

PRESENTED TO THE

HOUSE ON 21 / 03/2012

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

2011 - 2012

HUNDRED NINTH REPORT

ON

**(THE REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER & AUDITOR GENERAL OF
INDIA FOR THE YEARS 2008-2009 ,2009-2010 RELATING TO PUBLIC
WORKS(DWS)AND FISHERIES,EDUCATION(HIGHER) AND
AGRICULTUR DEPARTMENTS FOR THE YEAR 2008-2009)**



**TRIPURA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
SECRETARIAT
2012**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PARAGRAPH	PAGE
1. Composition of the Committee on Public Accounts(2011 – 2012)	(i)
2. INTRODUCTION	(ii)
3. Report	
A. Fisheries Department	1 – 40	1 - 16
B. Public Works (DWS) Department (2008-2009)(2009 – 2010)	41 – 60	17 - 30
C. Education (Higher) Department	61 - 64	30 - 33
D. Agriculture Department	65 - 69	33 - 36

(i)

COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

2011-2012

CHAIRMAN

Shri Sudip Roy Barman

MEMBERS

1. **Shri Sahid Choudhury**
2. **Shri Prasanta Deb Barma**
3. **Shri Sukumar Barman**
4. **Shri Sudhan Das**
5. **Shri Basudev Majumder**
6. **Shri Manoranjan Acharjee**
7. **Shri Sankar Prasad Datta**
8. **Shri Partha Das**
9. **Smt. Rita Kar (Majumder)**
10. **Shri Asish Kumar Saha**

ASSEMBLY SECRETARIAT

1. **Shri Subhas Bhattacharjee - Secretary**
2. **Shrimati L. Deb Barma - U.S.(C)**

NB: *Shri Sahid Choudhury ceased to be a member of the Committee on being appointed as a Minister w.e.f. 12th February, 2012 under rule 240(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Tripura Legislative Assembly.*

(ii)

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Public Accounts having been authorized by the Committee do present on its behalf, this 109th Report on the Audit Paragraphs relating to the Departments of Public Works (Drinking Water & Sanitation), for the year 2008-2009 & 2009 – 2010, Fisheries, Education (Higher) and Agriculture contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 2008-2009.

2 The Committee took evidence of the Representatives of the Fisheries, Public Works (DWS), Education (Higher) and Agriculture Departments on the Paragraphs relating to these in its meetings held on 20th December, 2011, 16th and 27th January, 2012. The Committee considered and finalized this Report in its meeting held on 16/ 03/ 2012.

3. The Committee would like to express its thanks to the Officers of the concerned Departments for the co-operation extended by them in furnishing information and tendering evidence before the Committee in connection with the examination of the subjects dealt with.

4. The Committee thankfully expresses its appreciation of the co-operation and assistance rendered by the Accountant General (Audit), Tripura and his officials in examination of the subject and compilation of this Report.

5. The Committee also places on record its appreciation of sincerity and devotion to duty of the Officers and Staffs of the Assembly Secretariat in connection with examination, compilation and presentation of this Report.

Sudip Roy Barman,
Chairman
Tripura Legislative Assembly.

Dated, Agartala, the

16 / 03 / 2012

AUDIT REPORT FOR THE YEAR 2008-2009.

A. FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

(i) Preparation of Annual Action Plan(AAP)(Para 3.1.7.2)

1. The Audit Paragraph stated that (i) Achievements of the preceding year were not recorded in the AAPs .Therefore, the unachieved targets of previous year, stated to have been assessed and included in the subsequent AAPs were not clearly projected.

(ii) The development of post harvesting facilities as flagged in the Perspective Plan was not addressed during the last five years. Though an initiative was noticed in the Annual Plan for 2005-06, the items were substantially different than that of the Perspective Plan as discussed in details at Paragraph 3.1.13.

(iii) & (iv) No scientific / rational method was used to quantify production of fish in the State. Survey was conducted by the Fisheries Department by collection of door to door data on fish production. Fishery Assistants visited the fish farmers and recorded the harvested quantity through verbal discussion. The anticipated stock in the tanks/ponds etc.was then added to the harvested quantity to arrive at the production for the year .The Government confirmed that in the absence of any scientific method in the country, the Department had to depend only on such methods.

The method adopted by the Department was not rational and therefore the claim of production was not reliable.

The reliability and correctness of the data was not assured as no mechanism exists to cross check and validate the data collected by the Fishery Assistants. The Government stated (September, 2009) that the data so collected was cross-checked at every level (Panchayat , Block, Sub-Divisional and at District level).The claim of the Government, however, could not be substantiated as these were not documented in any of the nine units test-checked in audit.

2.The Department in its written replies stated that the activities of the A.A.P. including the unachieved targets of the previous year are being reviewed thoroughly in the meeting and also evaluated through field visit at different levels from time to time .Due importance for completion of the unachieved targets of previous year specially related to constructional works, project activities are being laid on priority basis .Thus, question of un-assessment of unachieved targets of previous year does not stand fit for the Department. However it is not possible to quantify the achievements of the preceding year in A.A.Ps of the following year which is finalized during January to March for implementation (from April of the year for getting better result). The quantified data of achievement of preceding year is only available in the month of July-August of the following year when survey is completed.

ii)In respect of the queries regarding development of post harvest the reply against paragraph 3.1.13 is indicated as follows:

a)The proposed plan of construction of cold storage and supply of insulated van had to be modified as per expressed preference of Co-operative societies for Mini trucks, auto vans and visi coolers.

b) Due to paucity of fund, required allotment of fund for construction of new market shed and up gradation of existing market shed suffered. However, 14 nos. new markets shed have been developed and 2 nos. existing markets have been upgraded.

iii)(iv) In regard to the queries regarding – No scientific/rational method was used to quantify production of fish in the State –

It may be mentioned that till date no scientific methodology has been evolved to collect inland fish catch/production statistics in the Country. A Central Sector Scheme entitled “Strengthening of Database and Geographical Information System for the Fisheries Sector” is in operation to catch assessment survey under the Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairy & Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, GOI in different States of the country including Tripura. Pending such scientifically designed methodology, the Department has to depend on primary method of collection of data regarding production etc. through door to door survey which is scientifically accepted methodology for collection of statistical data and believed to be nearest to the truth as its sample size is 100%.

// 03 //

The survey data collected by Fishery Assistants are initially authenticated by local representative of PRIs and subsequently cross checked by the Fishery Officers at Block level, Superintendent of Fisheries at Sub-Division level, Dy. Director of Fisheries at District level through sample netting, and the recorded data of the Activity card maintained at GP level etc. Each data sheet is signed in the field by concerned fish farmers, enumerator and elected public representative at Panchayat /ADC village committee/ Nagar Panchayat etc. Thus, it would not be proper to say that the reliability & correctness of the data is not assured.

3. In this regard the Finance Department in its comments on the replies of the Fisheries Department stated that (i) it was pointed out by Audit that the unachieved targets of previous year were not clearly projected in the AAP. Department may please state whether AAP is reviewed for necessary modification after quantified achievement of preceding year is available in the month of July-August of the following year

ii) Para 3.1.7.2(ii) and Para 3.1.13 of the Audit Report revealed that there was huge deviation from perspective plan . Department, may please state reasons for such huge deviation from perspective plan.

4. During examination of the Audit Paragraph, in its meeting held on 20th December, 2011, the Committee wanted to know:-

How is the AAP prepared now? State whether unachieved target assessed and included in subsequent AAPs? How is the Government plan to address the problem of Post Harvest Facilities as per the Perspective Plan? What is the latest method available for quantification of fish production in the State? How is cross checking done without proper documentation for verification at different levels?

Contd...P/04

5. *In view of the above position as deposed by the Representative of the Department, the Committee has decided not proceed further with the matter.*

- (ii) Para 3.1.9.1 – Fish Production
- (iii) Para 3.1.9.2 = Dependence on outside supply
- (iv) Para 3.1.9.3 = Doubtful claim of production

6. The Audit Paragraph has pointed out on Para 3.1.9.1 that the Revised Perspective Plan (RPP) envisaged self-sufficiency in production of fish by 2012 through increased production from 20,500 MT in 2004-05 to 46,840 MT by 2012. However, the year-wise production of fish during 2004-09 was far below the requirement as given in Table :

Year	Requirement as per RPP (in MT)	Actual production (in MT)	Shortfall in MT (percentage in bracket)	Productivity As per RPP kg/ha/year	Actual Productivity kg/ha/year
2004-05	41,170	19,838	21,332 (52)	1,479	1,414
2005-06	41,940	23,871	18,069 (43)	1,649	1,650
2006-07	42,600	28,634	13,966 (33)	1,846	1,859
2007-08	43,280	32,830	10,450 (24)	2,059	1,931
2008-09	43,950	36,991	7,430 (17)	2,292	2,074

Source: Departmental records

The above table shows that although the production increased, the percentage of shortfall with reference to the requirement of Fish ranged from 17 to 52 during 2004-09. The anticipated quantum of productivity was also not achieved in 2004-05, 2007-08 and 2008-09. The shortfall was attributed by the Department to acidic nature of soil, non-adoption of scientific method due to high input cost and lack of awareness among the fish farmers.

Scrutiny of two Self Help Groups (SHGs) (Subhashnagar SHG, Jirania, West Tripura District and Sukanta Fishery SHG , Holakhet GP, South Tripura District) revealed that the average rate of productivity achieved by them was more than 3,500 kg per hectare per annum, much higher than the average of 1,865 kg per hectare per annum during 2004-09 taken to tabulate the target projected in RPP.

While there is no recorded reason for the low average productivity, discussion of the audit team with quite a few fish farmers revealed that inadequate technical support, short supply of high yielding fingerlings, unfavorable water and soil conditions, farmer's inability to use standard fish feeds and pilferage in Government farms are some major factors which hold back the productivity in the State. Audit observed that the average productivity of 1,865 kg per hectare was on the lower side as efficient implementation of various components of the Perspective Plan (as discussed in the succeeding paragraphs) and proper accountability at each level could have yielded higher average production.

In reply the Government stated (September, 2009) that different categories of farmers in the State were kept in mind while fixing the target and the instances quoted in audit were progressive farmers only.

7. The Department could not submit any further replies on Para.3.1.9.1. Replies are already given in earlier Para.

8. On Para 3.1.9.1, the Finance Department stated that Department may please state the measures which the Department contemplates to adopt for providing adequate technical support, supply high yielding fingerlings ,favorable water and soil condition to the fish farmers to increase production.

9. The Committee having regard to the above facts wanted to know :-

Whether the Government has identified the reasons for low production?
What steps are being taken to increase the production?

10. Audit observation on Para 3.1.9.2 stated that in addition to the production within the State, the quantity of fish brought in from outside the State and imported from outside the country plays a significant role in meeting the demand of the local market. The quantum of such inflow was as under:

(Quantity in MT)

Year	Inflow from other States	Imports from outside the country		Total inflow from outside the State	Requirement as per RPP
		Hilsha fish	Other varieties		
2004-05	3,239. 05	374.11	420.25	4,033.41	41, 170
2005-06	5292. 93	816.68	770.95	6,880.56	41, 940
2006-07	5,472. 30	616.53	1091.21	7,179.04	42, 600
2007-08	4,277. 16	318.77	4064.08	8,660.01	43, 280
2008-09	6,434. .60	687.08	4,374.89	11,496.57	43, 950

Source: Departmental records and information collected from custom Department

The above information may not necessarily give a comprehensive picture relating to availability of fish, as unofficial inflow of fish both from other States & across the porous border is not factored in.

Contd...P/06

Further, gradual increase in inflow over the years both from outside the State and also from outside the country was indicative of gradual increase in the State's dependence on outside supply rather than approaching towards self-sufficiency. Data collected from the Custom Department & the Tripura Chamber of Commerce confirmed the quantity of import & supply from outside the State as mentioned in the table above. The data on fish inflow affirm that the total quantity of inflow from outside the State increased from 10 per cent in 2004-05 to 26 per cent in 2008-09 of the total requirement.

11. The Department in its written replies admitted that self sufficiency target of 13 KG per capita has been fixed taking nutritional requirement of fish as recommended by WHO (11 KG / capita). It has no relation with the satiation level of the populace. Increase in inflow from outside of the State, in spite of local production, only indicates gradual higher per capita consumption of fish by State's populace. Even, otherwise, Tripura is known to be highest per capita consumer of fish among all inland States of India (Handbook of Fisheries Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India ,2007, page – 163)

12, The views of Finance Department on Para 3.1.9.2 stated that main objective of revised perspective plan of the Department was to achieve self sufficiency in fish production. Hence Department may please adopt measures to gradually reduce dependence on outside supply.

13. Committee desired to know whether Government is aware of increasing dependence on outside supply of fish. If yes, what are the steps taken to achieve self sufficiency?

Contd...P/07

It has been mentioned in Para 3.1.9.3 that data of fish production in the survey report was computed by taking into account the quantity of fish harvested and the anticipated stock of fish in the ponds on verbal discussion with fish farmers. As anticipated stock of fish in the ponds was taken into account to work out the total production of fish, the production claimed by the Department was only an anticipated quantity. Instances of discrepancies between the production records of the fish farmers/SHG/Matshya Samabay Samities(MSSs) and departmental survey records noticed are detailed below :

Name of the SHG/MSS/Fish farmers	Name of SF	Departmental Survey record		Actual position as per the records of the SHG/MSS etc.	
		Water area(in ha.)	Production (in kg.)	Water area (in ha)	Production (in kg)
Kamaleswari SHG	Bishalgarh	0.96	3,092	0.80	2,552
Ganga Fishery SHG	Do	1.60	2,885	1.60	1,540
Japa SHG	Do	1.21	3,650	1.20	2,500
Amarendra Debbarma	Do	0.16	380	0.16	330
Belonia MSS Ltd	Belonia	3.13	8,175	3.13	1,095
Radhanagar SHG	Do	5.80	5,680	1.0	252
Chebri MSS Ltd.	Khowai	10.34	14,238	10.34	9,371

Source:- Departmental Records and records of the Fish farmers.

These differences were due to inclusion of anticipated stock available in the ponds after harvesting during that year. This would also result in cumulative overstatement of production since the same stock of the previous year in the ponds was once again considered to calculate the production of the current year. The method adopted by the Department was not rational and therefore the claim of production was not reliable and casts doubt on the overall production claimed by the Department.

15. The Department in his written replies stated that the normal fish culture period is from June-July to May-June of the following year. The door to door survey for collection of data is done in June-July of the following year. By that time the total harvest of pond is completed and the actual production data available. It would just not be proper to say that the production claimed for the year or over all production claimed by the Department during the year is not reliable.

Contd...P/08

Side by side, it would not be correct to say that the anticipated stock available in the pond is also added to arrive at the total production. Moreover, the stock of the previous year is totally removed through repeated netting during preparation of tank for culture in the following year. Thus, there is no chance of cumulative over statement of production.

16. Finance Department stated that about doubtful claim of production in support of which it has shown difference in production figures of Department with that of different SHG/MSS etc. Department may please explain the reasons for difference in fish production figures.

17. The Committee in view of the above would like to know:-

Whether the Government taken measures to adopt a more scientific and realistic method for computation of the overall fish production.

18. The Committee after due consideration of the written as well as oral submission made by the Representative of the Department on being satisfied dropped Para Nos. 3.1.9.1, 3.1.9.2 and 3.1.9.3.

v) Para 3.1.11.2 – Water and Soil Testing Laboratory

19. The Audit Paragraph has brought out that Perspective Plan envisaged creation of laboratories in each block in addition to one each in districts and sub-divisions. The Plan envisaged creation of laboratories at district level initially, followed by sub-divisions and blocks. Forty laboratories were proposed to be constructed in the Perspective Plan of which 22 laboratories were proposed to be constructed during 2004-09. As of June, 2009 only 19 laboratories were taken up of which 8 were completed and functional. Scrutiny revealed that water and soil testing was done only in 5 to 6 per cent of total water area, leaving most of the water area out of quality testing.

Test – check of reports of soil and water samples analyzed during 2008-09 in Soil and Water Testing Laboratory, College Tila, Agartala disclosed the following:

(i) Out of 551 water samples tested, 453 samples (82 per cent) were found highly acidic (pH range: 5.5 and below) and 142 samples (26 per cent) were found strongly alkaline (Range: 9 and above).

(ii) Out of 472 soil samples tested, in 362 cases (77 per cent) the percentage of clay ranged between 5 and 38 which is much below the desired range of 70 per cent. Sand percentage varied between 5 and 25 while the desired level is 30 per cent in 121 cases (26 per cent) and in the case of 88 samples (17 per cent), pH value was found in the range of 4 to 4.5 against the acceptable range of 6.5 to 7.5.

The results of analysis indicated that 106.31 hectares tested area was below the required quality for pisciculture. Evaluation report or remedial measures prescribed /initiated by the Department were not on record. During the exit conference, the Government, while agreeing to the audit observation, assured that the corrective steps recommended after the laboratory evaluation would henceforth be documented.

20. The Department could not submit any further reply on Para 3.1.11.2.

21. Finance Department stated on this Para that Department may apprise the Committee whether corrective steps recommended after laboratory evaluation had since been documented.

22. During examination of the Audit Paragraph, in its meeting held on 20th December, 2011 the Committee desired to know:-

What is the latest position regarding (i) Creation of laboratories? (ii) Remedial measure taken for improving the quality for pisciculture ?

23. Replying to the question the Departmental Representative stated that Department are trying to encourage the farmer for testing the soil. Department will sent representative to the farmers for soil testing .23 nos. laboratory completed. Department's target is 40. There are 17 nos. operational laboratory .Six more under procurement of material.

24. *In this regard, the Committee would like to know the latest position of this para. A Comprehensive report in this regard should be furnished to the Committee within 3(three) months from the date of presentation of this report to the Assembly.*

vi) Para 3.1.11.3 - Fish Feed Analysis Laboratory

25. The Audit Paragraph has pointed out that a Fish Feed Analysis Laboratory (FFAL) was established in 2006-07 at College Tilla, Agartala to analyse sample of fish feed received from the districts for estimation of protein, fat carbohydrate , ash etc.

During 2007-09, test for estimation of only protein was done in respect of 169 samples(2007-08 : 78 nos. and 2008-09 : 91 nos.) received from the four districts. Out of these, 53 samples were found sub-standard. Due to non-availability of required lab equipment, other analysis like fat , carbohydrate, ash etc. were not conducted in the laboratory.

Instances of utilization of inferior fish feed and untested fish feed noticed during audit were as follows:

(i) Procurement and distribution of Sub-standard Fish Feed

During 2007-09 , three Superintendent of Fisheries(SFs) , (Sadar, Bishalgarh and Khowai) procured and distributed 1089 MT of fish feed, out of which 259MT worth Rs. 30.22 lakh was found to be substandard according to the laboratory reports. No action could be initiated as the supply order did not provide for penalty clause for supply of non-standard fish feed.

(ii) Procurement and distribution of Fish Feed without quality testing

During 2007-09, Superintendent of Fisheries,Sadar,Udaipur, Bishalgarh and Khowai procured and utilized 609 MT of fish feed worth Rs. 74.89 lakh without testing the quality.

26.The Government in reply stated (Septeber, 2009) that the required equipment was procured during 2008-09 and analysis of all the components would be done henceforth.

27.The Finance Department stated in their replies that the Department may please state whether necessary steps have been taken to make the Laboratory operational for conducting all kinds of test like estimation of fat ,carbohydrates ,ash etc.in fish feed.

The Finance Department also stated that whether Supdt. of Fisheries has been advised to carry out necessary modification in the supply order by inserting penalty clause for supplying non-standard fish feed. .

28 In this context, the Committee in the meeting held on the 20th December,2011 desired to know from the representative of the Fisheries Department the following question.

What is the latest status of analysis of fish feeds? Whether a mechanism has been in place to ensure procurement and distribution of quality fish feeds?

29. In his deposition before the Committee during evidence the representative of the Department stated that these are actually entertained in the tender. No action could be initiated as the supply order did not provide for penalty clause. Now penalty clause for is being included for the substandard fish feed. Department will analyse accordingly and action will be taken.

30. The Committee was not satisfied with this reply. It was seen that last 2-3 years no case of the penalty made down. Now the Government said that penalty has been started. The Committee wants to know the following from the Department.

31 What action is taken by the Department against these suppliers feed of fish? What action has been taken against them for procuring and distributing substandard fish feed? What is the latest position about the Superintendent of Fisheries, Sadar , Udaipur in 2007? What is the latest status of analysis of fish feeds? Whether a mechanism has been in place to ensure procurement and distribution of quality fish feeds?

These replies should be furnished to the Committee within 3(three) months from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

vii) Development of Fisheries through Cooperatives - Para 3.1.14

32. The Audit Paragraph has brought out that Fisheries Cooperatives were formed for proper fisheries development by involving the fishermen who are directly or indirectly dependant on this trade for their livelihood. The cooperatives were to provide guidance to fisherman to bring out an overall improvement in their socio-economic status. The Societies were mainly financed by the Government by investment in share capital and by providing managerial subsidy.

According to the Directorate, as of September, 2009, there were 110 Primary Fishery Co-operative Societies and one Tripura Apex Fishery Co-operative Society Limited (TAFSCL). The total number of members of these Societies was 16,480, which constituted only 21 per cent of the total fisherman population of 77,748 in the State. However, the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Government of Tripura reported in June 2009 that at the end of 2008-09 , there were 143 Societies out of which , 48 Societies (34 per cent) were dormant and 50 Societies (35 percent) were running in loss. Records also revealed that the Department had invested Rs. 10.86 lakh in dormant Societies and Rs. 35 lakh in loss making Societies upto 2007-08. The reasons for failure, as revealed from a scrutiny of the Audit report of the Societies, were mainly due to retention of cash balance by Ex-Secretary of the Society outside the Society account, non-realization of loans and advances and amount of rent receivable. The Department failed to keep proper vigil over the activities of the Societies which were corroborated by the following instances:

Contd...P/14

(i) Scrutiny of Audit Report of “ Rudra Sagar Utbastu Fisherman Samabay Samity Ltd” for 2006-07 revealed that Rs. 10.12 lakh being the amount of rent receivable remained outstanding as of March 2007.

(ii) There was an outstanding lease rent of Rs. 3.91 lakh as per Audit Report for 2007-08 of “ Udaipur Samaj Kalyan Matsyajibi Samabay Samity Ltd.”

(iii) Accounting books and records were not maintained properly.

(iv) Meetings of the Board of Directors were not held regularly.

(v) Audit of 107 societies were in arrears for 3 to 7 years due to non-finalization of accounts .

(vi) Revenue of Rs. 14.69 lakh on account of harvesting charges and royalty payable by Apex Co-operative Society to Government for marketing of fish harvested from reservoir remained outstanding as of March 2009. In reply, the Government stated that the outstanding amount is being recovered @ Rs. 10,000 per month starting from April 2009.

33. Government stated (September 2009) that the administrative control of the Cooperatives vests with the Co-operative Department and the role of Fisheries Department was restricted to technical guidance and financial support to the societies. The reply is not acceptable, as the societies receiving financial assistance are accountable for their activities to the funding Department.

34. The Department stated in their written reply that money advanced to the respective Co-operatives against managerial subsidy and share capital is duly accounted for and Utilization Certificate is furnished by the Co-operative to the Fisheries Department.

35. The Finance Department stated in its views that reasons for failure for development of fisheries through Co-operatives, as pointed out by audit, were retention of cash balance by ex-Secretaries of societies outside the society account, non-realization of loans and advances and amount of rent receivable etc. The Department may please state whether the short coming pointed out by audit was taken up with the Co-operative Department for necessary action. If so, status of action taken by the Co-operative Department may be intimated.

36. On this being pointed out in Audit, replies of Department and Finance Department the Committee desired to know (i) what is the latest position of financial management in the fisheries Co-operatives? (ii) How is the working of the cooperatives being monitored by the Fisheries Department to improve their efficiency?

38. In his reply during the evidence, the Additional Chief Secretary, In-charge of the Fisheries Department stated that Co-operative is given entire LOC. He also stated that Department is concerned with the operational object regarding production of fish. The respective Cooperative Societies are providing guidance to fisherman to bring more quality and quantity output from the resource. Money is advanced to the societies against managerial subsidy and share capital. Utilization certificate is furnished by the Cooperative to the Fisheries Department

The Representative of the Department also stated that out of 143 Nos. total Fisheries Co-operatives 110 Nos. are running.

39. The Committee would, therefore, like to know:-

How many Co-operatives are running at a Loss? How many Co-operatives took loan from Central NCDC Scheme? Name of those Cooperatives and amount of rupees? How many rupees were due from those Cooperatives? A detailed replies should be furnished to the Committee within 1(one) month from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

40. The Committee also recommends that Fisheries Department should help the Cooperatives for revival .National method should be introduced to quantity the production of fish. Mid time resolution should be conducted to adjust the targets which were formulated on the basis of lower regulated productivity. Post harvesting facilities need to be fully implemented to ensure higher economic returns. Concrete action should be taken to comb the long term adverse effect of un-favorable characteristics of water and soil. The training needs of Officials and fish farmers should be addressed. Management supervision of the fish farmer Co-operative should be strengthened. A detailed reply should be furnished to the Committee within 1(one) month from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly .

Contd...P/17

**B. PUBLIC WORKS (DRINKING WATER AND SANITATION)
DEPARTMENT**

2008-2009

i) Doubtful utilization of ductile iron pipes (Para 2.3)

41. The Audit Paragraph has pointed out that the work relating to ‘ Accelerated Urban Water Supply Scheme at Knowai ’ was awarded in June 2003 to the lowest tenderer as a lump sum contract at a negotiated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore for completion within 24 months from the 15th day of issue of work order i.e. by July ,2005.

Scrutiny (April, 2009) of records of the Executive Engineer, Drinking Water and Sanitation Division –II , Agartala revealed that the work commenced in July 2003 and was completed in November , 2006 i.e. after 17 months from the stipulated date of completion. The contractor was paid Rs. 2.78 crore upto January, 2007 in 14 separate running account bills against the work done for Rs. 2.80 crore. Payment of 15th and final bill to conclude the work at Rs. 2.81 crore was pending as of April, 2009.

As per the contract, for the component of “ Raw Water Rising Main ” , the contractor was to supply and lay 2,040 meters of 400 mm dia ductile iron pipes at a lump sum cost of Rs. 74.92 lakh (cost of pipes : Rs. 72.42 lakh and laying charges : Rs. 2.50 lakh). The contract further stipulated that in the event of requirement of pipes beyond 2,040 metres, a higher rate of Rs. 3,745 per metre would be charged. The contractor was paid Rs. 94.89 lakh for supplying 2,640 metres of pipes (2,040 metres at Rs. 72.42 lakh and 600 metres @ Rs. 3,745 per metres). Scrutiny of measurement book and site account,

however , revealed that out of 2,640 metres of pipes supplied by the contractor, 2,372 metres were issued to the contractor for the work (upto June, 2006) out of which, only 2040.50 metres were used by him on the work. There was nothing on record to establish that the contractor had returned the balance 331.50 metres of pipes worth Rs. 12.41 lakh . The 15th and final bill awaiting payment does not contain any recovery of the unutilized pipes. Further, the details of utilization of 268 metres of pipes costing Rs. 10.04 lakh which was not issued to the work was also not on record.

Thus, existence of 599.50 metres of ductile iron pipes worth Rs. 22.45 lakh, supplied by the contractor at higher rate, remained doubtful.

The Executive Engineer stated in April, 2009 that the matter would be investigated. Further development is awaited.

42. The Government in its reply dated 24th January, 2011 stated that the agency supplied 2639.50 meters of 400 mm dia D.I. pipes vide Invoices.

The details of supply and utilization of 400 mm dia D.I. pipes in the work are show that all the material that is 2639.50 meters of D.I. pipes were used in the work and were duly recorded in M.B.Nos.2129 ,2131,2133 and 2135.

Copies of Invoice bearing nos. 010529/0506, 003116/0607 and 003117/0607 and site accounts for 267.50 meters have been misplaced and not traceable at present. However, 400 mm dia D.I. pipes received vide above mentioned Invoice had been recorded in M.B. No. 2129 at page 18.

43. The Finance Department stated in its views that the reply furnished by the Department indicates that 599.50 meters of D.I .pipes were received and entered in M.B.No. 2131 and 2129 at page 18 respectively. The utilization of the pipes was also shown in the same MB and at the same page no. indicated above .Accountant General (Audit) may be requested to arrange for verification of the reply of the Department by deputing an audit team .

44. The Committee desired to know the following questions:-

- a) When was the payment of 15th and final bill made?
- b) When was the utilization recorded in MB No.2129?
- c) When rests of the 268 Km pipes (2640-2372) were issued to the contractor?

45. The Representative of the Department informed the Committee that final bill is already done. And final payment is in arbitration. Actual payment already recorded in the MB. The D.I. pipe of 2640 metres of 400 mm dia procured at a time had been utilized fully as per full requirement. There is no question about any doubtful utilization as of now.

46. The Committee was not pleased to all these replies as Invoice bearing Nos. 010529/0506, 003116/0607 and 003117/0607 and site accounts for 267.50 metres had been misplaced and not traceable at present.

Contd...P/ 20

47. In view of the facts the Committee would like to recommend that Accountant General (Audit) may verify jointly with the Departmental Representative the reply of the Department by deputing an audit team.. The Committee would like to know the latest position in this regard.

This information should be furnished to the Committee within 3(three) months from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

AUDIT REPORT FOR THE YEAR 2009-10

i) Loss in procurement UPVC pipes (Para 2.2)

48. The Audit Paragraph highlights that the Drinking Water & Sanitation (DWS) wing of the Public Works Department (PWD) , headed by a Chief Engineer (CE), is responsible for construction and maintenance of piped water supply system in Tripura. However, the procurement of different categories of pipes is with the Water Resource (WR) wing of the Department, headed by another CE. The Resource division under WR wing is responsible for procurement, stocking and issue of pipes required for both the DWS and WR wings of PWD.

For procurement of 902.526 Km UPVC pipes of different dia of 6 kg / sq. cm, pressure required for utilization in DWS works during 2008-09 for all the four districts of the State the CE,DWS placed the requirement to the CE,WR in April,2008.

Test check (November, 2009) of records of the Executive engineer (EE), Resource Division, Panchamukh, and Agartala revealed the following:

- For Procuring 286 Km pipes (out of total 902.526 Km.) the EE invited tenders in May 2008 and with the approval (January ,2009) of the Supply Advisory Board(SAB) issued (February,2009) supply orders to the lowest tender , a local firm , M/S. Tripura Polymer Private Limited (Firm-A) at the agreed rates (` 128, ` 186 and ` 305.10 per cent meter for 90 mm dia, 110 mm dia and 140 mm dia pipes respectively) with stipulation to complete the supply within six months .
- The EE again invited tenders in August, 2008 for procuring 351.361 Km. pipes (out of balance 616.526 Km) . Observing the rates quoted by the tenderers being high in view of prices of PVC resin the CE,WR instructed (January , 2009) for re-tendering . Out of three tenders received (March, 2009) in the 2nd call, the rates of a local firm , M/S. Hightension Switchgears Private Limited (Firm-B) being the lowest (` 101.90, ` 145.90 and ` 236.90 per meter for 90 mm dia, 110 mm dia and 140 mm dia pipes respectively) were recommended (29th April, 2009) by the CE, WR for approval of the SAB.
- While this tendering process was in progress, the CE, DWS, in contravention of the established procedure of channelising demands through WR wing, directly submitted (18 May,2009) a proposal to the SAB for procurement of additional 900 Km. pipes required for utilization against the target of 180 new DTWs for the first and second quarter of 2009-10 by repeat order of existing agreements (with Firm – A) , stating that the procurement of such quantity pipes through WR wing by calling of tenders would be almost an impossible task .

- The SAB approved the proposal of CE, DWS (for procuring 900 Km pipes at the rates of Firm-A, by repeat order of existing agreements) on 19th May, 2009. The SAB also approved on the same day (19th May, 2009) the rates of Firm- B (for procuring 351.361 Km pipes) recommended through tendering process, which were lower by about 30 per cent than the rates of Firm – A.

- Based on the approval of the SAB, the CE, WR in spite of being aware of availability of lower rates instructed (2nd June, and 8th June, 2009) the EE to procure the 900 Km pipes from Firm-A and Firm B(450 km each) at the rates of existing agreement . The EE in spite of availability of lower rates went ahead and issued supply orders on 12th June,2009 at higher rates (` 128, ` 186 and ` 305.10 per meter for 90 mm dia, 110 mm dia and 140 mm dia pipes respectively) to Firm – A and Firm – B.

- On receipt of approval of SAB from the CE, WR (3rd June, 2009), the EE issued supply orders again to Firm – B on 18th June, 2009 to supply 351.361 Km pipes at the approved lower rates (101.90, 145.90 and 236.90 per meter for 90 mm dia, 110 mm dia and 140 mm dia pipes respectively) with the stipulation to complete the supply within six months.

Upto June, 2010, against the total ordered quantity of 736 Km pipes to Firm –A and 801.361 Km pipes to Firm-B, 568.081 Km and 750.543 Km respectively had been supplied. Against the supply orders for 900 Km,. the two firms had supplied 731.830 Km pipes upto June, 2010 (Firm – A: 282.081 Km. and Firm – B: 449.749 Km) and the rest supply was in progress (July, 2010).

Thus purchase of 900 Km pipes by CE, WR and EE at higher rates despite being aware of availability of lower rates for the same pipes, points towards not only lack of prudence in expending Government funds on their part but is also resulting in loss of ` 3.61 crore, of which the loss of ` 2.88 crore had already been incurred on supply of 731.830 Km pipes upto June, 2010.

49. The Department stated in its written replies that the Drinking Water & Sanitation Wing of PWD is responsible for creation and subsequent maintenance of piped water supply system in Tripura since 01.04.2008. Mostly, the underground water resources through commissioning of DTW in rural Areas and Surface Water Resource in Urban areas are utilized for creation of sustainable piped water supply system in the State of Tripura. A massive programme to cover maximum habitations as per guidelines of Government of India, a 3 Years Action Plan (2008-2009,2009-2010, 2010-2011) was then prepared/finalized by Government of Tripura to provide drinking water facility in 2627 Nos. of partly covered habitation and 2922 Nos. of Non-covered habitations throughout the State of Tripura as on 01.04.2009. The habitations as mentioned above are mostly covered by SC/ST category population located in interior, remote and bordering areas in all 4(four) districts in Tripura .

As per 3 Years Action Plan the target during the year 2009-2010 for sinking New Deep Tube Wells, Commissioning of Deep Tube wells and lying of UPVC pipes are as follows:

1) There was a target of sinking & commissioning of 180 Nos. Deep Tube Wells during 1st & 2nd Quarter of the financial year 2009-10. For commissioning these 180 Nos. Deep Tube Wells total 900 KM UPVC pipes (5 Km for each Deep Tube Well) were required.

// 24 //

2) Commissioning and laying of pipelines for 92 Nos. deep tube wells that were sunk during the year 2008-2009 and the requirement of UPVC pipe @ 5 Km per Deep Tube Well amounting to 460 Km were required .

3) Laying of balance distribution network of 78 Nos. commissioned deep tube wells that were commissioned during 2008-2009 with partial distribution network. For completion of balance distribution network, requirement of UPVC pipes were assessed to be a total length of 186 Km.

So the total requirement of UPVC pipes for the financial year 2009-2010 were assessed to be a length of 1546 Km.

As per procurement programme of Resource Division expected availability of UPVC pipe could be a length of 591 Km. (upto June, 2009) which was far behind the assessed requirement of 1546 Km UPVC pipes to be utilized by PWD(DWS) . The expected availability could cater the requirement for the assignments at Sl. No. 2 & 3.

To fulfill the requirement against Sl.No. 1 i.e.for a length of 900 Km., PWD(DWS) moved a proposal to the SAB for procurement of the UPVC pipes of 900 Km. by deviating the existing agreements of the Resource Division that was / were prevailed during the period of proposal. The prevailing accepted rates were ` 128.00 /m, ` 186.00/m , 305.10/m, for 90 mm,110 mm & 140 mm dia respectively.

Procurement of this additional 900 Km. pipeline through tender process required a considerable time which could frustrate the target of the Department as per 3 Years Action Plan.

Contd...P/ 25

As the rate of PVC resin (which is a prime constituent of UPVC pipes manufacturing process) fluctuate with the variation of the price of the crude petroleum oil in the international market, so the open tender rate may vary at any time . So it can not be opined that if the materials (900 Km UPVC Pipe) could be procured in the open tender system the expenditure could be reduced.

Though 1(one) tender for supplying UPVC pipe at a lower rate (`101.90/m , `145.90/m & ` 236.90/m for 140mm , 110 mm & 110 mm & 90 mm dia respectively) for a length of 351.63 Km was under consideration of the department and the same was accepted by the SAB on the same date (19.05.2009) , when the SAB approved this deviation proposal for 900 Km UPVC pipes , the deviated quantity could only be supplied at the accepted lower tendered quantity by the lowest tenderer on completion of the stipulated tendered quantity accepted by the SAB and the scope could be availed in later stage only if the rate of PVC resin was favourable for the agency during the supply of these additional quantity (900 Km). From the observation of the Audit it reveals that the tender in question which was approved by the SAB on 19th May, 2009 was the 2nd call of the tender. The 1st call of the tender that was invited during August, 2008 was recalled due to high rate. So it is very difficult to ascertain when the tender rate will increase or decrease as it depends on the rate of raw materials i.e. PVC resin, a petroleum product and its rate fluctuate with the fluctuation of rate of crude oil in the International market.

Considering the urgency of obtaining supply of pipes of different category in the interest of public service , the SAB had concurred the approval of the proposal on 23.05.2009 of PWD (DWS) as a special case with the direction not to be cited by any department as an instance in future .

In the light of the above, it is crystal clear that the action taken by PWD (DWS) was entirely in the interest of public service.

50. In view of the facts as revealed, the Committee would like to know the following queries:

a) Why 900 Km pipes were purchased at higher rates despite being aware of availability of lower rates for the same pipes?

b) Whether rest 168.170 Km.(900 – 731.830) pipes were supplied by the supplier ? If so, when and at what cost?

51. In his reply, the representative of the Department during evidence stated that as per requirement on 2009-10 there is short fall for 900 Km. because there is no time if they call the tender. If it is finalized after compilation of the entire tender, it will take minimum 6 months and maximum 8 to 10 months. There is no position in favour of the DWS to call the tenders.

52. The Committee could not be satisfied with the replies of the Department.

During the examination, the Committee observed that Department did not maintain the Government procedure. Department not supposed to float any tender without WR Department.

53. The Committee also finds that on the same day Department placed the order for both the Farms on two different rates. The Department did not receive the entire quantity pipes upto June, 2010.

54. During the oral Examination, the Committee observed that Department could not show reasonable grounds for delay of supply of pipes. The Committee was strange that Department compromised the Government exchequer in the name of public interest. But from the year 2008 to 2010 the entire pipe could not been supplied.

55. In this regard, the Committee would like to recommend that the Department should examine the matter from time to time with the tenders' party for timely supply of pipes as per agreement.

56. In view of the fact as revealed, the Committee would like to know the following queries:-

- a) How Km. pipes may were received by the DWS Department?*
- b) How many Km pipes were supplied by the Department? When & at what cost ?*

57. These information should be furnished to the Committee within 15(fifteen)) days from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

II. Avoidable extra expenditure (Para 2.5)

58.It is seen from the Audit Para that, as per Para 20.1.15.5 of CPWD Manual Vol-II, top priority for awarding a work should be given on receipt of tenders. Further , as per time schedule prescribed in Appendix – 28 of the manual, the maximum time allowed for scrutiny and disposal of tenders requiring orders of the highest authority (here Supply Advisory Board (SAB) is 40 days including the issue of work order by te Executive Engineer (EE) after approval.

Test –check (October-November , 2009) of records of the EE, Rig – Division, Agartala revealed that tenders were invited (3rd May,2006) for “ Supplying of one higher capacity direct Rotary Drilling Rig(2000 ft.) mounted on Leyland make model ‘Taurus’ (4 x 6) wheel Truck chassis along with all its operational equipment and accessories including commissioning complete ” . Tenders were valid for 180 days (upto 16th January, 2007) . JVM Engineering Co., Gujarat (Firm ‘A’) quoted the lowest rate for 1.55 crore (estimated cost put to tenders ` 1.03 crore). But, the Department got the tender approved from SAB only on 23rd February, 2007. The Department communicated (17th March, 2007) to the tenderer ,after expiry of validity of the tender ,their approval of the tender with the request to extend the validity upto 30th April,2007 and issued supply order on 23rd March,2007. But, the tenderer did not agree (26th March , 2007) to extend the validity due to price hike and demanded 25 per cent enhancement on their quoted rate which comes to ` 1.94 crore . After that, Department cancelled the supply order on 2nd April, 2007.

The EE invited (2nd April, 2007) tenders afresh, which were opened on 21st May, 2007. The SAB approved (21st August, 2007) the tender in favour of the lowest tenderer (LMP Precision Engineering Co.(P) Ltd., Gujarat : Firm 'B') at the negotiated tendered value of ` 2.71 crore (estimated cost put to tender : ` 1.03 crore). The supply order was issued on 4th October,2007 allowing six months time to complete the supply including commissioning . The supply of the Rig was completed on 21st July, 2008 and commissioned on 3rd 6June, 2009.

Thus, due to delay in finalization of the first tender within the validity period of 180 days, the department had to incur an extra expenditure of ` 1.16 crore , which could have been avoided had the Department adhered to the provision on tender under the CPWD Manual.

On this being pointed out in Audit, the EE stated (March ,2010) that as all the technical specifications were not specified in the tender of Firm ' A ' the same was not accepted by the Department and hence moved for fresh tender . The fact however, remains that the Department had issued supply order to the firm only after ascertaining all the technical specifications and had also requested the firm for extending the validity period .The reply is therefore , an afterthought to justify the revised call of tender and cannot be accepted .

59.The Department stated in their written replies that tender was invited for procurement of Higher Capacity Direct Rotary Drilling Rig(2000 ft) on 03.05.2006 for an estimated cost of ` 1.03 crores . Tenders were received and opened on 27.07.2006 with validity of tender up to 16.01.2007. As per comparative study M/S JMV Engineering Co., Gujarat was the lowest tenderer for an amount of ` 1.55 crore . As this is the 1st tender in Tripura for this special type of Higher capacity Drilling Rig , so it took a considerable time in evaluating the technical specifications of such complex type of machine in which lot of specialized items are involved and the tender was based on contractor's design where adequate special reasons exists . However, the tender was ultimately processed to the SAB on 13.11.2006 and the tender was put up in the SAB

meeting on 02. 12. 2006 in which the SAB advised the Department to send a Senior Engineer to visit the drilling site where the same type of machine supplied by the M/S JMV Engineering Co., the lowest tenderer, to collect the performance report of the machine. Accordingly, one senior engineer was sent to Pathancoat , Punjab where the same type of machine supplied by the M/S JMV Engineering Co. to Punjab state Tube Well Corporation was working.

After examining the performance of the machine by the deputed Engineer, the proposal was resubmitted to the SAB on 06.02.2007 and the SAB approved the proposal on 23.02.2007 and communicated the Department on 02.03.2007. As the validity of tender expired on 16.01.2007, the concerned Executive Engineer requested the firm on 17.03.2007 to extend the validity of tender but the agency vide his letter dated 26.03.2007 declined to extend its validity and claimed 25% extra rate for further extension of validity of this tender which is not admissible as per norms of tender .

Under the above circumstances there was no other alternative but to call the tender again on 02.04.2007 in which M/S LMP Precision Engineering Co. Pvt. Ltd., Gujarat was the lowest tenderer and its negotiated tender for an amount of ` 2.71 crore against the estimated cost of ` 1.03 crores was approved by the SAB on 21.08.2007.

In the light of the above facts, it is crystal clear that the Department had no intension for such delay rather had taken all sorts of measures so that a good quality High capacity Drilling rig Machine (2000 ft) is procured for the development of the State. Whatever delay has occurred, it was due to lengthy procedure followed to ascertain the performance and integrity of the Rig as well as of the supplier.

60. In the light of the replies from the Department the Committee wants to know the following questions:

- a) Why finalization of the tender could not be completed within the validity period of 180 days?*
- b) What measures have now been taken to avoid unnecessary delay in finalization of tender?*
- c) Why ` 1.16 crore was excess expenditure?*
- d) Whether any responsibility has been fixed for the avoidable extra Expenditure of ` 1.16 crore?*

These information should be furnished to the Committee within 15(fifteen) days from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

AUDIT REPORT FOR THE YEAR 2008-2009

C. EDUCATION (HIGHER) DEPARTMENT (TRIPURA UNIVERSITY)

i) Excess expenditure on a turnkey project (Para 2.4)

61. It is seen from the Audit Paragraph that the work of a turnkey project Campus –wide Networking in Tripura University was awarded by the University (September, 2006) to the second lowest bidder (Firm B) at a negotiated tendered value of Rs. 1.25 crore, setting aside the lowest tendered bid of Rs. 97 lakh (Firm A), stipulating completion within 14 weeks from the date of issue of work order . The work was completed in January, 2008 at a total cost of Rs. 1.37 crore and the system started functioning after trials in April, 2008.

Scrutiny (June – November 2008) of records of the University revealed the following:

- An Expert Committee, consisting of two members (appointed by the University), which, on technical consideration recommended two firms(Firm A and Firm B) out of 5 bidders , concluded Firm B to be relatively inexperienced . Thereafter, Firm A and B presented their technical and financial bids before an Appraisal Committee (appointed by the University) in April, 2006.
- The Appraisal Committee rejected the lowest bid of Firm A and recommended Firm B on the ground that the latter undertook site survey before submission of its bid and assured on site service for first three years free of cost .
- The need to undertake site survey was not a requirement of the bid document. Besides, the site survey done by selected Firm B was evidently not accurate, as about 700 meters of additional cables more than 3,000 meters (about 23 per cent excess) indicated in the work order were needed during execution.
- The bid document required that after successful commissioning of the system, the bidder should engage a system engineer at the site for three years. Firm A had accounted for the cost of a site engineer for three years in its bid.
- The bid document also required that prices indicated should be all inclusive. While the condition was fulfilled by Firm A , Firm B quoted the prices exclusive of State sales tax , which resulted in extra payment of Rs. 12.74 lakh .

Selection of Firm B thus lacked transparency and undue favour shown to the firm despite it not being the lowest tenderer.

The University stated (January ,2009) that while recommending Firm B willingness and technical ability to provide quality goods and post-commission services , presentation of schematic layout based on site survey and determination to undertake the job at a competitive price were given due emphasis . The reply does not address the rejection of an equally competent and experienced Firm with more beneficial offer.

62. The Department stated in its replies that the Tripura University has been converted into a Central University by an Act of Parliament w.e.f. 2nd July, 2007. Under Section 4 (c) of Tripura University at 2006 and all assets and liabilities have been vested with Tripura University. Therefore, under the Provision of the said Act a central University does not come under the purview of the State Legislation. Hence Education (Higher) Department is not supposed to answer to the Para in question.

However, Tripura University has been requested to take appropriate measures on the audit observation Para of the CAG from their end.

63. Finance Department stated in its views that the Department in its reply stated that Tripura University was converted into a Central University w.e.f. 2nd July, 2007. As such this university does no longer come under the purview of the State Legislation, for which Education (Higher) Department appears not to have competence to reply against the Para any more.

64. After careful examination the Committee recommend that Accountant General (Audit), Tripura will take necessary steps with the University and the Committee would not like to proceed further in this regard .

D. AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

i) Non – achievement of scheme objectives (Para 2.13)

65. It is seen from the Audit Paragraph that under a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) ‘Integrated Cereal Development Project,’ the Agriculture Department allotted (September, 2005) Rs. 1.07 crore to the Executive Engineer (EE), Mechanical, Agriculture Department, Agartala .The amount was drawn by the EE in five grants –in-aid bills in March, 2006 and kept in his Current Deposit (CD) account with State Bank of India, TLA House Branch, Agartala.

One of the components of the scheme was setting up three seed processing plants (Paddy) at Bikhora, Udaipur and Kumarghat. Three work orders, were issued to a Kolkata based firm in November, 2006 for supply and commissioning of the equipment at the lowest tendered value of Rs. 64.26 lakh. The work was stipulated to be completed by 31st Mach, 2007. The EE paid (November, 2006) Rs. 16.05 lakh to the firm as advance, as per the conditions of the contract against Bank Guarantees (BGs) which were valid upto 23rd February, 2007.

Scrutiny (May-June, 2009) of records of the EE revealed that the firm did not start the work and advance road permits were issued only in November, 2007 i.e. eight months after the expiry of the time for completion of the work .The Department, however, neither issued direction to the firm to complete the supply as per the contract nor issued notice to the firm for expediting the work. Instead, the Department extended in different spells the time for completion upto 31st March, 2008. The work was finally cancelled on 27th February, 2009. In the meantime, the BGs had lapsed as the firm did not extend them despite repeated requests of the Department. The amount of Rs. 16.05 lakh , advanced to the firm could not be recovered (June , 2009) as the BGs have lapsed. Besides, the purpose of establishing three seed processing plants of paddy in the State remained unachieved.

Thus, lack of effective and timely action by the Department resulted in non-recovery of Rs. 16.05 lakh. Besides, the objectives of the scheme remained unfulfilled even after the lapse of 45 months since allocation of funds.

While accepting the facts, the Government stated (October, 2009) that an FIR had been lodged against the concerned firm and tenders for completion of the works had been invited in June, 2009.

66. The Department in its reply stated that it is fact that an FIR had been lodged against the concerned firm and the case in under investigation of C.I.D. By this time International Commercial Traders, Kolkata has sent a Demand Draft of Rs. 5.35 lakh as return out of total advance of Rs.16.05 lakh. As per Government decision the Government pleader has prepared a draft notice against the firm to return advance amount with penal interest and file is moved to Law Department for views.

After cancellation of work order, tenders had again been invited in June, 2009 & tenders were finalized. The plant & machineries for Undaipur ,Baikhora & Kumarghat have been installed by the 1st lowest tenderer M/S. OSAW Agro Industries Pvt. Ltd. Ambala and commissioned in the month of July, 2010. The setting up of three seed processing plant for paddy may be considerer as implemented.

67. Finance Department stated in their views that the Department in its written reply stated that the firm had returned Rs.5.35 lakh against the Advance of Rs. 16.05 lakh. The Department may please apprise the Committee of the latest position regarding realization of the remaining amount of Rs. 10.70 lakh (Rs. 16.05 – Rs. 5.35 lakh) from the firm Suman Group of Industries, Kolkata. Besides, the following information may also please be furnished -

(i) Total expenditure incurred in procurement and installation of three seed processing plants from M/S OSAW Agro Industries Pvt. Ltd., Ambala .

(ii) Whether excess expenditure, if any, involved in procurement and installation of three seed processing plants has been recovered from Suman Group of Industries, Kolkata to whom the original work orders were issued as per risk and cost clause normally included in the agreement.

68. In this regard the Committee wanted to know the following questions:

- a) Why the Department did not monitor the progress of the work on time?
- b) Why advance road permit was issued in November, 2007 while the stipulated date of completion of the work was 31st March, 2007?
- c) What is the latest position of realization of the rest amount?
- d) What is the final cost of the work done by M/S. OSAW Agro Industries Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata?

// 36//

69. After oral examination the Committee recommends that the matter is Sub- Judice before a Court of Law and is uncertain when their will be decision. So, this Para be reserved and matter be adjourned sine-die till the decision by the Court. After decision the position of this Para should be intimated to the Committee.

**SUDIP ROY BARMAN
CHAIRMAN
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
TRIPURA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

Contd...P/ 37

**SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS / OBSERVATION OF THE
HUNDRED NINTH REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE .**

Sl.No.	Deptt. to which the recommendation is related	Ref.to page and para of 109 th Report	Recommendations/ Observations of the Committee
1	2	3	4
1.	Fisheries Department	Page – 04 Para - 05	In view of the above position as deposed by the Representative of the Department, the Committee has decided not proceed further with the matter
2		Page -08 Para -18	The Committee after due consideration of the written as well as oral submission made by the Representative of the Deptt. On being satisfied dropped para Nos. 3.1.9.1.,3.1.9.2 and 3.1.9.3.
3.		Page - 10 Para – 24	In this regard, the Committee would like to know the latest Position of this para. A comprehensive report in this regard should Be furnished to the Committee Within 3(three) months from the Date of presentation of this report to the Assembly.
4.		Page- 12 Para - 30 & 31	The Committee was not satisfied with this reply. It was seen that last 2-3 years no case of the penalty has been started.The Committee wants to know the following from the Department .

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

5. Fisheries Deptt.

What action is taken by the Department against these suppliers feed of fish? What action has been taken against them for procuring and distributing substandard fish feed? What is the latest position about the Superintendent of Fisheries, Sadar, Udaipur in 2007? What is the latest status of analysis of fish feeds? Whether a mechanism has been in place to ensure procurement and distribution of quality fish feeds?

These replies should be furnished to the Committee within 3(three) months from the date of presentation of this report to the Assembly.

6. Page – 16
Para - 39
40

The Committee would, therefore, like to know:-

How many Co-operatives are running at a Loss? How many co-operatives took loan from Central NCDC Scheme? Name of those Co-operatives and amount of rupees? How many rupees were due from those Co-operatives? Detailed replies should be furnished to the committee within 1(one month from the date of presentation of this report to the Assembly.

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

The Committee also recommends that Fisheries Department should help the Co-operatives for revival. National method should be introduced to quantity the production of fish, mid time resolution should be conducted to adjust the targets which were formulated on the basis of lower regulated productivity, Post harvesting facilities need to be fully implemented to ensure higher economic returns. Concrete action should be taken to comb the long term adverse effect of un-favorable characteristics of water and soil. The training needs of Officials and fish farmers should be addressed. Management supervision of the fish farmer Co-operative should be strengthened. A detailed reply should be furnished to the Committee within 1(one) month from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

7. Public Works Page – 20
(D.W.S.) Deptt. Para -47

In view of the facts the Committee would like to recommend that Accountant General (Audit) may verify jointly with the Departmental Representative the reply of the Department by deputing an audit team. The Committee would like to know the latest position in this regard.

This information should be furnished to the committee within 3(three) months from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

--	--	--	--

8. – Do - Page - 26 The Committee could not be satisfied with the replies of the Department.
Para - 52
- 53 During the examination, the Committee observed that Department did not maintain the government procedure. Department not supposed to float any tender without WR Department
- 54 The Committee also finds that on the same day Department placed the order for both the Farms on two different rates. The Department did not receive the entire quantity pipes upto June, 2010
- 54 During the oral Examination, the Committee observed that Department could not show reasonable grounds for delay of supply of pipes. The committee was strange that Department compromised the Government exchequer in the name of public interest. But from the year 2008 to 2010 the entire pipe could not been supplied.
- 55 In this regard, the Committee would like to recommend that the Department should examine the matter from time to time withy the tenders' party for timely supply of pipes as per agreement.
- 56 In view of the fact as revealed , the Committee would like to know the following queries :-
- a. How Km. pipes may were received by the DWS Department?
b. How many Km. pipes were supplied by the Department? When & at what cost?
- 57 These information should be furnished to the committee within 15(fifteen) days from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

--	--	--	--

9. -- Do -- Page - 30 In the light of the replies from the
 Para -60 Committee wants to know the following
 questions:
- a) Why finalization of the tender could not be completed within the validity period of 180 days?
 - b) What measures have now been taken to avoid unnecessary delay in finalization of tender?
 - c) Why ` 1.16 crore was excess expenditure?
 - d) Whether any responsibility has been fixed for the avoidable extra Expenditure of ` 1.16 crore?

These information should be furnished to the Committee within (fifteen) days from the date of presentation of this Report to the Assembly.

10. Education Page – 33 After careful examination the Committee
 (Higher) Para - 64 recommend that Accountant General(Audit),
 Department Tripura will take necessary steps with the
 University and the Committee would not
 like to proceed further in this regard.
11. Agriculture Page – 36 After oral examination the Committee
 Department Para - 69 recommends that the matter is Sub-Judice
 before a Court of Law and is uncertain when
 their will be decision. So, this Para be
 Reserved and matter be adjourned sine-die
 till the decision by the Court. After decision
 the position of this Para should be intimated
 to the Committee.
