

Annexure B

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
[BUDGET SECTION]

No.F.4(3)Budget/Performance Budget/2007-08/34

Dt. 17.2.09

**Sub: Minutes of the meeting of Monitoring Committee on DDA's Performance Budget for the period 1.07.08 to 30.09.08 held on 05.2.09.**

A meeting of the Monitoring Committee constituted to review the Performance Budget of DDA for the aforesaid period was held on 05.2.09.

Members/Officials present were:

1. Sh.Nand Lal, FM
2. Sh.B.K.Chugh, EM
3. Sh.G.R.Shiromani, CE(EZ)
4. Sh.N.L.Singh, CE(CWG)
5. Sh.Ramesh Chandra, CE(Rohini)
6. Sh.S.R.Solanki, CE(DWK)
7. Sh.Rajiv Pandey, CAO
8. Sh.S.K.Sethi, SE(HQ)SZ
9. Sh.J.P.Verma, SE(SWZ)
10. Sh.H.S.Dharamsattu, SE(HQ)NZ
11. Sh.Sushil Kumar, EE(HQ),CC-15,SZ
12. Sh.J.K.Behl, EA to CE(SZ)
13. Sh.K.R.Hans, Dy.CAO(Plan)
14. Ms. Kiran Seth, FO to CE(Elect.)
15. Sh.A.K.Datta, Sr.AO(Budget)

Initiating the discussion on the Performance Budget of DDA, FM pointed out that the shortfall in expenditure under Nazul A/c-II & BGDA was alarming. FM stated that before award of work it is ensured by Engineering Wing that the site is available, Technical sanction is available, AA & ES has been accorded to the scheme and for execution of work sufficient provision of funds is available. The scheme wise budget provision is accordingly proposed to be kept in the budget estimates of the Authority. In spite of this exercise it was not informed why the Engineering Wing is not able to incur expenditure as per the norms laid down by EM's office. He further stated that the main reason for not incurring expenditure could be that budget was not rationalized and it was proposed to be kept on higher side.

He referred to one of the schemes "D/o River front at Yamuna Pusta" and desired to know the reason where there was financial shortfall to the extent of 95.09%. The CE(EZ) clarified that the shortfall was due to flooding of the area and PWD had planned to construct four lane road in the area, therefore the revised development plan of scheme was to be drawn. In another scheme "D/o Mini Sports Complex at C.R.Park" the financial shortfall noticed was to the extent of 99.69% and the progress of the scheme was affected due to dispute amongst RWA of the area. FM remarked when the fate of the scheme was not known, care should have been taken to keep the budget provision after assessing the ground reality prevailing at the site.

FM also pointed out that in a number of development schemes substantial budget provision was available and no expenditure has been incurred, with the result the actual shortfall was to the extent of 100%.

The progress of various housing schemes under construction was also reviewed by FM. He pointed out that in a number of schemes the shortfall was 100% because no expenditure was incurred. In most of the other housing schemes the progress made was not satisfactory.

Observing the delay in completion of housing projects of DDA FM suggested that in some cases the aspect of construction of houses with public private participation may be considered and examined by Engineering Wing.

FM further stated that it was not possible to discuss and review every scheme and in order to project correct status of each scheme before the Authority the following detail may be provided by 10.2.09 in the physical performance budget of the Engineering Wing.

1. Date of accord of AA & ES of the scheme viz. its number, date and amount.
2. Date of approval of tender of the work by the WAB/CE under his own power.
3. Actual date of award of work to the agency.
4. Date of rejection of tenders, if rejected by the WAB/CE under his own power.
5. Remarks giving self-contained back ground note for shortfall in achieving the budgetary target.

This issues with the approval of FM/EM, DDA.



Chief Accounts Officer

1. Engineer Member,
2. Finance Member.
3. Chief Accounts Officer.
4. Sh.Rajesh Gehlot, Councilor, MCD
5. Chief Engineer(HQ),
6. Chief Engineer(EZ),(NZ),(SEZ),(SWZ),(RZ),(DWK),(Elect.)
7. OSD to VC for kind information of the latter.