Executive Summary

Executive Summary

In order to upgrade and provide centralized emergency 24x7 response system from the police to distress calls, Government of Madhya Pradesh undertook Dial 100 project with effect from 1st of November 2015 in all districts at a cost of ₹ 632.94 crore.

The model adopted by the Department was that the call centre, fleet of First Response Vehicles and technical assistance would be outsourced to the System Integrator. The call-takers from the System Integrator forward the call details to dispatchers who are police personnel who assign the event to the First Response Vehicles which are manned by two policemen (and driver provided by the System Integrator). The Project Management Consultant was to mine the data and monitor the activities of Dial 100 on behalf of the Police Department and advise the Department on supervision, monitoring and strategic decision-making.

We audited the project to seek an assurance that the Department assessed the requirements of the project properly; awarded the contracts in a fair, transparent and ethical manner and ensured the service delivery by the contracted agencies in its implementation. The audit covered implementation of the project in eight sampled districts during the period November 2015 to March 2020.

Once implemented, the First Response Vehicle was expected to reach the site within five minutes of a distress call in urban areas and within 30 minutes in rural areas. Our audit showed that this objective was not met during the audit period. The average response time in Dial 100 was 24 minutes in urban areas and 56 minutes in rural areas. We noticed delays in dispatch and arrival of vehicles even in serious crimes like rapes, attempt to rape, kidnapping, domestic violence etc. Over the period 2016-19, we did not find any noticeable improvement in the response time to distress calls. These delays defeated the objective of Dial 100 system, which is to provide rapid response to distress calls. On an average, the Department spent ₹ 104 crore annually to run the revamped system. We found that despite centralization, the quality of data generated did not lend itself for effective monitoring. Out of every 100 calls made to the system, only 20 were categorised as actionable and out of these actionable calls only two had valid data to support the dispatch of a First Response Vehicle. The Project Management Consultant (PMC) contracted at a cost of ₹ 72 lakh annually also did not ensure that complete and useable data was generated to monitor the

service levels provided by the system integrator. The revamped system was to benefit from the use of technical equipment to be fitted in the First Response Vehicles such as Mobile Data Terminals which were either not fitted or not functional and when functional, the police personnel did not feed the data in the requisite sequence. The Department gave several concessions to the System Integrator through extension of timelines as well as in provision of fully equipped vehicles as envisaged in the contract. The Police personnel were also slack in monitoring and did not exercise the supervisory controls through either use of technology or discharge on-site duties as required in the system. On its part, the Department did not provide adequate number of police personnel in the First Response Vehicles despite surplus manpower in certain districts. The delayed responses were not appropriately analysed for remedial action by officers who were responsible for monitoring the operation of the system.

We found that the Department put the services of the System Integrator to tender even before the finalization of the Draft Project Report. The system suffered inherent deficiencies at the planning stage which impacted the ability of the system to deliver as could be evidenced in the delays in response. For instance, the number of First Response Vehicles to be deployed was arrived at on a simplistic assumption of one First Response Vehicle per police station, without taking into account other factors that would affect response time like traffic, road conditions and crime rate as well as geographical conditions. Similarly, the work of dispatchers was fixed district-wise leading to skewed distribution of calls and consequently, delays in dispatch of calls.

Our audit also showed that the Department did not ensure transparency in tendering the services. The Project consultant did not disclose a potential conflict of interest with the selected bidder and remained actively engaged in the selection. The evaluation criteria were tweaked to alter the preferred bid at the final stage of selection of the Project Management Consultant. We also noted that the deliverables of PMC included certain aspects of monitoring like coordination with various stakeholders, which would have been best carried out by the Department itself.

We concluded that the Project was deficient in contract management, system design and implementation which led to failure in achievement of its objectives. We recommend that the systemic deficiencies of Dial 100 system may be reviewed comprehensively to ensure that its objective of delivery of prompt response is achieved.