

NINETY-SEVENTH REPORT
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(1986-87)

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

**CONSTRUCTION OF 1296 DWELLING UNITS AT
KISHANGARH BY DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT



Presented in Lok Sabha on 30-4-1987

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 30-4-1987

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

April 1987/Vaisakha 1909 (Saka)

Price Rs. 4.00

CORRIGENDA TO THE 97TH REPORT OF
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (8TH LOK SABHA)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
17	60	7	houshing .	housing
18	63	6	recommenden	recommended
18	66	last line	weer	were
25	88	4	shafting	shifting
25	89	2nd	tordiness	tardiness
		(from be- low)		
26	92	last	wore	were
27	93	4	withing	within
27	93	26	excecution	execution
31	102	10	whichr	which
86	88	8	Lamontably	lamentably
87	-	2-3	desciplinary	disciplinary
87	90	3	deigns	designs
88	92	5	the	there
89	-	7	improvits	improve
90	-	2	our	out
91	-	4	lases	lapses
91	97	1	dug	DUs
92	-	6	fcts	facts

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
REPORT	1
(i) Introductory	1
(ii) Administrative Approval	1
(iii) Award of Contracts	2
(iv) Laxity in Supervision of Works	2
(v) Delay in Execution of Works	11
(vi) Delay in providing Basic Amenities	19
(vii) Quality Control	20
(viii) Reorganisation of DDA	22
APPENDIX I	33
APPENDIX II	46
APPENDIX III	64
APPENDIX IV	67
APPENDIX V	69
APPENDIX VI	74
APPENDIX VII	85

*PART II

Minutes of the sittings of Public Accounts Committee held on :

17-12-1986 (FN)

28-1-1987 (AN)

23-4-1987 (AN)

*Not printed. One cyclostyled copy laid on the Table of the House and 5 copies placed in Parliament Library.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

(1986-87)

CHAIRMAN

Shri Erasu Ayyapu Reddy

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri J. Chokka Rao
3. Shri Amal Datta
4. Shri Ranjit Singh Gaekwad
5. Shrimati Prabhawati Gupta
6. Shri G.S. Mishra
7. Shri Vilas Muttemwar
8. Shri G. Devaraya Naik
9. Shri Rameshwar Neekhra
10. Shri Rajmangal Pande
11. Shri H.M. Patel
12. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
13. Shri S. Singaravadivel
14. Shri Simon Tigga
15. Shri Girdhari Lal Vyas

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi
17. Shri K.L.N. Prasad
18. Shri Ghulam Rasool Kar
19. Shri A. K. Antony
20. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
21. Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy
22. Shri Virendra Verma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri K.H. Chhaya
2. Shri S. Mehta

—*Joint Secretary*—

—*Senior Financial Committee Officer*—

INTRODUCTION

1, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee as authorised by the Committee do present on their behalf this Ninety-Seventh Report on Paragraph 5* of the Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1984-85—Union Government (Civil), Vol. II relating to Construction of 1296 dwelling units at Kishangarh by the Delhi Development Authority.

2. The Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1983-84—Union Government (Civil) was laid on the Table of the House on 7 May, 1986.

3. In this Report the Committee have pointed out that the Delhi Development Authority (DDA) undertook construction of 1296 dwelling units (DUs) under Self-Financing Scheme in 1982 under 3 schemes consisting of 768, 384 plus 48 and 96 units respectively. The construction work was to be completed within a period of 12 months. Even after spending Rs. 10.60 crores on construction, no dwelling unit could be allotted until November 1985. The abnormal delay in completing construction work has been stated to be due to structural defects, inadequate foundation of some of the dwelling units which was detected at a belated stage when four storeyed structure had been constructed, lack of essential basic amenities like sewage, water and electricity etc. indicating total lack of planning and unjustifiable delays in execution of work by some contractors. Besides other serious lapses that have come to light, the most painful aspect of execution work brought out had been criminal negligence and active connivance of the concerned officers of DDA who showed total callousness in the discharge of their duties. The very fact that inadequate foundation of some of the dwelling units could be detected only when four storeyed structure had been built is a clearly indicative of the total system failure in the Delhi Development Authority. The Committee have recommended that disciplinary action against the erring officials should be instituted, if not already instituted.

4. All the works awarded to various contractors for construction of 1296 DUs were required to be completed within 12 months from the date of commencement of work. However not even a single work was completed within the stipulated time schedule in spite of the fact the simplest type of construction was involved therein. The Committee have deplored, the delay in completion of construction works which ranged from 15 to 24 months. It has been pointed out that out of 768 flats completed in 2 lots of 384 each in October 1984 and June 1985, considered fit for allotment only in March 1986, only 525 were allotted and in these cases possession letters were issued only in 327 cases as on 11-3-1987. In 198 cases possession letters of units

*Appendix VI

allotted were still to be issued. It clearly indicate total lack of planning and perception which leads to corruption, red tapism and lack of awareness of time value of money on the part of DDA. The Committee have urged the Government to ensure that there is no avoidable delay in construction and allotment of dwelling units in future and assets created are put to productive use without avoidable loss of time. The Committee were informed that besides Kishangarh project, there were 74 other projects also whose construction was taken up prior to 31 December, 1983 but could not be completed till 31 May 1986 though the stipulation was to complete them within 12 months. The expenditure incurred upto 31 May 1986 on these projects was Rs. 5826 lakhs. The Committee noted with regret that physical performance in most of these cases has been tardy and not commensurate with the investment made. The Committee noted with regret that in spite of the fact that Delhi Development Authority undertook construction activities as early as 1967, it has not been able to enlist competent and dependable contractors to undertake construction of houses and continues to be at the mercy of unscrupulous contractors who can get away with poor quality of work due to totally callous supervision. The structures built by them in many cases are dangerous for human habitation and material used are sub-standard. The Committee have urged Delhi Development Authority to build up a cadre of efficient and competent contractors and streamline their own organisation to cut delays in execution of projects and also to ensure that these are executed in accordance with prescribed specification.

5. The Delhi Development Authority was intended primarily to act as an Urban Development Agency to plan, develop, distribute and regulate land in the Capital. However, the phenomenal population growth coupled with some historical factors made DDA's task much more complex than tackling the usual complexities of town building. As the DDA grew in size and capability to meet the public demand for large scale housing and other infrastructural needs, its ability to control development continue to diminish and its attempt to undertake implementation of plans on such a large scale without parallel gearing of its capabilities has resulted in present managerial crisis and total failure of system. The Committee are therefore of the opinion that there is urgent need for revamping and restructuring of the organisation to take up the challenge posed. In view of the fact that DDA find itself increasingly difficult to squarely meet the housing need of the ever increasing population of Delhi, the Committee consider that functions of DDA should be redefined.

6. The Public Accounts Committee examined the Audit Paragraph at their sittings held on 17 December 1986 and 28 January 1987.

7. The Committee considered and finalised this Report at their sitting held on 23 April 1987. The Minutes of the sittings form Part II* of the Report.

8. For reference, facility and convenience, the observations and recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report and have been reproduced in a consolidated form in Appendix VII to the Report.

*Not printed (One cyclostyled copy laid on the Table of the House and Five copies placed in Parliament Library).

9. The Committee express their thanks to the Officers of the Ministry of Urban Development and Delhi Development Authority for cooperation extended by them.

10. The Committee also 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.

NEW DELHI;
April 27, 1987

E. AYYAPU REDDY,
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

Vaisakha 7, 1909 (S)

REPORT

(BASED ON PARA 5* OF THE REPORT OF C&AG OF INDIA FOR THE YEAR 1984-85 (CIVIL), VOL II, UNION GOVERNMENT)

(i) *Introductory*

The Delhi Development Authority (DDA) undertook the construction of 1296 dwelling units (DUs) under the Self-Financing Scheme (SFS) at Kishangarh (Vasant Kunj) under 3 schemes consisting of 768, 384 plus 48 and 96 units respectively. The construction work of these 1296 DUs was awarded through 8 different contracts. The scheme of 768 units was divided into 4 groups of 192 units each. The contracts were awarded in June 1982 to four contractors with the approval of Work Advisory Board (WAB) at negotiated rate of 85.57%, 88.25%, 89% and 89.80% respectively above the estimated cost of 84.78 lakhs for each group against the justified rate of 78 percent worked out by the DDA. The works were awarded in anticipation of Administrative Approval and Expenditure Sanction which was subsequently received in May 1983 for Rs. 12.38 crores in respect of 768 DUs. Administrative Approval and Expenditure Sanction for the remaining 480+48 DUs was still awaited (July 1985).

(ii) *Administrative Approval*

2. The construction of 1296 Dwelling Units was taken up in anticipation of administrative approval and expenditure sanction. Sanction for 768 DUs was subsequently received but in respect of the remaining 480+48 DUs the sanction was still awaited. The reasons for not according Administrative Approval and Economic Sanction for this work was stated to be due to priority attached to execution of these works under self-financing scheme and "due to heavy workload of relevant times." It has also been stated that the Primary Estimates in respect of these schemes have since been completed and necessary administrative approval and expenditure sanction was being obtained. At the instance of the Committee, the Ministry of Urban Development furnished details (Appendix I) of works under execution in DDA without administrative approval and expenditure sanction as on 1 April, 1986.

3. It would be seen that 148 works tendered at the cost of Rs. 152 crores have been under execution without administrative approval and expenditure sanction. Of these 2, 5, 13, 7 and 34 cases pertained to the years 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983 and

*Appendix VI

1984 respectively. The reasons for abnormal delay in this regard in these cases are stated to be as under :—

“In some cases works were taken up in anticipation of A/A and E/S. The estimates were prepared there after and forwarded to Finance. In most of the cases the estimates were returned to the concerned officers for giving some clarifications. This took considerable time particularly because the officers did not pursue the matter: as works were already taken up. Now, strict instructions have been issued that no work should be taken up without obtaining A/A & E/S first.”

(iii) *Award of Contracts*

4. The construction of 4 pockets each containing 192 dwelling units was awarded at rates ranging from 85.57 to 89.80 percent above the estimated cost as against the justified rates of 78 percent above the estimated cost worked out by the Department. The Committee desired to know why contracts were awarded at rates which were high by 7.57% to 11.80% than the justified rates worked out by the Delhi Development Authority. In reply, the Ministry of Urban Development in a note stated :

“Contracts were awarded sometime in June-July 1982 with the approval of Works Advisory Board at negotiated rates ranging from 85.57% to 89.80 above DSR 1977 after taking into account the actual prevailing rates of bricks and other materials. The justified rate of 78% was worked out at the time of receipt of tenders on the basis of Delhi Administration Control rate of Rs. 215.07 per 1000 Nos. bricks. This rate did not include the rate of carriage of bricks to site. The rate of bricks was revised by Delhi Administration to Rs. 257.87 per 1000 Nos. (excluding cartage) in May 1982. At the time of award of works, the market rate of bricks varied from Rs. 350/- to 360/- per 1000 Nos. (including cartage). The increase in rate of bricks enhanced the justification from 78% to the range of 84.20% to 84.94%. Consequently the difference between justified rates and awarded rates narrowed down to the range of 1.92% to 3.89% only.”

(iv) *Laxity in Supervision of Works*

5. The Audit have pointed out that the works executed contained serious defects like structural unsoundness, inadequate foundations, cracked walls, weak RCC and weak mortar, etc. In the case of work executed through contractor 'A', the depth of the foundation was found to be ranging from 0.5 metre to 0.8 metre as against the actual requirement of 1.2 metres and beyond, width of foundation ranged from 0.6 metre to 0.715 metre instead of 0.750 metre to 1.1 metres. The works executed by different contractors also had less serious defects like bad workmanship and defective flushdoor, shutters, etc. Some of these were noticed by the Quality Control Wing of the DDA during their inspections conducted on 12 January, 1 October and 3 December 1983.

6. In view of these facts the Committee desired to know the responsibilities of supervisory staff at various stages viz. Junior Engineer/Assistant Engineer/ Executive Engineer and Superintending Engineer, etc. regarding supervision, checking and test-checking of work during execution to ensure specification and quality of work. In reply the Ministry of Urban Development in a note have stated that responsibilities regarding supervision, checking and test-checking of works by various officers are similar as prescribed in CPWD Code and Manuals. etc. These have been summarised in letter No. 18/1/78-W (E-in-C)/CPR/13/78 dated 10 March 1978 from V.R. Vaish, Director General (Works), C.P.W.D., New Delhi, addressed to all concerned including Ministry of Works and Housing as detailed below :—

- (a) Time over-runs could be minimised only by having a well-thought out programme and instituting a system of control by which progress is checked from time to time against the programme and corrective measures taken.
- (b) A course scale programme of this type should be prepared at the preliminary planning stage and should be attached to the preliminary estimates.
- (c) The Critical Path Method of programming is ideally suited for non-repetitive works. The production Time Technique can advantageously be adopted for repetitive construction and the Time of balance. Technique can be used for controlling the progress on repetitive types of works.
- (d) More refresher courses should be arranged for training of all levels of officers on 'Programming and Progress control' methods.
- (e) Control over quality is to be in-build in the architectural and structural design.
- (f) A comprehensive study of the plans for building projects by a composite team, construction architect, structural engineer, design engineer, Electrical and Service Engineer is essential to improve functional efficiency and accuracy. Scheme costing over Rs. 50 lakhs should be vetted by a Committee consisting of E-in-C, Chief Architects, CE (CDO), CE (Elect.) Chief Engineer and the Sr. Architect concerned with the works. Other schemes can be vetted by a Committee consisting of the concerned CE, SE, SSW & SE (E). Adequate testing facilities should be built up. To start with two laboratories must be set up at Calcutta and the other at Madras to carry out necessary mandatory tests incorporated in the revised specifications of works.
- (g) The responsibility for control over quality at site is to be pinpointed. A scheme as given below has been suggested for this purpose which puts emphasis on stage inspection.

Scheme of Quality Control Works

I. Materials	Authority responsible for inspection
Sand, stone, metal & chips, bricks, glass panes.	J.E.
Timber, paints, manufactured doors and windows, doors and windows fittings, sanitary fittings.	A.E.
Electrical Fittings	A.E. (E)
II. Items of works	
(i) foundations upto plinth	A.E.
(ii) brick masonry	J.E.
(iii) counterling and shuttering for RCC works reinforcement & concrete	A.E.
(iv) flooring, plastering and painting	J.E.
(v) Joints in pipes, slopes of slabs of rooms, varandah and terrace etc.	A.E.
(vi) General quality of work with particular reference to lines and levels, adherence to architectural and levels/ adherence to architectural details	Sr. Architect/ Architect/EE.
(vii) Electrical Wiring, layout of points and switches.	EE(E)
(h) Depending upon the magnitude and importance of works, the AE or the EE as the case may be, should be available at site. A well equipped site office should be put up which should function as a control room with all drawings of the project, programmes and progress control charts etc. properly displayed.	

7. The Committee enquired how far these instructions were actually observed by the Supervisory staff. In reply, the Ministry in a note stated as under :—

“It is obvious that the said requirements were not actually observed by officers supervising the work, and lack of supervision resulted in inadequate foundations, etc. The matter is under investigation with the CBI/Vigilance Deptt. of DDA for fixing the responsibility for the lapse.... These instructions pinpoint the level of inspection necessary and extent of supervision needed at different levels in insuring proper quality of works and materials and form part of the procedural checks and supervision aimed at in DDA also.”

8. Replying a query from the Committee regarding responsibility of officers entrusted with the supervision of quality of works executed, the Secretary, Urban Development stated in evidence :—

"The quality aspect to be looked into primarily by the officers who are engaged in construction. It is for the each officer to supervise the construction. Primarily, it is their duty to ensure quality of construction, quality of material used, quality of the work conformity to design, etc. Now, the quality control wing is charged with the responsibility of doing sample checking in each of the works which are selected on a random basis to see whether the quality control norms are being followed."

9. Supplementing the point further, the witness added:—

".....I would like to say that in this case, there had been gross negligence and lack of supervision."

10. The Committee enquired about the investigations made by the CBI in the case. In reply, the Secretary, Urban Development stated during evidence:—

"Regarding the limited question of 192 deficient dwelling units, the CBI is investigating. They are seized of the matter. No report has yet been received."

11. Replying a query from the Committee about the action taken against the two Superintending Engineers, the Secretary, Urban Development, stated in evidence]:—

"Of the two Superintending Engineers, one Shri Biswas has been repatriated to the parent Department. According to the Vigilance Manual, when CBI inquiry is on, no parallel action is taken. So no formal departmental action has yet been initiated against him."

12. The Committee asked whether the DDA had recommended to the parent Department of the Superintending Engineer to place him under suspension in view of the grave charges of misconduct against him when he was repatriated to his parent Department, the Vice-Chairman, DDA, replied :—

"We have not recommended."

13. The Committee enquired if any Enquiry Officer has been appointed to investigate the charges against the Officers who have been placed under suspension. The Chief Vigilance Officer, DDA, replied in evidence:—

"No such officer is yet appointed in their case."

14. In view of the fact that suspension cannot normally exceed six months and its very purpose will be defeated if there is delay in appointing the Enquiry Officer, the Committee enquired about the reasons for delay in appointing Enquiry Officer, the witness replied :—

"There are other officers also, who have been repatriated. In their case, we have to take the advice of the Central Vigilance Commission. Otherwise, they cannot be issued charge-sheets."

15. Replying a query from the Committee, the Secretary, Urban Development, stated during evidence that DDA Officers were suspended on 29-5-85. The reference to CBI was made on 18-6-85. The CBI had registered a case on 10-9-85 and till now they have not filed a charge-sheet nor have they advised DDA to suspend the concerned officers.

16. Sharing the Committee's concern on the abnormal delay in investigation by the CBI, the Vice-Chairman, DDA assured the Committee as under :—

“We will pursue this matter further.”

17. The Committee enquired whether the responsibility for lapses on the part of officials has been fixed. The Ministry of Urban Development in a subsequent note have stated that there were a number of works relating to C/o 1296 SFS DUs at Kishangarh. Out of these, the following two works involved vigilance angle. C/o. 768 DUs SH, C/o 192 DUs at Kishangarh Pkt. C. Gr. I Contractor M/s. Mittal Builders, C/o 768 DUs SH : C/o 192 DUs at Kishangarh Pkt. C Gr. II Contractor M/s. Uppal Engg. & Consn. Co. Pvt. Ltd.

“As regards (I) The Inspection report dt. 17-2-84 of Sh. Jaswant Singh, EE HD. VIII brought out that the foundation work of c/o 192 SFS houses at Kishangarh was not in accordance with the structural drawings issued by the SSW(I) and that *prima facie* it had been established that overpayment for the foundation work had been made and false measurements recorded by the J.E. incharge.

A preliminary enquiry in the matter was conducted by Sh. K. B. Rajoria, CE. On the basis of the said report the following officers were found responsible for lapses/defects in the said works:—

S/Shri

1. R. A. Khemani, CE
2. Vijay Kumar, EE
3. I. J. Mehta, JE
4. A. K. Singhal, JF
5. N. B. Pillai, JE
6. B. K. Biswas, SE
7. R. K. Garg, AE
8. H. D. Sharma, SE
9. Arjun Lal, Divisional Acctt.

Further action in this case will be possible after receipt of replies from the officers who have been repatriated for which the matter is constantly being pursued with the concerned Deptt./Min. recently vide DO letter dt. 17-2-87 the Secy., Ministry of Urban Development has been requested by the V. C. to place S/Shri B. K. Biswas, SE and R. K. Garg, AE also under suspension. Response to the same is still awaited.

As regards the work executed by M/s. Uppal Engg. Co. Pvt. Ltd., the inspection of the work was conducted by the QC Wing of DDA in March, 1983 apart from serious defects relating to weak cement mortar and weak RCC in columns, it was also pointed out that overpayment on account of secured advance was made as also no action for the recovery of the said overpayment of secured advance was taken. The following officers were held responsible :

S/Shri

1. Jaswant Singh, EE
2. Vijay Kumar, EE
3. S. K. Nanda, AE
4. R. K. Garg, AE
5. V. S. Rawat, AE
6. P. S. Jain, AE
7. K. D. Sharma, JE
8. B. S. Manik, JE
9. B. B. Yadav, JE
10. Shakil Ahmed, JE.

Explanation memos have been issued on 5-1-87 to the above officers except Sh. Vijay Kumar, Sh. Jaswant Singh, EE & Sh. R. K. Garg, AE. Sh. Vijay Kumar is under suspension since 29-5-85 and Sh. Jaswant Singh and Sh. R. K. Garg were repatriated to CPWD. The memo in r/o Sh. Vijay Kumar has been sent through CE (SWZ) on 22-1-87. Memos in r/o S/Shri Jaswant Singh, EE & R. K. Garg, AE have been sent through CPWD on 27-1-87. Sh. B.S. Manik, AE has also been placed under suspension vide orders dated 28-1-87. Charges memos consisted the following three charges :—

1. Overpayment of secured advance during the currency of the work before inspection of quality control.
2. Non-recovery of the overpayment of secured advance in the subsequent bills even after pointing out of this fact by the Q.C. Cell.
3. A number of major defects in the work observed during the inspection of Q.C.

Further action in the case will be taken when reply from all the above officers are received."

18. Clarifying the point, the Secretary, Urban Development, stated in evidence:—

"Eight Officers right from Chief Engineer, Superintending Engineer, Executive Engineer, Assistant Engineer and Junior Engineer have been suspended and vigilance cases have been taken. In certain cases, Audit have also indicated that some defects were found. Some of the cases will be looked into and if defects are serious enough, that will be taken and reported to the Committee."

19. The Committee asked about the age of the Chief Engineer at the time of his compulsory retirement and enquired whether compulsory retirement in his case was adequate punishment to match the lapses committed by him. The Ministry of Urban Development in a note have stated:—

“The date of birth of Sh. R. A. Khemani is 15-1-1934 and he was retired under FRB 56 (j) on 25-12-85. The decisions in this regard was taken by the Competent Authority on the basis of the recommendation of the review committee. The review committee took all the facts and circumstances into account and came to the conclusion that action under rule 56 (j) was warranted. Incidentally the action under rule 56 (j) is not deemed to be a punishment or a stigma.”

20. The Audit have stated that payments had been made for the full quantities as per specification though the execution was far much less quantities. This shows that the quantities executed were not noted in the records of DDA after actual measurements and payments were made for fictitious quantities. In this context, the Committee desired to know the quantum of overpayment made and why this could not be avoided. In reply, the Ministry in a note stated as under:—

“Random checks were exercised by excavating the foundations. It was found that against a designed depth of 1.00 m, actual depth at site varied from 0.345 Metre to 1.015 Metres. The designed width varied from 0.75 Metre to 1.100 Metres whereas it was actually found to vary from 0.610 Metres to 0.840 Metres. Based on the average difference between the actual and designed section, the quantum of overpayment on account of foundations is Rs. 1.50 lakhs app. However, the detailed investigations in this regard are being made by the C. T. E. on a reference from CBI, who are investigating this case. The overpayment could have been avoided had the supervisory staff been vigilant.”

21. Asked about it in evidence, the Secretary, Urban Development, replied:—

“That is why all these people have been suspended. The work actually executed was much less than what was entered in the measurement book. Therefore, the book was manipulated. The volume of work was actually less on the ground. This is one of the points for criminal investigation.”

22. The Ministry of Urban Development in a subsequent note furnished at the instance of the Committee have stated that both the contractors involved namely M/s. Mittal Builders and M/s. Uppal Engineering Construction Co. Pvt. Ltd., whose construction works were found to be defective, have been debarred from tendering in DDA and an intimation to this effect has been sent to Haryana P.W.D. (B&R) where these contractors were originally registered.”

23. The Committee asked why inadequate foundation could not be detected earlier i.e., before completing 75% of the work. In reply, the Ministry stated as under:—

"The defect of inadequate foundations could not be detected due to lack of proper supervision at the relevant time."

24. The case was referred to Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi, in March 1984 for their expert advice and a fee of Rs. 47,000/- was paid to them. A further sum of Rs. 50,000/- was paid to them for checking and approval of designs for strengthening of all Blocks and for conducting load test for one Block. The final method for strengthening of foundation was evolved in December 1985.

25. The Committee desired to know the strengthening measures that have been adopted. In reply, the Ministry stated that the work has been abandoned by M/s. Mittal Builders since May, 1985. The tenders received at the risk and cost of the contractor are under consideration. The requisite strengthening measures as per Vaish Committee recommendation for similar defects, will be done at the risk and cost of the original contractor. The expenditure so incurred for strengthening shall be recoverable from M/s. Mittal Builders.

26. The Committee desired to know the reasons for delay in award of contract and for how long tenders were under consideration. The Ministry in a subsequent note stated :

"The tender for the balance work was first called on 11-11-85 and received on 28-12-85. The rate of the lowest contract was however, considered to be on higher side and therefore, the same was rejected. Tenders were recalled on 16-5-86 and received on 4-6-86. Generally the response for this type of work, which is carried at the risk and cost of other agency is very poor. The work was awarded on 9-10-86 after detailed scrutiny and negotiations and same is in progress."

27. The Committee were informed subsequently that the work for strengthening of foundations has since been taken up and it will be completed by 31 March, 1987.

28. Asked about the expenditure involved in rectification of defects, the Ministry stated :

"Estimated cost for rectification of all defects is estimated to be Rs. 31.00 lakhs approx."

29. Clarifying the point further in evidence, the Deputy Chairman, DDA, stated that "this estimate was for 32 DUs. Work for foundation strengthening and removal of other defects has to be carried out on 128 DUs. This cost will have to be borne by the contractor."

30. The Committee desired to know whether defective RCC slab has since been replaced, the Ministry in a note have stated :

"The strengthening of foundation for their block is yet to be done. Defective RCC slab may have to be dismantled and relaid after the foundations of this block are strengthened."

31. The Ministry also stated that "balance work will be taken up after completion of the strengthening of foundations."

32. Commenting on the defects in works pointed out in Audit Para, the Engineer Member, DDA at the instance of the Committee stated in evidence :

"The defects in this building are of three categories. First, of course, is about the structural thing, and the second thing is about the materials used in the work and the third thing is about finishing. Finishing can always be rectified. Structural things and foundations are most important. That I want to take care of. In this case there are some items which are below the ground and there are some defects above the ground level which are open for inspection and quality control. As far as the foundations are concerned, the defect that has occurred is that supervision at some level has been lax. The directions have been given at two points. One is at what level the foundation is to be done. The second point is whether the ground at the final excavation is the same thing for which the design has been prepared. What happened in this case is that when the ground was undulating, they have excavated 4 feet depth but for levelling the top soil is to be chopped up with the result that the foundation has come to the ground level. Somebody else should have guided the man at the sight.

The second thing is, complete failure in following the structural drawings. They have laid much less width in foundation. This fact has come to our notice. I mean to the notice of the officials in the Department only. The foundation laid is much narrower than what it should have been and much shallower than what it should have been. In this matter the DDA thought of getting the advice from outsiders. We have come to the conclusion that this can be strengthened by putting up bored piles. In big building projects we have much bigger things, but in these buildings we have much smaller things. We examined whether it can stand the test. This proved successful. We have decided with the help of IIT and others at what places these piles are to be located. Apart from this, during the process of construction at intermediate stages the piles are tested. This is only in the process of our doing the work. We are not satisfied with just doing the work. After that and in between also we want to subject the entire building to limeload. We want to load all floors simultaneously to the maximum and find out whether the building is safe or not. We want to make them stronger than what they should be. I definitely feel that as far as this is concerned, there has been a lapse on our part.

The other question is, at what level these are to be approved. One is the structural aspect and the second is about the quality. By structural aspect, I mean, whether the concrete that has been done is strong or not. The other is about specification. Whether this is being done or not has

to be checked up at the lower level. In this specification control we rely on the junior engineers. We have got to take a different level for taking important decision. The Chief also cannot approved unless a load test is made in different buildings.

I will come to the next level, about the ground level. At the ground level there are some defects which have come to our notice by testing with hammer or rebound hammer. In these cases, the RCC columns are found to come out. We are satisfying ourselves by making a load test. All these things are being done. I asked the staff to make a complete history of what we are making. Not only we are satisfied with initial test, but specification tests in process also are going to be made for our satisfaction.

As far as the structure is concerned, we want to make the structure stronger than what it should be to restore the confidence of the public. These quarters will be occupied only after every defective block is fully tested by us."

33. Clarifying the point further in evidence, the Deputy Chairman, DDA stated that "this estimate was for 32 DUs. Work for foundation strengthening and removal of other defects has to be carried out on 128 DUs. This cost will have to be borne by the contractor".

34. The Committee desired to know whether defective RCC slab has since been replaced, the Ministry in a note have stated:—

"The strengthening of foundation for their block is yet to be done. Defective RCC slab may have to be dismantled and re-laid after the foundations of this block are strengthened."

35. The Ministry also stated that "balance work will be taken up after completion of the strengthening of foundations."

(v) *Delay in execution of works*

36. The works awarded to various contractors were required to be completed within 12 months from the date of commencement. However, the Audit have pointed out that none of these works has been executed within stipulated time. The work awarded to contractor B was completed in October 1984 i.e., after 15 months of stipulated date. Works awarded to contractor D were 99 and 97 per cent complete when last Running Account Bill was paid to the contractor in June 1985. Works in respect of 480 DUs on which expenditure of Rs. 258.66 lakhs had been incurred till July 1985, had been held up at various stages due to poor workmanship, inadequate foundation or slow progress of works by the contractors. Construction of 48 DUs was suspended in December 1983 due to stay orders and construction had not been resumed till November 1985.

37. In view of these facts, the Committee enquired why the DDA stipulated a period of one year for completion when the works could not be completed in that period. In reply, the Engineer Member, DDA, stated during evidence :

"We go according to the standards laid down by the CPWD. In normal conditions, this can be done in one year. But so many problems crop up. Otherwise the stipulated period is not unrealistic. Even tougher works were completed in four or five months time."

38. In reply to a further query from the Committee the witness further added as under :

"I would like to mention that these particular buildings are not of a difficult type. On the other hand, they are being founded on rock, which is a very good soil for construction of dwellings. From a professional point of view of an engineer, these are the simplest type of construction. Things went wrong only because of inadequate supervision or no supervision at all."

39. The Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development informed the Committee during evidence that "all the contracts were supposed to be completed within a period of one year. For the contract awarded in July 1982, the stipulated date of completion was July 1983.

40. The Committee, therefore, desired to know the reasons for abnormal delay in completion of works. In reply, a representative of DDA stated during evidence :

"There was a delay on account of land not being available in certain places Serial No. 1 was awarded to Mittal Builders in June 1982. The work was to be over in one year. It was going on. Then, inadequate foundations were detected and we have debarred him."

41. The delay has been attributed *inter-alia* to the late receipt of structural drawings and change of site etc. In this context, the Committee desired to know the extent of delay in supplying drawings and the reasons therefor. In reply, representative of the Delhi Development Authority stated in evidence :—

"The Tenders were called in April and we have awarded the work in the last week of June. We have taken two months to process the work. The drawings were supplied to them on 28-7-1982. Actually the drawings should be made available within ten days of the award of work."

42. At the instance of the Committee witness further clarified that only structural foundation drawing was given. In the issue of the lay-out drawing there was a problem due to some stay order to of a court. . . . There was a mango tree we did not get the clearance for cutting the mango tree.

43. Asked about the reasons for change of site, the witness replied as under :

"We had all the sites in possession. We had changed the sites for 96 units. These 96 houses formed part of six blocks. One block could not be done because

of the mango tree. Because of a stay order we had to stop the work in the other five. Later we have given them the alternative site for 5 blocks instead of six."

44. Thus, it would be seen that even after incurring an expenditure of Rs. 1060 lakhs till July, 1985 on the construction of 1296 dwelling units at Kishangarh, no dwelling units could be allotted [uptill November, 1985 on account of structural defects, inadequate foundation and non-availability of essential basic amenities.

45. Explaining the latest position of completed houses the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development at the instance of the Committee stated during evidence as under :—

"The total number of dwelling units are 1296, out of which 768 are complete, work is in progress in 336 and 192 are under litigation, that is contractor has filed a suit because he had not done the work satisfactorily. The measurement were taken again and the work was to be restarted. He has filed a case."

46. The Committee asked when construction of 768 houses was completed. In reply, the Ministry of Urban Development in a note stated :

"These 768 houses were completed in two lots of 384 each, in October 1984 and June 1985 except for final finishing items, fixing of fittings, electrical items etc. which are fixed at the time of handing over of possession of the flats. However, these houses were declared for allotment in March 1986 after availability of services."

47. Asked why these units were not allotted as soon as the construction was completed and when it is expected to allot the remaining 406 (768-362) dwelling units, the Ministry have furnished the following details of flats at Kishangarh :

1. No. of flats completed	768
2. Flats allotted	525
	243

Balance :

3. Possession letters issued as on 11-3-1987	327
4. Balance flats where possession have not been issued	525—327= 198

48. It has further been stated that possession letters to these allottees will be issued as and when they complete the formalities regarding payment of interest, balance payment of instalments, submission of documents. "Out of 243 flats which were available, 217 have now been allotted by shifting of allottees of Vasant Kunj from Sectors/Pockets where flats were not coming up. Remaining 26 flats are being allotted to the eligible persons."

49. The reasons for delay in completion of 336 dwelling units are stated to be as under :—

- (i) 192 DU's—Contractor—A.....strengthening of Inadequate foundations is in progress.

- (ii) 96 DU's — Contractor-A — The remaining work is in progress at the risk and cost of Contractor-A who abandoned the work.
- (iii) 48 DU's — Contractor-F — work, held up due to land dispute, has since been taken up and is in progress.

50. The Audit paragraph states that work of construction of 192 dwelling units lies at standstill since February 1984. In this context, the Committee desired to know the details of all works for construction of houses awarded upto 31-12-1983 by the DDA which could not be completed upto 31-5-1986. In reply the Ministry of Urban Development furnished details of 74 projects. Appendix (II) which were awarded upto 31-12-1983 and could not be completed upto 31-5-1986. The stipulated period for completion of each of these projects was one year. It would be seen that of the 74 works, six were awarded in 1980, 16 in 1981 and 29 in 1982. The estimated cost of these works was Rs. 3671 lakhs and tendered cost Rs. 6636 lakhs. The expenditure incurred on them upto 31 May, 1986 was Rs. 5826 lakhs. In a number of cases, balance work has not been awarded to any contractor for execution. It would also be seen that physical performance in most of these cases has not been commensurate with financial expenses incurred. In some cases works have been abandoned and in some cases the slow progress is due to reasons attributable to the contractor. In this context, the Committee desired to know the reasons for this unsatisfactory state of affairs and the steps that are being taken to get the work expedited. In reply the Ministry of Urban Development in a note have stated :

“The major reason for delay was due to poor capacity and incompetence of the contractors and abandonment of works by some contractors. As some contractors did not produce proper progress, works had to be rescinded after giving proper notices. This process of rescinding and completing the works at the risk and cost of original contractor caused considerable delay as some formalities are needed in such cases.

Originally contractors registered with Haryana PWD were eligible for award of works in DDA. As the performance of the Haryana State PWD contractors was not found to be satisfactory, it was decided not to award works to contractors registered with State PWDs. Other reasons for delay were shortage of materials, delay in approval of drawings, delay in giving sites, etc. It has now been decided to take up works only after sites and approved drawings are available.”

51. It would be seen that construction of 192 DUs by contractor-B had commenced in July 1982 and was scheduled to be completed in 12 months. However these were completed in 28 months. The delay was attributed to non-availability of water, cement and structural drawings in the initial stages. The

Committee wanted to know why these could not be provided by DDA in time. In reply the Ministry stated that—

“There was acute shortage of cement throughout the country in the year 1982-83, which was beyond the control of DDA. The water for construction could not be obtained from local tubewells as the area was rocky. The water was, therefore, transported from a distance through tankers. Subsequently, a deep tubewell was bored through rocky starta which eased the situation. Non-availability of water locally was beyond the control of DDA, and, therefore, nothing better could be done. The total delay of about 3 months in issue of structural drawings at different stages was due to heavy work load at the relevant time in the SSW Wing as there was no separate design Wing in the DDA at that time.”

52. The Committee asked why steps were not taken earlier to get water through tankers to avoid delay. The Ministry in a note have stated that the contractor made an effort to drill a tubewell but it was not successful. The contractor also arranged water through tankers was found to be inadequate for constructional requirements. The difficulties were in the notice of the DDA and the DDA was also making its own effort side by side, to drill tube wells. As soon as DDA's tube-well was ready water was supplied to the contractor in the required quantities and recoveries were effected accordingly from his bills.

53. According to audit para, the delay of 2 years in completion of 192 DUs by contractor 'D' was due to late receipt of structural drawings, change of site, shortage of construction materials, funds, etc. The Committee enquired why the DDA could not envisage all these bottlenecks before taking up the work. In reply, the Ministry have stated as under :

“All those reasons for delay are such which could not be anticipated before taking up the works in hand. Tenders for the various works were fixed from time to time. All the works were not awarded at the same time and there are different groups and categories. It is clarified that preliminary work in connection with the fixing of tenders were taken up in advance. However, all steps are taken to see that by the time the work actually commenced on the ground, relevant structural drawings for each category are made available to the contractors and the field staff. There were some delays in starting some quarters because the relevant structural drawings were not available but the works were actually commenced on the ground only after receipt of the relevant structural drawings. The works that were taken up before the acceptance of tender were preparation of tender documents, preparation of material requirements, planning with civil authorities, creation of site facilities etc. etc.”

54. The Committee desired to know the reasons for structural drawings not being made available in time and asked why it was not possible to correlate the work of acceptance and preparation of tenders and preparation of structural

drawings. The Ministry of Urban Development in a subsequent note stated as under:—

“The delay in issue of structural drawing was due to heavy work load at the relevant time in the SSW wing as there was no separate design wing in the DDA at that time. Normally issue of structural drawings are so related that there is no hold up in execution of work after the award of work on invitation of tenders.”

55. The Audit Para states that the work of construction of 144 DUs by Contractor 'D' was technically examined by the Vigilance Commission during October 1984 and the following major structural defects were noticed :

- Cement mortar used in brick work did not have desired strength;
- Thickness of M.S. Sheet used in the manufacture of pressed steel door and door frames was less than specified;
- The girth of profile was less than specified. Binding of reinforcement was done in one direction and as such steel could not be considered as tightly held in position;
- Rocking of joints in brick was not done during course of laying brick work;
- Cement concrete used in foundation had no strength and mostly fine sand was found;
- Stone ballast was over-sized etc.

56. The Chief Engineer suggested investigation [and strengthening of many RCC columns with the help of CRI, CERI, IIT, etc.

57. The Committee asked if the strength of concrete in RCC column has been got checked from these agencies like CRI, IIT etc., as suggested by the CE and if so, what were the findings of these Agencies. In reply, the Ministry in a note stated :

“the matter has been referred to the Director(IIT),(CBRI),(CRI) on 6-8-86 for assessing the strength of RCC columns. Necessary remedial measures and follow-up action shall be taken after the receipt of report.”

58. Evidently, the matter has been referred to these agencies only after the para has been taken by the Committee for their examination. In this context, the Committee asked why it was not referred to these agencies earlier, the Ministry have replied;

“The Quality control Wing suggested obtaining expert advice from CERI, CRI and IIT in 1984 regarding strengthening of columns. Meanwhile the contractor suspended the work in 5/85 and accordingly the contract was rescinded on 5-11-1985. It is correct that the reference to the agencies could have been made earlier. This was in no way linked with the PAC taking up this para.”

59. The Committee wanted to know when rectification of defects would be carried out. The Ministry in reply stated:

"The rectification work is in progress."

60. The progress of work of construction of 192 DUs started in July 1982 by contractor C was slow. Therefore, the Executive Engineer rescinded the contract in December 1983. The Fact Finding Committee (Vaish Committee) and Quality Control Wing⁵ of DDA which visited the sites pointed out serious structural defects and found the execution below specification. The Vaish Committee inspected 26 housing projects including Kishangarh housing complex at various locations in Delhi where housing projects were under execution.

61. The general impression gathered by the Committee was that the quality of work in most of the houses was very poor. There were common defects in most of the houses and no emphasis on quality of construction. According to this Report contractors as well as Engineers Incharge perhaps got the impression that they can do bad work and got away with it. "No one seemed to have been bothered about the structural safety of the houses. In case of 4 storeyed houses built with 9" walls on all floors lot of precautions have to be taken to satisfy the I.S. Code regarding masonry and earthquake forces. The Architects and Design Engineers seemed to have ignored the basic requirements of these codes. The Engineer-Incharge of supervision have also completely ignored the normal norms of sound construction of a building and the result has been that some of the house as built are not structurally sound." The quality of work in the following housing projects has been found to be particularly very poor.

- (i) 130 DU's of S.F.S. Houses at Gulabi Bagh contractor-V, Mittal & Sons.
- (ii) 96 DU's of MIG & 96 DU's of LIG flats in Dilshad Garden, Shahdara Contractor—M/s. Raj Construction.
- (iii) 224 DU's of S. F. S. Houses—Pocket B, (Sodella Extn.) Vikaspuri—Contractor Vee Aar Builders.
- (iv) S. F. S. Houses at East of Kailash, Contractor—Rishi Economics.
- (v) Constructions of 1092 Janta Type Houses at Paschimpuri—Contractor En Kay Construction.
- (vi) 194 DU's S. F.S. at Malviya Nagar Extn., Saket. Contractor—M/s. S. P. Chaudhary.
- (vii) 204 DU's of S.F.S. at Malviya Nagar Extn., Saket—Contractor—Dipson & Co.
- (viii) Construction of 208 mixed MIG and LIG Flats at Pritam Pura Group—I. Contractor Om Singh & Co.
- (ix) Constructions of MIG & LIG Flats at Pritam Pura Group-III. Contractor Parkash Sharma.
- (x) Construction of 160 S. F.S. houses at Shalimar Bagh Contractor Sunder Lal Khatri and Sons.

(xi) Construction of 960 houses at Lawrence Road, Contractor—M/s. Hans Raj Constructions.

(xii) 320 MIG DU's at Jahangir Puri, Contractor—W.S. Construction Co.

(xiii) Construction of 168 MIG. 56 LIG houses at Trilokpuri, Group A, Pocket-I, Contractor—M/s. Gujarat Construction Co.

62. The Vaish Committee Report further states that—

“even though the above are cases of exceptionally poor quality the Committee has observed generally poor quality of work in all the housing schemes which will have to be improved by appropriate strengthening measures. The strengthening measures have to be taken in almost all the houses, and special attention has to be given for the above exceptionally poor quality works.”

63. While concluding that “quality of the construction was very poor” the Committee was of the view that “any strengthening and improvements carried out at this stage however—well done would still be only a compromise when compared to a proper construction from the very beginning carried out in accordance with laid down specifications and codes of practice. “The remedial or strengthening measures recommended by the Committee in this report are the barest minimum under the circumstances. Even to achieve this degree of improvement it is most important that the various measures are fully understood and assiduously implemented in the field, the structures are properly tested for safety and it is ensured that all steps are taken as recommended in this report.”

64. The Committee asked whether the balance work has been awarded to any other agency for execution. The Ministry of Urban Development in reply have stated that “the matter is still subjudice as questions of finalisation of list of material lying at site and disputed measurements have been referred to the Arbitrator by High Court Delhi for award. Hence, action to award the balance work cannot be initiated at this stage.”

65. The Ministry have further informed the Committee in reply to another query that the contract for balance work shall be finalised after the decision in this regard. However a tentative claim has been worked out for Rs. 12.60 lacs to be preferred before the Arbitrator. This claim forms a part of Rs. 56.45 lacs. Contractor has also filed claim of Rs. 8.76 lack before the arbitrator. Besides, contractor as well as DDA have also asked for interest on the claimed amounts.

66. The Committee asked how the defects pointed out by the Quality Control Wing and Vaish Committee were not noticed by the concerned DDA Engineers who got the work executed and supervised the same. In reply, the Ministry of Urban Development have stated as under :

“Most of the defects observed by the Quality Control Wing and Vaish Committee were not very different from those already pointed out to the contractor from time to time by supervisory staff as these defects were

mainly of workmanship. However some additional defects pointed out by Quality Control Wing and Vaish Committee escaped immediate notice of the site staff, probably due to overloading of Units at the relevant period as already brought out in the conclusions of the Vaish Committee report itself. It may be added that rectification work was in progress simultaneously with the over-all progress of work and to ensure full rectification by the contractor, part rates were paid and sufficient amounts were withheld."

(vi) *Delay in providing Basic Amenities*

67. The Audit have pointed out that essential basic amenities like sewerage, water supply and electricity could had not been provided and therefore, houses constructed at enormous cost not be allotted. The DDA did not take timely action to provide these essential services concurrently with the construction of the Dwelling Units. Consequently, 656 dwelling units which were complete to the extent of 93 to 100 per cent with an expenditure of Rs. 692.95 lakhs upto July 1985 could not be allotted to the registered applicants. The Committee desired to know the efforts made by DDA to coordinate and monitor with MCD and DESU to provide these facilities simultaneously with the completion of the Dwelling Units. The Ministry of Urban Development in a note stated :

"DDA pursued with MCD and DESU for provision of services like water supply, sewerage and electricity, no sooner the DDA took up the construction work. It is only with the DDA's persistent efforts that DESU finally provided electricity. Regarding water supply and sewerage, in spite of persistent efforts, no help came from MCD. Finally, DDA had to make its own arrangements for water supply and also for interim sewerage treatment."

68. At the instance of the Committee, the Ministry of Urban Development furnished the details of correspondence made with the Municipal Corporation, Delhi and Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking to arrange services of water supply, sewerage and electricity to the houses built at Kishangarh (Appendix III & IV). The Ministry also stated :

"The water supply has been arranged from six tube-wells bored in Ghitorni area, where sufficient good quality of water has been found. The total expenditure for bringing the water supply from Ghitorni tubewell is approx. Rs. 40 lacs. In regard to sewage disposal, interim arrangements for sewage treatment has been made by providing oxidation ditches. The oxidation ditches provided for Sector-A has been designed to cater to about 3000 DUs. The cost of providing sewage disposal treatment works out to Rs. 45 lacs approx. i.e electrical works. As DESU has provided the electricity no extra expenditure has been incurred by the DDA on this account. It is stated here that no part of the expenditure incurred for providing water supply from Ghitorni tubewells or providing sewage

treatment arrangements is likely to be rendered infructuous. It is a known fact that there is an acute shortage of water in Delhi, and MCD is also supplementing its resources from tubewells and there is no other source of water supply with the MCD for these areas. These tubewells along with water supply, will be finally taken over by the MCD as and when they take over the services. Likewise, there is no scheme of providing sewage treatment arrangements for the Vasant Kunj and surrounding area by the MCD in the near future. The location and size of the sewage treatment plant which will ultimately cater to this area is yet to be decided by the MCD and thus, MCD facilities for sewage treatment may not be available for next 5 to 10 years. The oxidation ditches provided in Sector—'A' will, therefore, be utilised fully till such time MCD's treatment plant is installed and starts functioning. The MCD has been approving sewerage schemes in development areas with a condition that interim sewage treatment arrangements like oxidation pond, oxidation ditches etc. shall be made by the developing agency pending availability of MCD's final disposal arrangements. The expenditure for providing oxidation ditches is, therefore, in no way a wasteful expenditure to be considered as infructuous at any stage."

(vii) *Quality Control*

69. To ensure quality of works executed, the DDA set up a Quality Control Cell in 1982 when massive construction work for Asiad was taken up. Prior to it, all through the period since 1967 when DDA started constructing houses, quality checks were carried out by Chief Technical Examiner under Central Vigilance Commission. The Vice-Chairman, DDA stated in evidence that in the first few years, the number of houses built was about 8000 houses, per year; subsequently, it was raised to 10-12 thousand a year. By 1982 when Quality Control Cell was set up, DDA had built up about 1.25 lakh house. In this connection, the Committee enquired whether checking by the Chief Technical Examiner was as extensive as carried out by the Quality Control Cell, the witness replied :

"No sir, they were doing checks for the CPWD and others. Our quota was very little."

70. In reply to a query whether it was a lapse in not having an adequately staffed Quality Control Wing in DDA since the DDA works became perceptible, the witness replied :

"We must realise that quality control is the second check. The primary responsibility is of the immediate supervisory officer. It was only after the total magnitude of the work reached a certain stage and certain defects were noticed that we realised the necessity of an external agency and a second check. It was then that the DDA set up the quality control

cell in 1982. When the need was felt, it came into being and over the years, it kept on getting strengthened and sharpened."

71. He further added :—

"The quantum of work was very small earlier. There were not many complaints in pre-Asiad time."

72. It would be seen that out of 192 DUs for which construction work was awarded to contractor 'A', 128 DUs had inadequate foundation. The depth of the foundation as provided at site was ranging from 0.5 metre to 0.8 metre as against the actual requirement of 1.2 metres and beyond. Similarly, width of the foundation ranged from 0.6 metre to 0.715 metre instead of 0.750 metre to 1.1 metres. This was detected when four storeyed structure had been built up. The Committee enquired why Quality Control Wing could not detect the fault earlier, the Chief Engineer, Quality Control replied in evidence :

"Sir, the Quality Control Cell of DDA was entrusted with the job of random checking. The basic responsibility for measurement, quality and supervision rests with the DDA field staff. We are doing a test check, so that there is some independent check. The cell with a Chief Engineer was formulated in August, 1982. A Chief Engineer was appointed and at that time only one Executive Engineer was with him. With the available staff, we used to do random checking. The strength has now been increased."

73. In reply to a subsequent query from the Committee about the procedure relating to selection of construction work by the Quality Control Wing, the Ministry of Urban Development stated that :

"Selection of work for inspection by the Quality Control Wing is done on a random basis. Progress reports of works are received in the Quality Control Cell from the Ex-Engineers. Efforts are made to cover the various divisions one after the other and also to inspect works pertaining to different contractors. Generally, larger works costing more than 15 Lacs are inspected. However, some of the Smaller works are also covered by the Quality Control Cell. In addition to pre-planned inspections carried out with prior intimation to the field staff, surprise inspections are also done. While selecting works for inspection, to the extent possible, works at different stages of execution are taken up. After the inspection is carried out, detailed observation memo is prepared indicating precisely the defects observed and the units that have been inspected. The report is sent to the C.E., S.E. E.E. Major defects are pointedly brought to the notice of the C.E. The Ex. Engineer is expected to take immediate remedial measures on defects pointed out by the Quality Control Cell and send his report within 30 days."

74. The Committee asked if the defects pointed out by the Quality Control Wing in the works executed by the contractor 'E' were circulated to other divisions of DDA, the Ministry in a note replied:—

"The Quality Control Wings inspected this work on 31-12-83. These defects were not circulated to other divisions."

75. The Committee pointed out that in spite of a number of checks provided to ensure quality of work, it has remained poor. In reply the Vice-Chairman, DDA, stated during evidence:—

"When there is such a huge work, there will be complaints."

(viii) *Reorganisation of DDA*

76. At the instance of the Committee, the Ministry of Urban Development furnished the following details of expenditure of Fixed allowances (excluding contingencies and other expenses) on Engineering Wing of DDA which is primarily responsible for planning and execution of works.

(Rs. in crores)			
1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
6.14	7.52	8.74	11.41

77. It has also been stated that no comparison regarding the quantum of work done with any other housing construction agency has been done. It was also stated that works in DDA are being executed on the pattern of CFWD and the hierarchical set-up of the DDA along with average work load per unit compared to the work load yardstick in CFWD. A statement of the sanctioned strength of the staff employed categorywise is placed at Appendix V (a),(b),(c),(d).

78. The Committee enquired whether it was not a fact that quality of works executed by the DDA suffered not because of the lack of adequate staff but lack of quality in staff. In reply, the Vice-Chairman, DDA, stated in evidence:—

"Under-staffing is not much of a problem, I will agree with you. There may be some imbalances that somewhere more staff is there. A little bit of shifting and adjustment is there. Imbalance may be there."

79. In reply to a query by the Committee that DDA required to be reorganised and restructured, the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development in evidence stated:—

"We are looking into the question of restructuring of the DDA..... In the light of the recommendations given by the Estimates Committee and in the light of the reports submitted by the Tata Consultancy Services appointed by DDA to look into the total organisational structure. They have just come to the final stages. The Government is seized of the matter about re-structuring of the DDA."

80. In a subsequent note the Ministry of Urban Development have informed the Committee that "M/s Tata Consultancy Services have been engaged to suggest organisation structure for DDA. They have recently given their report. A Committee have been constituted to suggest after going through the report, the action plan for putting various recommendations of the Report into effect."

81. The Committee asked if the DDA have been able to discharge its allotted functions and achieve its objectives, the Secretary, Urban Development, replied in evidence :—

"I would submit that the DDA is supposed to be primarily concerned with the planning regulation and development of land etc. in Delhi. There have been some historical reasons with regard to this matter. The State should be primarily the facilitator and promoter. The EWS housing responsibility is that of the State."

82. The Committee pointed out that if this was the case, why the private construction agencies and individuals were not associated to augment the construction activities. In reply the witness stated :—

"As regards the EWS housing and the shelter to be given to the economically weaker sections, a certain amount of direct responsibility will remain on the State, and the State agencies. So far as the Low-income, Middle income and high income groups' housing is concerned, we are developing the land and giving the land to the Co-operative societies etc. We give the developed land on certain terms and conditions to the private developers. They do the construction work and sell out according to certain terms and conditions. These are the alternatives."

83. The Committee desired to know the number of persons registered since 1979 with DDA for flats and those who have been provided with built-up houses. In reply, the Vice Chairman, DDA stated in evidence that total registration to this date had been of the order of 1.72 lakhs. Out of this about 51 thousand have been allotted houses.

84. Asked how the DDA would clear this back-log, the witness replied :—

"If we have to provide flats or houses under hire-purchase scheme, our financial capability will go down because the money is recouped in 10-15 years. If Government supports, it will be possible to construct about 15,000 houses a year."

85. The Delhi Development Authority (DDA) undertook construction of 1296 Dwelling Units (DUs) under self Financing Scheme in 1982 under 3 schemes consisting of 768, 384 plus 48 and 96 units respectively. The construction work was awarded through 8 different contracts and each one was to be completed within a period of 12 months. Even after spending Rs 10.60 crores on construction, no dwelling unit could be allotted until November 1985. The abnormal delay in completing construction work has been stated to be due to structural defects, inadequate foundation of some of the dwelling units which was detected at a belated stage when four storeyed structure had been constructed lack of essential basic amenities like sewage, water and electricity etc. indicating total lack of planning and unjustifiable delays in execution of work by some contractors. Besides other serious lapses that have come to light, the most painful aspect of execution work had been criminal negligence and active connivance of the concerned officers of DDA who showed total callousness in the discharge of their duties. The very fact that inadequate foundation of some of the dwelling units could be detected only when four storeyed structure has been built is a clearly indicative of the total system failure in the organisation.

86. The construction work of 1296 dwelling units was awarded through 8 different contracts. The scheme of 768 units was divided into 4 groups of 192 DUs each and contracts were awarded in June 1982 to four contractors. The works were awarded in anticipation of Administrative Approval and Expenditure sanction which were received in May 1983 for Rs. 12.38 crores for 768 DUs. However, these were not received for the remaining dwelling units. The reasons for not obtaining administrative approval and expenditure sanction for this project has been stated to be due to priority attached to the execution of these works under Self Financing Scheme and due to heavy load of work at relevant times. The Committee have also been informed that there were 148 other works under execution at different locations in Delhi as on 1 April 1986 without administrative approval and expenditure sanction. The tendered cost of these works aggregate to Rs. 152 crores. Of these, two works pertained to the year 1980, five to 1981, thirteen to 1982, seven to 1983 and thirty four to 1984. In these cases works were taken up in anticipation of administrative approval and expenditure sanction. This situation exists despite relevant provisions in CPWD code and Manual. The Committee are distressed to note that works of such financial magnitude should have been taken up without according Administrative Approval and expenditure Sanction and urge the Government to take effective remedial measures to ensure that the gap between the administrative approval and awarding of work to contractors reduced to the barest minimum, and relevant instructions on the subject are scrupulously observed and suitable action taken against defaulting officers.

87. The Committee note that responsibilities of various functionaries of Delhi Development Authority viz., Junior Engineers/Assistant Engineer/Executive Engineer etc. with regard to planning, supervision, checking and test checking of

works are quite similar to those prescribed by CPWD for its officers. These instructions have been summarised by the Director-General (Works), CPWD in his letter No. 18/1/76--W(E-in-C)/CPR/13/73 dated 10 March 1978. According to these instructions the responsibility for control over quality at site has to be pinpointed. For this purpose, it has put emphasis on stage inspection by Junior Engineer/Assistant Engineer/Executive Engineer to ensure quality of materials and construction of works. These instructions pinpoint the level of inspection necessary and the extent of supervision needed at different levels to ensure proper quality of works and materials

88. Obviously these instructions were observed more in breach than in practice by the officers supervising the works at Kishangarh. In the work of construction of 192 dwelling units the deficiencies, viz., non-following of structural drawings correctly, weak cement mortar, cracked walls, lateral shafting of RCC columns, development of cracks in RSCC slabs and lintels, inadequate beam bearing and defective flush doors, shutters etc. which could have been easily detected by the concerned staff had they performed their duties with reasonable diligence, were detected by the quality control Wing in January, October and December, 1983. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that the staff deputed for supervision of the above work failed on all counts. Lamentably, when 75 per cent of the above work was completed it was noticed by the Executive Engineer in February 1984 that the houses had inadequate foundation in as much as the depth of the foundation as provided at site was ranging from 0.5 metre to 0.8 metre as against the actual requirement of 1.2 metres and beyond. Similarly width of the foundation ranged from 0.6 metre to 0.715 metre instead of 0.750 metre to 1.1 metre. This indicates that even the Quality Control Wing failed to pinpoint serious structural defects in foundation which were detected later on. The officers entrusted with the supervision of construction work thus totally failed in the discharge of their duties. The Committee recommend that disciplinary action against erring staff should be instituted if not already instituted.

89. Out of 8 works relating to construction of 1296 DUs each by two contractors M/s. Mittal Builders and M/s. Uppal Engineering and Construction Pvt. Ltd. involved vigilance angle. In the first case foundation work of 192 DUs was not in accordance with the structural drawings and prima facie it has been established that overpayment for foundation works to the tune of Rs. 1.50 lakhs approximately as per the initial estimates were made and false measurements were recorded by the Junior Engineer Incharge. However, matter is under further investigation by the Chief Technical examiner (CTE) on a reference from CBI who are investigating the case. It has been stated that over-payment could have been avoided had the supervisory staff been vigilant. The case which was referred to CBI in June 1985 has not yet been finalised and no Inquiry Officer has been appointed to institute departmental enquiry against delinquent officials who are under suspension since May 1985. The Committee deplore the tardiness and inordinate delay in expediting processing of disciplinary proceeding against the delinquent

officials. In the other case, there were serious defects relating to weak cement mortar and weak RCC in columns. In this case overpayment on account of secured advance was made and no action has been taken to recover the amount of overpayment. It has been stated that some of the supervisory officers involved have been suspended while those belonging to other departments have been reverted to their parent departments. It is disquieting to note that no further action has been taken against them. Those cases should be got finalised expeditiously and suitable action taken against delinquent officials.

90. The Committee note that Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi was engaged in March 1984 for their expert advice at a fee of Rs. 47,000 to strengthen the foundation. A further sum of Rs. 50,000 was paid to them for checking approval of designs for strengthening of all blocks and for conducting load test for one block. The estimated cost for rectification of all defects of 32 DUs was Rs. 31 lakhs and work of foundation strengthening and removal of other defects had to be carried out on 128 DUs. Evidently, the expenditure involved in rectification of defects would be quite high. It has been stated that requisite strengthening measures are yet to be carried out at the risk and cost of original contractor. The Committee would urge the Government to carry out the structural modifications expeditiously at the cost of the contractor and would like to be intimated of further developments including the total additional cost involved in the process. The delay in rectification of important structural defects would result in cost escalation and also allotment of these dwelling units to registered persons. The Committee hope that cost escalation in these cases would not be passed on to the registered persons as the entire responsibility for delay in allotment vests with DDA due to sheer callousness on their part.

91. All the works awarded to various contractors for construction of 1296 DUs were required to be completed within 12 months from the date of commencement of work. However, not even a single work was completed within the stipulated time schedule in spite of the fact that the simplest type of construction was involved therein. The Committee were informed that out of 1296 dwelling units, 768 units have been completed, work was in progress in 336 units and 192 units were involved in litigation. The delay in completion of construction ranged from 15 to 24 months. It is highly deplorable. It needs to be ensured that in future works are completed on schedule. The Committee would like to be apprised of action taken in this regard. The Committee also urge the Government to ensure that effective steps are taken to settle litigation cases due to which construction of 192 units were held up blocking not only Government funds but also depriving of shelter to persons registered. The progress in the settlement of these cases should also be monitored at an appropriately higher level.

92. Out of 768 flats completed in 2 lots of 384 each in October 1984 and June 1985, considered fit for allotment only in March 1986, only 525 were allotted and in these cases possession letters were issued only in 327 cases as on 11-3-1987. In 198

cases possession letters of units allotted were still to be issued. This is clearly indicative of total lack of planning and perception, which leads to corruption, redtapism and lack of awareness of time, value of money on the part of DDA and require immediate attention of the Government so that there is no avoidable delay in construction and allotment of dwelling units in future and assets created, are put to productive use without avoidable loss of time.

93. The Committee were also informed that besides Kishangarh project, there were 74 other projects also whose construction was taken up prior to 31 December 1983 but could not be completed till 31 May 1986 though the stipulation was to complete them within 12 months. Of these, six projects were awarded in 1980, sixteen in 1981 and twenty-nine in 1982. The estimated cost of these projects was Rs. 3671 lakhs and were tendered at a cost of Rs. 6636 lakhs. The expenditure incurred upto 31 May 1986 was Rs. 5826 lakhs. The Committee note with regret that physical performance in most of these cases has been tardy and not commensurate with the investment made. In a number of cases, the works were at standstill after having been abandoned by the original contractors. The reasons for unusual delays were attributed to poor capacity and incompetence of contractors and abandonment of works by some of them. In some cases, contracts were rescinded as the progress of work was not found satisfactory. The other factors causing delay were stated to be raw material shortage, delay in approval of drawings, delay in giving sites etc. The Committee regret to say that in spite of the fact that Delhi Development Authority undertook construction activities as early as 1967, it has not been able to enlist competent and dependable contractors to undertake construction of houses. It is pity that Delhi Development Authority which is required to undertake massive construction work of house in Delhi to clear the backlog and satisfy the heavy current demand of houses is still at the mercy of unscrupulous contractors who can get away with poor quality of work due to totally callous supervision. The structures built by them in many cases are dangerous for human habitation and material used are sub-standard. The Committee would like the DDA to improve its procedure of registration of contractors and deal firmly with those whose performance is found to be deficient. The procedure of approval of drawings should also be streamlined so that delay in execution of projects is avoided. To be precise, the Committee urge Delhi Development Authority to build up a cadre of efficient and competent contractors and streamline their own organisation to cut delays in execution of projects and also to ensure that those are executed in accordance with prescribed specification and adequate quality control is exercised in the use of material. The Committee are totally unhappy with the performance of DDA and the Audit para under discussion illustrate its low standard of performance.

94. Some of the reasons for delay in execution of projects were shortage of cement; non-availability of water and delay in issue of structural drawings. It has been stated that delay of 3 months in issue of structural drawings at different stages took place in one case due to heavy work-load at the relevant time in the

SSW Wing as there was no separate design wing in DDA at that time. The Committee are unable to accept this explanation. It is strange that contracts were awarded when even the basic requirement of structural drawings was not fulfilled. The delay on this account is highly deplorable. There was also failure in providing water and cement for construction and leads to the inevitable conclusion that no preparation was made with regard to material requirements and creation of site facilities etc. It speaks poorly of project planning and material management on the part of Delhi Development Authority.

95. The construction work of 144 DUs by contractor 'D' was technically examined by Vigilance Commission during October 1984 and they noticed major structural defect. To name a few, it included sub-standard cement mortar used in bricks, M.S. sheet used in pressed steel door and door frames was of less than specified thickness, girth of profile being less than specified etc. The Chief Engineer had suggested investigation and strengthening of many RCC columns with the help of CRI, CERI, IIT etc. Strangely, the matter has been referred to these organisations as late as on 6 August 1986. It has been stated that the contractor had suspended the work in May 1985 and the contract was rescinded in November 1985. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reasons for delay of almost 2 years in making a simple reference and would also like the responsibility in this regard to be fixed and action taken against the erring officials.

96. The Fact Finding Committee (Vaish Committee) and the Quality Control Wing of Delhi Development Authority have pointed out serious structural defects and found that the works were executed below specification. The Vaish Committee visited 26 housing projects including Kishangarh Housing Complex at various places in Delhi where construction work was under execution. The general impression gathered by this Committee was that the quality of work in most of the houses was very poor. Besides, there were common defects in most of the houses and indicated lack of emphasis on quality of construction. The Vaish Committee clearly brought out the fact that contractors and engineers incharge perhaps got the impression that they could get away with bad work. No one seemed to have been bothered about the structural safety of the houses. The Architects and Design Engineers simply ignored the basic requirements of the I.S. codes which provides for lot of precautions for building four storeyed houses with 9" walls on all floors. The Engineer Incharge of supervision also completely ignored the normal norms of sound construction of a building. Consequently, some of the built houses were found to be structurally unsound. out of the 26 housing projects visited by the Vaish Committee, houses built at 13 projects located at Gulabi Bagh, Dilshad Garden, Vikaspuri, East of Kailash, Paschimpuri, Malvia Nagar Extn. Pritampura, Shalimar Bagh, Lawrance Road, Jahangirpuri and Tirlokpuri were found to be particularly very poor. The Committee had further highlighted the fact that "even though the above cases are of exceptionally poor quality the Committee also observed generally poor quality of work in all the housing schemes which will have to be improved by appropriate strengthening measures." The Vaish Committee had concluded that strengthening measures had to be taken in almost all the houses and special attention has to be given for the above exceptionally

poor quality work. The strengthening and improvement measures suggested by the Vaish Committee could at least be termed as stop gap measures. The Committee itself as stated that at this stage these measures, however well done, would still be only a compromise when compared to a proper construction from the very beginning carried out in accordance with the laid down specifications and codes. The explanation that these defects escaped attention of the site staff due to overloading of units is not at all convincing as these common defects have been found in all the projects visited by the Vaish Committee. Evidently, buyers of DDA houses did not get fair value of the money as they have been handed over structurally defective houses which is commercially unsound and ethically in moral. At this stage the Committee cannot but strongly deprecate the ineffective tardy planning and implementation of construction of projects by the DDA and can only express the hope that the DDA would have taken suitable lessons from their past experience and would take adequate steps to ensure that similar mistakes are not repeated in future in respect of projects now under implementation or those which will be undertaken in future. The high expectation from the Government and the public at large centres round housing and the Committee hope that DDA would perform its functions with complete awareness of its mission. They would also like to be apprised of the remedial measures taken to strengthen and improve system which as a whole has failed miserably on all counts. The Committee would urge the Government to take action against the delinquent official and unscrupulous contractors responsible for various lapses pointed out by the Vaish Committee after undertaking a comprehensive review of these deficiencies. The result of the enquiry on the findings of Vaish Committee may be intimated to the Committee.

97. The construction of 192 dwelling units was started in July 1982 by contractor 'C'. As the progress of work was slow, the Executive Engineer rescinded the contract in December, 1983. The balance work has not been awarded to any contractor so far. The matter is sub-judice as the contractor has raised dispute on finalisation of list of materials lying at site and the measurements taken. The matter was under arbitration and hence balance work could not be awarded. The Committee are distressed to note that work of these 192 dwelling units started in July 1982 and stipulated to be completed initially in a year could not be completed so far. The lingering dispute between DDA and the contractor may finally lead to cost escalation beyond all proportions. The Committee would like the Delhi Development Authority to ensure that this is not passed on to the allottees. Logically the contractor should be made to pay for it and a claim on this account should be preferred before the arbitrator.

98. The Committee are perturbed to note that 656 constructed houses completed to the extent of 93 to 100 per cent with an expenditure of Rs. 692.95 lakhs upto July 1985 could not be allotted to registered applicants for want of essential basic amenities like sewage, water supply and electricity. It has been stated that Delhi Municipal Corporation for its own reasons were unable to provide water supply and sewage facilities to Kishangarh area. Consequently the DDA made its own

arrangements by boring six tubewells at a cost of Rs. 40 lakhs and provided oxidation ditches for sewage disposal treatment in Sector 'A' to cater to about 3000 DUs at a cost of Rs. 45 lakhs. The Ministry of Urban Development have stated that Municipal Corporation of Delhi has been approving sewage schemes in development areas with a condition that interim sewage treatment arrangements shall be made by the developing agency. This only indicated total lack of planning on the part of DDA in not making suitable arrangements in advance for water supply and sewage as that could have greatly expedited allotment of aforesaid units and would have made it possible for them to profitably utilise its assets. The Committee hope that such situation does not recur in future.

99. The Committee are concerned to note that prior to 1982, the Delhi Development Authority had no Quality Control Cell of its own. The pace of construction of houses in the initial years of taking up construction of houses in 1967 was about 8000 houses a year which was stepped up subsequently to 10-12 thousand a year. By 1982, the DDA had built up about 1.25 lakh houses. The quality checks during the period 1967 to 1982 were carried out by the Chief Technical Examiner under the Central Vigilance Commission. As the Chief Technical Examiner was doing checking job for other government organisations also including CPWD, their quota for DDA was very little. The reason for not setting up a Quality Control Cell is stated to be small quantum of work at that time and also the fact that primary responsibility to ensure quality of work was that of the immediate supervisory officer. However, the very fact that Quality Control Cell immediately after coming into existence has been able to bring out serious defects of structurally dangerous, materially sub-standard and of poor workmanship, it is apparent that immediate supervision had not all been effective. In fact it was noticed that supervisory staff have connived with contractors with ulterior motives. Viewed in the light of these facts, the Committee are quite apprehensive about the quality of works executed prior to 1982. Viewed in this light, the Committee would like to know why the creation of such organisation was not thought of earlier. They would also like the Delhi Development Authority to carry out random sample checking to ensure that the houses constructed prior to 1982 by the DDA do not suffer from any major defect.

100. The Committee also feel that the Quality Control Cell should be adequately strengthened so that it is in a position to perform its functions more efficiently and devotedly because even this Cell failed to point out serious defects in some construction works in recent past. It is also imperative that highly qualified and motivated staff is posted in Quality Control Cell so that it has a deterrent effect on officers involved on normal supervision of construction work. Due incentives/recognitions may be provided for the working in the Quality Control Cell for efficient work. Besides, as the Quality Control checking is done on random sampling the whole procedure of random checking requires reappraisal in consultation with experts whether their method of picking up is adequate. The defects pointed out by this Cell should be circulated to other divisions to ensure that such defects are avoided. The Committee would like to be intimated of final decision taken in this regard.

101. The Delhi Development Authority came into being to function as the authority on urban development affairs of the capital city, in coordination with other bodies like Municipal Corporation of Delhi, the New Delhi Municipal Committee and the agencies providing civil amenities, viz., Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking as well as other organisations which have any impact on the development of Delhi. Over the years activities of DDA have outstripped its originally conceived responsibilities. It has ventured into activities like land and site development, construction of roads and houses, maintenance of sport complexes, JJR Colonies and development of plot in JJR colonies and creation of additional facilities all over Delhi. The annual expenditure on these activities during the years 1982-83 to 1985-86 had been Rs. 243.31 crores, Rs. 202.62 crores, Rs. 192.59 crores and Rs. 296.96 crores respectively. The major chunk of this expenditure was on house building with Rs. 113.95 crores in 1982-83, Rs. 107.21 crores in 1983-84, Rs. 108.54 crores in 1984-85 and Rs. 197.52 crores in 1985-86.

102. In order to perform its multi-facet functions, the Delhi Development Authority have been maintaining a large establishment of more than 40,000 employees whose annual administrative expenses amount to Rs. 37.11 crores. The Engineering Wing alone have sanction strength of 905 Class I and II officers, 2220 of Junior Engineers, 352 Draftsmen; 1906 of other Class III staff and 3500 of Class IV staff. The total expenditure on pay and allowances of this staff of Engineering Wing alone was Rs. 11.41 crores in 1985-86. In the opinion of the Committee it is the quality of staff working in DDA rather than inadequacy of strength which is responsible for the present messing state of affairs in the DDA. The Committee consider that there is overstaffing in DDA which needs restructuring and rationalisation. The Vice Chairman, DDA admitted in evidence that "imbalances may be there and somewhere more staff is there." The Committee note that Government is already engaged with the question of restructuring of DDA and a committee has been set up for this purpose. It would be desirable to compare the staffing pattern of DDA with those of other reputed private construction companies before taking a final decision in the matter. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

103. The Delhi Development Authority was intended primarily to act as an Urban Development Agency to plan, develop, distribute and regulate land in the Capital. However, the phenomenal population growth coupled with some historical factors made DDA's task much more complex than tackling the usual complexities of town building. As the DDA grew in size and capability to meet the public demand for large scale housing and other infrastructural needs its ability to control development continued to diminish and its attempt to undertake implementation of plans on such a large scale without parallel gearing of its capabilities has resulted in present managerial crisis and total failure of system as has been indicated in preceding paragraphs. There is thus urgent need for revamping and restructuring of the organisation to take up the challenge posed.

104. The DDA today find itself in an environment far beyond its original precepts. The State should be primarily the facilitator and promotor. Building of houses for economically weaker sections should be the direct responsibility of the State and its agencies. In view of this and also because of the fact that DDA find itself increasingly difficult to squarely meet the housing need of the over increasing population of Delhi; the Committee consider that functions of DDA should be redefined. Out of the 1.72 lakhs registered applicants since 1979, only 51 thousand could be provided houses so far. In view of the resource constraint, it is not at all possible for DDA to clear this backlog even in the distant future. Even if financial support is made available by Government the DDA at the most can be expected to build 15 thousand houses a year. This is not at all an encouraging proposition. It would be appropriate if individuals, co-operatives and private agencies are increasingly associated in this endeavour as the DDA has failed to meet the growing challenge.

NEW DELHI;

April 27, 1987

7 Vaisakha, 1909 (S)

E. AYYAPU REDDY,

Chairman,

Public Accounts Committee.

APPENDIX I

(Vide Para 2)

List of work under execution in DDA as on 1-4-1986 without AA & ES

EAST ZONE

Sl. No.	Name of Division	Name of work	Tendered amount in lacs. of Rs.	Dt. of award	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	D.D. XI	C/o 904 DU's at Trilokpuri SH : C/o 168 MIG & 56 LIG DU's at Trilokpuri Pkt. I.	65.55	15-3-82	
2.	D.D. XI	SH : C/o 168 MIG & 56 LIG DU's at Trilokpuri Pkt. II.	65.55	29-4-82	
3.	D.D. XI	SH : C/o 171 MIG & 57 LIG DU's Trilokpuri Pkt. III.	67.74	15-9-81	
4.	D.D. XI	SH : C/o 171 MIG & 57 LIG DU's at Trilokpuri Pkt. IV.	67.74	15-9-81	
5.	H.D. XX	C/o 613 Janta houses at Dilshad Gdn. Pkt. Q.	98.00	24-3-83	
6.	H.D. XV	C/o 4688 LIG houses DU's (NP) at Dilshad Gdn. in Pkt. C in Zone E-6. SH : C/o 32 LIG DU's in Ph. I.	106.72	15-11-84	
7.	H.D. XIV	C/o 1184 LIG Houses (NP) at East of Loni Road i.e. Int. Dev. SH : C/o 320 LIG Houses i.e. Int. Dev. Group IV.	120.77	7-2-86	

1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	H.D. XIV	C/o 1184 LIG houses (NP) at East of Loni Road Pkt. 'C' i.e. Inv. Dev. SH : C/o 288 LIG houses (NP) at East of Loni Rd. Group II.	109.76	19-2-86	
9.	H.D. XIV	C/o 1184 LIG houses (NP) at East of Loni Rd. Pkt. 'C' in i.e. Int. Dev. SH : C/o 288 LIG houses (NP) at East of Loni Rd. Group	109.32	12-2-86	
10.	H.D. XIV	C/o 256 LIG DU's at Dilshad Gdn.	114.40	10-8-84	
11.	E.D. XI	C/o 256 LIG DU's at Dilshad Gdn. Pkt. 5 SH : Internal electrification.	5.67	24-9-85	
12.	E.D. XI	C/o 428 Janta DU's Pkt I. Dilshad Gdn.	3.50	9-7-82	
13.	ED. XIC	C/o 613 Janta DU's at Dilshad Gdn. Pkt. Q SH : internal electrification.	4.47	21-2-84	
14.	E.D. XI	C/o 494 Janta DU's Pkt. L. at Dilshad Gdn. II Internal electrification.	4.07	9-7-82	
15.	E.D. XI	C/o 424 Janta DU's Pkt. Q. at Dilshad Gdn. II : Internal electrification.	3.57	18-5-82	
16.	E.D. XI	C/o 428 Janta DU's Pkt. P. at Dilshad Gdn. II: Internal electrification.	3.64	18-5-82	
17.	E.D. XI	C/o 304 LIG DU's at Zafarabad Pkt. B SH :	5.50	11-7-83	
18.	H.D. XXXI	960 MIG houses at Nand Nagri Pkt. F i/c Inv. Dev. SH : C/o 160 MIG houses group III SH : C/o	92.20	31-10-84	
19.	Do.	160 MIG houses Group V.	92.20	31-10-84	
20.	H.D. XXXI	C/o 3200 EWS houses at Kondli Gharoli Complex i/c Int. Dev. SH : C/o 400 EWS houses Group II	74.70	27-9-85	
21.	H.D. XXXI	—do—	Group IV	74.58	27-9-85
22.	H.D. XXXI	—do—	Group V	75.68	30-9-85
23.	H.D. XXXI	—do—	Group VI	75.68	30-9-85
24.	H.D. XXXI	—do—	Group VII		

25.	D.D. VIII	C/o 1600/816 SFS DU's at Trilokpuri SH : C/o 160 SFS Cat. II & III Pkt.:	Pkt. 'C' Group I	210.42	3-3-86
26.	D.D. VIII	—do—	Group II	210.42	14-11-85
27.	D.D. VIII	—do—	Group III	210.22	1-3-85
28.	D.D. VIII	—do—	Group IV	210.22	7-4-86
29.	D.D. VIII	—do— 176 SFS	Group V	210.22	1-2-86
30.	D.D. VIII	—do— 584 DU's at Trilokpuri	Group I	57.38	24-11-85
31.	D.D. VIII	—do—	Group II	57.38	24-11-85
32.	H.D. XIX	C.S.C. at Nand Nagri Extn.		14.33	17-5-85
33.	H.D. XIX	Dev. of Unauthorisation Nathu Colony		9.47	15-4-85
34.	H.D. XXIII	C/o 496 MIG houses at Mansrover Park SH : C/o 272 MIG Group I		182.03	10-12-85
35.	H.D. XXIII	—do— 244 MIG	Group II.	151.61	7-12-85
36.	H.D. XXII	C/o 160 LIG houses at Zafarabad		36.32	6-11-82
37.	H.D. XXII	C/o 144 LIG houses at Zafarabad		33.77	Do.
38.	H.D. XXII	C/o 378 LIG houses at Nand Nagri		104.01	17-5-83
39.	H.D. XXII	C/o 160 MIG houses at Nand Nagri	Group I	92.21	31-12-84
40.	HD. XXII	C/o 160 MIG houses at Nand Nagri	Group II	92.21	31-10-84
41.	H.D. XXII	C/o 40 MIG houses at Nirman Vihar		17.50	15-2-83
42.	I.S.D.	C/o 960 MIG houses (NP) at Nand Nagri Pkt. 'F' i/c int. dev. SH : C/o 160 MIG houses	Group II	92.27	9-11-84
43.	I.S.D.	—do— SH : C/o 160 MIG houses	Group IV	92.20	31-10-84
44.	H.D. XVIII	C/o 1536 MIG at East of Loni Road SH : C/o DU's(NP) at East of Loni Road:	Group I	93.54	29-11-85
45.	H.D. XVIII	—do—	Group II	93.54	Do.
46.	H.D. XVIII	—do—	Group V	93.54	Do.
47.	H.D. XVIII	—do—	Group IV	94.60	28-2-86
48.	H.D. XVIII	C/o 192 MIG DU's (NP) at East of Loni Road	Group VI	124.53	28-2-86
49.	H.D. XVIII	—do—	Group VII	126.12	28-2-86

1	2	3	4	5	6
50.	H.D. II	C/o 590 DU's under SFS at Vasant Kunj Sec. C. Pkt. V. SH : C/o 90 Cat. III, 60 Cat. II & 90 Scooter Garages i/c int. dev. of land	176.30	27-12-84	
51.	H.D. II	—do— SH : C/o 84 Cat. III, 56 Cat. I & 84 Scooter Garages including int. dev. of land Group I	164.17	10-12-84	
52.	H.D. II	C/o 1008 DU's under SFS at Vasant Kunj Sec. C Pkt. I SH : C/o 80 Cat. III, 66 Cat. II & 110 Scooter Garages i/c int. dev. Gr. IV	181.14	10-12-84	
53.	H.D.X	C/o 1008 DU's under SFS in Pkt. IX Sec. 'C' at Vasant Kunj. SH : Gr. I C/o 80 Cat. III, 60 Cat. II & 80 Scooter Garages Alt. Sec. (D) Pkt. 7 & 8 Gr. I	165.45	10-12-84	
54.	H.D.X	(ii) Alt. SH : Gr. II C/o 80 Cat. 80, 60 Cat. II & 80 Scooter Garages, Sec. 'D' Pkt. 7 & 8 Gr. II	165.45	10-12-84	
	H.D.X	(iii) SH : Gr. II C/o 48 Cat. III, 36 Cat. II & 48 scooter garages Alt : Sec. D, Pkt. 7 & 8 Gr. III	99.14	10-12-84	
	H.D.X	(iv) SH : Gr. V C/o 88, Cat. III, 88 [Cat. II & 110 scooter garages. Alt. : Sec. C, Pkt. I, Group I	181.74	20-1-85	
55.	H.D.X	C/o 160 DU's under SFS at Vasant Kunj Sec. 'D' Pkt. 4 & 8 Gr. II Alt. Sec. 'D' Pkt. 7 & 8 Gr. IV	200.15	24-7-85	
56.	D.XI	C/o 840 DU's under SFS in Pkt. VIII, Sec. 'C' Vasant Kunj. SH : C/o 64 Cat. III, 48 Cat. II & 80 Scooter garages i/c int. dev. Gr. II	132.35	27-12-84	
57.	H.D.XI	C/o 840 DU's under SFS in Pkt. VIII, Sec. 'C' at Vasant Kunj. SH : C/o 64 Cat. III, 48 Cat. II, 80 Scooter garages i/c int dev. Gr. III	132.57	11-12-84	

58. H.D.XI C/o 840 DU's under SFS in Pkt. VIII Sec. 'C' Vasant Kunj. SH : C/o 104 Cat. III, 78, Cat. II & 130 Scooter garages i/c int. dev. Gr. I
59. H.D.XI C/o 340 DU's under SFS in Sec. 'C' Pkt. IV at Vasant Kunj. SH : C/o 102 Cat. III, 68 Cat II & 102 Scooter garages in Gr. I
60. HD.XXIV C/o 840 DU's under SFS at Vasant Kunj Sec. 'C' Pkt. 8; SH : 98 Cat. III, 72 Cat. II and 120 Scooter garages Group IV.
61. HD.XXIV C/o 840 DU's under SFS at Vasant Kunj. Sec. 'C' Pkt. 8; SH : 64 Cat. III, 48 Cat. II & 80 scooter Garages Group V
62. HD.XXIV C/o 840 DU's under SFS at Vasant Kunj. Sec. 'C' Pakt. 8, SH : C/o 88 Cat. III, 68 Cat. II & 110 Scooter garages Group VI
63. HD.XXIV C/o 160 DU's under SFS at Vasant Kunj. Sec. 'D' Pkt. IV SH. : 80 Cat. III, Cat. II 80 & 120 scooter garages Alt. Site : Sec. 'C' Pkt. 9 Gr. II
64. H.D.XXI C/o 120 houses for Cat. II & Cat. III & 90 scooter garages under SFS Pkt. I. Gr. I Sec. 'D' at Vasant Kunj.
65. H.D.XXI C/o 120 houses for Cat. II & Cat. III & 90 scooter garages under SFS Pkt. I, Gr. II, Sec. 'D' at Vasant Kunj.
66. H.D.XXI C/o 120 houses for Cat. II & Cat. III & 90 scooter garages under SFS Pkt. I, Gr. III, Sec. 'D' at Vasant Kunj.
67. H.D.XXI C/o 160 DU's under SFS & 120 nos. scooter garages in Pkt. II, Gr. II, Sec. 'D' at Vasant Kunj
68. H.D.XXI C/o 160 DU's under SFS & 120 scooter garages in Pkt. II, Gr. III, Sec. 'D' at Vasant Kunj.
69. H.D.XXI C/o 120 DU's under SFS & 90 scooter garages in Pkt. II Gr. IV, Sec. 'D' at Vasant Kunj.
-

215.05 11-12-84
200 31 14-1-85
197 92 29-11-84
131 94 29-11-84
181 41 29-11-84
200 21 1-2-85
150 15 7-12-84
150 00 12-12-84
150 00 12-12-84
199 81 1-1-85
200 94 21-12-84
150 40 21-12-84

1	2	3	4	5	6
70.	H.D.XVI	C/o 120 DU's under SFS in Sec. 'D' Pkt. III at Vasant Kunj. SH : 60 nos. Cat III, 60 nos. Cat. II & 90 scooter garages at Gr. IV i/c int. dev. of land.	150.20	7-12-84	
71.	H.D.XVI	C/o 160 DU's under SFS in Sec. 'D' Pkt. III Gr. I at Vasant Kunj.	200.81	5-12-84	
72.	H.D.XVI	C/o 160 DU's under SFS in Sec. 'D' Pkt. III, Gr. II at Vasant Kunj.	199.75	5-12-84	
73.	H.D.XVI	C/o 120 DU's under SFS in Sec. 'D', Pkt. III Gr. III, at Vasant Kunj.	149.85	5-12-84	
74.	H.D.XVI	C/o 160 DU's under SFS in Sec. 'D' Pkt. II, Gr. I at Vasant Kunj.	200.14	7-12-84	
75.	R.P.D.IV	C/o 1096 MIG in Pkt-D&E of sector XV SH : C/o 264 MIG in Pkt. D-I, Sector-XV	181.16	17-7-85	
76.	R.P.D.VI	C/o 544 MIG in Pkt. C&D sector-XVII (i) SH : C/o 176 MIG Pkt. C-2, Sector XVIII	119.82	8-7-85	
77.	R.P.D.VI	(ii) SH : C/o 168 MIG BL-C, Sector-XVIII	144.55	17-7-85	
78.	R.P.D.V.	C/o 1096 MIG Pkt-D&E, Sec. XV (i) SH : C/o 256 MIG Pkt. E-2, Sector XV	174.56	17-7-85	
79.	R.P.D.V.	(ii) SH : C/o 288 MIG Pkt-E-1, Sector XV	196.38	17-7-85	
80.	R.P.D.IV	(iii) SH : C/o 288 MIG Pkt. D-2 Sector XV	195.59	24-9-85	
81.	R.P.D.III	(i) C/o 8314 houses in Sector-XV C/o 448 EWS in Pkt.-8 to 11, B1-. G, Sec. XV	109.72	19-8-85	
82.	R.P.L.V.	(ii) C/o 448 EWS in Pkt. 16, 17, 19 & 20-B1.-F, Sec. XV	109.72	19-8-85	
83.	R.P.L.V.	(iii) C/o 448 EWS in Pkt-12 to 15, B1-G, Sec-XV	109.72	19-8-85	

84.	R.P.L.V.	(iv) C/o 704 EWS in Pkt. 8 to 13, B1. F., Sec. XV	172.42	19-8-85	
85.	R.P.L.IV	(v) C/o 38 @ EWS in Pkt. 6 to 8, B1-G, Sec-XV	94.04	19-8-85	
86.	R.P.L.IV	(vi) C/o 352 EWS in Pkt. 5 to 7, B1-A, Sec. XV	86.21	19-8-85	
87.	R.P.D.V.	(vii) C/o 588 LIG in Pkt. 3 to 7, B1-F, Sec. XV	214.00	6-12-85	
88.	R.P.D.III	(viii) C/o 480 LIG in pkt. 2 to 5, B1-G, Sec. XV	174.69	6-12-85	
89.	R.P.D.III	(ix) C/o 252 LIG in Pkt. 6 to 7, B1-G, Sec. XV C/o 1960 houses in B1-A&B, C, Sec. XVIII	91.71	6-12-85	
90.	R.P.D.VI	(i) C/o 324 LIG in Pkt. 8, 9&10, B1—B Sec. XVIII	138.86	24-9-88	
91.	R.P.D.VI	(ii) C/o 324 LIG in Pkt. 4, 5, &6 B1. B, Sec. XVIII	138.86	24-9-85	
92.	R.P.D.VI	(iii) C/o 432 LIG in Pkt. 4, 5, 6, 7&8 B1-A, Sec. XV-	188.09	6-12-85	
93.	R.P.D.VI	(iv) C/o 320 MIG in Pkt-1,2,3 & 4 B1. A, Sec. XVIII	205.62	6-12-85	
94.	R.P.D.VI	(v) C/o 200 MIG in Pkt 1, 2, &3 B1-B, Sec. XVIII	121.08	9-10-85	
95.	H.D. XXXIV	C/o*504 Janta DUs at Pkt. GH-6 G-17 area Paschim Vihar	138.92	26-7-85	Preliminary estimate sent to EO to EM for Rs. 20809540 for obtaining A&A ES Vide No. F. 1(16) SWI/S VIII 85/283 dated 18-4-85 sanc- tion awaited.
96.	DDIV	D/o Land for Group Housing Societies at Bodella Ph. II SH : Earth filling.	21.99	21-11-85	
97.	DDIV	SH : Roads & Paths	23.83	5-8-85	
98.	DDIV	Sh: Outfall drain part. II at Bodella.	66.77	24-2-86	
99.	CPD VI	112 Low cost Houses at Bodella	19.44	31-10-85	
100.	UVDII	136 L.C. H. at Totapur.	23.50	12-7-85	
101.	UVDII	144 Janta Houses, Possengipur	26.57	28-1-86	
102.	UVDII	208 Janta Houses, Madipur	42.61	15-2-86	
103.	HDX XVIII	360LIG DU's at Jaidev park i/c W/S. S/I & Int, Dev. of land.	97.00	26-5-82	
104.	HDX XVIII	360/252 LIG at Madipur	105.30	10-2-81	

WEST ZONE

1	2	3	4	5	6
105.	HDIV	C/o 464 MIG at Bodella Pkt. DG-3 (224+240 DU's)	243.40	Gr. I 225 DU's 14-11-84 Gr. II-240 DU's 15-11-84	PE sent to EM vide letter No. 26 (SWII)/SSWIII/84/3483.
106.	HDIV	288 SFS Houses at Rajouri Garden Opp. GOI Press, Mayapuri Gr. I, II & III	123.53	18-6-85	PE sent to CEII Vide Letter No. G-XIII/F4(44)/85/67 dt. 10-1-85
107.	HD IV	288 SFS House at Rajouri Garden Opp. GOI Press, Mayapuri Group. II	123.13	29-8-85	
108.	HD IV	288 SFS Houses at Rajouri Garden Opp. GOI Press, Mayapuri Group. III	124.72	18-6-85	
109.	HD IV	C/o Facility Centre at Mayapuri ph. II	18.13	14-10-85	Under process.
110.	HDIV	C/o CSC at Mayapuri Phase. I.	20.24	11-5-83	Under process
111.	HDIV	C/o Mech. workshop at Mayapuri SH: C/o Addl. workshop shed and expansion of Mech. Workshop at Mayapuri	9.73	17-1-86	Do.
112.	HDVII	C/o 144 MIG in Pkt. BD at Janakpuri	84.65	6-4-85	PE sent vide letter No. C-XIII/ F. 2 (34) 83/1081 dt. 28-5-84
113.	HDVII	C/o 48 LIG at A2A Janakpuri	23.15	5-10-85	Under process
114.	HDVII	C/o 872 Low cost Houses at Manglapuri SH : 192/ 136 Low cost houses at B1-C Janakpuri.	26.00	12-7-85	Under process
115.	HDIX	C/o 864 LIG Houses at Hastal, SH : C/o 252 LIG in Group IV	110.11	1-3-86	PE sent vide No. S EXIII /F9 (85)/1473 dt. 27-6-85
116.	HDXXX	C/o Transit Camps at JJR colony Raghubir Nagar, SH: (i) C/o 24 camping units	1.10	2-3-85	—

117.	HDXXX	C/O Transit Camps at JJR colony Raghbir Nagar, SH: (ii) C/o 520 camping units	23.75	1-4-85	—
118.	HDXXX	C/O Transit Camps at JJR colony Raghbir Nagar, SH: (iii) C/o 550 Camping Units	21.26	12-9-86	—
119.	HDXXX	C/O Transit Camps at JJR colony Raghbir Nagar, SH: (iv) C/o 472 Camping Units	21.26	12-9-85	—
120.	HDXXX	C/o 356 Transit Camps at Pandav Nagar	17.93	26-12-85	—
121.	DDII	C/o 384 LIG Houses at PKT. L (P) Pitampura	52.08	15-3-80	Work completed before 1-4-86.
122.	DDII	C/o 408 MIG houses at Pkt. A(D) Pitampura	82.31	7-10-80	Work rescinded before 1-4-86
123.	DDV	C/o 656 MIG at Jahangirpuri (i) SH C/o 320 MIG	130.68	11-3-82	Work rescinded.
124.	DDV	C/o 656 MIG at Jahangirpuri (ii) SH: C/o 336 MIG	132.5	15-2-82	Work rescinded.
125.	HDXXVII	C/o Police Station at Shalimarbagh, Blk, C&D	10.21	1-8-81	These are deposit works of Delhi Admn. & were take up as per orders of L .G. (Delhi).
126.	HDXXVII	C/o Police Qtrs. (32 Type-A, 24 Type-B, and 16 Type-C) at Blk. C & D, Shalimar Bagh.	19.36	1-8-81	These works are presently suspended.
127.	CPDIV	C/o 856 EWS Houses at Sarita Vihar Sec. I SH: C/o 624 EWS Houses at Sarita Vihar Sec. I pocket M&N	90.60	23-8-85	Permission to undertake work in anticipation of AA & ES accorded by VC on 21-6-85 on the note submitted vide No: CE (SEZ), 7 (12) 85/2284—85 dt. 18-6-85. Project estimate since to EM for accord of AA & ES.
128.	CPD IV	C/o 856 EWS Houses at Sarita Vihar Sec. I SH : C/o 232 Addl. EWS Houses at Sarita Vihar, Pkt. M&N	33.79	22-8-85	
129.	CPDIV	C/o 704 EWS:Houses at Mathura Road near Badarpur	102.22	23-8-85	
130.	CPD I	D/o Distt. Centre Janakpuri SH : (i) C/o Division office at Distt. Centre	1.75	4-11-82	All thees works have been taken up under the scheme of D/o Distt. Centre at Janakpuri.
131.	CPD I	(ii) P/ L. Sewerage line.	4.50	31-7-82	The scheme was initially started by HDVII and later

1	2	3	4	5	6
132.	CPD. I	(iii) Road Work	1.84	15-2-83	on transferred to CPD. In Oct. 82 works costing about
133.	CPD. I	(iv) P/L Water supply line	2.28	16-11-83	Rs.40.00 lacs have been taken up under this scheme The
134.	CPD. I	(v) Widening of road along with Police Station	2.25	9-10-84	Revised P.E. for the Scheme amounting to Rs.2,67,37,980/-
135.	CPD. I	(vi) C/o S.W. Drains	22.37	9-10-84	is under the process of accord of AA &ES of the competent Authority. In fact AA&ES has already been accorded by the VC, DDA and estimate is understood to be in the Finance Wing for concurrence. But formal communication of the AA & ES is still awaited.
136.	H.D. XXXV	C/o Houses under SFS at Tughlakabad opp. Hamdard Ngr. on M.E. Road SH : C/o 144 DU's(48 DU's of Cat. II 96 DU's of Cat. III) and 96 Car Garrages including internal dev. of land.	220.68	24-1-86	P. E. is under preparation in SSW's office. The works has been taken up in anticipation of AA & ES. Permission to undertake works in anticipation of AA&ES accorded by VC on 21-6-85 on the note submitted vide No. CE (SEZ)/7 (12) 85/2284 dt. 18-6-85.
137.		C/o houses under SFS at Tugalka bad opp Hamdard Nagar on M. B. Road SH ; C/o 108 DU's (36 Cat. II & Cat. III) ; & 72 Car garrages i/c Int. Dev. of land.	165.41	241.86	Do.

138.	HDXXXV	C/o Houses under SFS at MB Road opp. Saket. SH : C/o 96 DU's (32 DU's of Cat. II & 64 DU's of Cat. III) & 64 car garraage i/c internal development of land	147.20	16-1-86	Do.
139.	UVD. I	C/o 176 FWS Houses at Vill. Lado Sarai	22.80	16-9-85	Permission to undertake works in anticipation of AA& ES accorded by VC on 21-6-85 on the note submitted vide No CE (SEZ) /7 (12) 85/2284 dt. 18-6-85
140.	UVD. I	C/o 240 EWS houses at Village Khirki Group. I	33.80	21-8-85	Do.
141.	UVD. I	C/o 260 EWS Houses at Village Khirki Group. II	34.80	7-11-85	Do.
142.	UVD. I	C/o 26 SFS Houses at Gautam Nagr.	36.10	14-2-86	VC. vide his order dated 14-1-86 on the note submitted vide No. F. 2CE (SEZ) FO 89/ 85-86/176 dt. 13-1 -86 authorised to undertake works in anticipation of AA&ES
143.	HDXXXV	C/o Addl. 64 SFS DU's (32 Cat. II 32 Cat. III) and 48 Scooter garrages at Alakananda near Pkt. B-opp. Yamuna Co. operative Housing Bldg. society including intt. dev. of land	78.59	30-1-86	The P. E. is under preparation in SSW's office the work has been taken up in anticipation of AA& ES accorded.
144.	H.D. XXXV	C/o 36 DU's under SFS at Kalka ji, (West of community centre) Sh. C/o 12 Cat. II 24, Cat. III and 24 car garrages including internal dev. of land.	51.17	15-4-85	The P.E. is under preparation in SSW's office the work has been taken up in anticipation of AA & ES accorded.
145.	HDXXXV	C/o 270 Addl. DU's under SFS (90 DU's Cat. II and 180 DU's cat III) and 180 Car garrages at kalkaji west of community centre (Mandakini Enclave) SH: C/o 24 SFS Houses (8 DUs Cat. II, 16 DUs Cat. III & 16 car garrages.	37.50	27-3-86	P.E. is under perparation in SSW's office The works has been taken up in anticipation of AA &ES. V. C. vide his order dated. 14-12-85 on note of CE dt. 10-12-85 authorised to take works on 4 blocks in anticipation of AA & ES and clearance from DUAC.

1	2	3
146.	HIVI	C/o 450 Janta Houses at Dakshinpuri
147.	HDVI	C/o 440 Janta Houses at Tigri Gr. I
148.	HDVI	C/o 440 Janta Houses At Tigri Gr. II

4

5

6

65-35 21-8-85 Permission to undertake works
in anticipation of AA & ES
accorded by VC on 21-6-85
on the note submitted *vide*
No. GE (SEZ)/7 (12)85/2284
dt. 18-6-85

64-24 7-8-85 Do.

64-24 7-8-85 Permission to undertake works
in anticipation of AA & ES
accorded by VC on 21-6-85
on the note submitted *vide* No.
CE (SEZ)/7 (12) 2284 dt.
18-6-85 Works could not be
started due to non-availab-
lity of site.

44

APPENDIX II

(Vide Para 50)

APPENDIX—II

(vide Para 50)

Sl. No.	Divison	Name of work	Date of start	Name of contractor	Estt. cost (In lacs of Rs.)
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	HD. XXII	C/o 378 LIG houses at Nand Nagri, Pkt. BC & Di/cint. dev.	17-5-83	M/s Gormat Estate (P) Ltd.	51.37
2.	DD. VII	C/o 7000 houses in T.Y.A. at Trilokpuri. SH : C/o 285 DU's (57 MIG 228 LIG) at Trilokpuri, Type-B, Gr. II.	16-3-82	M/s Chander Kant & Co.	67.67
3.	DD. VII	C/o 7000 houses in T.Y.A. at Trilokpuri SH C/o 265 DU's (53 MIG + 212 LIG) at Trilokpuri type-B Group -II.	1-4-82	M/s Project engg. & Consultant.	63.03
4.	DD. IX	C/o 7000 houses : in T.Y.A. at Trilokpuri SH C/o 300 DU's (60 MIG + 240 LIG) at TRILOKPURI Gr. B.,	31-7-82	M/s Apex. Constn. Co.	71.59
5.	DD. XI	C/o 904 DUs at Trilokpuri SH : C/o 168 MIG/56 LIG DUs at Trilokpuri Pkt. I.	15-3-82	M/s Gujral Constn. Co.	66.56
6.	DD. XI	C/o 904 DU's at Trilokpuri SH : 168 MIG/56 LIG DUs at Trilokpuri, Pkt. II	29-4-82	M/s J.R. Sahni & Sons.	66.56
7.	DD. XI	SH : 171 MIG/57 LIG DUs at Trilokpuri, Pkt. III.	15-9-81	M/s Gujral Constrection Co.	67.74
8.	DD. XI	SH : 171 MIG/57 LIG DUs at Trilokpuri, Group-IV.	15-9-81	M/s J. R. Sahni & Co.	67.74

Tendered cost (Rs.)	Dt. of start	Stipulated date of completion	Expnd. incurred upto 31-5-86 (in lacs)	Percentage physical progress of work upto 31-5-86	Reasons for shortfall.	Whether balance work has been awarded if so, when ?
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
104.00	26-5-83	25-5-84	89.59	53%	The work has been abandoned by the contractor & since rescinded.	No. the tender for balance work has been recd. & is under scrutiny.
127.69	26-3-82	25-3-83	138.97	95.5%	The houses were complete except for availability of peripheral services.	N.A.
118.94	11-4-82	10-4-83	71.64	43%	Work delayed by the contractor and work rescinded	Under processes.
135.98	10-8-82	9-8-83	94.50	80%	Work delayed mainly due to QC (DDA) is objection & due to poor progress by the contractor.	The work is being executed by the original contractor i.e M/s. apex. Constn. Co.
125.46	25-3-82	24-3-83	91.62	47%	Work rescinded.	Under consideration for award.
128.32	9-5-82	8-5-83	132.21	90%	Shortage of material foundation drawing of hali stock were recd. after the stipulated date of completion.	N.A.
120.25	1-10-81	30-9-82	110.37	78.5%	Work rescinded.	Under consideration for award.
120.25	1-10-81	30-9-82	141.00	93%	Shortage of material foundation drawing of 1/2 block were recd. after the stipulated dt. of completion.	N.A.

1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	ED. XI	C/o 300 Janta DUs in Trans Yamuna Area Zone -B-2, near Seelampur. Int. electrification.	17-11-83	M/s Gulati Engg. works.	2.42
10.	HD. XX	C/o 412/412 DU's at Dilshad Garden C/o 96 MIG/96LIG DU's Gr. IV.	18-3-80	M/s Ray Constn. Co.	59.89
11.	HD. XX	C/o 613 Janta DU's at Dilshad Garden Pkt. Q.	24-3-83	M/s Civil Engg. (I)	47.62
12.	HD. XIX	C/o 960 LIG houses at Dilshad Garden.	31-3-83	M/s Vikas Engg. Co.	95.29
13.	HD. XIII	C/o 1200 MIG Houses (NP) at Vikaspuri, Bodella Pkt. DG. II i/c int. dev. SH : 304 MIG Gr. III (ii) 336 MIG Houses Gr. IV.	9-6-82	M/s Vee Aar Builders.	128.76
14.	DD. IV	C/o 84 MIG DUs at Bodolla Pkt. GG. III.	20-1-82	M/s. Agro Engg. Pvt. Ltd.	16.80
15.	HD. XXVIII	360 LIG at Jaidev Park i/c V/S, S I & int. dev. of land.	26-5-82	M/s J.K. Gandhi.	48.69
	SE (ZONE)				
16.	CPD. V	C/o 120 LIG houses, at. Madanpur khadar int. dev. of land.	26-6-82	Sh. R.S. Rana.	15.14
17.	CPD. VII	C/o M.S. Flats 120 Cat. III and 72 Cat. II (Duplex) at East of Kailash Pkt. A&B under SFS.	13-5-83	M/S Anant Raj Agencies.	142.97
18.	HD. XVII	C/o 768 MIG/640 MIG DUs in Sec. VIII, Pkt. O.	12-1-83	M/s Anant Raj Agencies.	197.92

7	8	9	10	11	12	13
					Allotment in progress and electrical work related with progress.	
2.68	27-11-83	25-5-84	2.07	90%		
97.92	27-3-80	26-3-81	90.00	70%	Work delayed by contractor.	Not yet.
98.00	4-4-83	3-4-84	45.22	50%	Do.	N.A.
181.84	10-4-83	9-4-84	227.49	70%	Due to slow progress by contractor.	
247.21	19-6-82	18-6-83	277.42	85%	Short supply of stipulated material. (2) Abandonment of work by contractor.	No.
31.79	30-1-82	29-1-83	23.43	37%	Contractor abandoned the work in Jan. 83.	Yes. Balance work was awarded in Aug. 85.
97.00	6-6-82	5-6-83	28.54	21%	Work rescinded on 22-2-85	Yes, Awarded.
29.76	9-7-82	8-7-83	15.60	40%	Work rescinded in 11/85	Part of the balance work awarded on 15-7-86.
317.39	23-5-83	22-11-84	374.42	65%	(i) Delayed approval from DUAC. (ii) Delayed on a c of structural drawing from CDO, CPWD. (iii) Revision of architectural drawings. (iv) Short supply of steel /G.I. Pipe and S.C.I. Pipes.	N.A.
345.75	21-1-83	21-10-84	347.64	92%	1. Delay in handing over actual site of Constn.	N.A.

1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	RPD. V	C/o 400 MIG/352 MIG DUs in Pkt. 3, Sec. VIII.	12-1-83	Do.	87.46
20.	HD. VIII	C 0944 Houses under SFS at Kishangarh. SH. C/o 95 Cat. III 96 Cat. II & 144 S. garages i/c int. water supply, S.I. & int. dev. of land at Kishangarh Pkt. 3 gr. II.	25-6-82	M/s Uppal Engg. Cons- truction Co. (P) Ltd. (P) Ltd.	84.77
21.	HD. VIII	C 0944 Houses under SFS at Kishangarh. SH. C/o int. water supply, S.I. & int. dev. of land at Kishangarh Pkt. Sgr. II Group -I.	25-6-82	M/s Mittal Builders.	84.77
22.	HD. I	C/o 95 Houses under SFS at Kishangarh. SH : 40 Cat. III & 40 Cat. II & 72 Scooter Gar- rages i/c int. deve- lopment.	25-6-82	Do.	42.05
23.	FD. X	C/o 240 Cat. II 360 Cat. III and 360 S. Garrages for SFS at Vasant Vihar opp. J.N.U. SH : (i) Gr. 10/p 90 Cat. III 60 Cat. II and 90s. garrages.	8-6-83	M/s Progressive Constn. Co.	76.24
24.		(ii) G. IV/C/o 81 Cat. III, 56 Cat. II and 88 S. Garrages.	9-6-83	M/s S.S. Constn. Co.	71.14

7	8	9	10	11	12	13
100.00	29-1-83	29-7-84	175.56	96%	Delay in receipt of drawings. Non availability of basic services like W/S sewerage Electricity in area. Shortage materials like G.I. Pipes & Cement & Steel during execution. Shortage of funds in 1986-87.	N.A.
157.5	5-7-82	4-7-83	68.09	31%	Work rescinded due to slow progress.	Not Awarded.
168.2	5-7-82	4-7-83	143.15	75%	Work abandoned by the contractor.	Do.
82.69	5-10-83	4-10-84	71.18	78%	Work rescinded due to stoppage of work by the contractor.	Tenders under progress.
148.51	18-6-83	17-6-84	118.30	82%	Delay due to area being rocky & delay in receipt of structural drawings.	No.
171.88	19-7-83	18-6-84	42.70	76%	Do.	No.

1	2	3	4	5	6
25.	CD. I Action is being taken for rectification of defects and balance work.	C/o 720 LIG DUs in Pkt. 'W' at Pitampura Gr. II SH : C/o 6324 LIG houses at Pitampura.	6-1-81	M/s Sudhir Bros.	36.39
26.	CD. I	-Do- Sh C/o 396 LIG Houses at Pitampura Gr. I Action is being taken for rectification of defects and balance work	6-1-81	Do.	44.46
27.	CD. I Completed	C/o 80 three B/R type III & 80 two B/R type II & 120 SG under SFS at Pitampura, Pkt. S(D) Gr. I.	16-9-81	M/s Sethi Builders	70.93
28.	CD. I Completed	Do, Gr. II	20-10-81	M/s Mohan Constn. Co.	73.11
29.	CD I Completed	C/o 96 three B R 96 two B/R and 144 SG under SFS at Pitampura Gr. III.	20-10-81	Do.	87.27
30.	CD. I In progress and likely to be completed by June 87 provided funds are made available.	C/o 64 three B R 64 two DR & 96 SG under SFS at Pitampura Pkt. E (D)	20-10-81	M/s Sudhir Bros.	56.95
31.	CD I In progress and likely to be completed by June 87 provided funds are made available.	C/o 440 MIG houses at Pitampura Resd]. Scheme B. 5 (pt.) in Pkt. K. (D). SH : C/o 256 MIG house at P. Pura Gr. II i/c int. dev. of land. (Actual 144 DUs)	28-4-82	Do.	53.39

7	8	9	10	11	12	13
57.71	16-1-81	15-1-82	52.19	66%	Work delayed due to contractor's Fault.	Work rescinded all for balance work for 5 times but no response is forthcoming.
70.52	16-1-81	15-1-82	46.43	62%	Contractor abandoned the work	—
123.35	25-9-81	24-6-82	123.00	99%	Due to shortage of stipulated materials from time to time.	—
128.60	29-10-81	28-7-82	130.77	99%	Do.	—
152.50	29-10-81	28-7-82	155.21	90.70%	Do.	—
90.66	30-10-81	20-7-82 org. bal. 40.15 5.98	40.15	53% 60%	Work rescinded on 2-7-84 slow progress due to work of strengthening & rectification of defects being carried out by deptt.	Balance work awarded to M/s Express Engg. Co. on 12-3-85.
98.21	7-5-82	6-5-83 org. bal. 25.5	7.50	14% 38.68%	Do.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
32.	In progress and likely to be completed by June 87 provided funds are made available.	5 (pt) in Pkt. K. (D) SH : C/o 192 MIG houses at P. Pura Pkt. K. (D) Gr. I (Actual 1,76 DUs)	28-4-82	M/s Sudhir Bros.	40.05
33.	CD. I In progress and likely to be completed by June 87 provided funds are made available.	—Do—SH : C/o 560 MIG DUs in Pkt. A(P) i/c int. dev. P. Pura. SH : C/o 192 MIG Gr. III.	11-6-82	Sh. Prakash Sharma	38.67
34.	CD. VI 240 Houses completed	C/o 192 MIG DUs at Motia Khan Gr. V. (Actual 152).	17-2-82	M/s Bhai Sardar Singh & Sons.	53.41
35.	CD. VI		7-2-82	M/s Manohar Singh Sahney & Co.	33.28
36.	Do.	C/o 288 LIG DUs at Motia Khan Gr. I (Actual 198).	25-11-81	Do.	59.41
37.	Do.	C/o 468 LIG DUs at Motia Khan Gr. II & III. (Actual 414).		13-7-81	
38.	Do. Completed	C/o 188 three bed room 72 two b/r 60 servant qts. 34 Car Gar. & 72 SG at Mall Road under SFS.	26-5-81	M/s Sunder Lal Khatri & Sons	83.42

7	8	9	10	11	12	13
73·68	7-5-82	6-5-83	org. 0·40 bal. 33·22	15% 40%	27-7-84 slow progress due to work of strengthening & rectification of defects being carried out by Deptt.	Awarded to M/s. Mohan Co. on 12-3-85.
72·83	2-6-82	1-6-83	27·09 42·30	33% 75·12%	Work rescinded on 24-8-84 & slow progress due to work of strengthening and rectification of defects being carried by the Deptt.	Do.
102·95	26-2-82	26-2-83	122·07	99·5%	Contractor have abandoned the work. Since May, 85 & move to High Court.	Balance work awarded spilling the tender as per order of CE(NZ) DDA during the month of Jan. & Feb. 86.
64·34	27-2-82	26-2-83	76·89	99·5%	Work delayed as contractor had gone to High Court.	
72·13	5-12-81	4-9-82	62·92	59%	Do.	
120·12	23-7-81	22-4-82	120·50	72%	Do.	Tender for balance work have been recd. and under scrutiny in CE(NZ) office.
136·22	5-6-81	4-3-82	214·00	85%	Originally the work was awarded to M/s S.L. Khatri & Sons. The Cont. could not complete the work.	The balance work has been awarded on 5-3-86.

1	2	3	4	5	6
39.	DD. I. completed	C/o 192 LIG Ashok Vihar Blk J. Ph. I.		M/s. Raj Co.	18-99
40.	Do. Completed	C/o 144 MIG Ashok Vihar Blk. J. Ph. I.		M/s. A.R. Khanna.	29-32
41.	Do. Completed	C/o 296 MIG P. Pura Pkt. J(D). SH. 144 MIG		M/s. Mohan Constn. Co.	40-02
42.	Do. Completed	SH: 152 MIG		M/s. Mohan Constn. Co.	42-44
43.	Do. completed	C/o 176 SFS Shalimar Bagh Blk. B. Pkt. W.		M/s Globe Co.	77-90
44.	Do. Completed	C/o 96 Shalimar Bagh Blk. B. Pkt. W.		M/s Paras Bldrs.	42-37
45.	DD. II Completed U (P)	C/o 400 LIG at P. Pura 15-2-80		Sh. Prakash Sharma	47-42
46.	Do. nearing Completion	C/o 160 MIG at P. Pura Pk. Q(U).	12-2-81	M/s Sudhir Bros.	53-20
47.	Do. Court Stay Order	C/o 400 MIG at P. Pura Pkt. A (D).	7-10-80	M/s K.C. Chibber & Co.	82-32
48.	DD. V.	656 MIG Jahangirpuri SH : C/o 336 MIG Gr. I	15-2-82	M/s Bansal Traders.	72-02
49.	Do.	SH. 320 MIG Gr. II	11-3-82	M/s W.S. Constn. Co.	60-42
50.	Do. Work has been rescinded and N.I.T. for balance work under preparation.	656 LIG Jahangirpuri	31-3-82	Do.	72-44
51.	HDXXIV	936 Janta Pitampura Pkt. V(P) N.I.T. under preparation		M/s W.G. Constn. Co.	56-40

7	8	9	10	11	12	13
85·85	27-3-82	26-12-82	51·94	94%	Weak plaster & lines/ level not proper work completed deptt.	
53·92	30-4-82	29-4-83	65·00	96%	Do.	
75·42	1-5-82	30-4-83	79·74	95%	Slow progress by contractor.	N.A.
79·59	1-5-82	30-4-83	79·88	96%	Do.	Do.
165·16	14-1-83	14-1-84	166·70	98%	Do.	Already allotment.
87·00	12-2-83	11-2-84	77·50	98%	Do.	Do.
69·75	25-2-80	24-2-81	153·85	96%	Lot of weak plaster /flooring damaged PVC pipes defective RCC and brick work at II floor poor.	Yes.
83·62	22-2-81	21-11-81	103·64	98%	Do.	Do.
125·54	17-10-83	16-10-81	52·50	47%	High court stay.	No.
132·51	25-2-82	24-2-83	24·56	27%	Poor foundation & weak brick work.	No. Work rescinded some of tasks to be demolish and re- constructed N.I.T. under preparation.
130·68	21-3-82	28-3-83	32·58	25%	Do.	No.
138·19	10-4-82	9-4-83	89·97	60%	Poor brick work and weak plaster.	No.
86·00	20-10-80	19-10-81	63·00	100 DUs completed & ready for allot- ment.	1820 DUs were rejected for allotment. demolition.	No.

1	2	3	4	5	6
52.	Do. N.I.T. for B. Work under process.	192 MIG at P. Pura Pkt. B. (P).		M/s Mohindra Constn. Co.	40.24
53.	Do. N.I.T. for B.W. under process.	560 MIG P. Pura Pkt. A (P) SH : 230 MIG Gr. II.		Sh. Om Singh	42.39
54.	HD. XXVII Nearing completion	C/o 240 LIG houses at Shalimar Bagh Pkt. D Blk. B. 21-12-79		M/s Suti Constns	24.00
55.]	HD. XXVII Rectification of defects in progress likely to be completed in Sept. 87.	C/o 192 LIG Houses at Shalimar Bagh Blk A. Pkt. J. 29-4-80		M/s Bunder Lal Khatri & Sons.	19.54
56.	HD. V Work rescinded and for balance work under preparation.	C/o 960 Janta Houses at Lawarence Road, Pkt. B-IV, 18-8-81		M/s Hans Raj Constn. Co.	82.49

7	8	9	10	11	12	13
73.64	30-4-82	23-4-83	51.65	90%	Poor RCC I weak and reconstruction plaster.	No.
77.39	30-4-82	29.4-83	71.50	90% Do-	Do- (i) this work was a sick scheme transferred from D.D.V as abanded work in Jan. 83. (ii) short supply stipulated material	No. N.A. since the work is being executed by original contractor.
33.59	31-12-79	30-12-80	67.80	90/	(iii) Delay in approval of services from MCD i.e. Sewerage, W. S. & Drainage.	
26.65	8-5-81	7-5-81	36.11	95%	(i) This sick scheme was transferred from DD. V, in June, 83 as abanded work. (ii) Short supply of stipulated material. (iii) Work rescinded on 1-12-84.	Balance work not awarded so-far.
138.50	28-1-81	27-2-82	165.66	91%	(i) Work checked by CE(QC) (ii) Work checked by Fact Finding Committee. (iii) Strength got determined for RCC structural element from CRR I Delhi (iv) Load test got conducted by I.I.T. Delhi. (v) Defective stair cases landings detected by field staff (EE/SE/CE) (vi) Deflection of RCC slabs stair case cantilever landing measured with dial gauges by field staff. Comprehensive report sent to SE vide No. F. 4 (122) 85/HDV/ DDA/1238 dt. 27-3-85. (vii) Work recommended for rescion.	

1	2	3	4	5	6
57.	HD V	C/o 288 MIG Houses at Shalimar Bagh, Blk. C, Pkt. A.	7-2-83	M/s Engg. Syndicate	62.32
	In progress 96 DU's expectation to be com- pleted by 3/87 and 192 DU's by 9/87				
58.	HD V	C/o 168 BFS DU's at Shalimar Bagh, Blk. B, Pkt. F.	24-4-81	M/s Sunder Lal Khatri & j Sons.	51.67
	Work has been rescin- ded Tenderer under consideration.				
95.	EE/EDIV	C/o 656 MIG DU's at GT K. Rd. Jahangirpuri Pkt. C. SH : 320 DU's Gr. I, New Pattern.	15-9-82	M/s Rajiv Radio & Engg. works.	8.81
60.	Do	-do-	Do.	M/s R.K. & Co.	9.26
	SH : IEI of 336 DU's in Gr. II.				
61.	Do.	C/o 656 MIG DU's at GTK Rd. Jahangirpuri Pkt. C. (NP) SH : IEI.	4-2-83	M/s Rajeev Engg. Works.	10.66

7	8	9	10	11	12	13
121.43	17-2-83	16-2-84	87.60	58%	Progress of work is slow. Contractor show caused. Work recommended for rescion.	
82.20	4-5-81	3-5-82	78.34	62%	(i) Work checked by CE (QC). (ii) Work checked by Fact Finding Committee. (iii) Strength got determined for RCC element from CRR I Delhi. (iv) Defective stair case landings detected by field staff (EE/SE/CE). (v) Work rescinded on 1st Sept. 84. (vi) Tender for balance work called and rejected by W.A.B. (vii) Tender for balance work reinvited which are being sent to CE (NZ) with necessary recommendations.	
9.25	25-9-82	24-9-83	1.08	15%	Civil work abandoned.	N.A.
9.72	Do.	Do.	1.50	15%	Do.	N.A.
11.18	14-2-83	13-2-84	2.59	20%	Do.	N.A.

1	2	3	4	5	6
62.	Do.	do--	6-8-83	M/s. R.K. & Co.	3-82
		SH: IEI of 128 MIG DU's Sec. I Pkt. A—J			
63.	EE/ED. VII	C/o 160 SFS houses Cat. II & 120 Scooter sheds under SFS at Shalimar Bagh SH : IEI	2-10-81	M/s Metro Elect. Co.	6-00
64.		C/o 756 LIG flats at Motia Khan SH : IEI of 216 DUs Gr. II	26-7-82	M/s R.K. & Co.	3-75
		SH : IEI of 252 DUs Gr. II	26-7-82		4-34
		SH : IEI of 288 DUs Gr. I.	26-7-82		4-94
65.		C/o 108 SFS Cat. III & 72 SFS at Cat. II & 60 Servant Qtr. 34 Car garages 72 Scooter sheds at Mall Rd. SH : IEI.	23-2-83	M/s S.L. Enter- prises	9-21
66.		C/o 480 SFS at Shalimar Bagh Blk B. Pkt. W. SH : IEI of 104 Cat. III & 104 Cat. II	18-7-83	M/s R.K. & Co.	8-15
67.		C/o 496 MIG DUs at Shali- mar Bagh Blk C. Pkt. A&B SH : IEI of 288 DUs (Para 11- Nil) 18-Nil.	1-12-83	M/s Goswamy Elect. works	7-44
68.	E.D. VIII	C/o 160 MIG houses at (Q) Uttari Pitampura SH: IEI.	12-84	M/s R.K. Elect. Co. works.	5-57
69.		C/o 408 MIG DUs at Pk Dakshini Pitam- pura SH: IEI.	3-83	M/s Bumrah Elect. Co.	11-80
70.		C/o 560 MIG houses in pk 'A' at Poorvi P. Pura SH : IEI in 192, DUs.	4-83	M/s R.K. Elect. Co.	5-26
71.		C/o 720 LIG DUs at Pitampura SH : IEI in 360 DUs.	9-81	Do.	4-55
72.		C/o 120 DUs under SFS at L' Dakshini P. Pura	1-82	M/s Metro Elect. Co.	5-21
73.		C/o 488 DUs at K. Dakshini P. Pura SH : IEI in 256 DUs.	9-82	M/s. R.K. & Co.	6-95
4.		M/s C/o. 192 MIG DUs at 'B' Poorvi P. Pura SH : IEI.	9-82	Do.	5-15

7	8	9	10	11	12	13
3-87	16-8-83	15-8-84	1-02	10%	-do-	N.A.
6-11	11-10-81	10-10-82	2-18	50%	Building work abandoned.	N.A.
4-10	5-8-82	4-8-83	1-90	65%	Do.	N.A.
4-77	Do.	Do.	1-85	60%	Do.	N.A.
5-44	Do.	Do.	2-06	65%	Do.	N.A.
9-68	4-3-83	3-9-84	4-91	70%	Bld. work slow contd.	N.A.
8-15	9-10-83	8-10-84	0-84	10%	Bldg. work abandoned	N.A.
7-33	10-12-83	9-12-84	2-42	35%	Bld. work slow	N.A.
5-75	7-1-82	6-1-83	3-06	70%	Due to slow progress of civil work.	N.A.
12-57	1-4-83	31-3-84	2-84	25%	Civil work abandoned	N.A.
5-34	2-5-83	1-5-83	2-12	60%	Slow progress of work	NIL
4-78	10-9-81	8-9-82	1-63	40%	Civil work abandoned	N.A.
5-26	21-1-82	20-1-83	2-87	60%	Do.	N.A.
7-29	2-10-82	1-10-83	2-70	40%	Slow progress of Bldg. work.	N.A.
5-43	1-10-82	30-9-83	3-06	75%	Civil work abandoned.	N.A.

APPENDIX III

(Vide Para 68)

Details of activities for arranging Services of Water Supply and Sewerage to DUs built at Kishangarh.

SERVICES:—

Water-supply and Sewerage:—

- (i) Kishangarh S.F.S. housing Scheme was initiated in January/Feb. 82.
- (ii) It is recorded in one of the inspection note of the then E.M. (Dated 16-1-82, Item No. 9 & 11 enclosed as Annexure-A), that availability of water-supply and sewerage by M.C.D. in this area will take a long time. In the mean-time, interim arrangements were to be made by the DDA for water-supply through tubewells & for sewerage treatments by oxidation pond etc.
- (iii) In the meeting dated 15-2-82 (Item No. 3 enclosed as Ann. B.) in the office of the E.M., it was decided that the work of providing trunk services i.e. water-supply and sewerage etc. is to be done by E.E., D.D. III who may prepare a tentative scheme. In the inspection note of E.M. dated 22-2-82 (Item No. 5 enclosed as Ann. B), it is also recorded that availability of water would be a problem in this area and, therefore, expert advice of Central Ground Water Board (C.G.W.B.), may be taken to identify the places for boring tubewells etc.
- (iv) In the meeting of the E.M. dated 26-2-82 (Item No. 4, as Annex. C) S.E., Circle-II, was directed to take up the matter with Engineer-in-Chief, M.C.D. and the Addl. Chief Engineer, MCD regarding water-supply and sewerage disposal arrangements on long term basis. It was again decided that for immediate needs, Central Ground Water Board be consulted to identify the water bearing locations.
- (v) E.E., H.D.-XXI contacted Hydrologist of C.G.W.B. and sought his advice who informed that water yield in this area is not more than 2000 gallons per hour. The possibility of providing tubewells at Ghitorni was also discussed with them. (Copy of letter dt. 30-3-82 is enclosed as Annex. D.)
- (vi) In April, 82, it was decided by the Chief Engineer to formally request the C.G.W.B. for carrying out detailed surveyed to explore the possibility of availability of water from Ghitorni or other nearby areas. (Copy of letter dt. 14-4-82 is enclosed as Annex. E.)

- (vii) E.E.,D.D. III in the mean time surveyed the entire area, consulted MCD Engineers and framed a scheme for providing interim arrangements of water-supply & sewerage. He also reported that MCD will not be able to provide these services atleast for next six to ten years. In the scheme, sewerage disposal was suggested through interim arrangements of providing oxidation pond. (Copy of E.E.D.D. III's report is enclosed as Annex. F.).
- (viii) Central Ground Water Board surveyed the entire area and submitted an interim report in September, 82 (Copy of letter dated 6-9-82 is enclosed as Annex. G.). The report was not encouraging the yield of tubewells in Kishangarh area was estimated to about 2000 G.P.H. and in the Ghitorni about 5000 G.P.H. only. Final report from C.G.W.B. was received in November, 1983 only.
- (ix) It was decided in August, 83 (E.M.'s D.O. letter dated 5-8-83 is enclosed as Annex. H.) a net-work of six or seven tubewells may be provided at Ghitorni and also to explore the possibility of laying water-supply lines from Ghitorni to Kishangarh.
- (x) A scheme was framed for laying P.S.C. water-supply lines of 450 mm dia from Ghitorni, C/o under-ground reservoir in Kishangarh etc.
- (xi) In Sept. 83, S.E., Circle-II, again discussed the matter personally with the MCD Engineers for providing water-supply and sewerage facilities. The Engineer-in-chief, MCD water-supply & sewerage disposal undertaking intimated that MCD has no plans to supply water even in immediate future. He also reported results of his discussions, recommendations of C.G.W.B. etc. to the Chief Engineer and proposal for providing U/G tank and water-supply line from Ghitorni. (Copy of S.E., Circle-II's letter dated 7-9-83 is enclosed as Annex. I.).
- (xii) In Sept. 83, the matter was again referred to C.G.W.B. to carryout detailed survey etc. If water-supply for about 20000 DUs could be managed from surrounding areas etc. (Copy of letter dated 14-9-83 from C.G.W.B. is enclosed as Annex. J.).
- (xiii) Orders for procurement of PSC pipes for water-supply was placed on Indian Hume Pipes Company, Ballabgarh and tenders were called for laying PSC water-supply lines from Ghitorni to Kishangarh in Oct./Nov. 1983. Since, the response to tenders was poor, tenders were allowed to MCD contractors also. (Copy of E.E.'s Note dated 25-11-83 is enclosed as Annex. K.).

- (xiv) Proposals for peripheral water-supply scheme and for peripheral sewerage scheme were framed and submitted to the MCD for approval of the scheme in Dec. 83. (E. E./HD. XXI's letter dated 2-12-83 is enclosed as Annex. L. RL2).
- (xv) The work of laying PSC water-supply lines from Ghitorni was awarded in March, 84 and was completed in Oct./Nov. 1985. The delay in laying these lines was due to passing of these lines through private lands & narrow kachha tracks where trucks for cartage of bricks were playing day and night. Laying of water-supply lines from U/G tank in Kishangarh (Sector-D) to the houses in Kishangarh scheme was also delayed as some portion of the land in the alignment of water lines was not acquired and the owner had to be pressurised at personal levels. The entire net-Work were completed in March/April, 1986.
- (xvi) The MCD, while approving the integrated water-supply scheme for Vasant Kunj, Sector-A, B, C & D *Vide* their letter dated 4/9/84, Para 9. & 10 are enclosed as Annex. M.) have mentioned even at this stage that they have no provision for water for this development. DDA shall arrange water from its own sources.

Sewerage-

- (xvii) As stated above (para xiv) scheme for peripheral sewerage was submitted to MCD in Dec. 83. The work was taken up in February, 84 in anticipation of MCD's approval. (Copy of EE/HD-XXI's letter dated 17/2/84 is enclosed as Annex. N). The work could be completed only by January 1986, as the *sewer* lines has to be re-aligned to avoid passing through unacquired land coming in way.
- (xviii) As per MCD's advice for interim *treatment*, oxidation ponds were to be constructed but it was later decided to provide better & improved system for interim treatment by providing oxidation *diches*.
- (xix) In Feb./March, 85 an Engineer was sent to Nagpur (NERI) to study functioning of oxidation ditches and seek technical guidance. NERI demanded a fees of Rs. 40,000/- (Rs. Forty thousand only) as consultancy and a period of six months for finalising the proposals and design details. In June, 85 it was decided to study the oxidation ditches treatment system and start the work without any consultancy from ERI.
- (xx) The work of C/O oxidation ditches system was started in July, 85, and completed in March, 1986.

APPENDIX IV
(Vide Para 68)

*Summary of Activity for Electrification
and References to D.E.S.U.*

Kishangarh SFS Flats in Pkt. B&C (768+96)

Sl. No.	Name of activity	Dt.
1.	Request for electrification sent to DESU	27/12/82
2.	Payment of Rs. 1,94,159.80 for construction of sub-station buildings (4 nos.) deposited with DESU vide letter No. W-94/ED-III(80)/DDA/972 dated 23/5/83.	23/5/83
3.	Estimate and Demand Note for Rs. 39,03,895/- received from DESU vide their letter no. CD-II/R&D/Dev-1909/11057 dated 19/12/83,	20/12/83
4.	Part payment amounting to Rs. 15,62,400/- (because of shortage of funds) made to DESU vide this office no. F. 3(10)/ED-III/DDA/A/83-84/6960-63 dated 24/2/84.	24/2/84
5.	Balance payment amounting to Rs. 8,39,515/- made to DESU and the remaining amount proposed to be adjusted against Revolving Fund	27/3/84
6.	Work started by DESU	2/85
7.	Work completed by DESU	9/85

Note:—

Work of external electrification was promised for completion within two months of start from 1/2/85 vide d.o. letter no. ACE (Const) 43/5399 dated 31/1/85 and No. AGM/1/29/1108 dated 26/2/85 of Shri M.K. Ahiya, Addl. Chief Engineer (Const) DESU and Shri P.S. Sawhney, Addl. General Manager (T) DESU respectively addressed to Shri R.A. Khemani, CE(SWZ), DDA. The work of external electrification could not be completed as per the above programme because of heaps of *malbas* lying on cable routes and for DESU service connection cables pipes not laid for proposed concrete paved areas around flats. Letters addressed for the needful to Executive Engineer, Housing Division No. 1 and Executive Engineer, Housing Division No. XXI vide letter Nos:

W-94/ED-III/82/1885-88 dated 16/3/85

W-94/ED-III/83/1901-03 dated 18/3/85

W-94/ED-III/82/4035-38 dated 16/7/85

SE(E)-'s letter no. SE(E)-I/3(19)85/528 dated 8/3/85 to SE/Circle-I also stressed the necessity of getting the *malbas* removed from the cable routes.

KISHANGARH SFS FLATS IN PKT. A(400+40)

Sl. No.	Name of work activity	Dt.
1.	Request for external Elect. sent to DESU vide letter No. ED-III/W-94/81/5162-67 dt. 11-11-83	11/11/83
2.	Payments made for constn. of s/stn. bldgs. vide letter No. F.3(10)/ED-III/DDA/83-84/7168-71 dt. 6/3/84 and No. W-94/ED-III/DDA/81/523 dt. 19-5-84	19/5/84
3.	Estimate and demand note amounting to Rs. 18,54,830/- for external elect. received vide DESU's demand note No. CO-II/R&D/Div./1909(1)/3204 dt. 16/6/84	16/6/84
4.	Payment made to DESU vide letter No. F. 3(10)ED-III/84-85/1369 dt. 3/7/84	3/7/84
5.	Work started by DESU	Feb. 85'
6.	Work completed by DESU	Sept. 85'

Note:—

Work of external electrification was promised for completion within two months of start from 1-2-85 vide D.O. letter No. ACE(Constn.) 43/5399 dt. 31-1-85 and No. A.G.M./1/29/108 dt. 26-2-85 of Sh. M.K. Ahiya Addl. Chief Engineer (Constn.) DESU, New Delhi and Sh. P.S. Sawhney Addl., General Manager/DESU respectively addressed to Sh. R.A. Khemani CE(SWZ) DDA, New Delhi. The work of external electrification could not be completed as per the above programme because of heaps of *malbas* lying on cable routes and for DESU service connection cable pipes not laid for proposed concrete paved areas around flats. Letters addressed for the needful to Executive Engineer, Housing division No. 1 and executive engineer, housing division No. XXI vide letter No.

W-94/ED-III/82/1885-88 dt. 16-3-85

W-94/ED-III/83/1901-08 dt. 18-3-85

W-94/ED-III/82/4035-38 dt. 16-7-85

S.E.(Elect.)/Circle-I/DDA, New Delhi's letter No. SE(E)-I/3(19) 85/528 dt. 8/3/85 to S.E. Circle-I/DDA also stressed the necessity of getting the *malbas* removed from the cable routes.

APPENDIX V (a)

(Vide Para 77)

*Statement of Expenditure incurred by Engineering Wing
during 1982-83 to 1985-86 as Per Detail given below :*

(Fig. in crores of Rs.)

	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
1. Expenditure on works & Development Scheme	12.88	9.03	10.92	16.01
2. Expenditure on development of land	35.85	36.76	35.20	41.14
3. Expenditure on Road.	0.77	0.59	0.31	0.02
4. Construction of Houses	113.95	107.21	108.54	197.52
5. Development of plot in JJR	2.94	2.55	2.95	1.52
6. Additional facilities	8.55	5.26	9.11	7.61
7. Maintenance of JJR	14.58	17.36	23.72	30.41
8. Sport Complex Funds	15.96	4.20	1.83	2.47
9. Deposit Works	37.83	19.66	0.01	0.26
TOTAL:	243.31	202.62	192.59	296.96

APPENDIX V (b)
(Vide Para 77)

*Sanctioned Strength of the Engineering Wing
(Class-I & II)*

Sl. No.	Category	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
1.	E.M.	1	1	1	1
2.	C.E.	5	8	8	8
3.	S.E. (C)	19	20	21	23
4.	S.E. (B)	2	3	3	3
5.	E.E. (C)	90	105	113	127
6.	E.E. (E)	11	16	16	16
7.	A.E. (C)	364	498	524	576
8.	A.E. (S)	19	19	19	19
9.	A.E. (E)	43	93	93	93
10.	A.E. (Radio)	1	1	1	1
11.	A.E. (Auto)	—	—	1	1
12.	Finance Officer	3	5	5	5
13.	Asstt. Director	2	2	2	2
14.	Private Secretary	2	2	2	2
15.	Superintendent	9	18	19	21
16.	Personal Asstt.	3	5	5	7
					905

APPENDIX V (C)

(Vide Para 77)

Statement showing the Sanctioned Strength of various Categories

under Personnel Branch-II during the year 1982 to 1986

Sl. No.	Category	Years			
		1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Junior Engineer (Civil)	1248	1700	1773	1955
2.	Junior Engineer (E/M)	97	265	265	265
					2220
3.	Draftsman (Gr.-I) Civil	21	35	35	41
4.	Draftsman (Gr.-II) Civil	98	146	150	176
5.	Draftsman (Gr.-III) Civil	50	70	70	92
6.	Draftsman (Gr.I) E/M	2	6	6	6
7.	Draftsman (Gr.II) E/M	8	24	24	24
8.	Draftsman (Gr.-III) E/M	5	13	13	13
					352
9.	Asstt.	45	73	78	84
10.	UDCs.	245	406	426	459
11.	LDCs.	253	587	635	708
12.	Steno	29	89	99	112
13.	Asstt. Security Officer	8	8	10	10
14.	Head Security Guard	34	34	34	34
15.	Store Keeper	2	2	2	2
16.	Store Supervisor	1	1	1	1
17.	Carpenter	12	12	12	12
18.	Plumber	3	3	3	3
19.	Tech. Operator Radio	2	2	2	2
20.	Sr. Operator	3	3	3	3
	Operator (E&M)	7	7	7	7
	Operator Foldable Partition	1	1	1	1
					1438

1	2	3	4	5	6
		1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
					1438
23.	Genertor Operator	3	3	3	3
24.	R.R. Operator	12	12	12	12
25.	Pump Operator	70	70	70	70
26.	Lift Operator	20	20	20	20
27.	Sr. G.O.	15	23	23	24
28.	Sr. Mech. (E&M)	1	1	1	1
29.	Sr. Mech (ARC)	1	1	1	1
30.	Sr. Mechanic	1	1	1	1
31.	Mechanic	4	4	4	4
32.	Mech (ACR)	3	3	3	3
33.	Mech (E&M)	1	1	1	1
34.	Radio Mech.	2	2	2	2
35.	Sanitary Mech.	1	1	—	—
36.	Sr. Sanitary Mech.	—	—	1	1
37.	Cooler Mech.	1	1	1	1
38.	Fitter	30	30	30	30
39.	Cable Jointer	1	1	1	1
40.	Foremen (Elect.)	4	4	4	6
41.	Foreman (ACR)	1	1	1	1
42.	Electrician	7	7	7	7
43.	Elect. (ACR)	1	1	1	1
44.	Auto Electrician	1	1	1	1
45.	Wiremen	25	25	25	25
46.	Wiremen (ACR)	1	1	1	1
47.	Driver	50	50	50	89
48.	Asstt. Supervisor	—	—	90	90
49.	A.S.I.	2	2	2	2
50.	Painter	4	4	6	6
51.	Mason	19	19	19	19
52.	Welder	1	1	1	1
53.	Work Asstt.	39	39	39	39
54.	Meter Reader	1	1	1	1
55.	Wireless Operator	1	1	1	1
56.	Asstt. Radio Mech	1	1	1	1
57.	Tele Mech.	1	1	1	1
58.	Shift Incharge	—	1	1	1
					1906

APPENDIX V(D)

(Vide Para 77)

Engineering Wing—Sanctioned Strength of Class—IV Staff

No.	Category	As on 1982-83	As on 1983-84	As on 1984-85	As on 1985-86
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Jamadar	1	1	1	1
2.	Daftary	127	163	167	174
3.	Peons/Khallasi	772	1036	1073	1148
4.	Security Guards	664	692	698	707
5.	Sweepers	217	217	221	223
6.	Beldars	383	383	415	443
7.	Farash	36	36	36	36
8.	Chair Recanner	5	5	5	5
9.	Sanitary Mates	4	4	4	4
10.	Mate	202	202 (90 posts —92 upgraded in June, 112 1984 as Asstt. Supervisor	112	112
11.	Asstt. Pump Operator	292	292	292	292
12.	Asstt. Mechanic	3	3	3	3
13.	Asstt. Painter	8	8	8	8
14.	Asstt. Mason	119	119	119	119
15.	Asstt. Lift Operator	3	3	3	3
16.	Asstt. Carpenter	30	30	30	30
17.	Asstt. Plumber	4	4	4	4
18.	Asstt. Fitter	127	127	127	127
19.	Asstt. Wiremen	44	44	44	44
20.	Sewerman	14	14	14	14
21.	Valveman	9	9	9	9
					3506

APPENDIX VI

Delhi Development Authority

Para 5. Construction of 1296 Dwelling Units (DUs) at Kishangarh (Vasant Kunj)

5.1 The Delhi Development Authority (DDA) undertook the construction of 1296 dwelling units (DUs) under the Self Financing Scheme (SFS) at Kishangarh (Vasant Kunj) under three schemes consisting of 768, 384 plus 48 and 96 units respectively. The construction work of these 1296 DUs was awarded through eight different contracts as per details given in the Annexure.

5.2.1 The scheme of 768 units (Main Scheme for 944 DUs) was divided into four groups of 192 units each. The contracts were awarded in June 1982 to four contractors with the approval of Work Advisory Board (WAB) at negotiated rate of 85.57%, 88.25%, 89% and 89.80% respectively above the estimated cost of Rs. 84.78 lakhs for each group (Total Rs. 3.39 crores) and against the justified rate of 78 per cent worked out by the DDA. The works were awarded in anticipation of Administrative approval and expenditure sanction which was subsequently received in May 1983 for Rs. 12.38 crores.

5.2.2 A test check of these schemes was conducted in Audit. The following observations are made:—

5.2.2.1 *Construction of 192 DUs by contractor 'A'*: The civil work of 192 DUs was awarded to contractor 'A' at a negotiated tendered cost of Rs. 160.23 lakhs i.e. 89% above the estimated cost of Rs. 84.78 lakhs and 11% above the justified rate of 78% above the estimated cost. The work was started in July 1982 and was to be completed in July 1983.

5.2.2.2 During the execution of the work, a number of defects of bad workmanship viz, non-following of structural drawings correctly, weak cement mortar, cracked walls, lateral shafting of RCC columns, development of cracks in R.C slabs and lintels, inadequate beam bearing and defective flush door shutters etc., were noticed by Quality Control Wing of DDA during their inspections conducted on 12th January 1983, 1st October 1983 and 3rd December 1983.

DDA stated (November 1985) that all the defects referred to by the Quality Control in the three Inspections conducted had been set right except replacement of one RCC slab which had developed cracks and could not be completed as the work was suspended by the contractor in February 1984. It was also stated that the balance work was being got completed at the risk and cost of the original contractor.

5.2.2.3 After completion of 75 per cent of the above work, it was noticed by the Executive Engineer in February 1984 that the houses had inadequate foundation. The depth of the foundation as provided at site was ranging from

0.5 metre to 0.8 metre as against the actual requirement of 1.2 metres and beyond. Similarly, width of the foundation ranged from 0.6 metre to 0.715 metre instead of 0.750 metre to 1.1 metres.

5.2.2.4 The case was referred to Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi for their expert advice and a fee of Rs. 0.47 lakh was paid to them. They recommended laying of piles on either side of the foundation walls and connecting them through holes bored into the walls so that the weight of the four storeyed building could be borne by the piles.

5.2.2.5 The work lies at stand still since February 1984. DDA stated (November 1985) that the work of consultancy in respect of strengthening the foundation of the defective blocks had been entrusted to the IIT Delhi. It was also stated that the final proposals of each defective work are being worked out in consultation with the Experts, which is a time consuming process and any hasty decision may lead to future problems and complications.

5.2.2.6 However, the payments had been made for the full quantities as per specification though the execution was for much less quantities. This shows that the quantities executed were not noted in the records of DDA after actual measurements and payments were made for fictitious quantities.

5.2.2.7 The contractor has been debarred (30th May 1985) from tendering any work in DDA. DDA stated (November 1985) that the matter relating to payments in excess of quantity executed at site had been under investigation by their Vigilance Department.

5.2.2.8 An expenditure of Rs. 137 lakhs had been incurred upto 18th running account bill paid in January 1984. Further expenditure to be incurred on rectification of defects was being estimated (July 1985) by the DDA.

DDA stated (November 1985) that the entire strengthening work was being carried out at the risk and cost of the contractor but the amount likely to be incurred on the rectification could not be estimated at present till the final design or rectification of defects was finalised in consultation with the IIT Delhi.

5.2.3 Construction of 192 units (96 Category III and 96 Category II by Contractor 'B')

5.2.3.1 The civil work of 192 units (Pocket C) (Group IV) was awarded to contractor 'B' at a negotiated tendered cost of Rs. 161.00 lakhs i.e. 89.80% above the estimated cost of Rs. 84.78 lakhs and 11.80% above the justified rate of 78%.

5.2.3.2 The work was commenced in July 1982 and was scheduled to be completed in 12 months. It was, however, completed in 28 months. The delay was attributed to non-availability of water, cement and structural drawings in the initial stages.

DDA stated (November 1985) that delay in completion was due to difficult site conditions.

5.2.3.3 The work was technically examined by the Quality Control Wing of DDA and found to be of very poor and sub-standard quality. Some very serious defects such as "structurally dangerous" and "foundation width being less than stipulated" were also listed by Quality Control Wing.

DDA stated (November 1985) that the defects pointed out by the Quality Control Wing had been rectified.

5.2.3.4 The houses were completed in October 1984 but could not be allotted (July 1985) because basic essential amenities like water, sewerage and electricity were yet to be provided.

DDA stated (November 1985) that it had no control over other civic bodies responsible for the provision of basic amenities like water, sewerage and electricity etc.

5.2.3.5 The entire expenditure of Rs. 202.67 lakhs incurred (July 1985) stood blocked as the houses could not be allotted. The lack of proper planning and co-ordination with the municipal authorities and lack of supervision by the DDA during execution of work had led to the above state of affairs.

5.2.4 Construction of 192 DUs (96 Category III and 96 Category II by Contractor 'C')

5.2.4.1 The lowest tender of contractor 'C' was accepted by the WAB at negotiated tendered cost of Rs. 157.32 lakhs i.e. 85.57% above the estimated cost of Rs. 84.78 lakhs against the justified rate of 78% above the estimated cost worked out by the Department. The work was started in July 1982 and was scheduled for completion by July 1983. The contractor took 1.5 years to execute 30% of the work till September 1983.

5.2.4.2 As the progress of work was slow the Executive Engineer rescinded the contract in December 1983. The Fact Finding Committee (Vaish Committee) and Quality Control Wing of the DDA during their respective inspections in March 1983 pointed out serious structural defects and found the execution below specification. The defects persisted till rescission of the work.

DDA stated (November 1985) that most of the defects had since been got rectified and others would be got rectified.

5.2.4.3 A local Commissioner was appointed to make a list of material brought at site by the contractor. The list prepared by the Commissioner was not acceptable to the contractor. The contractor also challenged the appointment of an arbitrator by the Department in Delhi High Court (December 1983) and also appealed against the list prepared by the local Commissioner, of the materials

brought at site by the contractor. The matter is subjudice (July 1985). An amount of Rs. 56.45 lakhs (compensation under clause 2 Rs. 8.48 lakhs, penalty for balance work Rs. 14.12 lakhs, Security Rs. 0.90 lakh, excess payment of bricks escalation Rs. 0.94 lakh, empty cement bags Rs. 0.25 lakh, for labour returns Rs. 0.02 lakh, recovery for hand work Rs. 0.13 lakh, loss suffered by the department Rs. 1.50 lakhs, secured advance Rs. 16.03 lakhs, material Rs. 10.42 lakhs, interest on secured advance Rs. 2.42 lakhs and interest on departmental material Rs. 1.14 lakhs, cost of Arbitration Rs. 0.10 lakh) has been counter-claimed by the Department against the claim of Rs. 8.85 lakhs, preferred by the contractor.

Although the work stood abandoned since September 1983 the balance work was yet to be awarded (July 1985). This had resulted in the blockade of funds to the tune of Rs. 51.71 lakhs incurred on the project.

DDA stated (November 1985) that tenders had been called and the work would be taken up at the earliest.

5.2.5 Construction of 192 Dwelling Units (96 Category III and 96 Category II by Contractor 'D')

5.2.5.1 The construction of 192 units was awarded to contractor 'D' at a negotiated tendered cost of Rs. 159.60 lakhs i.e. 88.25% above the estimated cost of Rs. 84.78 lakhs against the justified rate of 78 per cent above the estimated cost.

5.2.5.2 The work was to be completed within 12 months i.e. by July 1983. Upto July 1985, 99 per cent of the work was complete. The delay was attributed to late receipt of structural drawings, change of site, shortage of construction material like cement, steel, shortage of funds, extra and substituted items, etc.

5.2.5.3 The work was examined by the Vigilance Commission during October 1983 and the following defects of bad workmanship were pointed out:—

- (i) Cement mortar used in brick work did not have desired strength.
- (ii) Thickness of M.S. sheet used in the manufacture of pressed steel door frames was less than specified.
- (iii) The girth of profile was less than specified. Binding of reinforcement was done in one direction and as such steel could not be considered as tightly held in position.
- (iv) Rocking of joints in brick was not done during course of laying brick work.
- (v) Cement concrete used in foundation had no strength and mostly fine sand was found.
- (vi) Stone ballast was also over-sized etc.

DDA stated (November 1985) that some of the defects pointed out by the Chief Technical Examiner had been complied with and some minor defects which were not of structural nature remained to be attended for which payment would be made to the contractor at reduced rate.

5.2.5.4 Although the work had almost been completed (99 per cent) the trunk services for water supply, sewage and electricity, etc. were yet to be provided thereby blocking a sum of Rs. 206.41 lakhs invested on the Project (July 1985).

DDA stated (November 1985) that as the services which were to be provided by MCD and DESU were not available, necessary arrangement had been made by the DDA itself and the houses since released for allotment. DDA had, however, not intimated the number of houses actually allotted and number of houses in respect of which possession had been given.

5.3 Construction of 384 units (main scheme for 400 DUs) was divided in three groups of 128, 112 and 144 units each.

5.3.1 The construction works of 384 units were awarded in April 1983 in anticipation of Administrative approval and expenditure sanction which were awaited (July 1985) although the works had reached the level of 89 to 97 per cent. The following points were noticed during review of the three contracts awarded for construction of these houses.

5.3.2 Construction of 128 units (64 Category III and 64 Category II) Grade II by Contractor 'E'.

5.3.2.1 The civil work of 128 units was awarded to contractor 'E' in April 1983 by H.D.I on the basis of negotiated tendered cost of Rs. 112.23 lakhs i.e. 96 per cent above the estimated cost of Rs. 57.26 lakhs. The work was scheduled for completion by April 1984 (12 months). Till August 1983 no part of the site could be handed over to the contractor and till August 1984 the site for 16 units could not be made available.

5.3.2.2 The work on remaining 112 dwelling units was inspected by Superintending Engineer during February 1984, March 1984 and also by Quality Control Wing of DDA during March 1984 who found a number of structural defects, poor workmanship and usage of sub-standard bricks and execution of work below specification.

DDA stated (November 1985) that the lapses relating to structural defects had since been attended to and for other defects amount had been withheld and payment would be made at reduced rate.

DDA stated (November 1985) that all 128 houses had been completed and were scheduled to be allotted by December 1985.

5.3.3 Construction of 112 DUs (56 Category III and 56 Category II) by Contractor 'F'

The civil work on 128 units to be constructed in 8 blocks consisting of 16 units each was awarded to contractor 'F' by Housing Division I during March 1983 at a tendered cost of Rs. 112.29 lakhs i.e. 96.10 per cent above the estimated cost of Rs. 57.26 lakhs (DSR-1977). The stipulated date of completion of this work was 1st April 1984.

5.3.3.1 The work was initially taken up on 128 DUs. However, due to court's stay order issued on 3rd December 1983 the work on 3 blocks of 48 DUs was suspended and the contractor was offered alternative sites for two blocks consisting of 32 houses. The work was thus carried out in 112 DUs excluding 48 DUs where the work was suspended after partial construction as a result of stay order by the Court in December 1983. The stay order for 48 DUs has been vacated by the Court in March 1985. The contractor was asked by the DDA to take up work on the partially completed DUs. The firm demanded 50 per cent above the DSR 1981 for the balance work due to increase in market rates. DDA stated (November 1985) that the balance work would be carried out after call of fresh tenders which had been invited. The work on 112 DUs was also held up due to non-availability of G.I. pipes. DDA stated (November 1985) that the total quantity of G.I. pipes required for 112 DUs had been arranged and the DUs would be ready for allotment in December 1985.

5.3.3.2 The work was inspected by the Quality Control Wing of DDA during December 1983 who pointed out a number of defects e.g. weak concrete in RCC columns, weak mortar in foundation brick work, RCC columns out of plumb, slabs carrying brick wall but not designed for it, reinforcement displaced from position, etc. DDA stated (November 1985) that in view of Court's stay order the rectification work could not be carried out in the group of 48 DUs. It was also stated that the contractor had already been directed to rectify the defects which would be completed before the balance work was awarded to a new agency. It was also stated that in other houses, defects had been rectified.

5.3.3.3 So far a sum of Rs. 108.83 lakhs has been spent (July 1985) which has been blocked.

5.3.4 *Construction of 144 Dwelling Units (72 Category III and 72 Category II by Contractor 'D')*

5.3.4.1 The civil work of 144 units was awarded in April 1983 by Housing Division I to contractor 'D' with the approval of the WAB at the negotiated tendered cost of Rs. 126.58 lakhs i.e. at the rate of 96.50 per cent above the estimated cost of Rs. 64.42 lakhs and against the justified rate of 89.16 per cent. The work was scheduled to be completed by April 1984 (12 months) but was delayed due to late finalisation and revision of lay out plan, revision of plinth level, non-availability of G.I. pipe 20 mm dia etc.

5.3.4.2 The Superintending Engineer inspected the work during May 1984 and observed the following major defects:—

Defective Caulking,
Weak Cement mortar,
SCI pipe not of good quality,
The quality of Badarpur was not good,
Weak brick masonry and plaster,
Cement concrete blocks made for the hold fasts of doors and windows were of less dimensions and
Cement concrete sills did not achieve proper strength etc.

5.3.4.3 The work was also examined by the Quality Control Wing of DDA during March 1985 who also found major defects like defective re-inforced concrete slabs, less lead used in joints than required, RCC circular tanks had cracks, weak plaster, etc. DDA stated (November 1985) that rectification work had been carried out and that rate reduction was also being proposed for the approval of the competent authority.

5.3.4.4 Although 97 per cent of the work has been completed, essential basic civic amenities like water, sewage, electricity, etc. were yet to be provided. Consequently, entire expenditure of Rs. 155.60 lakhs incurred (July 1985) stood blocked. DDA stated (November 1985) that alternative arrangements had been made and the services had since been completed.

5.4.1 Construction of 96 Dwelling Units by Contractor 'A'

5.4.1.1 The construction work of 96 Dwelling Units was awarded by the Housing Division I in October 1983 to the lowest tenderer 'A' at the negotiated tendered cost of Rs. 82.69 lakhs ie. 92.97% above the estimated cost of Rs. 42.85 lakhs inspite of the fact that the work being executed by the contractor in other Divisions was not satisfactory as per reports of the Quality Control Wing of DDA.

5.4.1.2 The work was started in October 1983 in anticipation of Administrative Approval and Expenditure sanction and was scheduled to be completed by October 1984.

5.4.1.3 The work was inspected by the Superintending Engineer during February and March 1984 who found the workmanship thoroughly unsatisfactory. The work was also technically examined by the Quality Control Wing in October 1984 and major structural defects were noticed. The Chief Engineer, Quality Control specifically pointed out that the concrete in many RCC columns was found to be weak and suggested investigating the strength with the help of CRI, CERI,

IIT etc. and strengthening being carried out. No steps were taken for the rectification of defects as no compliance report was found on record. It was also noticed that the contractor did not employ proper technical staff as required under clause 36 of the Agreement.

DDA stated (November 1985) that some of the defects had been rectified and the remaining defects would be got rectified at the risk and cost of the contractor.

5.4.1.4 Consequent upon being debarred on 30th May 1985 from tendering in DDA, the contractor stopped the work in June 1985 when 65 per cent of the work was complete. The delay in execution of work was attributed to non-availability of water, steel, G.I. pipe, late receipt of foundation drawings, earth for filling low lying area, etc.

5.4.1.5 Amount of Rs. 69.95 lakhs paid upto June 1985 had thus been blocked due to selection of unsuitable contractor and lack of proper supervision during execution of work.

DDA stated (November 1985) that tenders for the balance work had been called for at the risk and cost of the original contractor.

The following are the main points that emerge:—

- The construction of 1296 Dwelling units was taken up in anticipation of administrative approval and expenditure sanction. In respect of 768 dwelling units the sanction was subsequently received but in respect of the remaining 480 + 48 dwelling units the sanction was awaited (July 1985).
- The construction of 4 pockets each containing 192 dwelling units was awarded at rates ranging from 85.57 to 89.80 per cent above the estimated cost as against the justified rates of 78 per cent above the estimated cost worked out by the Department. The works executed contained serious defects like structural unsoundness, inadequate foundations, cracked walls, weak RCC, weak mortar.
- There was lack of supervision during the execution of works and the payment was made for quantities which had not been actually executed.
- Essential basic amenities like sewage, water supply and electricity had not been provided. The DDA did not take timely action to provide these essential services concurrently with the construction of the Dwelling units. The result was that 656 dwelling units on which expenditure of Rs. 692.95 lakhs had been incurred upto July 1985 and which were complete to the extent of 93 to 100 per cent could not be allotted to the registered applicants (November 1985).

- Works in respect of 480 dwelling units on which expenditure of Rs. 258.66 lakhs had been incurred (July 1985) had been held up at various stages due to poor workmanship, inadequate foundation or slow progress of works by the contractors.
- The work of 48 units was suspended after partial construction due to Court stay orders in December 1983. Construction work thereon had not been resumed (November 1985) even though the Court stay orders were vacated in March 1985. Expenditure of Rs. 108.83 lakhs incurred upto July 1985 stood blocked.
- Even after incurring expenditure of Rs. 1,060.44 lakhs (July 1985) on the construction of 1296 dwelling units in Kishangarh, no dwelling units could be allotted (November 1985) on account of structural defects, inadequate foundation and non-availability of essential basic amenities, etc.

ANNEXURE

Sl. No.	Particulars of work	Name of Contractor	Rs. in lakhs		Rate accepted above the estimated cost	Rs. in lakhs		Date of start of work	Rs. in lakhs		Physical percentage of work done	Remarks
			Estimated cost	Justified Rate above the estimated cost		Tendered cost	Stipulated date of completion		Total Expenditure incurred (July 1985)	When last Running Account Bill paid to the contractors		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Construction of 768 DUs SH. 192 DUs at Kishan Garh Pocket 'C' Group I	A	84.78	78%	89%	160.23	July 1982	July 1983	137	January 1984	75%	The work lying suspended due to inadequate foundations since February 1984.
2	Do. Pocket 'C' Group IV	B	84.78	78%	89.80%	161	July 1982	July 1983	202.67	June 1985	100%	Work completed in October, 1984. DUS still to be allotted due to lack of basic essential civic amenities.
3	Do. Pocket 'C' Group-II	C	84.78	78%	85.57%	157.32	July 1982	July 1983	51.71	September 1983	30%	Work resinded in December 1983 due to slow progress of work.
4	Do. Pocket 'C' Group III Construction of 384 DUs at Kishan Garh.	D	84.78	78%	88.25%	159.60	July 1982	July 1983	206.41	June 1985	99%	DUs are almost complete but could not be allotted due to lack of trunk services which are yet to be provided.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	SHs Construction of 128 DUs Group II	E	57.26	89.16%	96%	112.23
6	SHs Construction of 112 DUs Group I Pocket 'C' + 48 DUs	F	57.26	89.16%	96.10%	112.29
7	SH Construction of 144 DUs Group III Pocket 'C'	D	64.42	89.16%	96.50%	126.58
8	SH. Construction of 96 DUs Pocket 'B'	A	42.85	99.22%	92.97%	82.69

8	9	10	11	12	13
April 1983	April 1984	128.27	June 1985	93%	Do.
April 1983	April 1984	108.83	June 1985	89% 112 DUs	Construction of 48 DUs was suspended in December 1983 due to stay orders and alternative site for 32 DUs was given.
April 1983	April 1984	155.6	June 1985	97%	DUs are almost completed but could not be allotted due to lack of trunk services which are yet to be provided.
October 1983	October 1984	69.95	June 1985	65%	Work stopped in June, 1985 consequent upon the debaring of the firm on 30-5-1985.

00
4

APPENDIX VII

Statement of Conclusions and Recommendations

Sl. No.	Para No.	Ministry/ Department Concerned	Recommendations and Observations
1	2	3	4
1.	85	Urban Development	<p>The Delhi Development Authority (DDA) undertook construction of 1296 Dwelling Units (DUs) under Self Financing Scheme in 1982 under 3 schemes consisting of 768, 384 plus 48 and 96 units respectively. The construction work was awarded through 8 different contracts and each one was to be completed within a period of 12 months. Even after spending Rs. 10.60 crores on construction, no dwelling unit could be allotted until November 1985. The abnormal delay in completing construction work has been stated to be due to structural defects, inadequate foundation of some of the dwelling units which was detected at a belated stage when four storeyed structure had been constructed, lack of essential basic amenities like sewage, water and electricity etc. indicating total lack of planning and unjustifiable delays in execution of work by some contractors. Besides other serious lapses that have come to light, the most painful aspect of execution work had been criminal negligence and active connivance of the concerned officers of DDA who showed total callousness in the discharge of their duties. The very fact that inadequate foundation of some of the dwelling units could be detected only when four storeyed structure had been built is a clearly indicative of the total system failure in the organisation.</p>
2.	86	Do.	<p>The construction work of 1296 dwelling units was awarded through 8 different contracts. The scheme of 768 units was divided into 4 groups of 192 DUs each and contracts were awarded in June 1982 to four contractors. The works were awarded in anticipation of Administrative Approval and Expenditure sanction which were received in May 1983 for Rs. 12.38 crores for 768 DUs. However, these were not received for the remaining dwelling units. The reasons for not obtaining administrative approval and expenditure sanction for this project has been stated to be due to priority attached to the execution of these works under Self Financing Scheme and due to heavy load of work at relevant times. The Committee have also been informed that there were 148 other works under execution at different locations in Delhi as on 1 April 1986 without administrative approval and expenditure sanction. The tendered cost of these works aggregate to Rs. 152 crores. Of these, two works pertained to the</p>

year 1980, five to 1981, thirteen to 1982, seven to 1983 and thirty four to 1984. In these cases works were taken up in anticipation of administrative approval and expenditure sanction. This situation exists despite relevant provisions in CPWD code and Manual. The Committee are distressed to note that works of such financial magnitude should have been taken up without according Administrative Approval and Expenditure Sanction and urge the Government to take effective remedial measures to ensure that the gap between the administrative approval and awarding of work to contractors reduced to the barest minimum, and relevant instructions on the subject are scrupulously observed and suitable action taken against defaulting officers.

3. 87 Do. The Committee note that responsibilities of various functionaries of Delhi Development Authority viz., Junior Engineer/Assistant Engineer/Executive Engineer etc. with regard to planning, supervision, checking and test-checking of works are quite similar to those prescribed by CPWD for its officers. These instructions have been summarised by the Director-General (Works), CPWD in his letter No. 18/1/76-W (E-in-C)/CPR/13/73 dated 10 March 1978. According to these instructions the responsibility for control over quality at site has to be pinpointed. For this purpose, it has put emphasis on stage inspection by Junior Engineer/Assistant Engineer/Executive Engineer to ensure quality of materials and construction of work. These instructions pinpoint the level of inspection necessary and the extent of supervision needed at different levels to ensure proper quality of works and materials.
4. 88 Do. Obviously these instructions were observed more in breach than in practice by the officers supervising the works at Kishangarh. In the work of construction of 192 dwelling units the deficiencies, viz., non-following of structural drawings correctly, weak cement mortar, cracked walls, lateral shifting of RCC columns, development of cracks in RCC slabs and lintels, inadequate beam bearing and defective flush doors, shutters etc. which could have been easily detected by the concerned staff had they performed their duties with reasonable diligence, were detected by the quality Control Wing in January, October, and December 1983. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that the staff deputed for supervision of the above work failed on all counts. Lamontably, when 75 percent of the above work was completed it was noticed by the Executive Engineer in February 1984 that the houses had inadequate foundations inasmuch as the depth of the foundation at provided as site was ranging from 0.5 metre to 0.8 metre as against the actual requirement of 0.2 metres and beyond. Similarly width of the foundation ranged from 0.6 metre to 0.715 metre instead of 0.750 metre to 1.1 metre. This indicates that even the Quality Control Wing failed to pinpoint serious

structural defects in foundation which were detected later on. The officers entrusted with the supervision of construction work thus totally failed in the discharge of their duties. The Committee recommend that disciplinary action against erring staff should be instituted if not already instituted.

5. 89 Do.

Out of 8 works relating to construction of 1296 DUs each by two contractors—M/s. Mittal Builders and M/s. Uppal Engineering and Construction Pvt. Ltd. involved vigilance angle. In the first case foundation work of 192 DUs was not in accordance with the structural drawings and *prima facie* it has been established that overpayment for foundation work to the tune of Rs. 1.50 lakhs approximately as per the initial estimates were made and false measurements were recorded by the Junior Engineer incharge. However, matter is under further investigation by the Chief Technical Examiner (CTE) on a reference from CBI who are investigating the case. It has been stated that overpayment could have been avoided had the supervisory staff been vigilant. The case which was referred to CBI in June 1985 has not yet been finalised and no Inquiry Officer has been appointed to institute departmental enquiry against delinquent officials who are under suspension since May 1985. The Committee deplore the tardiness and inordinate delay in expediting processing of disciplinary proceeding against the delinquent officials. In the other case, there were serious defects relating to weak cement mortar and weak RCC in columns. In this case overpayment on account of secured advance was made and no action has been taken to recover the amount of overpayment. It has been stated that some of the supervisory officers involved have been suspended while those belonging to other departments have been reverted to their parent departments. It is disquieting to note that no further action has been taken against them. Those cases should be got finalised expeditiously and suitable action taken against delinquent officials.

6. 90 Do.

The Committee note that Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi was engaged in March 1984 for their expert advice at a fee of Rs. 47,000 to strengthen the foundation. A further sum of Rs. 50,000 was paid to them for checking approval of designs for strengthening of all blocks and for conducting load test for one block. The estimated cost for rectification of all defects of 32 DUs was Rs. 31 lakhs and work of foundations strengthening and removal of other defects had to be carried out on 128 DUs. Evidently, the expenditure involved in rectification of defects would be quite high. It has been stated that requisite strengthening measures are yet to be carried out at the risk and cost of original contractor. The Committee would urge the Government to carry out the structural modifications expeditiously at the cost of the contractor and would like to be intimated of further developments including the total additional cost involved in the process. The delay in rectification of important structural defects would result in cost escalation and also allotment of these dwelling units to registered persons. The Committee hope that cost escalation in these cases would not be passed on to the registered persons as the entire responsibility for delay in allotment vests with DDA due to sheer callousness on their part.

7. 91 Urban Development

All the works awarded to various contractors for construction on 1296 DUs were required to be completed within 12 months from the date of commencement of work. However not even a single work was completed within the stipulated time schedule, in spite of the fact that the simplest type of construction was involved therein. The Committee were informed that out of 1296 dwelling units, 768 units have been completed, work was in progress in 336 units and 192 units were involved in litigation. The delay in completion of construction ranged from 15 to 24 months. It is highly deplorable. It needs to be ensured that in future works are completed on schedule. The Committee would like to be apprised of action taken in this regard. The Committee also urge the Government to ensure that effective steps are taken to settle litigation cases due to which construction of 192 units were held up blocking not only Government funds but also depriving of shelter to persons registered. The progress in the settlement of these cases should also be monitored at an appropriately higher level.

8. 92 Do.

Out of 768 flats completed in 2 lots of 384 each in October 1984 and June 1985, considered fit for allotment only in March 1986, apply 525 were allotted and in these cases possession letters were issued only in 327 cases as on 11-3-1987. in 198 cases possession letters of units allotted were still to be issued. This is clearly indicative of total lack of planning and perception, which leads to corruption, red tapism and lack of awareness of time, value of money on the part of DDA and require immediate attention of the Government so that there is no avoidable delay in construction and allotment of dwelling units in future and assets created are put to productive use without avoidable loss of time.

9. 93 Do.

The Committee were also informed that besides Kishangarh project, there were 74 other projects, also whose construction was taken up prior to 31 December 1983 but could not be completed till 31 May, 1986 though the stipulation was to complete them within 12 months. Of these, six projects were awarded in 180 sixteen in 1981 and twenty-nine in 1982. The estimate cost of these projects was Rs. 3671 lakhs and were tendered at a cost of Rs. 6636 lakhs. The expenditure incurred upto 31 May 1986 was Rs. 5826 lakhs. The Committee note with regret that physical performance in most of these cases has been tardy and not commensurate with the investment made. In a number of cases, the works were at stand-still after having been abandoned by the original contractors. The reasons for unusual delays were attributed to poor capacity and incompetence of contractors and abandonment of works by some of them. In some cases, contracts were rescinded as the progress of work was not found satisfactory. The other factors causing delay were stated to be raw material shortage, delay in approval of drawings, delay in giving sites etc. The Committee regret

to say that in spite of the fact that Delhi Development Authority undertook construction activities as early as 1967, it has not been able to enlist competent and dependable contractors to undertake construction of houses. It is pity that Delhi Development Authority which is required to undertake massive construction work of houses in Delhi to clear the backlog and satisfy the heavy current demand of houses is still at the mercy of unscrupulous contractors who can get away with poor quality of work due to totally callous supervision. The structures built by them in many cases are dangerous for human habitation and material used are sub-standard. The Committee would like the DDA to improvise procedure of registration of contractors and deal firmly with those whose performance is found to be deficient. The procedure of approval of drawings should also be streamlined so that delay in execution of projects is avoided. To be precise, the Committee urge Delhi Development Authority to built up a cadre of efficient and competent contractors and streamline their own organisation to cut delays in execution of projects and also to ensure that these are executed in accordance with prescribed specification and adequate quality control is exercised in the use of material. The Committee are totally unhappy with the performance of DDA and the Audit para under discussion illustrates its low standard of performance.

10. 94 Do.

Some of the reasons for delay in execution of projects were shortage of cement, non-availability of water and delay in issue of structural drawings. It has been stated that delay of 3 months in issue of structural drawings at different stages took place in one case due to heavy work-load at the relevant time in the SSW Wing as there was no separate design wing in DDA at that time. The Committee are unable to accept this explanation. It is strange that contracts were awarded when even the basic requirement of structural drawings was not fulfilled. The delay in this account is highly deplorable. There was also failure in providing water and cement for construction and leads to the inevitable conclusion that no preparation was made with regard to material requirements and creation of site facilities etc. speaks poorly of project planning and material management on the part of Delhi Development Authority.

11. 95 Do.

The construction work of 144 DUs by contractor 'D' was technically examined by Vigilance Commission during October 1984 and they noticed major structural defects. To name a few, it included sub-standard cement mortar used in bricks; M.S. sheet used in pressed steel door and door-frames was of less than specified thickness; girth of profile being less than specified etc. The Chief Engineer had suggested investigation and strengthening of many RCC columns with the help of CRI, CERI, IIIT etc. Strangely, the matter has been referred to these organisations as late as on 6 August 1986. It has been stated that the contractor had suspended the work in May 1985 and the contract was rescinded in November 1985. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reasons for delay of almost 2 years in making a simple reference and would also like the responsibility in this regard to be fixed and action taken against the erring officials.

12. 96 Urban Development

The Fact Finding Committee (Vaish Committee) and the Quality Control Wing of Delhi Development Authority have pointed out serious structural defects and found that the works were executed below specification. The Vaish Committee visited 26 housing projects including Kishangarh Housing Complex at various places in Delhi where construction work was under execution. The general impression gathered by this Committee was that the quality of work in most of the houses was very poor. Besides, there were common defects in most of the houses and indicated lack of emphasis on quality of construction. The Vaish Committee clearly brought out the fact that contractors and engineers incharge perhaps got the impression that they could get away with bad work. No one seemed to have been bothered about the structural safety of the houses. The Architects and Design Engineers simply ignored the basic requirements of the I.S. codes which provides for lot of precautions for building four storeyed houses with 9" walls on all floors. The Engineer Incharge of supervision also completely ignored the normal norms of sound construction of a building. Consequently some of the built houses were found to be structurally unsound. Out of the 26 housing projects visited by the Vaish Committee, houses built at 13 projects located at Gulabi Bahg, Dilshad Garden, Vikaspuri, East of Kailash, Paschimpuri, Malviya Nagar Extn; Pritampura, Shalimar Bagh, Lawrence Road, Jahangirpuri and Tirok-puri were found to be particularly very poor. The Committee had further highlighted the fact that "even though the above cases are of exceptionally poor quality, the Committee also observed generally poor quality of work in all the housing schemes which will have to be improved by appropriate strengthening measures." The Vaish Committee had concluded that strengthening measures have to be taken in almost all the houses and special attention has to be given for the above exceptionally poor quality work. The strengthening and improvement measures suggested by the Vaish Committee could atleast be termed as stopgap measures. The Committee itself has stated that at this stage these measures, however well done, would still be only a compromise when compared to a proper construction from the very beginning carried out in accordance with the laid down specifications and codes. The explanation that these defects escaped attention of the site staff due to overloading of units is not at all convincing as these common defects have been found in all the projects visited by the Vaish Committee. Evidently, buyers of DDA houses did not get fair value of their money as they have been handed over structurally defective houses which is commercially unsound and ethically immoral. At this stage the Committee cannot but strongly deprecate the ineffective tardy planning and implementation of construction of projects by the DDA and can only express the hope that the DDA would have taken suitable lessons from their past experience and would take adequate steps to ensure that similar mistakes are not repeated in future in respect of projects now under implementation or those which will be undertaken in future. The high expectation from the Government and the public at large centres round housing and the Committee hope that

DDA would perform its functions with complete awareness of its mission. They would also like to be apprised of the remedial measures taken to strengthen and improve system which as a whole has failed miserably on all counts. The Committee would urge the Government to take action against the delinquent official and unscrupulous contractors responsible for various lapses pointed out by the Vaish Committee after undertaking a comprehensive review of these deficiencies. The result of the enquiry on the findings of Vaish Committee may be intimated to the Committee.

- 13-97 Do. The construction of 192 dug units was started in July 1982 by contractor 'C'. As the progress of work was slow, the Executive Engineer rescinded the contract in December 1983. The balance work has not been awarded to any contractor so far. The matter is sub-judice as the contractor has raised dispute on finalisation of list of materials lying at site and the measurements taken. The matter was under arbitration and hence balance work could not be awarded. The Committee are distressed to note that work of these 192 dwelling units started in July 1982 and stipulated to be completed initially in a year could not be completed so far. The lingering dispute between DDA and the contractor may finally lead to cost escalation beyond all proportions. The Committee would like the Delhi Development Authority to ensure that this is not passed on to the allottees. Logically the contractor should be made to pay for it and a claim on this account should be preferred before the arbitrator.
- 14-98 Do. The Committee are perturbed to note that 656 constructed houses completed to the extent of 93 to 100 per cent with an expenditure Rs. 692.95 lakhs upto July 1987 could not be allotted to registered applicants for want of essential basic amenities like sewage, water supply and electricity. It has been stated that Delhi Municipal Corporation for its own reasons were unable to provide water supply and sewage facilities to Kishangarh area. Consequently the DDA made its own arrangements by boring six tubewells at a cost of Rs. 40 lakhs and provided oxidation ditches for sewage disposal treatment in Sector 'A' to cater to about 3000 DUs at a cost of Rs. 45 lakhs. The Ministry of Urban Development have stated that Municipal Corporation of Delhi has been approving sewage schemes in development areas with a condition that interim sewage treatment arrangements shall be made by the developing agency. This only indicated total lack of planning on the part of DDA in not making suitable arrangements in advance for water supply and sewage as that could have greatly expedited allotment of aforesaid units and would have made it possible for them to profitably utilise its assets. The Committee hope that such situation does not recur in future.
- 15-99 Do. The Committee are concerned to note that prior to 1982, the Delhi Development Authority had no quality Control Cell of its own. The pace of construction houses in the initial years of taking up construction houses in 1967 was about 8000 houses a year which was stepped up subsequently to 10-12 thousand a year. By 1982, the DDA had built up about 1.25 lakhs houses. The quality checks during the period 1967 to 1982 were carried out by the Chief Technical Examiner under the Central Vigilance Commission. As the Chief Technical Examiner was doing checking job for other government organisations also including CPWD, their quota for DDA was very

little. The reason for not setting up a quality Control Cell is stated to be small quantum of work at that time and also the fact that primary responsibility to ensure quality of work was that of the immediate supervisory officer. However, the very fact that quality Control Cell immediately after coming into existence has been able to bring out serious defects of structurally dangerous, materially sub-standard and of poor workmanship, it is apparent that immediate supervision had not all been effective. In fact it was noticed that Supervisory staff have connived with contractors with ulterior motives. Viewed in the light of these facts, the Committee are quite apprehensive about the quality of works executed prior to 1982. Viewed in this light, the Committee would like to know why the creation of such organisation was not thought of earlier. They would also like the Delhi Development Authority to carry out random sample checking to ensure that the houses constructed prior to 1982 by the DDA do not suffer from any major defect.

16. 100 Urban Dev.

The Committee also feel that the Quality Control Cell should be adequately strengthened so that it is in a position to perform its functions more efficiently and devotedly because even this Cell failed to point out serious defects in some construction works in recent past. It is also imperative that highly qualified and motivated staff is posted in Quality Control Cell so that it has a deterrent effect on officers involved on normal supervision of construction work. Due incentives/recognitions may be provided for the working in the Quality Control Cell for efficient work. Besides, as the Quality Control checking is done on random sampling the whole procedure of random checking requires reappraisal in consultation with experts whether their method of picking up is adequate. The defects pointed out by this Cell should be circulated to other divisions to ensure that such defects are avoided. The Committee would like to be intimated of final decision taken in this regard.

17. 101 Do.

The Delhi Development Authority came into being to function as the authority on urban development affairs of the capital city. In coordination with other bodies like Municipal Corporation of Delhi, the New Delhi Municipal Committee and the agencies providing civil amenities, viz; Delhi Electric Supply undertaking as well as other organisations which have any impact on the development of Delhi. Over the years activities of DDA have outstripped its originally conceived responsibilities. It has ventured into activities like land and site development, construction of roads and houses, maintenance of sport complexes, JJR Colonies and development plot in JJR colonies and creation of additional facilities all over Delhi. The annual expenditure on these activities during the years 1982-83 to 1985-86 had been Rs. 243.31 crores, Rs. 202.62 crores Rs. 191.59 crores and Rs. 296.96 crores respectively. The major chunk this expenditure was on house building with Rs. 113.95 crores in 1982-83, Rs. 107.21 crores in 1983-84, Rs. 108.54 crores in 1984-85 and Rs. 197.52 crores in 1985-86,

18. 102

Do.

In order to perform its multi-facet functions, the Delhi Development Authority have been maintaining a large establishment of more than 40,000 employees, whose annual administrative expenses amount to Rs. 37.11 crores. The Engineering Wing alone have sanctioned strength of 905 Class I and II officers., 2220 of Junior Engineers; 352 Draftsmen; 1906 of other Class III staff and 3500 of Class IV staff. The total expenditure on pay and allowances of this staff of Engineering Wing alone was Rs.11.41 crore in 1985-86. In the opinion of the Committee it is the quality of staff working in DDA rather than inadequacy of strength which is responsible for the present messing state of affairs in the DDA. The Committee consider that there is overstaffing in DDA which needs restructuring and rationalisation. The Vice Chairman, DDA admitted in evidence that "imbalances may be there and somewhere more staff is there." The Committee note that Government is already engaged with the question of restructuring of DDA and a committee has been set up for this purpose. It would be desirable to compare the staffing pattern of DDA with those of other reputed private construction companies before taking a final decision in the matter. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

19. 103

Do.

The Delhi Development Authority was intended primarily to act as an Urban Development Agency to plan, develop, distribute and regulate land in the Capital. However, the phenomenal population growth coupled with some historical factors made DDA's task much more complex than tackling the usual complexities of town building. As the DDA grew in size and capability to meet the public demand for large scale housing and other infra-structural needs its ability to control development continued to diminish and its attempt to undertake implementation of plans on such a large scale without parallel gearing of its capabilities has resulted in present managerial crisis and total failure of system is has been indicated in proceeding paragraphs. There is thus urgent need for revamping and restructuring of the organisation to take up the challenge posed.

20. 104

Do.

The DDA today find itself in an environment far beyond its original precepts. The State should be primarily the facilitator and promoter. Building of houses for economically weaker sections should be the direct responsibility of the State and its agencies. In view of this and also because of the fact that DDA find itself increasingly difficult to squarely meet the housing need of the over increasing population of Delhi; the Committee consider that functions of DDA should be redefined. Out of the 1.72 lakhs registered applicants since 1979, only 5 thousand could be provided houses so far. In view of the resource constraints, it is not at all possible for DDA to clear this backlog EVEN IN THE distant future. Even if financial support is made available by Government the DDA at the most can be expected to build 15 thousand houses a year. This is not at all an encouraging proposition. It would be appropriate if individuals, Cooperative, and private agencies are increasingly associated in this endeavour as the DDA has failed to meet the growing challenge.

