; | | |
| (v) | *** | *** | *** |
| (vi) | *** | *** | *** |
| (vii) | *** | *** | *** |
| (viii) | *** | *** | *** |
| (ix) | *** | *** | *** |
| (x) | *** | *** | *** |

3. Giving an overview of the issues contained in the Draft Reports and the comments of the Committee thereupon, the Chairman solicited the views/suggestions of the Members.

4. After some discussions, the Committee adopted the above-mentioned Draft Reports. The Committee, then, authorised the Chairman to finalise the Reports in the light of the factual verifications, if any, made by the Audit and present them to Parliament on a convenient date.

5. The Chairman thanked the Members for their active participation in the consideration and adoption of the Reports.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

(Vide para 5 of Introduction)

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE CONTAINED IN THEIR FORTY-FIRST REPORT (FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

(i) Total No. of Observations/Recommendations:	06
(ii) Observations/Recommendations of the Committee which have been accepted by the Government: Para Nos. 1—5	Total: 05 Percentage-83.33%
(iii) Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the replies received from the Government:	Total: 0 Percentage-0%
-NIL-	
(iv) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:	Total: 0 Percentage-0%
-NIL-	
(v) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies: Para No. 6	Total: 01 Percentage-16.67%

PARLIAMENTARY PUBLICATIONS CAN ALSO BE OBTAINED FROM THE FOLLOWING AUTHORISED AGENTS:—

Sl.No.	Name of Agent	Sl.No.	Name of Agent
	ANDHRA PRADESH		
1.	M/s. Ashok Book Centre, Benz Circle, Vasavya Nagar, Vijaywada-520006. (A.P)	13.	M/s. Jayna Book Depot, Chowk Chhapparwala, Bank Street, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.
	BIHAR	14.	M/s. Standard Book Co., 125, Municipal Market, Connaught Place, P.B. No. 708, New Delhi-110001. (T. No. 23411919)
2.	M/s. Progressive Book Centre, Zila School, Pani Tanki Chowk, Ramna, Muzaffarpur-842002. (Bihar)	15.	M/s. D.K. Agencies (P) Ltd. A/15-17, Mohan Garden, Najafgarh Road, New Delhi-110059.
	DELHI	16.	M/s. Vijay Book Service C-D/123/C, Pitam Pura, New Delhi-110034.
3.	M/s. Jain Book Agency, C-9, Prem House, Connaught Place, P.B. No. 1113, New Delhi-110001.		MADHYA PRADESH
4.	M/s. Bookwell, 2/72, Sant Nirankari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-110009.	17.	M/s. Suvidha Law House, 28 Malviya Nagar, Roshanpura, Bhopal-462003.
5.	M/s. Rajendra Book Agency, IV-D-50, Lajpat Nagar, Old Double Storey, New Delhi-110024. (T. Nos. 26412362 & 26412131)		MAHARASHTRA
6.	M/s. Central News Agency Pvt. Ltd., P-23, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110001.	18.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, 585/A, Chitra Bazar, Khan House, P.B. No. 2621, Mumbai-400002.
7.	The Manager, M/s. Books India Corporation, Publishers, Importers & Exporters, L-27, Shastri Nagar, Delhi-110052.	19.	M/s. Jaina Book Agency (India), 649-A, Girgaum Road, Opp. 2nd Dhobi Talao Lane, Mumbai-400002.
8.	M/s. Sangam Book Depot, LG-3, Akarshan Bhawan, 23, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002.		PUDUCHERRY
9.	M/s. Biblia Impex Pvt. Ltd., 2/18, Ansari Road, New Delhi-110002. (T.No. 23262515)	20.	Editor of Debates, Legislative Assembly Department, Puducherry-605001.
10.	M/s. Universal Book Traders, 80, Gokhale Market, Opp. New Courts, Delhi-110054. (T. No. 23911966)		TAMILNADU
11.	M/s. Seth & Co. Room No. 31 D, Block-B, Delhi High Court, Sher Shah Road, New Delhi-110003.	21.	M/s. M.M. Subscription Agencies, 123, Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore-641012.
12.	M/s. Dhanwantra Medical & Law House, 592, Lajpat Rai Market, Delhi-110006. (T. No. 23866768)	22.	M/s. C. Sitaraman & Co., 73/37, Royappettah High Road, Chennai-600014.
			UTTAR PRADESH
		23.	M/s. Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P.B. No. 1077, Allahabad (U.P)
		24.	M/s. Ram Advani Bookseller, Mayfair Building Hazrat Ganj, GPO Box No. 154, Lucknow-226001.