



**(LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF GOA)**

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
(2017-19)**

**SEVENTY SIXTH REPORT**

**Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Report of the  
Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year  
2013-14**

**LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE**

**ON 31<sup>ST</sup> JANUARY, 2019.**

---

**GOA LEGISLATURE SECRETARIAT  
ASSEMBLY COMPLEX  
PORVORIM – GOA**

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
(2017-19)**

**SEVENTY SIXTH REPORT**

**(LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF GOA)**

**Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Report of the  
Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year  
2013-14**

**LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE  
ON 31<sup>ST</sup> JANUARY, 2019.**

---

**GOA LEGISLATURE SECRETARIAT  
ASSEMBLY COMPLEX  
PORVORIM – GOA**

(i)

**INDEX**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>Pg. No.</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Composition of the Committee</b>	<b>(ii)</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>(iii)</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Report</b>	
	<b><u>CHAPTER-I</u></b>	
	<b>Sports &amp; Youth Affairs</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b><u>CHAPTER-II</u></b>	
	<b>Public Health Department</b>	<b>5</b>
 <b>Audit paras from the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2014.</b>		
<b>4.</b>	<b>Appendix – I</b>	<b>(Minutes of the meeting) 7</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Appendix – II</b>	<b>(Minutes of the meeting) 10</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Appendix – III</b>	<b>(Minutes of the meeting) 13</b>

(ii)

**COMPOSITION OF THE  
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
(2017-19)**

**CHAIRMAN**

**SHRI PRATAPSINGH RANE**

**MEMBERS**

**SHRI CHURCHILL ALEMAO**

**SHRI NILESH CABRAL**

**SHRI GLENN TICLO**

**SHRI RAJESH PATNEKAR**

**SHRI DAYANAND SOPTE**

**SMT JENNIFER MONSERRATE**

**GOA LEGISLATURE SECRETARIAT**

**SHRI N. B. SUBHEDAR, SECRETARY,**

**SMT CELIZA FERNANDES, UNDER SECRETARY**

(iii)

## **INTRODUCTION**

I, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee (2017-19) of the Sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of Goa having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on its behalf, present this Seventy Second Report of the Committee on the Audit Paras reflected in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 2013-14.

During its two sittings the Public Accounts Committee considered the explanation of the Departments in respect of Memorandum of Important points on paras reflected in the Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 2013-14.

The minutes of the meetings are at Appendix "I" to "II". After careful consideration, the Committee formulated its recommendations, which are embodied in the Report. The draft report was considered and adopted by the Committee at its meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> November, 2018. Minutes of the meeting are at Appendix III.

The Committee is grateful to Shri. Ashutosh Joshi, Accountant General, Audit, Porvorim, Shri Muralidharan, Sr. Audit Officers (Report) for their valuable guidance rendered to the Committee.

The Committee also places on record the cooperation extended to the Committee by Shri N. B. Subhedar, Secretary, Smt. Celiza Fernandes, Under Secretary, Smt. Perpetina D'Souza, Section Officer and all the concerned staff of the Legislature Secretariat and commends their contribution towards the Report.

ASSEMBLY HALL  
PORVORIM, GOA  
DATED: 2<sup>ND</sup> NOVEMBER 2018

SHRI PRATAPSINGH RANE  
CHAIRMAN

## CHAPTER-I

### SPORTS AND YOUTH AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

#### **Avoidable expenditure of ₹ 1.33 crore due to faulty estimates**

*There was large deviation in original estimated quantity on items of filling and compaction due to change in site for construction of athletic stadium. The Department invited tenders without revision of estimates. Further failure of the Department to obtain clarification on exorbitant rates (up to 13,614 per cent above the estimated rates) quoted by the agency on these items resulted in acceptance of second lowest offer at additional expenditure of ₹ 1.33 crore.*

The Government of Goa (GoG) decided (July 2012) to construct an Athletic Stadium at the Goa Medical College, Bambolim. The Sports Authority of Goa (SAG) was responsible for construction of the stadium. The GoG also appointed (August 2012) M/s Shashi Prabhu and Associates as Architect and Project Management Consultants (Consultant) at a consultancy fee of 4.50 per cent of the project cost. As per the agreement with the GoG, besides project management, the Consultant was required to undertake land survey, soil investigations, preparation of estimates, tender documents etc. for the work and was also responsible for preparation of the comparative statements and evaluation of the bids received.

The SAG invited (October 2012) tenders for construction of the Athletic Stadium at Bambolim and received three offers. The lowest offer of the M/s Simplex Ltd. for ₹ 61.83 crore (9.65 per cent above the estimated cost of ₹ 56.39 crore) was accepted (December 2012) by the Goa State Works Board. The work order was issued (December 2012) with scheduled date of completion by 03 October 2013.

We observed (November 2013) that the SAG did not specifically demarcate the land for construction of the Stadium and consultant prepared plans and estimates considering the land indicated by the SAG. However, this was objected by the adjacent land owners as it was the encroachment to their land. This led to shifting the athletic stadium towards the National Highway side. The new site/location had a different soil strata than envisaged and resulted in large deviation in quantity of the

items for filling and compaction, valuing ₹ 4.15 crore. The SAG, despite change in location, did not revise the estimates prior to inviting tenders.

Our scrutiny further revealed that the contractor (M/s Simplex Ltd.) had quoted abnormally higher rates on the items of filling and compaction, as compared to the other two dealers (second lowest and third lowest) ranging from 658 *per cent* to 13,614 *per cent* for which neither the consultant nor the SAG sought clarifications during evaluation of the tenders.

Had the SAG and the consultant revised the estimates considering the actual site before inviting tenders, the offer of M/s Venkata Rao Infra Projects (Second lowest) would have been the lowest offer at ₹ 63.95 crore against ₹ 65.29 crore of M/s Simplex.

Audit also observed that the value of work done (on the basis of actual quantity executed on all the items) by applying the rates quoted by M/s Venkat Rao was ₹ 40.98 crore as against ₹ 45.02 crore at the rates quoted by M/s Simplex.

Thus, failure to revise the estimates according to the changed location of the Athletic stadium resulted in incorrect estimates being put to tender. The consultant and Department also did not compare the exorbitantly higher rates quoted on the above three items with estimated rate quoted by other contractors. This resulted in avoidable expenditure of ₹1.33 crore.

The SAG accepted (May 2014) that the consultant had failed to analyse the quoted rates of individual items of each agency. It was also stated that it had relied on the expertise of the consultant who had executed similar projects in the past for which their services were availed. The SAG also admitted that the large deviation in the quantity was on account of faulty estimate prepared and submitted by the consultant which might be on account of time constraint and non-visualisation and non-deployment of experienced quantity surveyors/ engineers for preparation of the estimate. It also apprised that they had penalised the consultant ₹ 49 lakh for preparation of faulty estimates. The SAG also admitted the fact of abnormally high quoted rates should have been taken into account at the time of scrutiny of tenders and this remained unattended to from both sides inadvertently.

The Department in its written reply stated that the adjacent land which was reserved for educational Institutions was a barren undeveloped

and demarcated. The consultant prepared the plans and estimates based on available site at the point of time. At the time of tendering while demarcating the actual site the educational institutions objected to it as the Department was encroaching upon their land and this necessitated shifting of the locations. As there was a time gap of only 11 months for the commencement of the games, the revision of estimates could not be resorted to. The consultant has also failed to identify the abnormally quoted rates and he has been penalised accordingly.

As the work has been satisfactorily completed and the international sports event successfully organized, the Department requested to drop the Para.

Further, in written reply Department stated that the selections of the various sites for Lusofonia Games were considered taking into account the future utilisation of the created facilities as expenditure involved in the construction of projects was huge. The selected land at Bambolim belonged to Goa Medical College and it was barren land with thick vegetation. The adjacent land which was reserved for the educational institutions was also a barren land, undeveloped and undemarcated. The consultant had prepared the drawings and the estimate based on the available site at that point of time. But, at the time of tendering and while demarcating the actual site for the project on account of the objections raised by the said educational institutions, it was necessitated to shift the location of the Synthetic track towards National Highway. By this time, only 11 months' time including monsoon period was left for the commencement of the Games and the infrastructure to be ready. Moreover, any synthetic track needs to be laid before the onset of monsoon (i.e. absence of any moisture is a primary requirement for laying any synthetic track).

In view of the above circumstances, the revision of the estimates afresh before call of tender could not be resorted to because of the time constraint, as the Lusofonia infrastructure works were to be completed ahead of the Games.

It is a fact that the contractor had indeed quoted abnormally high rates for the items of filling and compaction i.e. for the item nos. 28, 29 and 371 as observed by the Audit. Nevertheless, all the tenderers had been given an opportunity to visit and access the site conditions before quoting. The composite tender of M/s. Simplex Project Ltd., New Delhi, was accordingly accepted by the Government with the consent of Work Advisory Board (WAB), being the lowest.



Although the CPWD Works Manual, 2007, which was then in force does not specify the need of comparison of abnormally high/low quoted rates, the identification of abnormally high/low-quoted-rates would have definitely assisted the SAG in negotiations only. However, it is a fact that the consultant to some extent has failed to identify the abnormally high/low-quoted-rates as pointed out by Audit, which would have helped the SAG only for negotiation for which the consultant has been penalised, accordingly.

It is again reiterated that a call of tender after the expected revision of the estimate could not be resorted to, only because of a time constraint, as stated above, since a considerable time is required for completing the formalities right from the date of call of tender till the date of issue of Work Order and such time comfort was not available with SAG at that period of time. Nevertheless, it will be appreciated for efforts made by this Authority, inspite of all constraints to complete the project in time for holding Lusofonia Games. In case this Authority had failed in setting up the projects for the international event well in time, the image of the Goa Government in particular and that of the Country as a whole would have been tarnished and one would agree that this loss, on account of failure in completing the infrastructure work in time, that would might have been suffered on account of unforeseen humiliation could have been incomparable to the avoidable expenditure, if any.

This Authority has taken due care to protect the Government interest to complete the work with the least possible cost and the work has been completed to the satisfaction of all concerned including that of 'Associacao dos Comites Olimpicos de Lingua Official Portuguesa (ACOLOP)'.

Incidentally, it may please be noted that a penalty imposed on the Consultant is not ₹ 49 lakh as stated in the PAC report. The Consultant has been penalised for ₹ 13,13,297/- and ₹ 42 lakh had been withheld. The details of penalty imposed and amount withheld had been already clarified. The said amount of ₹ 42 lakh which had been withheld has now been converted into penalty.

As the work has been satisfactorily completed and the international sports event successfully organised and in view of the above clarifications, it is requested that the Para may please to drop.

*The Committee would like to firstly point out that the Department's stand, that the loss to the Ex-chequer of ₹ 1.33 crore was preferably to the loss of image of the Government is unacceptable, as the Department's and Consultants' primary function is to execute the works on time and at the best cost possible with the best quality of workmanship. It sees a gross negligence in the working of the Consultant as the highly inflated rates were blindly accepted without any record written dissent or condition of acceptance of high rates. It chastises the Department for not having made a proper study of land ownership before inviting the tenders for the project which was the primary cause of the inflated cost of the project at the alternate site. The Committee recommends that the appointment process of consultants should be more stringent to avoid such lapses and they should be held more accountable.*

## **CHAPTER-II**

### **PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

#### **LOSS OF REVENUE TO THE TUNE OF ₹ 1.06 CRORE DUE TO NON-REVISION OF RENT IN RESPECT OF PRIVATE PHARMACY IN THE PREMISES OF GOA MEDICAL COLLEGE, GOA.**

**Goa Medical College allowed a private firm to run a pharmacy without proper agreement and without revision of rent for a long period which resulted in undue benefit to the contractor besides loss of revenue to the tune of ₹ 1.06 crore.**

The Goa Medical College (GMC) had permitted two pharmacies viz. M/s Goa Antibiotics Pvt. Ltd. (GAPL), a Government of Goa Undertaking and M/s Stelton (India)-New Goa Pharmacy to operate in its premises with effect from 20 January 1994 and 01 August 1997 respectively.

declined to accept the allotment. Therefore, the second highest bidder, M/s Stelton (India) Limited who quoted ₹ 47,152 was allotted the premises (August 1997). Subsequently (August 1998) due to reduction in the area allotted, the quoted amount was reduced to ₹ 39,239 per month and further increased to ₹ 45,681 with effect from 01 April 1999. The firm was also directed (July 1997) to execute an agreement with GMC. No such agreement was, however, executed till date (January 2015).

The tender

Our scrutiny revealed that a Power of Attorney was executed by the Proprietor of M/s Stelton (India) Limited to run the pharmacy on their behalf to Shri Mahesh B Naik (The proprietor of M/s ICM agencies, who had quoted highest amount but declined the offer). The above transaction clearly indicated an intention to deceive the GMC, the GMC, however, did not initiate action to cancel the contract.

It was also noticed that the Hon'ble Health Minister had also pointed out (May and September 2011) that though the premises was allotted to M/s Stelton (India) Limited for one year, the GMC had allowed the party to continue running the pharmacy for approximately eight years without Government approval and instructed the Dean to initiate action to vacate the premises. Earlier the Public Health Department, Government of Goa had also conveyed (May 2006) the approval to GMC for fresh tendering and initiate action for vacating M/s Stelton (India) Limited. However, the illegal occupation continued (January 2015).

It is also observed that the GMC had provided for an increase of annual rent by 10 per cent every year in respect of the pharmacy run by GAPL. However, no such provision was made in the case of M/s Stelton (India) Limited. Had the GMC resorted to similar action and enhanced the rent of M/s Stelton annually, it could have earned an additional revenue of ₹ 1.06 crore for the period April 2000 to January 2015.

The Department in its written reply stated that the process for eviction based on the order of the Principal District Judge, North Goa is already started.

***Since the Private Firm has been evicted and the premises re-tendered, the Committee would like to point out that greater care should be taken during framing of tender clauses to prevent fraudulent manipulations between tendering parties leading to loss of revenue to the Ex-chequer. Back door entries of other tender entities should be disallowed and if necessary re-tendering should be carried out. There should also be a system in place to ensure that the awardee does not retain the premises beyond the stipulated period of the Agreement.***

## **APPENDIX-I**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 27<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2017.**

Meeting of the Public Accounts Committee was held on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2017 at 3.00 pm in the PAC Room, Assembly Complex, Porvorim, Goa to further examine Para 2.1 pertaining to Public Works Department reflected in the CAG's Report for the year 2012-13 and Para 3.2 pertaining to Sports & Youth Affairs Department reflected in the CAG's Report for the year 2013-14.

The following were present:

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Shri Pratapsingh Rane

#### **MEMBERS**

1. Shri Churchill Alemao
2. Shri Dayanand Sopte
3. Shri Rajesh Patnekar

#### **GOA LEGISLATURE SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri N.B. Subhedar, Secretary, Legislature

2. Smt. Celiza Fernandes, Under Secretary, Legislature

**AUDIT DEPARTMENT**

1. Shri Ashutosh Joshi, Accountant General
2. Shri Muralidharan Sr. Audit Officer (Report)

2. The Committee examined Para 2.1 pertaining to Public Works Department reflected in the CAG Report for the year 2012-13 regarding Performance Audit on Water Supply Schemes in the State.

3. At the outset the Committee wanted to know as to why there was a delay in taking a decision. The concerned officer informed that for the first water supply weightages, Water Treatment Plant, the pipelines and the MBR, there was a delay because of the forest land which was explained in the last PAC meeting. The diversion of the forest land took a period of 11 to 12 months.

4. The A.G. stated that a performance Audit of the water supply Schemes in the State was conducted with the objective to assess the effectiveness of the planning process, the implementation of Schemes with due consideration to economy and efficiency.

5. The Committee wanted to know where the forest land was. The Committee was informed that the Water Treatment Plant was constructed into the forest land and that about 11.1 hectares had been taken from the Forest Department in Selaulim. It further stated that it was totally forest area which was obtained, at Rupees one crore, twenty-six lakhs towards diversion of the land. It was not acquired. What was acquired was for the first treatment plant which was existing. The Committee was also informed that they had the records of the diversion which was issued by the Government of Goa.

7. The Committee was informed that when the proposal was submitted, JICA Project did not exist. The JICA studies were taken up in the year 2006 onwards and the agreement was signed in 2007 with JICA. All efforts were made, the Executive Engineer was deputed there, and Mr. Paranjape visited Bangalore Office on many occasions but it was found to be difficult to get the approval.

8. The Committee examined para 2.9.4 regarding failure to capitalize the earlier forest approval which resulted in a delay in starting work and consequent liability of 16.65 crore and informed the Department that

something had gone wrong somewhere. The Committee was given an explanation as to how the escalation was worked out.

9. The Committee further examined Para 3.2 pertaining to Sports & Youth Affairs Department for the year 2013-14 regarding unavoidable expenditure of Rupees 1.33 crore due to faulty estimates. The Committee wanted to know as to who prepared the estimates. The Committee was informed that the estimates were prepared by the consultant Shashi Kapur from Mumbai. He had the task to prepare the estimates along with the stadium, with a couple of other stadiums. Similar to the athletic track in Peddem and the new door stadium at Peddem. The Consultant was penalized for the faulty estimates.

10. The Officer concerned informed the Committee that there were as many as 700 items in that particular contract. Some of the items were quoted abnormally high and some abnormally low by the contractor. It was a composite tender and hence could not go item wise. Importantly the rates were 61.82 crore, it was 7.6% below the reasonable cost. Entire tender put together was 4.76% below reasonable cost.

11. The Committee was further informed that total 65 lakhs have been penalized for the consultant. The Committee wanted to know what happened to the Sports City. It said that the Sports City offered a lot of things and wanted to know how much money had been invested in it.

12. The Committee made a comment about the avoidable expenditure that before doing anything contour survey needed to be carried out

13. Digital and verbatim records of the proceedings of the meeting were kept.

14. The Committee adjourned its sitting at 4.20 pm

## **APPENDIX-II**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 10<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2018.**

Meeting of the Public Accounts Committee was held on 10<sup>th</sup> August 2018 at 3.30 p.m in the PAC Room, Assembly Complex, Porvorim, Goa to further examine Paras reflected in the CAG's Report for the year 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-2014.

The following were present:

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Shri Pratapsingh Rane

#### **MEMBERS**

1. Shri Rajesh Patnekar
2. Shri Nilesh Cabral

**GOA LEGISLATURE SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri N.B. Subhedar, Secretary, Legislature
2. Smt. Celiza Fernandes, Under Secretary, Legislature

### **AUDIT DEPARTMENT**

1. Shri Ashutosh Joshi, Accountant General
2. Shri Muralidharan Sr. Audit Officer (Report)

2. At the outset, the minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2018 were circulated to the Members. The agenda for the day included further examination of Para 2.1 pertaining to Tourism and Para 3.6.3 pertaining to RDA reflected in the CAG's Report for the year ending 2011-12. Para 3.1.3 pertaining to PWD, Para PA-4.2 pertaining to Law and Para 3.1.5 pertaining to Women & Child reflected in the CAG's Report for the year ending 2012-13. Para 3.4 pertaining to Public Health GMC reflected in the CAG's Report for the year 2013-14.

3 The Committee examined the Officers of Tourism Department regarding Para 2.1 Performance Audit of promotion of Tourism in Goa. The Committee wanted to know about the 10 infrastructure projects proposed for execution with Central financial assistance at a total estimated cost of Rs 238.24 crores, out of which only one was under execution, three were yet to be sanctioned by GOI and execution of the remaining six projects were held up for want of various approvals/permissions.

4 In regards to Para 2.1.6.2 and Para 2.1.7.2, the Committee brought to the notice of the Officer that the Tourism Policy in 2001 was formulated without amending it and a single consultant was appointed without calling tenders.

5 Para 2.1.9.1 and Para 2.1.9.3 the Committee was informed that whatever are the Regulations and Norms and SOP's of Tourism Department the audit felt that they did not have an enforcement mechanism. Under the Beach Shack Policy certain conditions were put that they should have toilets and cameras. If any violations are noticed, show-cause notice is issued immediately. Security deposits are also kept.

6. Para 2.1.11.1, 2.1.11.2 and 2.1.11.4 the Committee was informed that marketing was carried out by the GTDC. It tendered out the empanelment of new event agencies and seven event management agencies were short listed in 'A' category only for the year 2013. The



Department has recently taken over the promotion and marketing back from the GTDC.

7. In regards to Para 2.1.12 the Committee brought to the notice of the Officer Tourism that new tourism products like festival tourism, health tourism were not adequately promoted. The Government did not make any additional arrangements to start cruise activities in other parts of the State. A number of water sports operators carried out business without valid registration with the Department.

8. Para 2.1.13.2, 2.1.13.3 and 2.1.13.8 the Committee was informed about Salmona spring and the beach cleaning activities that Solid Waste Management Plant had been constructed at Saligao and it is in operation. Most of the requirements of ground water which is getting damaged because of this pollution have been handled.

9. Regarding Para 2.1.13.10 the Committee was informed that the Department is going to claim the money lost on account of prolonged grounding of ship, once the arbitration is done including the loss of land washed away amounting to 21 crore and due to reduced occupancy in hotels amounting to Rs 17 crores.

10. The Committee also examined the Officers of RDA in relation to Para 3.6.3 in which the Officer informed the Committee that an inquiry Committee was formed and the responsibility has been fixed on the concerned Officers and the file has been sent to the Government.

11. The Committee examined the Officers of Public Works Department in relation to Para 3.1.3 regarding extra cost due to re-alignment of pipeline. The Committee was informed that the point which was chosen for tapping the water line was changed and therefore there was extra expenditure. The tender which was called was 20% below the estimated rate.

12. The Committee further examined Para 3.1.5 pertaining to Women and Child Development Department and was informed that the procurement of wheat and rice was made through the Goa marketing Federation which had resulted in a higher procurement cost which could have been avoided if it was procured through Wheat based Nutrition Programme of the Govt. of India. The reason was the rice and wheat was found to be of substandard quality.

13. The Committee also examined Public Health Department in relation to Para 3.4. The Committee was informed that the owner of the private firm who ran the pharmacy went to court. The same was challenged by him before the District Court and since 2011 matter had been pending and in 2017 the order was finalized. He was evicted and whatever had to be paid for that period has been collected and there are no dues.

14. The Committee examined the Officers in relation to Para 4.2 pertaining to Revenue/Law the Committee was informed that all the cases have been verified and the people claimed the remission and was implemented under the notification. Remission upto 80% was allowed in case of huge areas. The Committee desired to have the circulars and documents attached and annexures of the action taken, legislations and recommendations in its next meeting.

15. Digital and verbatim records of the proceedings of the meeting were kept.

16. The Committee adjourned its sitting at 5.49 p.m.

### **APPENDIX-III**

#### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 2<sup>ND</sup> NOVEMBER 2018.**

Meeting of the Public Accounts Committee was held on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2018 at 3.30 p.m. in the PAC Room, Assembly Complex, Porvorim, Goa, to further examine Paras reflected in the CAG's Report for the year 2014-15.

The following were present:

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Shri Pratapsingh Rane

#### **MEMBERS**

1. Shri Churchill Alemao

## **GOA LEGISLATURE SECRETARIAT**

1. N.B. Subhedar, Secretary, Legislature
2. Smt. Celiza Fernandes, Under Secretary, Legislature

## **AUDIT DEPARTMENT**

1. Shri Ashutosh Joshi, Accountant General
2. Shri Murlidharan Sr. Audit Officer (Report)

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2018 were circulated to the Members. The agenda for the day included further examination of Para 1.5 (P.A.) pertaining to Public Health, Para 1.11 pertaining to Education Department and Para 2.2 (P.A.) pertaining to Revenue Department reflected in the CAG's Report for the year 2014-15.

3. The Committee examined the Secretary Revenue in relation to Para 2.2 regarding Performance Audit on Management of Alvara Lands. The Officer concerned informed the Committee that the reply needs the finance audit approval from the Finance Department. The Committee asked the Officer to submit the Alvara Land reply in the next meeting.

4. The Committee further examined the Secretary Education in relation to Para 1.11 regarding Faulty tendering under Laptop e- scheme. The Officer agreed to the fact that the tender was badly drafted. Further informed that the cyber age Scheme would be modified and the redrafting of the Scheme was under submission.

5. The Committee also examined the Secretary Health in relation to Para 1.5 regarding Performance Audit of functioning of Goa Medical College. The Committee was informed that the common point which was highlighted was the undue delay in processing and finalizing the tender process. It starts in one financial year and by the time it is completed it goes to the next financial year. Here the purpose of the price, which should have been procured for and making the services and product available to the public was defeated. Taking stock of the observations made by the Audit a circular had been issued recently in the month of October, whereby it was stated that all the purchase companies should keep in mind, that whenever the tender is processed the time gap between

the opening of the technical and the financial bid should not exceed beyond two months so that within 2 to 3 months period from the date of opening of the tender, the tender should be finalized and send from their end. Secondly undue or unnecessary queries should not be raised which delays the processes.

6. Draft Reports for the year 2010-11, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 were circulated to the Members of the Committee and adopted.
7. Digital and verbatim records of the proceedings of the meeting were kept.
8. The Committee adjourned its sitting at 4.46 p.m.