

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(2016-2017)

38

SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained
in the Thirty-sixth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'Pradhan Mantri Gram
Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)']*

THIRTY EIGHTH REPORT



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

THIRTY EIGHTH REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(2016-2017)

(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-sixth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)']

Presented to Lok Sabha on 19.07.2017

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 19.07.2017



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

July, 2017/Asadha, 1939 (Saka)

CRD No. 135

Price : Rs.

© 2015 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fourteenth Edition) and Printed by _____.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2016-2017)	(ii)
INTRODUCTION	(iii)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government	9
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	20
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	21
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	25

APPENDICES

I. Extracts of Minutes of the Thirteenth Sitting of the Committee held on 11 July, 2017....	26
I. Analysis of Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-sixth Report (16th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Rural Development	28

(ii)

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2016-2017)

Dr. P. Venugopal -*Chairperson*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Sisir Kumar Adhikari
3. Shri Kirti Azad
4. Shrimati Renuka Butta
5. Shri Harish Chandra Deoram Chavan
6. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
7. Shri Biren Singh Engti
8. Shri Vijay Kumar Hansdak
9. Shri Ajay Misra Teni
10. Shri Manshankar Ninama
11. Dr. Ramesh Pokhriyal "Nishank"
12. Shrimati Mausam Noor
13. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
14. Shri Gokaraju Ganga Raju
15. Dr. Anbumani Ramadoss
16. Shri Jugal Kishore Sharma
17. Dr. Yashwant Singh
18. Shri Niramalli Sivaprasad
19. Shri Balka Suman
20. Shri Ladu Kishore Swain
21. Adv. Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri Munquad Ali
23. Shri D. Bandyopadhyay
24. Shri Pratap Keshari Deb *
25. Shri Samsher Singh Dullo
26. Shri Mahendra Singh Mahra
27. Shri Narayan Lal Panchariya
28. Shri A.K. Selvaraj
29. Shri Shiv Pratek Shukla
30. Shri Rewati Raman Singh
31. Shri Devender Goud T.

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Abhijit Kumar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri S. Chatterjee - Director
3. Smt. B. Visala - Additional Director
4. Shri Satish Kumar - Senior Committee Assistant

* Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 07.07.2017 vice Shri Bishnu Charan Das

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2016-2017) having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present the Thirty Eighth Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-sixth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (16th Lok Sabha) on 'Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)'.

2. The Thirty-sixth Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 20 March, 2017. Replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 03.05.2017.

3. The Draft Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 11 July, 2017.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-sixth Report of the Committee (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) is given in **Appendix-II**.

NEW DELHI;
11 July, 2017
20 Asadha, 1939 (Saka)

DR. P. VENUGOPAL
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2016-17) deals with the action taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in their Thirty-sixth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on 'Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)'.

2. The Thirty-sixth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 20.03.2017 and was laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the same date. The Report contained 12 Observations/Recommendations.

3. Action Taken Notes in respect of all the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Report have been received from the Government. These have been examined and categorized as follows: -

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| (i) Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:
Serial Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12. | Total:10
Chapter-II |
| (ii) Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of replies of the Government:
Serial No. NIL | Total: NIL
Chapter-III |
| (iii) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:
Serial No. 2 and 11 | Total: 02
Chapter-IV |
| (iv) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:
Serial No. NIL | Total:NIL
Chapter-V |

4. The Committee desire that Action Taken Notes on the observations/ recommendations contained in Chapter-I of the Report may be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of this Report.

5. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of their Observations/Recommendations that require reiteration or merit comments.

A. Institutional arrangements of PMGSY

[Recommendation Serial No. 2 (Para No. 2.3)]

6. In the context of institutional arrangements of PMGSY, the Committee had recommended as under:-

"The Committee note that Ministry of Rural Development is the nodal Ministry for implementation of PMGSY. At the National level, National Rural Roads Development Agency (NRRDA) has been constituted to provide technical and managerial support for implementation of the programme at Central Level. At the State level, State rural Roads Development Agency (SRRDA) have been constituted for the programme implementation at the State Level. Also, depending upon the work load, Programme Implementation Units (PIU) are constituted for each district by the States. The Department of Rural Development has informed that Central Public Sector Units (CPSUs) in the States of Bihar, Jharkhand, Tripura, Odisha and West Bengal have been engaged to augment the execution capacity under PMGSY. The Committee also note that due to preponement of completion target to March 2019 from March 2022, there would be requirement of further augmenting the execution capacity in 9 States viz Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttarakhand, Rajasthan and Odisha where there are large number of works in hand. The Ministry also informed that meeting of top officials of the Ministry with the Chief secretaries of the above States except for Jammu & Kashmir have been held to increase the execution and contracting capacity.

The Committee further note that the steps taken for the effective implementation of PMGSY by the Ministry include

- (i) using Remote Sensing and GIS in planning and monitoring of PMGSY.
- (ii) use of non-conventional Materials/Green Technology for cost and time saving.
- (iii) adoption of State Specific Rural road Maintenance Polices.
- (iv) Mobile based App"Meri Sadak" as well as "Citizen Monitoring" for transparent public grievance redressal and Social Audit.
- (v) Mobile Application based Quality Monitoring.

The Committee are constrained to note that as against the target of 183599 habitations (including habitations of 100 and above in LWE Blocks as indentified by MHA), only 119156 habitations have been connected by States (upto September, 2016). The Committee also note that the Department in consultation

with Ministry of Finance and the States has formulated an Action Plan to achieve the target by March 2019 with enhanced financial allocation to the States and modified funding pattern of the Scheme. The Committee find that during 2014-15 and 2015-16, States have constructed road length of 36337 kms and 36449 Kms respectively and even the Ministry has set a target of 48812 km (133 km per day) road length during 2016-17 and have achieved 119 km/day from April 2016 to September, 2016.

The Committee are dismayed to note that despite initiation of several steps, the Department has not been able to meet its own target of 133 km per day during the first half of the financial year 2016-17. The Committee strongly recommend that the execution capacity in the above mentioned 9 States should be expeditiously augmented so that the large number of pending works are completed as per the target. The Committee would also like the Department of rural Development to engage top officials of the State of Jammu & Kashmir to expedite the increase in execution capacity and contracting capacity in the State. The Committee may inc to be apprised of the progress made in this regard."

7. The Ministry in their action taken reply have stated as under :-

"Table 1: CPSUs engaged

S.No	State	CPSUs engaged
1.	Bihar	5
2.	Jharkhand	4
3.	Tripura	2
4.	Odisha	3
5.	West Bengal	2

An analysis of the completion of pending works in the 9 States where maximum balance works of PMGSY are situated would reveal that substantial progress has been made by these States. In October, 2016, a total of 7,797 works were pending completion in these States, for 2-4 years. This number in March, 2017 has come down to 3,364 works. Similarly, in October, 2016, a total of 4,574 works were pending completion in these States, for more than 4 years. This number, in March, 2017 has decreased to 2,974.

Table 2: Status of Pending works

Sl. No	State	Upto October, 2016		Upto March, 2017	
		Pending for 2-4 years	Pending for more than 4 years	Pending for 2-4 years	Pending for more than 4 years
1.	Assam	536	310	411	264
2.	Bihar	3163	788	1981	665
3.	Chhattisgarh	200	251	115	220
4.	Jharkhand	1066	739	520	625
5.	West Bengal	616	223	335	116
6.	J&k	542	90	86	527
7.	Uttarakhand	178	75	136	55
8.	Rajasthan	327	201	203	100
9.	Odisha	1169	687	787	402
	Grand Total	7,797	3,364	4,574	2,974"

8. The Committee in their recommendation had raised the issue of very slow progress of work in the LWE districts. Also, the Committee had urged the Department to augment the execution capacity of 9 States viz. Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttarakhand, Rajasthan and Odisha where there are large number of works in hand. The Department in their reply have furnished the data showing the progress of work in the above 9 States. However, the Department have not mentioned anything about the enhancement of execution capacity in these States and also the status of work specifically in the LWE districts of the country. The Committee deplore the casual attitude of the Department with regard to their recommendation and urge the Government to expedite the completion of pending work in the LWE districts and also augment the execution capacity and contracting capacity of the above mentioned States so as to achieve the target set by the Government.

B. Maintenance of Rural Roads

[Recommendation Serial No. 4 (Para No. 2.5)]

9. In the context of maintenance of Rural Roads, the Committee had recommended as under:-

"For ensuring sustainability of roads built under PMGSY, each contractor has to provide for defect liability of 5 yrs along with paid routine maintenance after completion of work. The Committee find that as per the National Quality Monitor (NQM) Grading Abstract, as high as 20.80% of the completed works of PMGSY which were under maintenance was found to be unsatisfactory. The Committee also find that so far only 15 States viz Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal have formulated Rural Roads Maintenance Policy (RRMP). On being further probed by the Committee as to why only 15 States have such a Policy, the Department simply stated that remaining States have been advised to notify such

a policy during the current Financial Year i.e. 2016-17. The Committee deplore the casual approach of the Department on such a critical issue and urge the Department to impress upon the States to come up with such a policy at the earliest so that the rural roads built under the Scheme remain functional for the people. The Committee recommend the Department to encourage the use of innovative ideas for saving PMGSY roads from being eroded. The Committee also found that so far 1732 engineers and 1020 contractors have been trained out of a target of 7271 personnel in 8 World Bank assisted RRP-II/PMGSY. The Committee are not satisfied with the progress and recommend that a time-bound strategy should be evolved to impart training to the remaining engineers/contractors to ensure proper construction and maintenance of rural roads."

10. The Ministry in their action taken reply have stated as under :-

"The formulation of the Rural Roads Maintenance Policy (RRMP) of the State helps in focusing a proper maintenance system of all the rural roads built under State's own different schemes, NABARD, CRF, PMGSY, MGNREGA etc by providing required budgetary provision for maintenance, every year. These rural roads assets play a major role in achieving in sustainable poverty alleviation in rural areas. All the States, since recent years, on the insistence and continuous follow up by MoRD/ NRRDA by way of holding meetings viz, Regional Review Meetings, Empowered Committee Meetings, correspondences, uploading on PMGSY website the RRMPs already formulated by certain States etc., have taken it seriously and as a result so far, 16 States viz Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal have formulated their Rural Roads Maintenance Policy (RRMP). However, the remaining 13 States are in the final process of formulation of their RRMP at State Govt. level and the majority of the States have assured of notifying their RRMPs during 2017-18.

The maintenance of rural roads built under PMGSY upto five years after construction, are strictly monitored by MoRD/ NRRDA as the construction and maintenance for five years after construction is done by the same agency who is constructing the road, as part of the agreement and as five year defect liability period (DLP), with due provisions in the DPR, release of maintenance fund by the State and also through periodical inspections for watching quality of maintenance by deputing NQMs at national level and SQMs at State level.

NRRDA has vigorously pursued Trainings on Rural Roads Maintenance for Engineers and Contractors in 8 World Bank assisted RRP-II States. Out of a target of 7271 personnel to be trained, 4054 engineers and 1866 contractors totaling to 5920 is already achieved. States have planned more such trainings for next FY."

11. While noting the issue of unsatisfactory maintenance of Rural Roads, the Committee observed that only 15 States have so far formulated the Rural Roads Maintenance Policy (RRMP) which helps in focussing a proper maintenance system of all the rural roads built under State's own different schemes, NABARD, CRF, PMGSY, MGNREGA etc by providing required budgetary provision for maintenance every year. These rural roads play a major role in achieving sustainable poverty alleviation in rural areas. In this context, the Committee had *inter alia* asked the Government as to why only 15 States have such a policy and urged the Department to impress upon the States to come up with requisite policy at the earliest so that the rural roads built under the scheme remain functional for the people. In their action taken reply, the Department informed that on the insistence and continuous follow up by the Ministry of Rural Development/NRRDA by way of holding meetings, so far 16 States have formulated their Rural Roads Maintenance Policy (RRMP) and remaining 13 States are in the final process of formulation of their RRMP and they also assured of notifying their RRMPs during 2017-18.

While appreciating the fact that the DoRD has taken steps to accelerate the pace of completion of RRMPs by the States, the Committee, again urges the DoRD to pro-actively take all possible steps for completion of RRMP in the remaining States in a time bound manner for effective implementation of the Scheme and apprise the Committee in this regard.

C. Procurement process.

[Recommendation Serial No. 11 (Para No. 2.12)]

12. With regard to procurement process in PMGSY, the Committee had recommended as under:-

"Based on the best National and International practices, a Standard Bidding Document (SBD) has been developed by the Department for the procurement of works under PMGSY. All the works under the programme are procured and managed on the basis of provision of Standard Bidding Document (SBD). To ensure transparency and harness various advantages of electronic tendering, entire bidding of procurement of works under the programme is being carried out only through e-procurement. During the examination, the issue of mis-procurement in Uttar Pradesh and Manipur have been raised before the Committee. Issue of non-payment of dues to the contractors in Uttarakhand for the work done under PMGSY also came up during the examination. Delay in preparation of DPRs, quoting 10%-15% less than the estimated price during bidding in Jharkhand, award of contracts to the dubious contractors, contractors not doing the work even after the award of tender were also highlighted before the Committee.

The Committee take a serious view of the above issues and recommend that a National Data-Base of the corrupt and dubious contractors be prepared so that they do not get any contract of the Government. Also, timely payment of works done under the programme be ensured so that the workers are paid in time. They also recommend revamping of the procurement process to weed out corruption and mis-appropriation at various level. The Committee may be apprised of the steps taken in this regard."

13. The Ministry in their action taken reply have stated as under :-

"Regarding contractors quoting 10-15% less than the estimated amount/amount put to tender by the States, provisions have been made in the PMGSY bidding document which empowers the Employer i.e. the State to take the additional securities from such contractors quoting unreasonably low /high rates. The amount of additional security, sufficient to protect the Employer from financial loss in the event of default, is decided at the sole discretion of the Employer, which is final and binding on such successful bidders.

Under the revised provisions of SBD, the payment to the contractor for routine maintenance is being done on monthly basis, as against the earlier provision of making payment on quarterly basis. New provisions have been added in the bidding document which makes the discrimination of wages on gender basis, child labour and default to pay EPF/ ESI by the contractor as event of fundamental breach of contract which may lead to termination of contract at contractor's cost. Further, to effectively address the issue of complaint related to procurement of works, the Ministry vide its letter dated 04th November, 2016 has already requested all the States to review the PMGSY Procurement

management system in their States and to identify an officer of the level of Chief Engineer and designate him as the Nodal officer to receive and enquire into the complaints relating to procurement.

PMGSY bidding document requires the bidder to submit an affidavit about the correctness of the information submitted by him in his bid. In case the information furnished by the bidder is found incorrect at the later stage, the State is required to take appropriate legal action including blacklisting of the defaulting bidder/ contractor.

Further, in case there is a variation in the scanned copy of documents unloaded in e-tendering and hard copy of documents submitted by bidder, the bidder is liable to be debarred from participating in PMGSY projects for a period of five years."

14. While taking a serious note of various issues highlighted before the Committee like quoting of less than the estimated price during bidding, non initiation of work even after the award of tender, award of contracts to dubious contractors, delay in preparation of DPRs, etc., the Committee strongly recommended the Department to prepare a National Database of the corrupt and dubious contractors so that they do not get any contract of the Government. The Department in their action taken reply have spelt out the procedure adopted by the Government while awarding the tender. The Ministry has conveniently avoided any reply about the preparation of National Data Base of the corrupt and dubious contractors so that they can be barred from the very beginning of the contract process. The evasive reply furnished by the Department on such a crucial issue is not acceptable to the Committee. While reiterating their earlier recommendation, the Committee expect the Government to make concerted efforts to implement the recommendation of the Committee in a time bound manner and apprise the Committee of action taken in the matter.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Serial No. 1, Para No. 2.2)

The Committee note that the main objective of the PMGSY is to connect 1,83,599 habitations in the core-network including habitations of 100 and above in LWE blocks as identified by Ministry of Home Affairs. The Department of Rural Development has stated that due to considerable reduction of funds for the scheme under BE during 2012-13 and 2013-14 and various other reasons such as inadequate execution capacity in the States, low contracting capacity, unfavorable weather conditions, shortage of raw material, law and order problem, non-availability of land and forest issues, the scheme has adversely suffered a lot. The Department of Rural Development has also informed that substantial number of unconnected habitations are concentrated in 9 States viz. Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttarakhand, Rajasthan and Odisha. The Committee, however, the lackadaisical approach of the Department is also responsible for the large number of unconnected habitations under PMGSY. The Committee strongly feel that necessary impetus required to rev-up the things are grossly missing on the part of Department of Rural Development. The Committee, therefore, recommended that apart from Regional Review Meetings, video conferences and meetings to oversee the progress of the Scheme, some pro-active steps like, field visits of the official should be made mandatory for physical verification of the actual implementation at the ground level and to identify the areas which need immediate attention to redress and facilitate completion of projects in time, particularly in the said 9 States.

Reply of the Government

Chief Secretary level review meetings have been held with 7 States (Assam, Odisha, Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttarakhand, West Bengal and Chhattisgarh) out of 9 States where maximum balance works are required to be completed. These have been followed by follow up meetings to review compliance by States. All the 9 States (Assam, West Bengal, Odisha, Jharkhand, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan, J&K and Uttarakhand) have prepared Annual Action Plan with month-wise and PIU-wise target for completion of PMGSY roads which are being reviewed on a continuous basis. The growth trajectory has shown 5% increase in habitation connectivity from September, 2016 to March, 2017. 1,19,156 habitations were connected till September, 2016 which progressively increased to 1,24,709 in March, 2017.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 3, Para No. 2.4)

The Committee note that the PMGSY Guidelines have provisions for consultation with Members of Parliament at various stages of implementation of the Programme and inter-alia stipulate that Core-Network and District Rural Roads Plan should be finalized by District Panchayats after giving full consideration to the suggestions given by the MPs. Due consideration must also be given to the suggestions of MPs while finalizing not only Core-Network, but also up gradation and preparation of Annual Proposals for road works. Further, to ensure effective participation of Members of Parliament, all elected representatives associated with the programme should be duly invited to the foundation laying and inauguration ceremonies and the function should be held with due regard to the various protocol requirements and also, the foundation stone for PMGSY road should be laid and the road should also be inaugurated by the Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha). Despite the above stipulations in the Guidelines, the committee were unanimous that no cognizance is being given to the MPs at the time not at all involved in these public welfare measures. The issue of dropping of proposals of MPs without assigning any reason also came before the Committee during the examination. The Committee strongly disapprove of the treatment being meted out to the MPs which is in gross violation of the relevant guidelines. The Committee also, take a strong exception to the inauguration of PMGSY roads by any person other than a Member of Parliament and recommend the Department to secure and protect the rights of the MPs as laid down in the Guidelines. The Committee is of the view that the Department should take appropriate action regarding the complaints of the MPs for its speedy redressal and strictly ensure that such incidences do not recur in future. The Committee strongly recommend the Department to issue necessary advisories to the States from time to time in the matter and also impress upon the States to strictly comply with the stipulations made in the PMGSY Guidelines for consultation with MPs on all related issues by giving due cognizance to their role and suggestions. The concerned Member of Parliament may also be kept in the loop.

Reply of the Government

The role of MPs in foundation laying and inauguration of PMGSY works was reiterated by the Ministry by issuing advisories on 11th March 2010, 28th July 2011 and was repeated on 27th July 2016. Further, the Ministry has also issued advisories to the States reiterating the following:

1. Provisions regarding consultation with Hon'ble MPs issued on 23rd July, 2015.
2. Submission of filled up formats i.e. MP-I, MP-II and MP-III (which show specific road-wise recommendations received from specific MPs), made mandatory along with Annual Proposals from the States, issued on 31st July, 2015.

As per the records available with the Ministry, broadly all States do follow the above stipulation. However, it has been brought to the notice of the Ministry that the MPs are not being consulted for inauguration of PMGSY works in Darbhanga district in Bihar and in a few districts of Jharkhand. On receipt of such information, the Ministry immediately took up the matter with Chief Secretary of the States concerned (in case of Jharkhand) and the Secretary, RWD, Bihar (in case of Darbhanga, Bihar) and impressed upon the States the need for complying with the stipulation made by the Ministry in this regard. The relevant correspondence is given at **annexure I**.

In respect of complaints received from Hon'ble MPs, it may be noted that these are treated as VIPs and given topmost priority in replying. But, some cases demand in-depth delving into issues and comprehensive inputs are solicited from the concerned State as well as NRRDA (PMGSY's technical wing) which takes time. Only after receipt of State (s) as well as NRRDA's inputs, Ministry is in a position to furnish reply to Hon'ble MPs. But, from now onwards, extra care would be given in dealing with Hon'ble MPs matters.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 4, Para No. 2.5)

For ensuring sustainability of roads built under PMGSY, each contractor has to provide for defect liability of 5 yrs alongwith paid routine maintenance after completion of work. The Committee find that as per the National Quality Monitor (NQM) Grading Abstract, as high as 20.80% of the completed works of PMGSY which were under maintenance was found to be unsatisfactory. The Committee also find that so far only 15 States viz Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal have formulated Rural Roads Maintenance Policy (RRMP). On being further probed by the Committee as to why only 15 States have such a Policy, the Department simply stated that remaining States have been advised to notify such a policy during the current Financial Year i.e. 2016-17. The Committee deplore the casual approach of the Department on such a critical issue and urge the Department to impress upon the States to come up with such a policy at the earliest so that the rural roads built under the Scheme remain functional for the people. The Committee recommend the Department to encourage the use of innovative ideas for saving PMGSY roads from being eroded. The Committee also found that so far 1732 engineers and 1020 contractors have been trained out of a target of 7271 personnel in 8 World Bank assisted RRP-II/PMGSY. The Committee are not satisfied with the progress and recommend that a time-bound strategy should be evolved to impart training to the remaining engineers/contractors to ensure proper construction and maintenance of rural roads.

Reply of the Government

The formulation of the Rural Roads Maintenance Policy (RRMP) of the State helps in focusing a proper maintenance system of all the rural roads built under State's own different schemes, NABARD, CRF, PMGSY, MGNREGA etc by providing required budgetary provision for maintenance, every year. These rural roads assets play a major role in achieving sustainable poverty alleviation in rural areas. All the States, since recent years, on the insistence and continuous follow up by MoRD/ NRRDA by way of holding meetings viz, Regional Review Meetings, Empowered Committee Meetings, correspondences, uploading on PMGSY website the RRMPs already formulated by certain States etc., have taken it seriously and as a result so far, 16 States viz Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal have formulated their Rural Roads Maintenance Policy (RRMP). However, the remaining 13 States are in the final process of formulation of their RRMP at State Government level and the majority of the States have assured of notifying their RRMPs during 2017-18.

The maintenance of rural roads built under PMGSY upto five years after construction, are strictly monitored by MoRD/ NRRDA as the construction and maintenance for five years after construction is done by the same agency who is constructing the road, as part of the agreement and as five year defect liability period (DLP), with due provisions in the DPR, release of maintenance fund by the State and also through periodical inspections for watching quality of maintenance by deputing NQMs at national level and SQMs at State level.

NRRDA has vigorously pursued Trainings on Rural Roads Maintenance for Engineers and Contractors in 8 World Bank assisted RRP-II States. Out of a target of 7271 personnel to be trained, 4054 engineers and 1866 contractors totaling to 5920 is already achieved. States have planned more such trainings for next FY.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 11 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Serial No. 5, Para No. 2.6)

The Committee find that in addition to regular monthly monitoring on the aspects of physical and financial progress, regional review meetings are also organized. The empowered committee meetings chaired by the secretary (RD) are also utilized for the detailed review of the implementation of the programme and progress is also being monitored through video conferences. During the examination, the Committee were informed that frequent transfer of trained and experienced staff of SRRDAs also hampers the effectiveness of the monitoring. The Department also informed that it has a web based Online Monitoring Management and Accounting System (OMMAS), which the States are required to update regularly. The Committee were also informed that certain States do not update their data regularly. The Committee also find that various modules of the OMMAS are also posing difficulty in regular updation of data in the web base monitoring system. The Committee also observe that OMMAS is functional in all the states except Delhi and Goa. In view of the foregoing the Committee would like the Department to put Goa and Delhi in the web based monitoring module. The staff must also be trained in the various modules of OMMAS in a time bound manner. Apart from the above, physical verification processes of the roads under construction must be made robust.

Reply of the Government

The provision for data entry in respect of Delhi and Goa has already been made available on OMMAS. However, no data has been entered by Delhi. That's why, it is not appearing on physical achievement and relevant modules of OMMAS. Also, in respect of Goa, data has been entered in earlier years but in the year 2016-17, the progress is Nil and that's why it is displaying zero.

In respect of Goa State, a training programme for local engineers and programme officers, will be organized in next two months time. However, in respect of Delhi, the State has not communicated the nodal department responsible for PMGSY programme. Training programme can be provided only after the nodal department is identified by the State Government and communicated to NRRDA.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Para No. 2.7)

The Committee were informed that Govt. of India have launched a Mobile App named 'Meri Sadak' on 20.07.2015 with a view to achieve the objective of e-governance and Digital India for user friendly and transparent citizen feedback and complaint redressal system. The Committee were also informed that till September, 2016 there have been more than five lakh downloads of the App. The Committee while appreciating the launch of the App, however, feel that the intended purpose would only be served if it is popularized in a big way and the complaints are attended to in a time bound manner.

The Committee therefore, recommend that the App may be advertised in a big way through print and electronic media. The Committee also recommend the Department to make the App multilingual so that it is available in major regional languages to make it more user friendly for effective monitoring of the implementation of the programme.

Reply of the Government

To publicize 'Meri Sadak' Mobile App among the masses, a Video Spot, Radio Jingle broadcasted on TV/FM Channels & advertisement on IRCTC Railway Catering products used to disseminate & highlight the features of "Meri Sadak" Mobile App. In September, 2016, there were 5,70,180 no. of downloads of Meri Sadak which has increased to 7,23,560 no. of downloads in March, 2017.

It has been observed that the popularity of the "Meri Sadak" Mobile App through mass media campaign has increased the number of registrations and Complaints / Feedbacks being received through this app.

It has been decided to make "Meri Sadak" Mobile App available in Hindi, as majority of the rural public find it convenient to make use of it by communicating their grievances, feedbacks etc. The development work has already been entrusted to C-DAC and Hindi version of "Meri Sadak" will be released by 30th April, 2017.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 7, Para No. 2.8)

The committee find out of 183,599 habitations to be connected under PMGSY, by March 2019, only 1.53 Lakh projects were cleared and 1.19 lakh number of habitations were connected till September, 2016. The Committee were also informed that 23673 projects across the country were behind schedule. The reasons put forth by the Department for the delay are:

- (i) inadequate execution and contracting capacity
- (ii) unfavorable weather conditions
- (iii) law and order issues
- (iv) non-availability of land and forest clearance
- (v) storage of raw material.

The Committee were informed that to accelerate the pace of road construction in the 9 major States which are lagging behind viz Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, Jammu & Kashmir, West Bengal and Odisha, the ministry has framed Accelerated Action Plan in consultation with these States to substantially complete the projects by the year 2019. The Committees examination further revealed that in light of massive work in hand and the future Projects, these States need to increase number of implementing agencies. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Department to ensure adequate number of implementing agencies at the earliest. The Committee also note that since inception of the programme in the year 2000 out of 183,599 eligible habitations, only 119155 habitations could be connected in the last 16 years. The Committee feel that the department needs to make more concerted efforts to achieve the target by March, 2019. The Committee would like the Department to sort out the issues of contracting capacity, raw materials, relevant clearances etc. at the earliest in consultation with all the stakeholders.

Reply of the Government

Since inception of PMGSY, 1,59,818 habitations have been cleared by the Ministry and 1,24,709 habitations have been connected (upto March, 2017). In order to achieve the target by March, 2019, Chief Secretary level review meetings have been held with 7 States (Assam, Odisha, Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttarakhand, West Bengal and Chhattisgarh) out of 9 States, where maximum balance works are required to be completed. These have been followed by follow up meetings to review compliance by States. 9 States (Assam, West Bengal, Odisha, Jharkhand, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan, J&K and Uttarakhand) have prepared Annual Action Plan with month-wise and PIU-wise target for completion of PMGSY roads which are being reviewed on a continuous basis

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 8, Para No. 2.9)

PMGSY-II was started in May, 2013. Under the scheme, only up-gradation of rural roads could be taken up. It aims to consolidate the existing rural roads network to improve its overall efficiency as a provider of transportation of services for people, goods and services based on their economic potential and their role in facilitating the growth of rural market centres and rural hubs. The target length for the Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-17) is 50,000 Kilometers out of which works of 13525 Kilometers road length has been sanctioned and 7701 Kilometers have been completed in eight States viz Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Punjab, Telangana and Uttar Pradesh. The Committee were also given to understand that poor response to the PMGSY-II was due to the fact that as per the programme guidelines, States which had substantially awarded PMGSY-I works can participate in PMGSY-II. The Department expects the States of Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tripura to transit to PMGSY-II in 2016-17. The revelation of the Department that only 8 States have so far had been transited from PMGSY-I to PMGSY-II and another 5 above mentioned States would move in 2016-17 speaks poorly of state of affairs in PMGSY-I. Further, of the target of 50,000 kilometer during 2012-17 only 13525 kilometer could be sanctioned and of that only 7701 Kilometers could be completed till September, 2016 speaks volumes about the state of progress and implementation of the scheme. The Committee while expressing its displeasure feel that with this speed, the target would be missed by miles which does not augur well for the overall implementation of PMGSY-II. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Department to take all the necessary steps to achieve the target and apprise the Committee of the same.

Reply of the Government

Against the target of 50,000 km of road length under PMGSY-II, 18,340 km of road length has been sanctioned to various States (upto March, 2017). In addition, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh have transited to PMGSY-II during the current financial year. For the purpose, introductory workshops have also been held in the month of January and February, 2017 to start PMGSY-II in the State of Rajasthan, Chhattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 9, Para No. 2.10)

The Committee find from the data provided by the Department that since inception of the programme, till 27.05.2015 a total of Rs. 1,25,427 crore have been released for the programme. The Committee also find that as against the original allocation of Rs. 124000 crore for the XIIth Plan, the department could get only Rs. 50230 crore during the first four year of the twelfth plan. There is also a huge gap between the original allocation and actual allotment during the four years of the Twelfth Plan. The Committee's examination has further revealed that the budget under PMGSY was substantially reduced during the years 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15. But, under the Accelerated Action Plan, the allocation of PMGSY has been substantially increased during 2015-16 (Rs. 18200 crore) and 2016-17 (Rs. 19,000 crore) excluding State share

of Rs. 8963 crore. The Ministry of finance has made a commitment of maintaining current level of funding till 2018-19. The Secretary, Department of rural Development during the briefing was candid in admission that upto 2010-11 adequate funds were being released for the programme, however, in last few years, the amount of budgetary allocation actually provided to States was disproportionate to value of works. The Committee were also informed that the shortage of funds under PMGSY has been resolved from the year 2015-16 onwards. On the issue that whether the states would be able to provide the matching share in the light of the changed funding pattern from 90:10 to 60:40, the Department stated that States have substantial fund availability which will be sufficient for the States to meet their requirement. In view of the foregoing, the Committee feel that the Department would have ample financial resources to meet the requirement of funds. The Committee recommend the department to ensure that the finances are utilized optimally and properly, leakages are checked and utilization certificates are received in time to plug the loopholes and that e-payment should be emphasized.

Reply of the Government

Funds during a year are released to the States, on the basis of utilization of funds by the States which is reported through Utilization Certificates (UCs). States need to ensure 60% utilization of funds available with them for becoming eligible to receive further funds. The Ministry also conducts regular Regional Review Meetings (RRMs) to monitor optimum utilization of funds. April, 2016 onwards, it has made mandatory to make e-payment to the contractors.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 10, Para No. 2.11)

PMGSY has a three tier quality management mechanism. First tier of this mechanism is in-house quality control at Programme Implementation Unit (PIU). Second tier is structured as an independent quality monitoring at State Level through State Quality Monitors (SQMs) and under the third tier, independent National Quality Monitors (NQMs) are deployed by NRRDA for inspection of road works. The Committee's examination revealed that despite having a three tier mechanism the Quality of rural roads remain an issue of serious concern. The Committee, therefore, recommend that structural reforms in the extant mechanism is needed to fix the responsibility at each level so that the Quality of roads is not compromised. Moreover, the Committee emphasize that all the roads constructed under PMGSY must bear the name of the contractors also their mobile number to have transparency.

Reply of the Government

Ensuring the quality of the road works is the responsibility of the State Governments who are implementing the programme. However, a Three Tier Quality Mechanism has been put in place for ensuring the quality of road works under the programme. In the first tier of this mechanism, the quality standards are enforced through in-house mechanism by establishing well-equipped field laboratory and carrying

out mandatory tests by the contractor. The 50% of the total test are conducted in the presence of Junior Engineer in –charge of the work. Similarly, the AE and EE incharge of the work are required to ensure that 20% and 5% of the tests respectively are conducted in their presence. The EE incharge also ensures that the non-conformance reports are issued in time and timely action is taken by the contractor. PIU also ensures that the first payment to the contractor is made only after the contractor has set up the field laboratory with prescribed equipment.

In order to further strengthen and improve the accountability of the first tier, a provision has recently been made in programme MIS (OMMAS) wherein the PIU is required to upload geo-referenced photographs of field laboratory through his login, which are validated by the State Quality Coordinator (SQC) of the respective State.

Under the Second tier, the State ensures that each work is inspected at least thrice by the State Quality Monitors (SQMs), independent of PIUs. In order to minimize the subjectivity in reporting, the SQMs are required to report the quality of work in the prescribed formats. The SQMs are also required to upload the abstract of quality grading and geo-referenced photographs of the roads inspected by them, in programme MIS (OMMAS) which is available in public domain.

To improve the reliability of the SQM reporting, NRRDA has prescribed detailed guidelines for periodic Performance Evaluation of SQMs by a Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) at State level. The PEC evaluates the inspection reports of SQMs and the further continuation of the SQMs depends on the outcome of the PEC. Besides, the periodic PEC meetings, various MIS reports have been developed at the State Quality Co-ordinator login which provides insight about the individual SQM activities relating to number of inspection conducted in a day, time taken to upload the inspections in programme MIS and general quality observations given by the SQMs for the works vis-a-vis., the overall quality grading the works in the district.

The Third tier is an independent monitoring through retired Senior Engineers of the level of Suptd. Engineer and above, designated as National Quality Monitors (NQMs). Under this tier, NQMs are engaged for inspections of roads, selected at random. The NQMs carry out inspections on the basis of guidelines and they are required to make observations about the quality of works in an objective manner, after performing the required laboratory tests, hand field tests or visual observations, as the case may be. The NQMs are also required to upload the abstract of quality grading and geo-referenced photographs in programme MIS (OMMAS), through use of Mobile Application, which is available in public domain. To improve the reliability of the NQMs reporting, NRRDA has prescribed detailed guidelines for periodic Performance Evaluation of NQMs by a Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) comprising academicians from reputed Technical Institutes. During the last two years as many as 22 NQMs have been de-empanelled based on the basis of observations of the PEC.

Recently, with a view to avoid conflict of interest in case of same person working in the capacity of NQM and SQM with the State(s), the Monitors were advised to exercise their options to work either as NQM or SQM. Based on their option, the monitors have been allowed to work either as NQM or SQM. Such NQMs who are de-empanelled because of their poor performance reported by PEC and other disciplinary matters have not been permitted to work as SQMs also.

Name of the contractors and their mobile numbers on the Information and the Maintenance Boards of works executed under PMGSY: Chief Engineers of all States have been advised vide communication dated 30th March, 2017 (**copy enclosed**) to ensure that the name of the construction agencies and their registered

phone numbers are displayed on the PMGSY Information and Maintenance Boards which are to be necessarily erected on PMGSY roads. The States have also been asked to ensure that the registered phone numbers of the construction agencies displayed on the PMGSY Information and Maintenance Boards are valid and active.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Recommendation (Serial No. 12, Para No. 2.13)

The Department of Rural Development has constituted District Development co-ordination and Monitoring Committee called 'Disha' by replacing Vigilance and Monitoring Committee in June, 2016. The provisions regarding the Chairpersonship of the Disha are as under:

“ The Chairperson of the Disha should be a Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) elected from the district.”

- (i) Where there are more than one Parliament Member (Lok Sabha) representing the district, the senior-most Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) should be nominated as the Chairperson. However, the Warrant of Precedence maintained by the Ministry of Home Affairs should be followed, which may result in exceptions.
- (ii) If the district has more than one Parliamentary Constituency (Lok Sabha) as its segments and the senior-most Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) is made Chairperson of Disha in some other district, the next senior-most Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) should be the Chairperson.
- (iii) In case of same seniority, the Chairperson should be the Member of Parliament in whose Parliamentary Constituency the largest geographical area of the district falls.
- (iv) One MP (Rajya Sabha) representing the State and exercising option to be associated with the district level Committee of that district (on first come basis), to be designated as Co-Chairpersons by the Ministry of Rural Development.

Note: In case the MP from RS is senior following the Warrant of Precedence maintained by the Ministry of Home Affairs, he / she may be made as Chairperson of the committee. “

During the examination, non-intimation about the Disha meetings, holding of irregular meetings and a case of denial of Chairmanship to a senior Member of Parliament also came up before the Committee. The Committee are of the considered view that regular meetings of Disha should be held and it should be ensured that Members of Parliament is properly intimated about the meeting and guidelines of Disha should be strictly adhered to and any deviation in this regard should be viewed seriously and the responsibility should be fixed and action taken against the person responsible for any such lapse.

Reply of the Government

The Para 6 of Disha guidelines stipulates that meetings of the Disha should be held at least once in every Quarter, after giving sufficient notice to the Hon'ble MPs/MLAs and all other Members. The Ministry vide its order No. Q-13016/1/2016-

VMC dated 27th June 2016 advised all State Governments/District administrations to convene meeting of District Development Coordination & Monitoring Committee as per the guidelines. Secretary, Rural Development in his letter No. Q-13016/2/2016-VMC dated 26th July, 2016 to States informed them that the meeting of Disha should be held at least once in every quarter. Again, Secretary, Rural Development vide letter No. Q-13016/2/2016-VMC(Pt) dated 12th January, 2017 and 15th March, 2017 to States emphasized that meetings of Disha should be convened as prescribed in the guidelines.

Further, para 8 (b) of Disha guidelines stipulates that Meeting notice should reach all members at least 15 days prior to the meeting, Agenda note should reach all members at least 10 days prior to the meeting and Proceedings of the meetings should be issued within 10 days of the meeting. The Member Secretary is vested with the responsibility of convening of meeting and ensuring that meeting notice, agenda notes and proceedings of meetings are uploaded on the website of the Ministry of Rural Development and also the website of the State.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Chapter III

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

-NIL-

Chapter IV

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Serial No. 2, Para No. 2.3)

The Committee note that Ministry of Rural Development is the nodal Ministry for implementation of PMGSY. At the National level, National Rural Roads Development Agency (NRRDA) has been constituted to provide technical and managerial support for implementation of the programme at Central Level. At the State level, State rural Roads Development Agency (SRRDA) have been constituted for the programme implementation at the State Level. Also, depending upon the work load, Programme Implementation Units (PIU) are constituted for each district by the States. The Department of Rural Development has informed that Central Public Sector Units (CPSUs) in the States of Bihar, Jharkhand, Tripura, Odisha and West Bengal have been engaged to augment the execution capacity under PMGSY. The Committee also note that due to preponement of completion target to March 2019 from March 2022, there would be requirement of further augmenting the execution capacity in 9 States viz Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Jammu & Kashmir, Uttarakhand, Rajasthan and Odisha where there are large number of works in hand. The Ministry also informed that meeting of top officials of the Ministry with the Chief secretaries of the above States except for Jammu & Kashmir have been held to increase the execution and contracting capacity.

The Committee further note that the steps taken for the effective implementation of PMGSY by the Ministry include

- (i) using Remote Sensing and GIS in planning and monitoring of PMGSY.
- (ii) use of non-conventional Materials/Green Technology for cost and time saving.
- (iii) adoption of State Specific Rural road Maintenance Polices.
- (iv) Mobile based App "Meri Sadak" as well as "Citizen Monitoring" for transparent public grievance redressal and Social Audit.
- (v) Mobile Application based Quality Monitoring.

The Committee are constrained to note that as against the target of 183599 habitations (including habitations of 100 and above in LWE Blocks as indentified by MHA), only 119156 habitations have been connected by States (upto September, 2016). The Committee also note that the Department in consultation with Ministry of Finance and the States has formulated an Action Plan to achieve the target by March 2019 with enhanced financial allocation to the States and modified funding pattern of the Scheme. The Committee find that during 2014-15 and 2015-16, States have constructed road length of 36337 kms and 36449 Kms respectively and even the Ministry has set a target of 48812 km (133 km per day) road length during 2016-17 and have achieved 119 km/day from April 2016 to September, 2016.

The Committee are dismayed to note that despite initiation of several steps, the Department has not been able to meet its own target of 133 km per day during the first half of the financial year 2016-17. The Committee strongly recommend that the execution capacity in the above mentioned 9 States should be expeditiously augmented

so that the large number of pending works are completed as per the target. The Committee would also like the Department of rural Development to engage top officials of the State of Jammu & Kashmir to expedite the increase in execution capacity and contracting capacity in the State. The Committee may inc to be apprised of the progress made in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Table 1: CPSUs engaged

S.No	State	CPSUs engaged
1.	Bihar	5
2.	Jharkhand	4
3.	Tripura	2
4.	Odisha	3
5.	West Bengal	2

An analysis of the completion of pending works in the 9 States where maximum balance works of PMGSY are situated would reveal that substantial progress has been made by these States. In October, 2016, a total of 7,797 works were pending completion in these States, for 2-4 years. This number in March, 2017 has come down to 3,364 works. Similarly, in October, 2016, a total of 4,574 works were pending completion in these States, for more than 4 years. This number, in March, 2017 has decreased to 2,974.

Table 2: Status of Pending works

S.No	State	Upto October, 2016		Upto March, 2017	
		Pending for 2-4 years	Pending for more than 4 years	Pending for 2-4 years	Pending for more than 4 years
1.	Assam	536	310	411	264
2.	Bihar	3163	788	1981	665
3.	Chhattisgarh	200	251	115	220
4.	Jharkhand	1066	739	520	625
5.	West Bengal	616	223	335	116
6.	J&k	542	90	86	527
7.	Uttarakhand	178	75	136	55
8.	Rajasthan	327	201	203	100
9.	Odisha	1169	687	787	402
	Grand Total	7,797	3,364	4,574	2,974

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 8 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Serial No. 11, Para No. 2.12)

Based on the best National and International practices, a Standard Bidding Document (SBD) has been developed by the Department for the procurement of works under PMGSY. All the works under the programme are procured and managed on the basis of provision of Standard Bidding Document (SBD). To managed on the basis of provision of Standard Bidding Document (SBD). To ensure transparency and harness various advantages of electronic tendering, entire bidding of procurement of works under the programme is being carried out only through e-procurement. During the examination, the issue of mis procurement in Uttar Pradesh and Manipur have been raised before the Committee. Issue of non-payment of dues to the contractors in Uttarakhand for the work done under PMGSY also came up during the examination. Delay in preparation of DPRs, quoting 10%-15% less than the estimated price during bidding in Jharkhand, award of contracts to the dubious contractors, contractors not doing the work even after the award of tender were also highlighted before the Committee.

The Committee take a serious view of the above issues and recommend that a National Data-Base of the corrupt and dubious contractors be prepared so that they do not get any contract of the Government. Also, timely payment of works done under the programme be ensured so that the workers are paid in time. They also recommend revamping of the procurement process to weed out corruption and mis-appropriation at various level. The Committee may be apprised of the steps taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Regarding contractors quoting 10-15% less than the estimated amount/amount put to tender by the States, provisions have been made in the PMGSY bidding document which empowers the Employer i.e. the State to take the additional securities from such contractors quoting unreasonably low /high rates. The amount of additional security, sufficient to protect the Employer from financial loss in the event of default, is decided at the sole discretion of the Employer, which is final and binding on such successful bidders.

Under the revised provisions of SBD, the payment to the contractor for routine maintenance is being done on monthly basis, as against the earlier provision of making payment on quarterly basis. New provisions have been added in the bidding document which makes the discrimination of wages on gender basis, child labour and default to pay EPF/ ESI by the contractor as event of fundamental breach of contract which may lead to termination of contract at contractor's cost. Further, to effectively address the issue of complaint related to procurement of works, the Ministry vide its letter dated 04th November, 2016 has already requested all the States to review the PMGSY Procurement management system in their States and to identify an officer of the level of Chief Engineer and designate him as the Nodal officer to receive and enquire into the complaints relating to procurement.

PMGSY bidding document requires the bidder to submit an affidavit about the correctness of the information submitted by him in his bid. In case the information furnished by the bidder is found incorrect at the later stage, the State is required to take appropriate legal action including blacklisting of the defaulting bidder/ contractor.

Further, in case there is a variation in the scanned copy of documents unloaded in e-tendering and hard copy of documents submitted by bidder, the bidder is liable to be debarred from participating in PMGSY projects for a period of five years.

[No. P-17017/6/2016-RC (FMS: 352161) dated 13.04.2017, Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development)]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 14 of Chapter I of the Report)

Chapter V

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

-NIL-

**NEW DELHI;
30 June, 2017
09 Ashadha, 1939 (Saka)**

**DR. P. VENUGOPAL
Chairperson,
Standing Committee on Rural Development**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2016-2017)

MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON
TUESDAY, THE 11 JULY, 2017

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1130 hrs. in Committee Room No. E,
Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

Dr. P. Venugopal -- *Chairperson*

MEMBERS**Lok Sabha**

2. Smt. Renuka Butta
3. Shri Sanjay Dhotre
4. Shri Vijay Kumar Hansdak
5. Shri Ajay Mishra (Teni)
6. Smt. Mausam Noor
7. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
8. Shri Gokaraju Ganga Raju
9. Shri Jugal Kishore Sharma
10. Dr. Yashwant Singh
11. Shri Ladu Kishore Swain
12. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

13. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullo
14. Shri Mahendra Singh Mahra
15. Shri Narayan Lal Panchariya
16. Shri Shiv Pratap Shukla

Secretariat

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Shri Abhijit Kumar | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. Shri S. Chaterjee | - | Director |
| 3. Smt. B. Visala | - | Additional Director |

2. At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members of the Committee to the sitting convened to consider and adopt two Draft Reports viz. XXX XXX XXX and (ii) Draft Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty Sixth Report on 'Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) pertaining to the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development).

3. After discussing the above Draft Reports in detail, the Committee adopted the same without any modifications. The Committee then authorised the Chairperson to finalise the aforesaid Draft Reports and after factual verification from concerned Ministries/ Departments, present the same to the Hon'ble Speaker

4. XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX

5. The Committee appreciated the work done and the assistance rendered to them by the Secretariat.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX - II

[Vide Introduction of Report]

**ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE
RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE THIRTY SIXTH REPORT
(16TH LOK SABHA) OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

I.	Total number of recommendations:	12
II.	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government :	
	Serial Nos.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12	
	Total:	10
	Percentage:	83.30 %
III.	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies :	
	Serial No. - NIL -	
	Total:	00
	Percentage:	0.00 %
IV.	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:	
	Serial No. 2 and 11	
	Total:	2
	Percentage:	16.70 %
V.	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited :	
	Serial Nos. NIL	
	Total:	00
	Percentage:	00 %