

Minutes of the Annual Zonal Review Meeting with the CVOs held on 25-06-09 at New Delhi.

The list of participants is at *Annexure-A*.

2.0 CVC in the Chair. The meeting started with introductory remarks by CVC. This was followed by presentations by CTEs on the inadequacies observed in the CTE examination of certain works and procurement contracts of some of the organizations present in the meeting. The Commission made some observations during discussion with the attendee CVOs. The observations needing follow up action are indicated below.

Introductory Remarks:

3.0 CVC:

3.01 Delhi had the special status of being a Union Territory and therefore public services come under CVC jurisdiction. In case of other states neither the Central Government nor CVC had any jurisdiction over the public services. But even in case of Delhi things had not improved and there was a need to have a centralized complaint handling system to tackle the grievances of the citizens. The grievance redressal system and the response time was the crucial factor.

3.02 In the case of CBDT and CBEC there were a few areas of concern. The number of cases was quite large and there were delays caused due to multiple levels of disciplinary authorities and frequent changes of Inquiry officers. There was a need to make the whole system more responsive. Internal instructions were required to be issued that inquiry was to be completed by the IOs before handing over charge in case of transfer.

3.03 Long delays were observed in various investigations and cases despite frequent instructions from the Commission. Time frame had been laid down for sending investigation reports in the case of normal complaints as well as PIDPI, but the response was below expectation. In such cases where delay was abnormal, when the Commission invoked the process of Direct Inquiry, the reports had invariably been submitted immediately by the CVO to the Commission suggesting deliberate intention at delay.

3.04 It had been observed that any complaints having serious allegations and involving senior officials took a long time which was quite inexplicable, given the fact that a well organized vigilance set up was available in the attendee organizations. CVOs did not take specific positions and did not send investigation reports with specific recommendations. CVOs were not to act as post office and simply endorse the reports of the junior functionaries. The analysis of facts and allegations needed to be made by the CVOs themselves.

3.05 Departmental proceedings were quantitatively different from criminal trials. The tendency to prolong the inquiry for years was not in the interest of the officials or the organizations. There was a need for a careful review of all the pending inquiries.

3.06 The Commission's guidelines on leveraging of technology were not being taken seriously enough. There seemed to be total lack of will. Majority of the

departments were behind in implementation. There was a need for reducing the public interface of the government officials and to develop dynamic and interactive websites.

3.07 Regular monthly reports from Part time CVOs were not being received. The part time CVOs should send monthly reports on a regular basis. The monthly reports received in the Commission were very routine in nature and lack application of mind and personal attention of CVO. There was a need for making Monthly Report an important and dynamic communication tool. The last paragraph of the monthly report was very important and CVOs should pay attention to it, indicating the new initiatives and quality related issues in this paragraph.

4.0 VC (R)

4.01 CVO should be assertive in their role and not act as routine functionaries.

4.02 The CVOs had to pay attention to complaint handling policy and to ensure that all complaints having vigilance angle came to the notice of the CVO.

4.03 Internal audit was an important instrument of good governance and should be strengthened in all Government Departments. CAG audit reports needed to be examined on a regular basis from the point of view of vigilance angle involved. Guidelines were already available on this issue.

4.04 The cases were dealt by CVOs in a very peripheral manner. The key issues needed to be investigated thoroughly. The roles of Supervisory level officers should be examined and more attention was to be paid to the quality of investigation report.

4.05 It was observed that first stage advice was sought for initiating major penalty proceedings but at the time of second stage advice, charges remained not proved. The reasons for such anomalies needed to be examined by the CVOs and the role of the IOs be analyzed.

4.06 The CVO should comment on the quality of the report of the Inquiry Officer and whether the case was not proved due to ineffective inquiry.

4.07 The delegation of authority in the departments was crucial and needed to be clearly specified. Any ambiguity in the policy should be clearly mentioned. While specifying acts of the policy guidelines should be necessarily quoted. There was a need to review the administrative set up of vigilance, staff working for long time in vigilance should be changed.

5.0 Presentation by the participants:

5.01 Leveraging of Technology:

The guidelines about leveraging of technology in most of the organizations were not fully implemented. The second phase had not been implemented in many of the organizations completely and test checks were required to be conducted by the CVOs concerned.

5.02 Access of CVOs to complaints:

In most organizations, the complaints handling mechanism required improvement. CVOs did not have access to all the complaints. It was advised that the CVOs should go through all the complaints to ensure that complaints with vigilance angle were attended to properly.

5.03 Structured meetings between CVOs and the CMD:

During last year's Annual Zonal meetings, the Commission had directed the CVOs to have monthly or quarterly structured meetings with their CEOs as per their requirement with a proper agenda and minutes of the meetings. It is observed that this was not being followed in many of the organizations. The Commission directed the CVOs to immediately commence the practice and report compliance in the monthly reports, with a copy of the minutes of the meetings so held.

5.04 Agreed List

Some Organizations had not prepared an "Agreed List". It was viewed seriously by the Commission. Immediate action was called for.

6.0 Action Points:

6.01 The report on leveraging of technology should be sent in the next monthly report. An independent check about the interactive status of the site should be done by CVO.

(Action: CVO, MCD, CVO DTC)

6.02 CVO, MCD informed that one case of prosecution was pending. The Commission desired that this should be immediately done.

(Action: CVO-MCD)

6.03 2 CTE paras were pending in the case of MCD. CVO-MCD assured that it would be submitted in two weeks time.

(Action: CVO-MCD)

6.04 The Commission desired that a copy of the CTE type inspection report should be sent to CTE for action.

(Action: CVO-MCD)

6.05 The Commission desired that cases pending for more than six months should be expedited.

(Action: CVO-MCD)

6.06 It was observed that 2 PIDPI complaints were pending for long time. The Commission viewed it seriously and desired that immediate action should be taken to submit investigation reports.

(Action: CVO-MCD)

6.07 The Agreed List was not ready. Immediate action should be taken to prepare the agreed list by the end of July.

(Action: CVO-MCD, DJB, DTC, NDMC, CBEC, GNCTD)

6.08 CVO, DJB informed that the guidelines on leveraging of technology were under implementation and the system would be in place in one year time.
(Action: CVO-DJB)

6.09 CVO ,DJB pointed out that a few investigations had been pending for a long time because of some technical aspects involving underground works. The Commission desired that CTE should hold a meeting in this respect and resolve the issues.
(Action: CVO-DJB, CTE (VKG))

6.10 The Commission desired that the structured meeting with agenda items and minutes recorded should be immediately started
(Action: CVO-DJB, CBEC)

6.11 The Commission observed that the monthly report had not been received from Delhi Police since January 2009. The report should be sent regularly.
(Action: CVO-Delhi Police)

6.12 The Commission desired that an interactive and dynamic Complaints System was to be immediately put in place.
(Action: CVO-CBDT)

6.13 The Commission desired that the Commission guidelines on Leveraging of Technology with respect to procurements should be immediately implemented.
(Action: CVO-CBDT)

6.14 There was a need for reconciliation of pending cases with the branch officer.
(Action: CVO-CBDT, CBEC)

6.15 The Commission desired that every department should have part time CVOs.
(Action: CVO-GNCTD)

Annexure-A

List of the participants for the meeting dated 25/06/09:

- 1 Sh Ashutosh Kumar, Addl Secy, Govt. of NCT of Delhi
- 2 Sh Suresh Gupta, CVO, DTC
- 3 Sh Satish Chander, Spl. Commissioner(Vig), Delhi Police
- 4 Smt P Gopinath, CVO, DJB
- 5 Sh Pradeep Srivastava, CVO, MCD
- 6 Sh Philip Bara, Dir(Vig), NDMC
- 7 Sh R.K.Saxena, Dir(HR) & CVO, DTL
- 8 Sh K Jose Cyriac, AS(R) & CVO, D/o Revenue
- 9 Sh S.K.Goel, CVO, CBEC
- 10 Sh A.K.Handa, CVO, CBDT

Commission's officers

1. Shri K.S. Ramasubban, Secretary
2. Shri Vineet Kumar Gupta, Addl. Secretary
3. Shri V. Ramachandran, CTE
4. Shri V.K.Gupta, CTE
5. Smt Shalini Darbari, Director
6. Smt Deepa Bajwa, Director
7. Smt Mamta U Lal, Director
8. Shri K.Subramaniam, OSD
9. Shri J.Vinod Kumar, Under Secretary