

# Systemic Improvements by the Chief Technical Examiners' Wing (CTE)

## SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT UNDERTAKEN ON ADVICE OF CTE WING 2020

<b>No</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Action Taken by CTEO</b>
1	In the contracts of an organization related to construction of Road Over Bridge, Station Buildings etc., separate rates were quoted for concrete and cement items. Invoices of cement were not available for major quantity of cement supplied by the contractor and even the available invoices were not containing the make/ brands of cement.	<p>Some systemic improvements were taken by the organization by issuing following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. With regards to materials like cement, steel, sanitary fittings, fixtures and other materials for which there is supply clause in the Schedule of contract for use in the works, contractor should be immediately asked in writing to submit invoices/bills of all such materials in original along with manufacturer's test certificates wherever applicable.</li><li>b. The bills/ invoices should contain make / brands of the materials as applicable.</li></ul>



		<p>c. The bills for such supply of materials shall be passed only after getting the invoices / bills and their test reports after getting the material tested for each lot or as applicable from approved laboratories or at the site field laboratory.</p> <p>d. All such bills/ invoices and test reports shall be properly maintained as site records of the work. A certificate to this effect shall be made while making payments to the bills.</p>
2	<p>As per the contract condition in an organisation, steel procured from TISCO, IISCO SAIL, RINL only was only to be allowed in the work and in specific circumstances, steel could be procured from other sources with cost reduction @15% with the approval of competent authority. It was found that steel procured from secondary producers was being used without any evidence of non-availability of steel from primary producers. Beside this, neither any approval of the competent authority was taken in this regard nor any cost adjustment done.</p>	<p>Some systemic improvements were taken by the organisation by amending the condition of contract as given below:</p> <p>a. Structural Steel for the work shall be procured from following manufacturers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Steel Authority of India Ltd (SAIL)</li> <li>ii. Tata Iron &amp; Steel Company Ltd (TISCO)</li> <li>iii. Indian Iron &amp; Steel Company Ltd (IISCO)</li> <li>iv. Rashtriya Ispat Nigam Ltd. (RINL)</li> <li>v. JSW Steel Ltd.</li> <li>vi. ESSAR Steel Ltd.</li> </ul>



		<p>b. In case of non-availability of steel from above sources, it can also be procured from any other manufacturers if so, approved by Chief Engineer (Construction) concerned, duly satisfying that Structural steel procured is as per specifications mentioned in BIS's document-IS: 2062. Independent tests shall be conducted to ensure that the materials procured conform to the specifications. Manufacturer's test certificate shall be obtained along with invoice/ bill.</p>
3	<p>Minimum and maximum cement content for different grades of cement concrete was specified as per the provision given IRS Concrete Bridge Code which was on higher side vis a vis the corresponding provisions in BIS Code. Besides no super plasticizer was used to reduce the water cement ratio.</p>	<p>Some systemic improvements were taken by the organisation by issuing following guidelines:</p> <p>a. The condition of minimum cement content as provided in IRS Concrete Bridge Code and as given in Technical Specification and Technical Conditions of contract for concrete works should be made applicable only for bridge works carrying rail loads.</p> <p>b. For all other civil structures including ROB, minimum cement content as per Table 5 (IS 456) and relevant IRC Code for ROBs should be referred to and used for mix design of the concrete. Mixes should be reviewed and re-designed if required for all ongoing works also.</p>
4	<p>In a work estimate cost of Rs. 24 Cr. contract, being executed by a Public Sector Undertaking (PSU), there</p>	<p>The organization issued systemic improvement guidelines for future NITs and introduced the provision for penalty on late</p>



	was no provision of penalty for late submission of Bank Guarantee.	submission of Bank Guarantee
5	In a PSU, elapse time and Auto extension time in e-Reverse auction, were not defined initially in the tender documents. This made the e-reverse procedure a bit non-transparent. Moreover, price bid comparative downloaded from website after reverse auction was available in editable excel format which could be misused.	Some system improvements were taken by the PSU by revising the guidelines. Now elapse time along with Auto extension time, are being defined in all future tenders and comparative analysis of price is now available in non-editable format.
6	In a PSU, tender of value 1144 Cr. was called for and consortium bids were allowed. However, all the eligibility criteria were supposed to be fulfilled by the leader of consortium only with no requirement of fulfilling eligibility criteria by any other member of consortium. Therefore, the members of the consortium other than leader could be assigned any work even if it was not having the corresponding work experience.	Some system improvements were taken by the PSU and now the eligibility criteria are supposed to be fulfilled by other members of consortium also, in proportion to the job assigned to them.
7	In a PSU, tenders were not being posted on Central Public Procurement Portal.	Organization implemented the systemic improvement for mandatorily posting of all the tenders on CPP portal. Systemic improvement for maintaining the insurance policies and proper record of cement and steel was also made.

