

Appendix 1.1
(Reference: Paragraph 1.7.2, Page 6)

Statement showing details of Departmental Notes pending as of December 2016

Sl. No.	Department	2003-04	2004-05	2008-09	2009-10	2012-13 [@]	2013-14 [@]	2014-15 [@]
1	Commerce & Industries	-	-	1	-	3	3	4
2	Forest, Ecology & Environment	1	-	-	-	-	2	1
3	Horticulture (Sericulture)	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
4	Information Technology, Bio-technology and Science & Technology	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
5	Water Resources (Minor Irrigation)	-	2	3	1	1	1	3
6	Public Works, Ports & Inland Water Transport	1	-	-	-	7	4	-
7	Infrastructure Development	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
8	Tourism	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
9	Water Resources	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Total		02	02	04	01	13	12	09

(@ Report on Economic Sector)

Appendix 1.2
(Reference: Paragraph 1.7.3, Page 6)

Statement showing number of Paragraphs/Performance Audits yet to be discussed by PAC as of December 2016

Sl. No.	Department	92-93	93-94	94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12 [@]	12-13 [@]	13-14 [@]	14-15 [@]	Total	
1	Forest, Ecology & Environment	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	2	3	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	2	1	1	2	1	20	
2	WRD	14	7	7	6	8	7	2	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	63	
3	WRD (MI)	1	5	3	5	4	2	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	3	2	1	-	1	3	3	37	
4	PWD	-	2	2	4	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	4	2	23
5	RDPR(PHE)	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	01
6	Co-operation	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	02
7	Commerce & Industries	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	3	3	4	17
8	Horticulture (Sericulture)	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	03
9	IT&BT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	03
10	Tourism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	02
11	Infrastructure Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	01
	Total	17	15	13	17	13	12	04	03	04	09	05	02	02	01	01	06	02	05	01	14	15	11	172	

(@ Report on Economic Sector)

Appendix 2.1
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.6.6.4; Page No. 22)

Statement showing execution of CRF works with less than 10 km road length

SI No.	Division	Package	No. of works executed under 10 km road length
1	Chitradurga	35,37,42,45	7
2	Hubballi	62,64,66,71	12
3	Karwar	80	1
4	Tumakuru	16,17,28,32	22
5	Vijayapura	72,73,75,77	7
Total		17 packages	49

Appendix 2.2
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.6.7.3; Page No. 24)

Statement showing cost overrun

(₹ in crore)

SI No.	Package No.	Job No.	Administratively approved amount	Expenditure incurred as on June 2016	Extra expenditure over & above 110% of the approved cost
1	9	1559	3.00	3.39	0.09
2	16	1588	5.00	5.53	0.03
3	19	1341	8.00	12.59	3.79
4	37	1578	2.00	7.38	5.18
5	38	1355	4.00	5.08	0.68
6	42	1414	4.00	4.44	0.04
7	43	1527	2.00	2.77	0.57
8	44	1456	4.00	4.77	0.37
9	45	1428	4.00	5.59	1.19
10	46	1485	4.00	4.81	0.41
11	48	1473	4.50	5.16	0.21
12	50	1344	2.00	2.56	0.36
13	53	1429	3.00	3.62	0.32
14	54	1504	2.00	2.81	0.61
15	55	1469	1.50	4.53	2.88
16	63	1439	5.00	5.68	0.18
17	75	1393, 1422, 1523, 1524, 1525	22.00	33.35	9.15
18	80	1361	4.00	4.46	0.06
Total			84.00	118.52	26.12

Appendix 2.3
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.6.8.1; Page No. 25)

Statement showing status of CRF works as on December 2015

Sl No.	Division	No. of packages	No. of works	No. of works in progress	No. of works completed
1	Bengaluru	25	52	26	25
2	Chitradurga	12	46	17	29
3	Hubballi	15	50	8	41
4	Mangaluru	15	41	18	23
5	Karwar	8	26	10	13
6	Tumakuru	9	28	10	18
7	Vijayapura	3	13	0	13
Total		87	256	89	162

Note: Five works were dropped/yet to be started

Appendix 2.4
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.6.8.4 (a); Page No. 28)

Statement showing extra expenditure due to providing unnecessary overlay with BM

(Amount in ₹)

Sl No.	Division	Package	Quantity of BM provided over existing BT surface (cum)	Extra expenditure
1	Bengaluru	5,6	1,103.750	82,75,525
2	Chitradurga	35,37,42	7,928.875	6,33,04,116
3	Hubballi	62,64,66,71	1,06,059.500	3,79,93,467
4	Karwar	80	4,488.640	4,11,15,942
5	Mangaluru	47,48,49,52,57,58	13,674.750	10,80,35,163
6	Tumakuru	16,17,28,32	9,233.730	6,31,68,345
Total		20 Packages	1,42,489.245	32,18,92,558

Appendix 2.5
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.6.8.4 (b); Page No. 28)

**Statement showing extra cost due to construction of GSB by adopting
'Mix in place' method**

(Quantity in cum & amount in ₹)

SI No.	Division	Package	Executed quantity	Extra cost
1	Bengaluru	1,3,5,6,7,8,9,15,18,19,22,23,25	1,51,783.56	1,44,03,880
2	Chitradurga	35,37,42,45	54,296.97	79,40,803
3	Hubballi	62,64,66,71	36,852.00	86,59,743
4	Mangaluru	47,49	25,974.81	17,17,130
5	Tumakuru	16,17,28,32	22,305.46	40,63,429
6	Vijayapura	72,73,75,77	57,517.12	45,23,623
Total		31 packages	3,48,729.92	4,13,08,608

Appendix 2.6
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.6.8.4 (c); Page No. 29)

Statement showing excess payment due to repetition of compaction item

(Amount in ₹)

SI No.	Division	Package	Quantity in sqm	Excess payment
1	Bengaluru	1,3,5,6,7,8,9, 15,18,19,22, 23,25	7,48,967.50	31,65,285
2	Chitradurga	35,37,42,45	3,42,885.60	20,55,484
3	Hubballi	62,64,66,71	2,97,500.00	12,59,529
4	Mangaluru	47,49	1,16,400.00	4,24,860
5	Tumakuru	16,17,28,32	6,604.81	4,03,330
6	Vijayapura	72,73,75,77	2,52,780.10	17,29,143
Total		31 packages		90,37,631

Appendix 2.7
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.6.8.4 (d); Page No. 29)

Statement showing avoidable extra expenditure due to non-utilisation of excavated soil for embankment

(Quantity in cum; Amount in ₹)

SI No.	Division	Package	Qty of soil excavated	Qty of embankment executed	Qty of embankment executed with available soil	Qty of embankment executed with borrowed soil	Extra expenditure due to non utilisation of available soil
1	Bengaluru	5,6,7,8,9,13,15,18,19,22,23,25	21,793	53,436	0	21,793	32,15,651
2	Chitradurga	35,37,42,45	32,291	19,940	0	19,940	37,08,805
3	Hubballi	62,64,66,71	360	0	0	360	99,000
4	Karwar	80	20,900	6,230	0	6,230	32,40,057
5	Mangaluru	47,52,58	10,350	10,350	0	10,350	8,59,433
6	Tumakuru	16,17,28,32	17,768	19,167	10,832	23,067	12,56,013
7	Vijayapura	72,73,75,77	33,885	2,00,936	0	2,00,936	93,20,377
Total		32 packages					2,16,99,336

Appendix 2.8
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.6.8.4 (f); Page No. 31)

Statement showing payment made without measuring the work done

(₹ in crore)

SI No.	Division	Package	Payment made without measuring the work done	
			For sub base & bituminous courses	For excavation/ embankment & sub-grade
1	Chitradurga	35,37,42,45	42.59	2.92
2	Hubballi	62,64,66,71	37.11	10.08
3	Karwar	80	7.82	0.37
4	Tumakuru	16,17,28,32	24.09	6.67
5	Vijayapura	72,73,75,77	32.56	0.99
Total		17 packages	144.17	21.03

Appendix 2.9
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.8; Page No. 35)

Statement showing extra cost incurred

(in ₹)

Sl No.	Item of work	Up to 125% of BOQ		Beyond 125% of BOQ		Difference in rate (6-4)	Extra cost (5 × 7)
		Quantity	Rate as per tender	Quantity	Revised rate		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Main Building Ground Floor: Providing & laying pattern flooring for staircase treads & risers (Item 17)	204.53	4,833	2,499.98	8,696.95	3,863.95	96,59,798
2	Main Building Ground Floor: Providing & laying flooring for corridors/lobbies (Item 61)	3,863.49	3,403	4,836.13	4,288.71	885.71	42,83,409
3	Main Building Ground Floor: Providing & laying Hassan green granite flooring (Item 68)	1,439.80	4,305	6,490.43	4,775.80	470.80	30,55,694
4	Main Building First Floor: Providing & laying pattern flooring for staircase treads & risers (Item 1)	379.79	4,833	1,170.21	8,696.95	3,863.95	45,21,633
5	Main Building First Floor: Providing & laying flooring for corridors/lobbies (item 31)	2,105.58	3,403	5,299.56	4,288.71	885.71	46,93,873
6	Main Building Second Floor: Providing & laying pattern flooring for staircase treads & risers	356.80	4,833	1,052.38	8,696.95	3,863.95	40,66,344
7	Main Building Second Floor: Providing & laying flooring for corridors/lobbies	2,105.58	3,403	7,086.43	4,288.71	885.71	62,76,522
Total							3,65,57,273

Appendix 2.10
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.9; Page No. 37)

Statement showing adjustment cost for bitumen consumption

(Amount in ₹)

IPC ⁹⁸ No.	Qty as per IPC (in cum)	Density	Applicable Base percentage of Bitumen content	Actual per cent of bitumen content provided	Excess per cent of bitumen content (Col 5 - Col 4)	Excess bitumen quantity in MT (Col 2 × Col 3 × Col 6 ÷ 100)	Rate of bitumen	Amount payable (Col 7 × Col 8)	Paid	Excess paid
-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-	-8-	-9-	-10-	-11-
(1) Adjustment cost for bitumen consumption: WEP-1 package										
Up gradation of road: Hoskote (km 0.000) to Chintamani bypass (km 52+400) of SH 82										
1	450.000	2.369	4.50	4.54	0.04	0.43	28,235	12,040	86,399	74,359
2	604.125	2.369	4.50	4.52	0.02	0.29	28,235	8,082	1,07,575	99,494
3	805.000	2.369	4.50	4.52	0.02	0.38	28,235	10,769	1,46,935	1,36,166
4	970.000	2.369	4.50	4.53	0.03	0.69	28,235	19,465	1,84,092	1,64,628
5	848.000	2.354	4.50	4.57	0.07	1.40	28,235	39,454	1,78,953	1,39,500
6	1,216.500	2.354	4.50	4.59	0.09	2.58	28,235	72,769	2,73,908	2,01,138
7	598.501	2.354	4.50	4.61	0.11	1.55	28,235	43,757	1,39,227	95,469
8	1,660.550	2.354	4.50	4.62	0.12	4.69	28,235	1,32,443	3,86,283	2,53,841
9	1,550.051	2.354	4.50	4.63	0.13	4.74	28,235	1,33,932	3,60,589	2,26,657
10	1,529.940	2.354	4.50	4.61	0.11	3.96	28,235	1,11,857	3,55,902	2,44,046
11	757.818	2.354	4.50	4.61	0.11	1.96	28,235	55,405	1,76,299	1,20,894
12	227.500	2.354	4.50	4.60	0.10	0.54	28,235	15,121	52,912	37,792
13	549.908	2.354	4.50	4.61	0.11	1.42	28,235	40,205	1,27,933	87,728
14	2,806.100	2.354	4.50	4.66	0.16	10.57	28,235	298,413	6,52,765	3,54,352
15	831.004	2.356	4.50	4.80	0.30	5.87	28,235	165,839	2,76,392	1,10,553
16	1,330.943	2.356	4.50	4.80	0.30	9.41	28,235	265,610	4,42,697	1,77,087
17	640.896	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	3.93	28,235	110,847	2,13,174	1,02,327
18	855.550	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	5.24	28,235	147,973	2,84,552	1,36,580
19	188.184	2.356	4.50	4.78	0.28	1.24	28,235	35,051	62,597	27,546
20	1,437.027	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	8.80	28,235	248,543	4,77,962	2,29,419
21	397.350	2.356	4.50	4.77	0.27	2.53	28,235	71,367	1,32,168	60,801
22	845.927	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	5.18	28,235	1,46,308	2,80,515	1,34,206
23	1,115.997	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	6.84	28,235	1,93,019	3,71,177	1,78,159
24	1,087.380	2.356	4.50	4.75	0.25	6.40	28,235	1,80,836	3,61,662	1,80,826
25	637.630	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	3.91	28,235	1,10,282	2,11,028	1,00,746
26	620.180	2.356	4.50	4.75	0.25	3.65	28,235	1,03,139	2,05,438	1,02,299
27	998.394	2.356	4.50	4.75	0.25	5.88	28,235	1,66,037	3,32,072	1,66,035
28	1,511.631	2.356	4.50	4.75	0.25	8.90	28,235	2,51,391	5,02,781	2,51,390
29	798.110	2.356	4.50	4.75	0.25	4.70	28,235	1,32,729	2,62,811	1,30,082
30	1,150.142	2.356	4.50	4.75	0.25	6.77	28,235	1,91,273	3,82,556	1,91,283
31	849.636	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	5.20	28,235	1,46,950	2,82,604	1,35,654
32	1,754.406	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	10.75	28,235	3,03,436	5,83,533	2,80,097
33	863.008	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	5.29	28,235	1,49,263	2,87,037	1,37,774
34	1,076.828	2.356	4.50	4.77	0.27	6.85	28,235	1,93,407	3,58,161	1,64,754
35	448.913	2.356	4.50	4.75	0.25	2.64	28,235	74,656	1,48,968	74,312
36	452.823	2.356	4.50	4.75	0.25	2.67	28,235	75,306	1,50,605	75,299
37	2,659.992	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	16.29	28,235	4,60,062	8,84,744	4,24,681
38	12.880	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	0.08	28,235	2,228	4,292	2,064
39	120.259	2.356	4.50	4.76	0.26	0.74	28,235	20,800	40,009	19,209
Total (A)								49,40,062	10,76,909	58,29,247

⁹⁸ Interim Payment Certificate

(2) Adjustment cost for bitumen consumption: WEP-4 package										
Up gradation of road: Tinthini (km 0) to Kalmala (km 73.8) of SH 61 & SH 15 in Raichur										
1	2,229.500	2.353	4.50	4.64	0.14	7.34	28,235	2,07,370	5,18,423	3,11,053
2	1,166.250	2.353	4.50	4.65	0.15	4.12	28,235	1,16,223	2,71,197	1,54,974
3	2,872.500	2.353	4.50	4.63	0.13	8.79	28,235	2,48,092	6,67,927	4,19,835
4	3,615.000	2.353	4.50	4.65	0.15	12.76	28,235	3,60,254	8,56,876	4,96,621
5	320.000	2.353	4.50	4.66	0.16	1.20	28,235	34,016	74,399	40,384
6	1,572.500	2.346	4.50	4.65	0.15	5.53	28,235	1,56,242	3,54,152	1,97,910
7	2,815.500	2.346	4.50	4.61	0.11	7.27	28,235	2,05,146	6,34,102	4,28,955
8	1,873.500	2.346	4.50	4.57	0.07	3.08	28,235	86,870	3,97,125	3,10,256
9	929.000	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	1.96	28,235	55,383	2,09,221	1,53,839
10	1,048.250	2.346	4.50	4.57	0.07	1.72	28,235	48,605	2,22,181	1,73,576
11	484.500	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	1.02	28,235	28,884	1,09,128	80,245
12	1,627.000	2.346	4.50	4.58	0.08	3.05	28,235	86,217	3,55,648	2,69,431
13	1,422.149	2.346	4.50	4.61	0.11	3.67	28,235	1,03,622	3,25,945	2,22,322
14	1,239.800	2.346	4.50	4.61	0.11	3.20	28,235	90,336	2,79,216	1,88,880
15	817.500	2.346	4.50	4.61	0.11	2.11	28,235	59,566	1,84,120	1,24,555
16	1,803.500	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	3.81	28,235	1,07,516	4,06,160	2,98,644
17	1,979.500	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	4.18	28,235	1,18,009	4,45,802	3,27,794
18	2,167.650	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	4.58	28,235	1,29,225	4,88,183	3,58,958
19	579.000	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	1.22	28,235	34,517	1,30,389	95,872
20	2,152.500	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	4.54	28,235	1,28,322	4,77,651	3,49,329
21	1,022.799	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	2.16	28,235	60,975	2,30,341	1,69,367
22	434.500	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	0.92	28,235	25,903	97,863	71,960
23	1,071.300	2.346	4.50	4.58	0.08	2.01	28,235	56,770	2,34,181	1,77,411
24	717.000	2.346	4.50	4.59	0.09	1.51	28,235	42,744	1,61,476	1,18,732
25	440.815	2.346	4.50	4.58	0.08	0.83	28,235	23,359	96,366	73,007
26	736.126	2.346	4.50	4.58	0.08	1.38	28,235	39,008	1,60,911	1,21,903
27	610.500	2.346	4.50	4.58	0.08	1.15	28,235	32,351	1,33,439	1,01,087
28	75.000	2.346	4.50	4.58	0.08	0.14	28,235	3,974	14,146	10,171
30	233.412	2.346	4.50	4.58	0.08	0.44	28,235	12,369	51,021	38,652
Total (B)								27,01,869	85,87,591	58,85,722
(3) Adjustment cost for bitumen consumption: AEP-8 package										
Up gradation of road: From Mudgal (km 0) to Gangavathi (km 74.200) of SH 29 in Koppal and Raichur districts										
1	1,844.669	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	3,18,802	3,18,802
2	1,462.000	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	2,52,727	2,52,727
3	1,296.000	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	2,23,936	2,23,936
4	1,719.000	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	2,97,123	2,97,123
5	916.000	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	1,58,235	1,58,235
6	1,389.000	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	2,40,030	2,40,030
7	1,319.000	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	2,87,507	2,87,507
8	794.000	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	1,76,142	1,76,142
9	1,536.000	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	3,45,702	3,45,702
10	256.717	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	57,550	57,550
12	221.758	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	52,934	52,934
13	165.176	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	39,176	39,176
14	229.883	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	55,057	55,057
15	191.919	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	46,109	46,109
16	99.570	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	24,124	24,124
17	109.809	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	26,596	26,596
19	23.271	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	5,504	5,504
24	19.378	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	4,561	4,561
25	4.178	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	983	983
27	18.363	2.401	4.5	4.5	0	0	28,791	0	4,325	4,325
Total (C)								0	26,17,123	26,17,123
Grand total (A+B+C)								1,43,32,092		

Appendix 2.11
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.9; Page No. 37)

Statement showing short recovery on account of incorrect base percentage of bitumen

(Amount in ₹)

Sl. No.	Qty of DBM Grade-1 as per IPC (in cum)	Density	Applicable Base percentage of Bitumen content	Actual percentage of bitumen content provided as per designs	Excess per cent of bitumen content (Col 5 - Col 4)	Excess bitumen quantity in MT (Col 2 × Col 3 × Col 6 ÷ 100)	Rate adopted for bitumen per MT	Amount recoverable (Col 7 × Col 8)	Amount recovered	Short recovered (Col 10 - Col 9)
-1-	-2-	-3-	-4-	-5-	-6-	-7-	-8-	-9-	-10-	-11-
1	369.879	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-2.6808830	28,791	77,185	16,139	61,046
2	209.080	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-1.5154118	28,791	43,630	9,188	34,442
3	625.715	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-4.5351823	28,791	1,30,572	27,922	1,02,650
4	1,552.099	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-11.2496140	28,791	3,23,888	70,295	2,53,593
5	2,073.068	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-15.0255970	28,791	4,32,602	93,514	3,39,088
6	2,123.973	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-15.3945560	28,791	4,43,225	97,752	3,45,473
7	4,875.811	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-35.3398780	28,791	10,17,470	2,34,246	7,83,224
8	3,121.078	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-22.6215730	28,791	6,51,298	1,49,037	5,02,261
9	1,295.022	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-9.3863195	28,791	2,70,242	62,398	2,07,844
10	2,390.857	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-17.3289320	28,791	4,98,917	1,15,593	3,83,324
11	2,345.011	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-16.9966400	28,791	4,89,350	1,14,288	3,75,062
12	3,558.509	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-25.7920730	28,791	7,42,580	1,73,500	5,69,080
13	1,818.244	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-13.1786330	28,791	3,79,426	88,016	2,91,410
14	1,911.409	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-13.8538920	28,791	3,98,867	91,756	3,07,111
15	2,222.450	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-16.1083180	28,791	4,63,775	1,08,008	3,55,767
16	1,511.680	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-10.9566570	28,791	3,15,453	72,320	2,43,133
17	1,608.735	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-11.6601110	28,791	3,35,706	77,232	2,58,474
18	1,134.554	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-8.2232474	28,791	2,36,756	54,731	1,82,025
19	363.103	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-2.6317705	28,791	75,771	17,543	58,228
20	517.737	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-3.7525578	28,791	1,08,040	24,994	83,046
21	807.218	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-5.8507161	28,791	1,68,448	38,530	1,29,918
22	43.505	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-0.3153242	28,791	9,079	1,977	7,102
23	366.809	2.416	4.5	4.2	-0.3	-2.6586316	28,791	76,545	16,454	60,091
Total								76,88,824	17,55,433	59,33,391

Appendix 2.12
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.10; Page No. 39)

Statement showing avoidable expenditure due to incorrect adoption of technical specification for primer coat

(Amount in ₹)

Package	Sub reach work	Quantity of primer coat executed (sqm) at 7.5 to 9.8 kg/ 10 sqm)	Rate of primer coat as per SR			Extra cost
			for 7.5 to 9.8 kg/ 10 sqm	for 6 to 8 kg/ 10 sqm	Difference	
47	47	84,169.97	59.30	33.50	25.80	21,71,577
	47	40,886.71	59.30	33.50	25.80	10,54,877
	47	53,536.28	59.30	33.50	25.80	13,81,236
136	136 A	11,580.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	3,40,452
	136 A	7,700.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	2,26,380
	136 B	8,375.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	2,46,225
	136 B	18,797.75	66.80	37.40	29.40	5,52,654
135	135 A	55,000.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	16,17,000
	135 A	50,394.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	14,81,584
	135 B	23,035.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	6,77,229
	135 B	33,770.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	9,92,838
130	130 B	13,075.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	3,84,405
	130 B	1,785.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	52,479
	130 B	90,450.00	66.80	37.40	29.40	26,59,230
Total		4,92,554.71				1,38,38,166

Package	Sub reach work	Quantity of Clearing of WBM surface executed (sqm)	Rate paid	Avoidable extra cost
47	47	85,724.65	10.00	8,57,247
	47	38,510.46	10.00	3,85,105
	47	53,471.48	10.00	5,34,715
136	136A	11,580.00	14.00	1,62,120
	136A	7,700.00	14.00	1,07,800
	136B	8,375.00	11.50	96,313
	136 B	455.00	11.98	5,451
135	135A	19,323.00	11.50	2,22,215
	135A	54,626.00	10.82	5,91,053
	135A	50,394.00	10.82	5,45,263
	135B	23,035.00	10.82	2,49,239
	135B	33,770.00	11.82	3,99,161
130	130A	23,481.00	9.66	2,26,826
	130B	13,075.00	10.82	1,41,472
	130B	1,785.00	10.82	19,314
	130B	91,650.00	10.82	9,91,653
Total		5,16,955.59		55,34,947
Grand total: ₹ 1,38,38,166 + ₹ 55,34,947 = ₹ 1,93,73,113				

Appendix 2.13
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.11; Page No. 41)

Statement showing star rates payable

(Amount in ₹)

Star rates payable in respect of cement					
Month in which work executed	Basic price (in quintal)	Current index	Basic index (as of March 2011)	Quantity used (in quintals)	Star rate payable
March 2012	500	163.1	153.7	4,390.71	1,34,264
April 2012	500	164.6	153.7	5,124.30	1,81,701
May 2012	500	164.4	153.7	7,934.33	2,76,179
August 2012	500	171.9	153.7	5,878.43	3,48,040
January 2013	500	168.8	153.7	3,431.04	1,68,538
March 2013	500	172.9	153.7	4,535.04	2,83,256
Total (A)					13,91,978
Star rates payable in respect of steel					
Month in which work executed	Basic price (per MT)	Current index	Basic index (as of March 2011)	Quantity used (in MT)	Star rate payable
March 2012	33,200	144.7	137.8	14.8952	24,762
April 2012	33,200	148.8	137.8	10.2900	27,271
May 2012	33,200	149.0	137.8	28.8750	77,916
August 2012	33,200	146.2	137.8	58.1842	1,17,753
January 2013	33,200	141.7	137.8	57.0681	53,622
March 2013	33,200	141.9	137.8	22.1606	21,890
Total (B)					3,23,214
Total amount payable (A+B)					17,15,192

Appendix 2.14
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.13.7.2; Page No. 46)

Statement showing deficiencies in selection of beneficiaries

Sl. No.	Division	Name of the beneficiary	Remarks
Land Acquisition			
1	Vijayapura	Ramanna Hanamanth Bandiwaddar and Ramachandra Yamanappa Kubakaddi	Land proposed for acquisition by KIADB
2	Kalaburagi	Sri Sabana S/o Marrappa Rama Jagli	Land acquisition by KBJNL.
3		Sri Shankar S/o Valu Naik	Land acquired by SLAO of Small and Medium Irrigation
4	Mysuru	Sri Dasa Naika, Late Thimmanaika	Land coming under the jurisdiction of Major Irrigation (Sinduvalli Tank)
Benefit received from other departments			
5	Kalaburagi	Sri Sharannappa S/o Shivappa Harijan	The beneficiary had already availed the benefit under Dr BR Ambedkar Development Corporation and has availed loan towards the same as per the RTC
6		Sri Hiriya S/o Bhojya	The beneficiary had already in possession of borewell under Ashraya Yojane
Multiple installations			
7	Vijayapura	Krishna Daku Lamani & Others (Ranjith Daku Lamani)	The land in survey no. 48 was held by Krishna Daku Lamani and three borewells were provided to the same survey no. The "others" were not provided with any installation
8		Smt Yallava Gangappa Talakade along with Smt Pavitra Parava Harijan of Makkanpur	Agreement No. 372 & 375: The RTC was held jointly by both the beneficiaries and the same RTC was enclosed to both the works. The same beneficiary was provided with two installations in two different works. There was no justification to provide two installations for the same land with only four acres.
9		Smt Pavitra Parava Harijan of Makkanpur	
10		Gurupadappa Lakkavva Chalawadi & Others	Same RTC for 6.24 acres enclosed in MNRE form. Same beneficiary has obtained two installation vide agreement no. 458 (2 borewells)
11		Ratnabai Dhareppa Javanar and others	Five installation given in name of Ratnabai
Benefit to same family members			
12	Vijayapura	Shri Mahadev Yallappa Daddinavar & Shri Yallappa Mahadev Daddinavar	Two borewells were provided to the same beneficiary. (Father and Son)
13		Shri Hariba Jemula Lamani, Shri Vittal Hariba Lamani & Shri Ramesh Jemula Lamani	Three borewells were provided to the same family (Father & two Sons)
14		Shri Anandappa Narasappa Dor, Smt Shantabai (Kantabai) Anandappa Dor	Two borewells were provided to the same family (Husband and Wife)
15		Shri Babu Kashiram Lamani & Shri Venu Kashiram Lamani	Two borewells were provided to the same family (Brothers)
16		Shri Amasidda Basava Holer & Shri Sanjeev Amasidda Holer	Two borewells were provided to the same beneficiary (Father and Son)
17		Shri Ashok Shivappa Chalavadi & Shri Ishwar Shivappa Chalavadi	Two borewells were provided to the same family (Brothers)
18		Shri Satappa Ramanna Madar, Shri Suresh Ramanna Madar, Shri Tulajappa Ramanna Madar & Shri Shetteppa Ramanna Madar	Four borewells were provided to the same family (Brothers)
19		Shri Gopal Somulu Rathod, Shri Bhimu Somulu Rathod & Shri Sharubai Bhimu Rathod	Three borewells were provided to the same family
20		Shri Somulu Jemulu Lamani & Shri Meghu Jemulu Lamani	Two borewells were provided to the same family (Brothers)
21		Shri Ramu Deshu Lamani & Shri Chandu Deshu Lamani	Two borewells were provided to the same family (Brothers)

Appendix 2.15
(Reference: Paragraph No. 2.13.8.1; Page No. 47)

Statement showing installation in non-feasible cases

Division	Installed	Feasible cases as per Agencies Report	Feasible cases as per Norms	Remarks
Vijayapura	119	14	Nil	The agency stated that out of a total of 211 beneficiaries, borewells in 14 cases only were feasible. In respect of the other cases the depth was in the range of 300 ft to 400 ft and the discharge level was in the range of only 15,000 LPD to 18,000 LPD and the agency was willing to execute the work if acceptable to the Department. In cases where depth was beyond 400 ft the agency declined to take up the work. However, based on the directions (9.10.2014) of the Hon'ble Minister for Minor Irrigation, the agency was directed to provide solar systems to all the borewells drilled irrespective of the depth of the borewells. Out of 119 SWPS installed, the depth of borewell was less than 300 ft only in four cases. However none of the four cases had the minimum yield prescribed and hence none of the borewells taken up for installation of SWPS were feasible as per the tender norms.
Kalaburagi	241	106	02	Out of 241 cases, feasibility reports were given initially for 192 cases out of which 114 cases were feasible and 78 were not feasible (3 cases were repeated and 5 cases were not taken up hence only 106 cases was shown as feasible). SWPS was installed in 65 out of these 78 without any justification. Subsequently another 34 cases were shown as not feasible out of which 18 cases were provided with SWPS. Out of 106, only two cases satisfied the minimum yield, depth of borewell and head.
Dharwad	252	108	Nil	The feasibility studies were not properly conducted. Details of water levels and depth of borewells were available only for 108 SWPS. The depth of water in 108 cases reported as feasible were more than the prescribed depth and hence not feasible. In the other cases SWPS was installed without detailed feasibility reports.
Mysuru	330	180	02	Out of 330 SWPS installed, yield details were not available for 127 SWPS and 23 SWPS were entrusted to an agency M/s Enzen Solar System Limited without any feasibility tests. Out of the balance 180 cases, only 25 borewells had sufficient yield. Out of these 25, only two borewells had less than prescribed depth. Hence as per tender specifications only 2 cases were feasible.
Hassan	228	228	Nil	Details of list given to the agency were not available. The agency in their feasibility report submitted that 228 cases were feasible against 290 cases. All the 228 cases reported as feasible were having more than the prescribed depth and hence not feasible. Scrutiny of the yield reports of 74 cases revealed that none cleared the minimum technical requirement.
Total	1,170	636	04	

