



भारत सरकार
रेल मंत्रालय

भारतीय रेल सिविल इंजीनियरी संस्थान, पुणे - 411001

(आई एस ओ : 9001-2008 प्रमाणित भारतीय रेल का प्रथम केंद्रित प्रशिक्षण संस्थान)
Government of India
Ministry of Railways



INDIAN RAILWAYS INSTITUTE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, PUNE - 411001

(Indian Railway's First ISO : 9001-2008 Certified Centralized Training Institute)

No.151/10308

13th December, 2010

All CAO/Constn. – All Indian Railways.

Sub : Proceedings of CAO/Cs' Seminar.

A copy of the proceedings of CAO/Cs' seminar from 08.09.2010 & 09.09.2010 held at IRICEN Pune is enclosed herewith for kind information and necessary action please.

Encl.: One booklet.

13/12/10
(Surendra Kr. Bansal)
Sr.Professor/Projects

Copy to :

1. ED/Works Railway Board, Rail Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. OSD to ME, Railway Board, Rail Bhavan, New Delhi.
3. Director General, RDSO, Manak Nagar, Lucknow.
4. Sr.ED/Civil, RDSO, Manak Nagar, Lucknow.

13/12/10
(Surendra Kr. Bansal)
Sr.Professor/Projects

PROCEEDINGS OF "CAO/Cs' SEMINAR" HELD AT IRICEN/PUNE
FROM 8th & 9th September, 2010

PRESENT:

Railway Board

1. Board Shri Chandar Prakash, Adv./Projects, Railway Board
2. Shri Virendra Kumar, Director/Works, Railway Board

Others

1. Shri B.K.Makhija, Director/Project, RITES
2. Shri P.K. Singh, ED/RVNL
3. Shri P.K. Sharma, Director/MRVC
4. Shri D.S.Rana, CPM/DFCCII – Mumbai

Zonal Railways

1. Shri S.K. JINDAL, CE/C, C.RLY.
2. Shri V.K.BAHMANI, CAO/C/ E.Co.
3. Shri PRAMOD KUMAR, CAO/C/N/ECR
4. Shri MADHURESH KUMAR, CAO/C/S, ECR
5. Shri DHARAM SINGH, CAO/C-I, N.Rly
6. Shri HARI SHANKAR YADAV, CAO/C, N.Rly.
7. Shri DHARAM PAL, CAO/C, NE RLY.
8. Shri S.C.Rajak, CE/C/ NF rly.
9. Shri SANTOKH SINGH, CAO/C, NW Rly.
10. Shri R. RAMANATHAN, CAO/C, S.Rly.
11. Shri S.K. SHARMA, CAO/C, SC.Rly.
12. Shri SUDHIR MITTAL, CAO/C/GRC, SE.Rly.
13. Shri B.D. KUMAR, CAO/C/SEC.Rly.
14. Shri S.S.NARAYANAN, CAO/C, SW.Rly.
15. Shri SUBODH.JAIN, CAO/C, W.Rly.
16. Shri B.S.CHITTODIA, CE/CON.II, WC RLY.

IRICEN

1. Shri A.K. Goel, Director
2. Shri Surendra Kumar Bansal, Sr. Prof./Project
3. Shri S. K. Garg, Sr. Prof./Works and other faculty members

- 1.0 At the outset, Director/IRICEN welcomed the participants to the Seminar and wished the Seminar a success. Director advised participants about the format of the agenda and he also mentioned that in the seminar on some of the issues decisions may not be there yet discussion will be there to appreciate the issues involved.

Part-A : PMC its relevance and implementation – guidelines issued by Railway Board.

Board have circulated guidelines for PMC vide L.No.2007/CE.1/CT/18 dtd... 05.07.2010.

MD/RITES, Shri Makhija explained various models of PMC. Railway can design the PMC model as per its suitability.

ED/RVNL presented the model of PMC consultants as adopted in RVNL, some merits and demerits of various clauses.

The provisions in draft contract for PMC as decided by Rly Bd were also discussed. CAOs were requested to submit their views to Rly Bd. at the earliest.

Part-B: Good quality control practices in major infrastructure projects.

Sri S K Sharma CAO SC Rly gave presentation on good quality control practices being adopted on SC Rly projects and inter relation between quality, cost and time of completion.

Part-C: Discussion and recommendations on AGENDA ITEMS.

Agenda item C1 : Assessment of suitability of valid L-1 in case of excessive on hand works:.

The existing criteria for eligibility of tenders stipulates on experience of similar nature of work and turnover. However it does not take into account the available workload of the tenderer. It is also a fact that the guidelines issued by Board on open tender system suggest that information on works on hand needs to be called from the tenderers and deliberated & considered in the TC proceedings.

In practice however, it is found that ignoring the valid L1 (who satisfies the laid down eligibility criteria) on the basis of excessive works on hand is difficult as it is a subjective issue. Generally consensus among all the TC members (including accepting authority) on the issue of ignoring/bypassing valid eligible L1 on account of excessive work load is never reached.

Therefore, suitable guidelines to reinforce the concept of considering the existing work load of tenderers and remedy in terms of ignoring or bypassing L1 on account of excessive on hand work load may be issued.

Discussion : CAO/C Western Railway brought out that some of the contractors are keen to work in a particular area or a particular Engineer/Chief Engineer and they tend to grab the contracts in that area.

The Director/IRICEN stated that a particular tenderer may work in more than one area also. So constraining contractor in a particular area considering works awarded in that area may not be logical.

ED/RVNL brought out that RVNL is taking Affidavit from the tenderer regarding the works on hand based on which the tender is considered. However, the Director/IRICEN opined that since the works are centralized in RVNL, the same thing may not be applicable for Open line/Construction Works.

CAO W Rly opined that lot of discretionary powers are given to the tender committee in this regard and TC may come at a conclusion regarding the working capacity of the tenderer.

Recommendations:

Director/IRICEN and CAO/C opined that to judge the working capacity of tenderer is the role of Tender Committee. The limit of working capacity as per the formulae given by World Bank could be taken for guidance based on experience of RITES. However, Director/Projects-RITES was of the opinion that this formula is not beneficial. The limit of working capacity has to be decided by the Tender committee taking into consideration of various aspects.

Item discussed and dropped.

C2 : Revival of contract after termination –

CAO Southern Railway stated that if after termination, the contractor comes out with an acceptable scheme of work with a definite time frame then Railway (CAO) should be able to revive it. He also brought out that the big agencies some times bring altogether different teams on a particular contract (After termination and revival) which are capable of satisfactorily executing the work. He also brought out, since fixing out an agency after termination takes very long time due to which we prolong under performing agency. However, revival of a contract after termination was not considered beneficial by most of the CAOs as we lose the sanctity of contract management by reviving a contract.

Railway Board have issued clarification vide L.No.99/CE.1/CT/28 dt.24.5.2001 regarding revival of contract after termination. As per the clarification once the formal notice of termination of contract has been issued, revival of the contract, even if on the same terms and conditions, is possible only as single tender and would require observance of all relevant orders relating to such tenders.

In this connection, following points needs clarification in view of recent changes in tender and contract procedure:

a) Since revival of contract can be done as a single tender observing procedure for single tender, whether single tender is to be invited from the contractor? If single tender is again invited from the contractor, he will have opportunity to revise his rates. Therefore, it is felt that only approval of General Manager with Finance concurrence should suffice for revival of contract on the terms and conditions of the terminated contract.

b) With introduction of Performance Guarantee, after termination of contract the Bank Guarantee for Performance Guarantee is encashed. If it is decided to revive the contract, whether encashed Performance Guarantee amount can be

refunded and fresh performance guarantee taken or encashed Performance Guarantee taken or encashed Performance guarantee be retained in cash.

c) Since the balance work is to be got done independently, there may be need for revision/modification of the quantity of balance work, introduction of certain additional items or change in tender conditions etc.. Whether such changes can be done while inviting the tender for execution of the balance work and in such situation whether the original contractor can still be debarred from participating in the tender for the balance work, needs clarification.

Revocation of terminated contract should be simpler and need not be processed as a single tender through tender committee etc.

Discussion CAOs were of the opinion that invitation of tender after termination with finance concurrence may be avoided. This is badly needed in traffic facility work and last mile project which otherwise get delayed on the account of delayed finalization. This was also felt by CAOs that re-invitation takes a lot of time needs to be made easier and less time consuming.

Recommendations :

a) Clear guidelines on this aspects exists from Railway Board as such this items was discussed and dropped.

b) After revival of contract, the PG has to be obtained as per existing instructions.

c) Avoiding finance may not be acceptable and clear guidelines of Railway Board exists such this para was **discussed and dropped, being not practical.**

C3 : Performance Guarantee :

a) Finance is of the view that additional performance guarantee should be taken from the contractor for the enhanced value of the contract. The contractors are representing such action. It is requested that guidelines on this item may be issued by Railway Board.

b) For non submission of PG within 21 days, earnest money to be forfeited, recovery of PG is not required. (SER)

i) For non performing part concept, full PG to be encashed, equivalent SD amount to be forfeited. Balance to be refunded. (SER)

ii) Only earnest money to be forfeited for non submission of PG. (NWR)

Discussion : In this regard Railway Board had already issued guidelines vide L.No.2003/CE-I/CC/IV/PG dtd. 10.08.2010 "para 1.a".

For non submission of PG within 21 days earnest money to be forfeited, CAO- stated that there is a clear provision in the tender condition that if PG is not submitted within one month, the earnest money will be forfeited.

CAO Western Railway stated that forfeiter of earnest money and cancellation of acceptance letter has been categorically mentioned in the acceptance letter, if PG is not submitted within one month .

Director/Works Railway Board brought out that this issue was raised in the last CAOs seminar also and subsequently Railway Board EDs committee was setup to address this issue which has already submitted its recommendation which are already under consideration in the board. Director/Works also brought out that this was a case specific of ECR in which contract value was 1 Crore.

Director/IRICEN stated, since the issue is under consideration of Rly Bd, as such we should wait for the Board's decision.

For non performing part (rescinded contract), GCC clause 4(d) states that-

“wherever the contractor is rescinded, the security deposit shall be forfeited and the performance Guarantee shall be encashed and the balance work shall be got done independently without risk and cost of the failed contractor the failed contractor shall be debarred from participating in the tender for executing the balance work. If the failed contractor is a JV or a partnership firm, then every member/partner of such a firm shall be debarred from participating in the tender for the balance work either in his/her individual capacity or as a partner of any other JV/Partnership firm”

- for non performing part concept, full PG to be encashed, equivalent SD amount to be forfeited. Balance to be refunded.

Discussion : The issue of taking additional performance guarantee from contractor has already been deliberated by a committee of Executive Directors, Railway Board on a specific issue raised by ER. The committee has already submitted its recommendations which are under consideration of the Board.

Recommendations : For non submission of PG within stipulated time, Board directions already exists. As per existing instructions, the PG has to be submitted before execution of agreement. This is to be done within 15 days after acceptance letter is issued. Existing instructions of Board to be followed.

C4 : Variation of individual NS items / New items :

Variations of individuals NS items: Sudhir Chandra Committee's recommendations should be adopted again.(NER)

Power for operating new items can be raised as proposed below (SR)

	Present power	Proposed power
HAG level	Rs.10.00 lakhs	Rs. 25.00 lakh
SAG level	Rs. 5.00 lakh	Rs. 10.00 lakh

Quantity variations in various items of contracts need to be considered w.r.t. total contract agreement rather than on individual items. This will avoid a large number of negotiations being resorted to at present (NER)

Lot of difficulties are being faced during execution which is causing delay in the sanction of the variation as well as execution of the work. It has also been observed that the reduction in rates for the increased quantum of work is not being done by the agencies during negotiation. It is suggested that earlier stipulation of Sudhir Chandra committee may be restored **(NR)**

Discussion : CAO, Southern Railway stated that power of variation / operating new items should be raised as under-

	<u>Present power</u>	<u>Proposed power</u>
HAG level	Rs.10.00 lakhs	Rs. 25.00 lakh
SAG level	Rs. 5.00 lakh	Rs. 10.00 lakh

On this all the CAOs were having similar views for existing powers to be enhanced as brought out above. CAO Southern Railway further opined that the Sudhir Chandra Committee recommendations should be followed as the same are much clear. Enhancement was demanded for contract accepted at HAG level by CAOs.

Advisor/Projects asked the CAOs to furnish the powers being exercised presently by various Railways.

Director Railway Board brought out that this issues regarding variations in new items has been considered by Committee of EDs in Railway Board and is under consideration of Railway Board.

Recommendations : For the contracts accepted at HAG level, powers for operating new items can be raised as proposed below-

	Present power	Proposed power
HAG level	Rs.10.00 lakhs	Rs. 25.00 lakh
SAG level	Rs. 5.00 lakh	Rs. 10.00 lakh

Sudhir Chandra committee's recommendation should be adopted again for various and individual items.

C5 : Submission of bills by contractors :

Agenda: Permitting submission of bills by contractors, in contracts of value above Rs.8.00 crore. (WCR)

- This is likely to improve cash flow of contractors as they will submit the bills of the work done as and when payment is required by them and will avoid chances of any complaint for not making regular payment by railways. Further, the system will enable railway supervisors to devote more on ensuring quality of ongoing works. This system has already been implemented successfully in railway PSUs like RVNL..

Discussion : CAO/C/WCR stated that this is likely to improve the cash flow of contractors as they will submit the bills of the work done as and when payment is required by them and will avoid chances of any complaint for not making regular payment by railways. Further, the system will enable railway supervisors to

devote more on ensuring quality of ongoing works. This system has already been implemented successfully in railway PSUs like RVNL.

Director Railway Board apprised that this items has already been put up to ME and is under consideration of Board.

Recommendations : For Contracts value more than 8 Crores, contractors may be allowed to submit the bills to be checked by Railways and Railway Bd may issue orders at earliest possible.

C6 : Measurement recording system :(NR & SR)

Vide L.No. 71/W/CT/6 dtd. 16.01.86, Rly.Bd has issued instructions in respect of powers for recording the measurements. According to this, IOW/PWI can record measurement of works for values only upto Rs. 10 lacs and for works of value more than Rs. 10 lacs. AENs have to record measurements.

Instructions in these references may be issued to have uniform system of recording measurements and subsequent test check at the level of AENs and Dy.CE/Cs all over the Indian Railways.

Recording and test check of measurement : Similar to ballast measurement recording by SE/JE vide Railway Board L.No. 2006/CE-II/MB/2 dtd. 25.05.07. three bills should not be missed in continuation

Discussion : CAO/C Northern Railway initiated the discussion that presently different systems are being followed by different Railways and Railway Bd should issue guidelines so as uniformity is there between different Rlys. In N Rly, more than 10 lakhs being recorded by AEN. CAO/SRly was of the opinion that Railway should permit recording of measurement by contractor. Advisor Works/RB stated that the limits of recording of measurement by SEs/SSEs are to be considerably increased.

CAO/C S. Rly also was of the view that measurement should be recorded by the SE. Advisor/Project brought out that this is under consideration of Bd , the measurement power of recording measurement of SE & SSEs are being greatly enhanced (in Crores).

CAO/C W.Rly stated that SE should be permitted to record measurement 100%, with test check by AEN. Some test check must be done by Dy.also to have some control over measurements.

Recommendations : SSEs/SEs should have full power of recording measurements with the test check of AENs/Dy.CEs.

C7 : (a) Eligibility Criteria : Verification of credentials, declaration on stamp paper to be taken from tenderer that if credentials found wrong subsequently then legal action is liable.

Advisor/Rly Bd wanted to know the CAOs opined that whether the clause of summary rejection for non submission of the credentials should be included?. CAO/W Rly and other CAOs opined that this will be risky proposition, some times

the reputed contractors are not submitting the documents and we can not ignore their offer.

DIRECTOR/PROJECT /RITES opined that if all the tenderer have not submitted some the documents, then the only way available will be to re-invite the tender which is not the intention. In two packet system(RITES is calling all tenders as two packets only), there is no vitiation of the system. If we call the additional documents. RITES have further introduced a system that if some of the tenderers have submitted all the documents then they do not call the missing documents from the balance who offer is rejected summarily.

CAOs were also of the opinion that if the tenderer gives an affidavit that the documents submitted by them in support of the work experience and similar nature work are true then we need not waste time in verification.

DR/IRICEN was also of the opinion that there is a provision in the finance code to call for clarification / additional documents and the summary rejection condition will not be advisable, Board is also not accepting this.

(b) Certificates from Private firms

Railway Board vide L.No.94/CE-I/CT/4 dtd. 17.10.2002, mentioned that certificates from private individuals should not be accepted for working out the financial eligibility criteria. It is proposed that permission may be granted for considering certificates issued by reputed/established private firms, with turn over beyond a certain level, for determining financial eligibility.

Discussion : This issue raised by N.Rly. CAO/NR was of the opinion that we should consider the certificate from the reputed companies. However, Railway Board's Letter No.94/CE-I/CT/4 dtd. 17.10.2002, mentioned that certificates from private individuals should not be accepted for working out the financial eligibility criteria. It is proposed that permission may be granted fro considering certificates issued by reputed/established private firms(listed firms with the stock exchange), with turn over beyond a certain level, for determining financial eligibility.

CAO/S.Rly was of the opinion that if there is a safeguard in the form of agreement in performance certificate is available then a certificate by private firm is also acceptable. He further stated that in this regard references have been made to board by S.Rly. However the CAOs were of the opinion that the certificates from listed private firms may be considered while judging the eligibility criteria.

DIRECTOR/Works brought out that there is a letter from the Rly Bd that certificate from private individuals should not be acceptable.

CAO/W Rly suggested that if a certificate is given by a private individual which is supported with the facts that the sub contractor was awarded a specific work by the main contractor and is supported by audited statement then it should be acceptable.

Recommendation : Experience certificate from listed companies can be accepted and Board may like to modify the instructions that certificate from private individuals will not be accepted.

c) Tenderers to submit self attested documents : RVNL has made it mandatory for the bidder to submit self attested documents in support of their credentials and a affidavit on a stamp paper that document and information submitted by them with the bid is correct and in case any thing is found otherwise, the bidder will be liable for banning of business and other legal consequences

Discussion & Recommendations : Affidavit to be obtained from tenderer that if any wrong information is given by the tenderer, the tenderer will be debarred which is not being done presently.

C8 : Improvement in Tendering system :

(a) Credentials of tenderers, as a sub contractor may also be considered, so long as the projects in question, are under govt./PSU etc. and credential certificates are given by the Govt./PSUs authorities.

Discussion : Non submission of documents by the tenderer : We should mention in the tender conditions, that tender is likely to be rejected.

Director RITES was of the opinion that if summary rejection conditions regarding missing tender documents is included then we can enforce this.

Director/IRICEN stated that there is a provision in Finance Codes, that if any document is missing while submission of tender by the tenderer , the same can be asked within 15 days. As such summary rejection conditions should not be included in the tender. Currently we should not enter into post tender correspondence. In the tender document, it requires for establishing the EQ, shall be liable to be rejected.

(b) Tenders with 21 days notice. The financial limit may be increased to Rs.15 crores

Discussion : CAO/ W. Rly stated that board has empowered the Rly to issue small value tender with 21 days notice.

CAO/ S. Rly was of the opinion that tender notice can be reduced up to 21 days without any financial limit and for further reduction up to 15 days finance concurrence may be taken.

Recommendations : For inviting tender with restricted notice period, the limit of small value tender should be upto Rs. 2 crore.

(c) Tender Acceptance power should be with CAO/Con upto the limit entrusted to the Zonal Railways

Discussion : Tender acceptance power should be with CAO/C upto the limit entrusted to the Zonal Railways. – CAO/C/S.Rly.

Recommendations : CAO/Cs must have power of acceptance upto the powers given to Zonal Railways i.e. upto 100 crores.

d) All Inclusive Works Contract should be allowed to continue- (SR):

e) Quotation powers : A large number of minor works are required to be carried out in the projects in the last minute which are normally carried out mostly by processing quotations. The powers of calling quotations should be enhanced from the current limit of Rs. 2 lakhs per case with the current annual ceiling limit of Rs. 10 lakhs to Rs. 10 lakhs per case with annual ceiling limit of Rs. 2 crores at CAO/CE's level with suitable delegation for officers at various levels.

Recommendations Advisor/RB stated that small value limits may be revised as desired by CAOs and availability of funds shall be arranged by Board.

C9. Single Tender powers to CAO/Cs – issue raised by CAO/S& SC Rly.

Single tender power for CAO/Con needs to be available for all last mile projects instead of restricting to only throughput enhancement projects. The existing powers may be raised from 2 crores to 8 crores.

Discussion : Advisor /Rly Bd desired to know as to how much the exiting power of single tender has been used by various railways. On this CAO/S.Rly stated that it is very difficult to use the single tender powers.

Recommendations : Issue discussed by forum and not found workable hence dropped.

C10. Delegation of power for sanctioning part estimates covering land acquisition, earthwork, bridges, tunnels etc. upto 25% cost of the project :

Discussion: Issue discussed by forum and not found workable hence dropped. It was suggested by CAOs that the estimate for items required urgently for execution of projects should be got sanctioned on urgency certificate. CAO/W Rly stated that board will sanction only meager estimate.

Recommendations :As this item was not found practicable and workable, as such recommended for Dropped.

C.11 Finalization of contract for design, drawing & Survey –

Delegation of power of calling and finalization of contract for design, drawing and survey.

- vide Railway Board's L.No.97/W-1/Survey/CRPt.III dtd. 21.01.2009, the tender committee is to be at SAG level irrespective of value of work. This needs delegation further as suggested below:

- (a) For surveys, the nature of tender is of works side involving physical working, such activities have already been defined as works. For this, it is suggested to delegate power for tender committee as under:

Upto Rs. 25 lakh - JAG level

Beyond Rs. 25 lakh – SAG level

Discussion : The design tenders should be considered as works contract and not consultancy. CAO/S Rly opined that the tender committee for the design drawing and survey contract can be one level higher than the normal contracts. Normally the contracts are of JA grade level as such the design tender can be of SA grade level.

Director/Rly Bd brought out that this issue was deliberated at Board and it was considered to raise the TC level to SAG level, the matter being important.

Recommendations : The geotechnical investigation, final location survey and design of the parameters at the beginning of the works should be treated as Works Contract. This issue needs to be deliberated at Board Level.

C.12 Re-appropriation of Funds :CAO/C N.Rly raised this issue.

Powers for re-appropriation of funds :

It is suggested that no such limit may be laid and GM should have full powers in this regard. GM should also have full powers for re-appropriation of the funds within the same plan head provided the budget allotment of that "Plan head" does not exceed.

- GM has no power of re-appropriation of fund in plan heads "New Lines:, Staff Amenities", Staff quarters and Passenger Amenities even within the plan head. It is suggested that for these restricted plan head, GM should be given powers of re-appropriation at least within the same plan head under the same source.

Recommendations : GM should have full powers for re-appropriation of funds within the same plan. Provided budget allotment of that plan is not exceeded.

D.1 Removal of yardsticks for creation of work-charged post against estimate for Gazetted specially SA grade officer :

At present the percentage distribution of general charges among different departments has been laid down by Railway Board and for Engineering department, distribution among Gazetted and Non-Gazetted has also been prescribed.

Having prescribed the laid down percentage, there appears to be no need to create further barriers by prescribing the yard-sticks such as Rs.90 crores for SAG, Rs.20. crores for JAG, etc. These stipulations are causing serious impediments in the day to day functioning of Construction department and also putting Engineering department at a disadvantage vis-à-vis other departments, which is explained as follows:-

- a) Other departments, particularly minor departments, do not follow any yardsticks and therefore are able to utilize the entire provision available to them for creation of gazetted posts as per the need of the cadre.

- b) Whereas, in engineering department because of the structural problems and general anarchy, NG staff is not made available by the cadre controlling officers (Open Line) and therefore the provision remains underutilized. Similarly, provision of gazetted staff for the Engineering department also remains underutilized, which is then mis-utilized for creation of posts like Sports Officers, Safety Officers, Protocol Officers, Personnel Secretaries to GM, Addl. GM, etc.
- c) Over a period of time, these departments make claim that traditionally they have been utilizing these posts out of general charge of the Construction department and of now proper percentage is allocated by reducing the proportion available to Engineering department, as has happened while allocating the prescribed percentage to Vigilance/RPF departments.

Recommendations : Therefore, it is proposed that yardstick for creation of work charge post against estimate should be removed and kept at par for all the department.

d) Ad-hoc promotion for staff in Construction organization.

Discussion: CAOCs were of the common opinion that they should be empowered to recommend one promotion for the construction supervisors.

Recommendations: CAO should have powers to recommend one ad-hoc promotion to the staff working in construction organization.

E: Land Acquisition: DLAOs are appointed as Competent Authority on deputation. Power of appointing amins on deputations/or engaging retired amins should be delegated to competent authority/CAO/Cs.

Discussion: Training for IOW s in connection with land acquisition may be given at IRICEN

Recommendations: CAO should be given powers to recruit amines for land acquisition purpose.

F.1 Track structure on GC projects on unimportant lines : Review of Track structures and Formation specification for uneconomic/unimportant/low GMT lines for gauge conversions and new lines.

1.0 Advance correction slip no.117 dtd. 19.05.09 to IRPWM lay down track structures for BG/MG and sidings. While section of rails have been laid as 52kg for gauge conversion & new line constructions having annual GMT less than 5 but sleeper density and ballast cushion are not linked with low GMT or importance of line for GC and new lines.

As per para 244 (iv) minimum sleeper density of 1660mm has been prescribed for all track renewal, doubling, gauge conversions and new line works.

As per para-263 minimum depth of ballast cushion is laid as 350mm for all doublings, gauge conversions and new line construction works.

It is noted that there are many Gauge conversions and New line constructions which are on unimportant route with no likelihood of goods train running there or with projections of low GMT. Use of sleeper density of 1660mm and ballast cushion of 350mm on these lines looks uneconomical. It is recommended that for such uneconomic/unimportant/low GMT lines for gauge conversions & new lines, the standard of sleeper density of ballast cushion need to be lowered down as in case of rail section on economic considerations.

2.0 Similarly using the same guidelines & specifications of Formation laid down in RDSO's report issued in July, 2009 needs review specially in respect to formation width and blanket layers for Gauge conversions and new lines where heavy axle loads not projected.

There are many Gauge conversions and New line constructions which are on unimportant route with no likelihood of goods train running there or with projections of low GMT. Use of sleeper density of 1660/mm and ballast cushion of 350mm on these lines looks uneconomical.

Recommended that for such uneconomic/unimportant/low GMT lines for gauge conversions & new lines, the standard of sleeper density of ballast cushion need to be lowered down as in case of rail section on economic considerations.

Discussion : Board may review the RDSO report no. RDSO/2007/GE0014 regarding specifications and design of formation. Board may also like to review the Track Structure on uneconomic branch lines.

G.2 Specifications of manual blanket material

The RDSO specifications on **Mechanical** Blanketing stipulates particle size distribution must be in one of the gradation ranges (Grade A, B, C) in addition to the specified envelope curve. However, manual blanketing specifications only specifies the envelope curves without mentioning the particle size distribution range.

Presently most of the works are carried with manual blanketing & quality assessment is done using enveloping curve. It is felt that the quality of blanketing material can be ensured and regulated properly at the mixing stage itself if the manual blanketing specifications are alternatively stipulated in the tabulated form indicating particle size and percentage passing as being prescribed for mechanical blanketing.

Using the upper enveloping curve (Now axle load > 22.5 t) manual blanket gradation specification, is tabulated in terms of sieve size & % passing and further compared with Grade C of mechanical blanket

Sl.	IS Sieve size	Manual blanket % passing	Min % retention	Grade C Mechanical % passing	Min % retention (Grade C)
1	40mm	93-100	Nil	95-100	Nil
2	20mm	80-100	Nil	80-100	Nil
3	10mm	65-85	15	65-85	15
4	4.75mm	44-71	29	43-70	30
5	2mm	24-47	53	22-46	54
6	600 micron	12-22	78	08-22	78
7	425 micron	12-16	84	05-18	82
8	212 micron	0-12	88	00-10	90
9	75 micron	0-12	88	00-08	92

From the above comparison, it is seen that the particle size gradation for grade-C mechanical blanket and manual blanket is almost same i.e. the difference is mostly for Sieve 425 micron, 212 micron & 75 micron, mainly variation exists for finer particles. In case of manual blanket finer material i.e. 75 micron is permitted upto 12% whereas in case of grade-C mechanical blanket the permitted limit is 8%. It is to be noted that for grade-A mechanical blanket 75 micron material is permitted upto 12%.

Discussions & Recommendations : This issue was discussed and since manual blanketing is not permitted existing Board's instructions on blanketing may be followed. Item dropped.

Following presentations were given by the participants during the seminar :

1. Presentation on "Expeditious completion of projects through identification of 100 days projects" by Shri S.K.Jain, CAO/C/WR :-
2. Presentation on "Fast Track Projects – Execution of Railway Projects by Shri S.K. Sharma, CAO/C/SC Rly.
3. Presentation on "Fast Track Projects – Bogie Bhil Bridge in NF Railway by Shri Subhash Razak, CE/Con./NF Rly.
4. Quality control in infrastructure projects by Sr Chee Chiak Yang, Jt. Project Director, L&T.
5. Presentation on "Good Quality Control" practices in major infrastructure projects by Shri Madhuresh Kumar, CAO/C/EC Rly.
6. Presentation on "Recent guidelines of Railway Board on PMC" by Shri P.K. Singh, ED/RVNL.

<<<<>>>>

Recommendations Requiring Board's Approval

Sr	Subject	Recommendations
1	Permitting submission of bills by contractors, in contracts of value above ₹ 8.00 crore. (WCR)	For Contracts value more than 8 Crores, contractors may be allowed to submit the bills to be checked by Railways and Railway Bd may issue orders at earliest possible.
2	Measurement recording system	SSEs/SEs should have full power of recording measurements with the test check of AENs/Dy.CEs.
3	Certificates from Private firms regarding Credentials	Experience certificate from listed companies can be accepted and Board may like to modify the instructions that certificate from private individuals will not be accepted
4	Improvement in Tendering system	For inviting tender with restricted notice period, the limit of small value tender should be upto Rs. 2 crore.
5	Tender acceptance power should be with CAO/C upto the limit entrusted to the Zonal Railways	CAO/Cs must have power of acceptance upto the powers given to Zonal Railways i.e. upto 100 crores.
6	Quotation powers: A large number of minor works are required to be carried out in the projects in the last minute which are normally carried out mostly by processing quotations. The powers of calling quotations should be enhanced from the current limit of Rs. 2 lakhs per case with the current annual ceiling limit of Rs. 10 lakhs to Rs. 10 lakhs per case with annual ceiling limit of Rs. 2 crores at CAO/CE's level with suitable delegation for officers at various levels.	Small value limits may be revised as desired by CAOs and availability of funds shall be arranged by Board.
7	Finalization of contract for design, drawing & Survey	The geotechnical investigation, final location survey and design of the parameters at the beginning of the works should be treated as Works Contract. This issue needs to be deliberated at Board Level.
8	Removal of yardsticks for creation of work-charged post against estimate for Gazetted specially SA grade officer	Therefore, it is proposed that yardstick for creation of work charge post against estimate should be removed and kept at par for all the department.
9	Adhoc promotion for staff in Construction organization.	CAO should have powers to recommend one ad-hoc promotion to the staff working in construction organization.
10	Power of appointing amins on deputations/or engaging retired amins should be delegated to competent authority/CAO/Cs.	CAO should be given powers to recruit amines for land acquisition purpose