

## **PRADHAN MANTRI GRAM SADAK YOJANA**

[Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Ninety-Second Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha)]

## **MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

## **PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2018-19)**

## **ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY SIXTH REPORT**

---

## **SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

PAC NO. 2165

# ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY SIXTH REPORT

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2018-19)

(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)

### PRADHAN MANTRI GRAM SADAK YOJANA

[Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Ninety-second Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha)]

### MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT



*Presented to Lok Sabha on:* .....

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on:* .....

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

December, 2018 /Agrahayana, 1939 (Saka)

## CONTENTS

	<i>PAGE</i>
<b>COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2018-19)</b>	<b>(iii)</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>(iv)</b>
<b>CHAPTER I</b> Report .....	<b>1</b>
<b>C H A P T E R</b>	
<b>I I *</b>	
<b>CHAPTER III*</b> Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government .....	
<b>CHAPTER IV*</b> Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the replies received from the Government .....	
<b>CHAPTER V*</b> Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration .....	

### APPENDICES\*

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| I  | Minutes of the 21 <sup>st</sup> sitting of the Public Accounts Committee (2018-19) held on 14 <sup>th</sup> December, 2018.   |
| II | Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their Ninety-second Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) |

---

*\*Not appended to the cyclostyled copy of the Report*

**COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**  
**(2018-19)**

Shri Mallikarjun Kharge - Chairperson

**M E M B E R S**

**L O K S A B H A**

2. Shri Subhash Chandra Baheria
3. Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay
4. Shri Prem Singh Chandumajra
5. Shri Gajanan Chandrakant Kirtikar
6. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
7. Smt. Riti Pathak
8. Shri Ramesh Pokhriyal "Nishank"
9. Shri Janardan Singh Sigriwal
10. Shri Abhishek Singh
11. Shri Gopal Shetty
12. Dr. Kirit Somaiya
13. Shri Anurag Singh Thakur
14. Shri Shivkumar Chanabasappa Udasi
15. Dr. Ponnusamy Venugopal

**R A J Y A S A B H A**

16. Prof. M. V. Rajeev Gowda
17. Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita
18. Shri Shwait Malik
19. Shri Narayan Lal Panchariya
20. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy
21. Shri C.M. Ramesh
22. Shri Bhupender Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A.K. Singh - Additional Secretary
2. Shri Sanjeev Sharma - Director
3. Smt. Anju Kukreja - Under Secretary

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson, Public Accounts Committee (2018-19), having been authorised by the Committee, do present this One Hundred and Twenty Sixth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Ninety-second Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on "**Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana**" based on C&AG Report No. 23 of 2016 relating to Ministry of Rural Development.

2. The Ninety-second Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 28<sup>th</sup> March, 2018. Replies of the Government to all the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Report were received. The Public Accounts Committee considered and adopted the One Hundred and Twenty Sixth Report at their sitting held on 14<sup>th</sup> December, 2018. 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 Ninety-second Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) is given at *Appendix-II*.

**NEW DELHI;**  
**December, 2018**  
**Agrahayana, 1940 (Saka)**

**MALLIKARJUN KHARGE**  
**Chairperson,**  
**Public Accounts Committee**

**REPORT**  
**PART - I**

This Report of the Public Accounts Committee deals with the Action Taken by the Government on the Observations and Recommendations contained in their Ninety-second Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) on the subject "**Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana**" based on C&AG Report No. 23 of 2016 related to Ministry of Rural Development.

2. The Ninety-second Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) which was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 28<sup>th</sup> March, 2018, contained 23 Observations/Recommendations. Action Taken Notes in respect of all the Observations and Recommendations have been received from the Ministry of Rural Development and are broadly categorized as under:

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

Para Nos. 1-23

**Total: 23**  
**Chapter - II**

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

Para Nos. -NIL-

**Total: NIL**  
**Chapter - III**

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

Para Nos. NIL

**Total: NIL**  
**Chapter - IV**

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

Para Nos. NIL

**Total: NIL**  
**Chapter -V**

3. During the course of examination of the subject, the Committee found several irregularities in monitoring and implementation of Pradhan mantra Gram Sadak Yojana. It was found that some States deviated from the prescribed procedures while preparing District Rural Road Plan and Core Network. Consequently, eligible habitations were either left out or wrongly shown as connected. Some of the road works were taken beyond Core Network. Involvement of elected public representatives in planning process was also found lacking. Geographical information system data base for rural roads was not created. Project proposals were cleared beyond the permissible indicative fund allocation. As regards the programme implementation, the Committee found that the execution of road work suffered badly due to non-organisation of transect walk which led to dropping and abandonment of works because of land disputes, non-availability of required land and works were shown completed without providing complete connectivity to the targeted habitations. Instances of providing multiple connectivity to habitations in violation of guidelines were also observed. Maintenance funds were neither adequately provided nor fully utilised. Roads constructed under the programme were not properly maintained. Further in case of fund management of PMGSY, the Committee observed that funds released to States for implementation of the programme were considerably reduced during 2012-15 due to unutilized balance with the States. There were instances of non/short delayed release of programme funds. In certain States, Programme funds were diverted and utilized on inadmissible items. Figures of release and expenditure under the Programme maintained by the Ministry did not match with those maintained by the State Governments. The Committee also found that quality and monitoring control mechanisms were deficient in all the tiers of PMGSY. Field laboratories were either not set up or inadequately equipped at work execution sites. Inspections of roads at prescribed stages were not undertaken. Joint inspections with elected Public representatives were not undertaken. Performance Evaluation Committee meetings to evaluate the performance of the National Quality Monitors were not held at prescribed intervals. State Level Standing Committee meetings to monitor progress of ongoing works, quality control, budgeting of maintenance fund etc. were not held regularly. In regard to Online Management,

Monitoring and Accounting System (OMMAS), the Committee observed that even after more than 13 years, States were in the process of updating the data. Fund Processing and Analysis of Rate for Rural Roads (ARRR) modules were not implemented. Similarly, absence of application controls led to invalid data entry. MIS reports generated through the system were inaccurate and unreliable. The Committee had accordingly given their Observations/Recommendations in the 92<sup>nd</sup> Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha). The Gist of some important Observations/Recommendations are contained in the succeeding Paragraphs:

- (a) While Observing that even though guidelines were issued twice within a week of 2015 no other concrete action was taken by the Ministry of Rural Development to ensure that those guidelines were actually implemented in letter and spirit, the Committee, had urged upon the Ministry to take effective steps in constantly monitoring to ensure that guidelines issued are scrupulously followed and implemented by the States;
- (b) Upon noticing that the Ministry have again failed to fulfill its own commitment to ensure the C-DAC to complete the GIS Database Management System in all States by February, 2018, the Committee had desired that, PMGSY being one of the prestigious schemes of Central Government aimed at creating all weather roads in rural areas of the country, the Cabinet Secretary may take the lead in ensuring scientific, transparent and timely implementation of the programme.
- (c) The Committee had serious concern over the manner in which the Ministry released funds without satisfying themselves that the CNCPL and CUPL are properly verified by the State Technical Agencies on the basis of the prescribed guidelines. The Committee were of the considered view that proper connectivity of all weather roads in rural areas being the foundation of PMGSY, any flaw in the system will gravely vitiate its very objective. They had, therefore, desired the Ministry of Rural Development to deal the issue with more seriousness and take appropriate corrective measures to clean up the system. The Committee exhorted that all cases of irregularities should be thoroughly investigated and

responsibility of the erring officials fixed for the lapses. The Ministry should also consider withholding of financial assistance to the defaulting States.

- (d) The Committee had desired the Ministry to keep constant vigil over the States to ensure proper synchronisation of available excess funds and fixation of targets for better achievement of the objectives. They had also desired to be apprised of the present position of the targets set for completion of work in all the States, achievement made so far, States lagging behind in achievement of targets and action taken thereagainst.
- (e) While expressing their concern over non-conducting of transect walk the Committee, had, desired the Ministry of Rural Development to look into this vital area and take effective steps to ensure that transect walks are organised by the States as prescribed in the guidelines, failing which, penalty should be imposed on States for abandoning the works mid-way due to non-conducting of transect walk. Quarterly Reports from the States should be obtained in order to regularly monitor the transect walk organised by them. The Committee had also desired to be apprised of the impact of including women Panchayati Raj Institution members and representatives of women Self Help Groups in the transect walk.
- (f) The Committee had expected the Ministry to hold regular review meetings with the States to finish pending works. In this regard, guidelines may be suitably amended by prescribing periodical review meetings, imposition of strict penalty etc. so as to have purposeful monitoring and control over the pending projects. The Committee had also desired to be apprised of the conclusive action taken by the Ministry to prevent dropping/abandonment of works midway thereby saving valuable money of the exchequer.
- (g) The Committee, had felt that the Ministry should suitably take up the matter with the State Governments for ensuring to prevent delays/irregularities in tendering process in future besides apprising States to take stringent action against the officials responsible for such omissions.
- (h) The Committee had deplored the Ministry and concerned State Governments in wasting public money due to improper planning and for not making serious attempts to provide complete connectivity to the targetted habitations.

- (i) The Committee were of the considered view that accurate identification of habitations is necessary for achieving intended benefits of the programme and any flaws in this process particularly multiple connectivity which would vitiate its objective.
- (j) The Committee had urged upon the Ministry to investigate in coordination with State Governments all such cases of short release/non-utilisation of funds and ask them to fix responsibility against the officials for omissions. They had also recommended that in future penalty should be imposed on the defaulting States who fail to release/utilise funds for maintenance. Ministry should also consider withholding of Grants to State Governments upon noticing such irregularities.
- (k) The Committee had also desired that the Ministry should take all possible measures to ensure that sufficient release of funds to the States in time and all cases of financial irregularities probed into and appropriate action taken against the erring officials.
- (l) Since diversion of funds from intended purposes reflects poor fund management besides reducing the fund availability for the desired purposes, the Committee had recommended that in future the Ministry should ensure that suitable penal actions are taken to check diversion of funds and steps like withholding of funds to such States should be done.
- (m) Since quality control is a vital component of PMGSY to maintain quality of roads, the Committee had desired that Ministry should exercise quality control at three stages *viz.* firstly at the stage prior to construction, secondly during the construction phase and thirdly quality checks by the field engineers after completion of each stage of construction so that the roads get longer life and do not get damaged immediately after the construction.
- (n) The Committee while welcoming the steps taken by the Ministry for streamlining the process of inspections, recommend that the Ministry should ensure that the inspections are carried out as per the specifications mentioned in the guidelines and any aberration noticed in this regard should be dealt with sternly.
- (o) The Committee had desired the Ministry to ensure proper monitoring of the conduct of social audit by citizen volunteers regularly. Further, in order to achieve

the goals of social Audit, the Ministry should also ensure that volunteers are aware of their rights to participate in the ongoing process of social audit, their entitlements and obligations under the scheme. The Committee had also urged the Ministry to replicate the modalities of social audit of the MGNREGS be incorporated in the guidelines of PMGSY with immediate effect.

4. The Action Taken Notes furnished by the Ministry of Rural Development on each of the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Ninety-Second Report have been reproduced in the relevant Chapters of this Report. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government, on some of their Observations/Recommendations which either need reiteration or merit comments

A. **Clearance of works in excess of allocation of funds**  
**(Recommendation Para No. 7)**

5. Upon noticing that the Ministry cleared proposals valued much more than the indicative allocations, the Committee had desired to know as to whether any analysis of present level of fund requirement of States, expenditure incurred by them and funds remained unutilized therewith was done by the Ministry to keep constant vigil over the states to ensure proper synchronization of available excess funds and fixation of targets for better achievement of the objective. They had also desired to be apprised of the present position of the targets set for completion of work in all the States, achievement made so far, States lagging behind in achievement of targets and action taken thereagainst.

6. In their Action Taken Note on the aforesaid recommendation Ministry of Rural Development submitted as under:

"The Ministry gauges the funds requirement at many levels. The preliminary scrutiny is done while discussing any project proposal for granting clearance at Pre-Empowered Committee and Empowered Committee levels. While fixing the annual allocation, the unspent balance, absorption as well as execution capacity and balance quantum of works are weighed in on State to State basis. During the process of fund release, detailed scrutiny is done to ensure that there is no

misuse of funds. Proposals sent by the States are examined for level of expenditure, unspent balance, releases of state share of earlier central releases, and audited accounts. Against a target of connecting 1,78,184 habitations, 1,43,560 habitations have been connected under the scheme and 16,310 habitations connected by the states out of their own their own resources (90% of eligible). Most of the remaining habitations remaining to be sanctioned have either been sanctioned by the State Government or are not feasible. Most of the works are in an advanced stage of completion and the final black topping will now commence after the end of the rains and rapid progress is expected to ensure achievement by March, 2019. The Ministry is constantly reviewing works of the laggard States through Performance Review Committees, Regional Review Meetings, Empowered Committee, Pre-Empowered Committees, Video Conferences, regular visits of the Ministry officials to these States besides daily Monitoring through other electronic and IT means.”

**7. In their 92<sup>nd</sup> Report, the Committee had desired the Ministry of Rural Development to apprise them of the present position of the targets set for completion of work in regard to construction of PMGSY roads in all the States. This included achievement made so far, states lagging behind in achievement of targets and action taken thereagainst. In their Action Taken Notes the Ministry have stated that against a target of connecting 1,78,184 habitations, 1,43,560 habitations have been connected by the States out of their own resources. However, the Ministry have not furnished the quantified comparative data in regard to the target dates of completion of works and the projects pending thus far. Accordingly, the Committee are not able to understand the actual position of fixation of targets, outcome and the achievements made thereagainst. Further, in regard to the details of the States lagging behind in achievement of targets and action taken thereagainst, the Committee have been informed that the Ministry is constantly reviewing works of the laggard States through various Committees, video conferences, regular visits of the Ministry officials to these States. They have also informed that daily Monitoring through other electronic and IT means is being undertaken, nevertheless the Ministry have not provided the details of the States that have been lagging behind and the action has been initiated/taken by the Ministry against such defaulting States. At this stage, the Committee can only reiterate their earlier recommendation and accordingly desire to be apprised**

of complete details on the aforesaid issues. They also recommend that possibility be looked into for fixing responsibility against the concerned officials of the Ministry as well as States, which are lagging behind in the achievement of targets.

**B. Transect Walks not organized  
(Recommendation Para No. 8)**

8. The Committee was constrained to observe that in 17 States (Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal), transect walk was either not organized or required certificate/documents were not found attached with DPRs. Failure to implement this significant procedure at the time of project preparation led to dropping or abandoning of works mid-way due to land disputes, non-availability of required land and other reasons. While expressing their concern over this the Committee had desired the Ministry of Rural Development to look into this vital area and take effective steps to ensure that transect walks are organized by the States as prescribed in the guidelines, failing which, penalty should be imposed on States for abandoning the works mid-way due to non-conducting of transect walk. Quarterly Reports from the States should be obtained in order to regularly monitor the transect walk organized by them. The Committee had also desired to be apprised of the impact of including Women Panchayati Raj Institution members and representatives of Women Self Help Groups in the transect walk.

9. In their Action Taken Notes on the above said recommendation, the Ministry of Rural Development stated as follows:

“As per Guidelines, the PIUs are required to undertake ‘Transect Walk’ to determine the most suitable alignment for the proposed road. The transect walk shall be organized by the Assistant Engineer at the time of preparation of DPRs. The Panchayat Pradhan, local Patwari, the JE, Women PRI members and representatives of Women Self Help Group (SHGs) would participate in the transect walk. The Ministry has issued advisory to the States to ensure that this procedure is followed (28.4.2011). Further, during the sample scrutiny of DPRs by NRIDA, this aspect is being ensured by verifying the transect walk photos

uploaded by the States on OMMAS, attendance, summary of discussions, approval of Gram Panchayat and the certificate furnished by the States, in relevant DPRs. Also, all the States are providing the Photographs along the alignment at every 100 m interval with summary of observations for engineering design of proposed road. Though, some roads were taken up assuming that forest clearance would be granted, however, they had to be dropped eventually due to forest clearance not being granted for the case. No study has been undertaken so far to evaluate the impact of women on the transect walk and its consequent decisions. The Ministry will consider this while commissioning studies on various aspects of PMGSY in the future.”

10. **The Committee observe that the Ministry of Rural Development have taken several steps to ensure that transect walks are organized by the States as prescribed in the guidelines by them. However, the Committee are disconcerted to note that no study has been undertaken to evaluate the outcome/impact/contribution of including Women Panchayati Raj Institutions Members and representatives of the Women Self-Help Groups in the transect walk. The Committee are concerned to note that since Ministry had amended their own guidelines in September 2014 directing all the States to include Women PRI Members and Self Help Groups in the transect walk, no study has been undertaken by them to evaluate their impact in the transect walk even after lapse of four years of issuing such guidelines. This shows the lackadaisical approach of the Ministry on this aspect. Having regard to the mounting need for streamlining the procedure of transect walk, the Committee desire that the study on the impact of Member of WPRI Members and WSH Groups on the transect walk be undertaken at the earliest so that their contribution be evaluated which will eventually help in proper implementation of the scheme.**

**C. Multiple Connectivity of Habitations  
(Recommendation Para No. 13)**

11. Upon noticing that in nine States (Arunachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Nagaland, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal), 36 habitations were provided with more than one connectivity. Out of this, 31

habitations were provided multiple connectivity at a cost of Rs 29.49 crore, the Committee, had desired to know as to whether any enquiry of these 36 cases by SQM was done, if so, what were their findings and suggestions to overcome such instances in future. Whether any responsibility has been fixed against the erring officials. The Committee had also desired to know if the cost of the multiple connectivity has been borne by the State Governments concerned. The Committee were of the considered view that accurate identification of habitations is necessary for achieving intended benefits of the programme and any flaws in this process particularly multiple connectivity which would vitiate its objective. Thus, they had desired that the Ministry should evolve a suitable mechanism to avoid such instances in future.

12. In their Action Taken Note, the Ministry of Rural Development stated as under:

“All the States reported that the unconnected habitations in their CN and updated the data on OMMAS. This was reconciled by the States and in 2013, revised approval of Cabinet was obtained on reconciled number of habitations. In many cases, States have constructed roads along Non-CN alignments from their own funds, as the roads under PMGSY are being taken up as per CUCPL/CNCPL. Thus, such cases are not to be treated as multiple connectivity under PMGSY as only one connectivity was been provided under PMGSY. Further, in a case of Rajasthan where multiple connectivity was cleared due to the revenue villages being mapped on core network instead of habitations in the beginning, the Ministry has taken a very strong view and partial amount has been recouped from the state at the time of release of funds. In the absence of a comprehensive list of the said roads, specific reply could not be given for the 36 cases enquired upon.”

13. **The Committee are constrained to observe that the comprehensive list of road could not be provided to them for the 36 cases of habitations having multiple connectivity as pointed out. In the absence of such a list, it is very difficult to draw any inference on the progress of connectivity or even to point out the areas which are wanting for improvement. Further, the reply of the Ministry is also silent on the original recommendation of the Committee wherein they had desired to make an enquiry of these cases by the State Quality Monitors (SQM). Moreover, the Ministry have not provided any reply on the issue of cost of the multiple connectivity, specifically whether they were borne by the State**

**Governments concerned or through any other sources. The Ministry have also not apprised about the mechanism evolved by them to avoid such instances in future. The Committee are distraught at the Ministry having furnishing such a vague reply on this important aspect of multiple connectivity. Thus, while deploring the casual approach of the Ministry in dealing with this issue, the Committee desire that a comprehensive reply containing all the aforesaid issues be furnished to them within six weeks of the presentation of this Report to Parliament.**

**D. Shortfall in inspections by SQMs**

**(Recommendation Para No. 19)**

14. The Committee had observed that State Quality Monitors (SQMs) carried out inspections for 51521 road works during 2010-15 in States. Out of these, 1671 road works (3.24 per cent) were not inspected even once. 26691 roads works (51.81 per cent) were inspected only once. From the detailed scrutiny, the Committee find that in Andhra Pradesh 48 road works were not inspected whereas seven road works were inspected 10 to 18 times. In Assam, 124 road works were not inspected whereas four road works were inspected 10 to 13 times. In Gujarat, 47 road works were not inspected whereas 21 road works were inspected 10 to 26 times. In Madhya Pradesh, nine road works inspected 10 to 16 times, whereas 193 road works were never inspected. In Maharashtra, 77 road works were not inspected whereas five road works were inspected 10 to 11 times. It is therefore, evident that SQMs did not carry out the prescribed inspections uniformly. According to Ministry, in some States, short fall has been reported due to various reasons including that of shortage of technical personnel. In order to address this issue, the States have been advised by the Ministry to engage independent agencies for State Quality Monitor inspections to increase the number of SQMs and use the mobile application developed by NRRDA for such inspections. Further, NRRDA has set annual/monthly targets for each State for SQM inspection and the progress of the same is also monitored by NRRDA on monthly basis and the matter is taken up with the States lagging in achieving the target. The Committee while

welcoming these steps taken by the Ministry for Streamlining the process of inspections, had recommended that the Ministry should ensure that the inspections are carried out as per the specifications mentioned in the guidelines and any aberration noticed in this regard should be dealt with sternly. Penal measures should be taken against the States in the aforesaid cases pointed out by Audit.

15. In response to the aforesaid Audit observations, the Ministry of Rural Development stated as under:

“As regard to shortfall of SQM inspection for each work, this aspect is now being very closely monitored both at the State and Ministry/NRIDA level. Various MIS reports have been developed to monitor these aspects in OMMAS. Consequent to this, the category of ongoing works having zero SQM inspections have significantly reduced. Such aberrant SQM inspections are accounted while fixing the annual SQM inspection targets for each State. The State-wise achievement vis-à-vis., the targets set for SQM inspection is closely monitored on monthly basis and the matter is taken up with the State lagging in achieving the targets. Thrust has been given to augment SQM capacity which in turn has resulted in increase in number of SQM inspections during successive years. This is evident from the table below indicating the number of SQM inspections carried out during last few years:

<b>Year</b>	<b>SQM inspections carried out</b>
2014-15	34558
2015-16	34586
2016-17	31660
2017-18	40124
2018-19 ( up to 26th Oct,2018 )	18640

In addition to the above, a roster app for deputing NQM and SQMs for inspections has been developed by C-DAC. The app is being tested and would be in operation in a month’s time.”

16. **From the Action Taken Notes, the Committee observe that thrust had been given by the Ministry to augment State Quality Monitors (SQMs) Capacity which**

in turn had resulted in increase in number of SQM inspections during successive years. However, from the details furnished in this regard for the past five years i.e. from 2014-15 to 2018-19, the Committee find that the number of SQMs carried out during these years has increased except the year 2016-17 where it has shown a marginal decline. To the utter dismay of the Committee, the Ministry have not apprised them about the targets fixed for SQMs in these years and the achievements made thereagainst. The Committee would like to be apprised of such details within two months alongwith the SQMs carried out upto December, 2018. They would also like to be informed of the contents of recommendations of the SQMs, which in the opinion of the Committee, will help in making this PMGSY effective. Further, while welcoming the steps taken to develop a roaster app for deputing NQM and SQMs for inspections, the Committee would desire to be apprised of the present position of testing and operationalisation of such an app.

**NEW DELHI;**  
**December, 2018**  

---

**Agrahayana, 1940 (*Saka*)**

**MALLIKARJUN KHARGE**  
**Chairperson,**  
**Public Accounts Committee**

**APPENDIX-II**  
(Vide Paragraph 5 of Introduction)

**ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE  
OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
CONTAINED IN THEIR NINETY-SECOND REPORT (SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

(i)	<b>Total number of Observations/Recommendations</b>	<b>23</b>
(ii)	<b>Observations/Recommendations of the Committee which have been accepted by the Government: Para Nos. 1 to 23</b>	<b>Total : 23 Percentage: 100%</b>
(iii)	<b>Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the reply of the Government:  Para Nos. -Nil</b>	<b>Total : 0 Percentage: 0</b>
(iv)	<b>Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:  Para Nos. -Nil</b>	<b>Total : 0 Percentage: 0</b>
(v)	<b>Observations/Recommendations in respect of which the Government have furnished interim replies:  Para Nos. -Nil</b>	<b>Total : 0 Percentage: 0</b>