

**File No.P-17024/29(2)/2019-RC(370849)**

Government of India  
Ministry of Rural Development  
Department of Rural Development  
Rural Connectivity (RC) Division


Room No.378  
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi,  
Dated the 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2020.

**MINTUES**

**Subject:- Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee to consider project proposals for PMGSY-III ,Batch-I(2019-20) submitted by the State Government of Telangana.**

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith a copy of Minutes of the meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 6<sup>th</sup> March, 2020 under the Chairpersonship of the Additional Secretary (RD) & DG (NRIDA) to discuss the proposals submitted by the State Government of Telangana under PMGSY-III, Batch-I(2019-20).

2. It is requested that a compliance report on all the observations of the Committee may be sent to this Ministry/NRIDA.

  
(A.A. Sreekanth)  
Under Secretary (RC)  
Tel. No.011-23070978

**Distribution:**

1. Principal Secretary, Panchayat Raj & Rural Development (FAC), Government of Telangana, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, B-Block, Telangana State Secretariat, Hyderabad-500022.
2. Empowered Officer & Chief Engineer (PMGSY), Panchayati Raj & Rural Development, Telangana State Rural Road Development Agency (TSRRDA), Government of Telangana, S.R.T.G.N Bhawan, Errum Manzil Colony, Hyderabad-500082, Telangana.

**Copy for information to:-**

PS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS &FA/PPS to AS(RD)/All Directors, NRIDA.

**Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee Meeting held on 06.03.2020 for consideration of proposal of the State of Telangana under PMGSY-III, Batch I of 2019-20**

A meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held on 06.03.2020 at 11.00 AM under the Chairpersonship of Addl. Secretary, Department of Rural Development & DG (NRIDA) to consider the proposal of the State of Telangana for PMGSY-III, Batch I of 2019-20. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Smt. Alka Upadhya	Addl. Secretary & DG(NRIDA)
Ms. Mamta	Joint Director (RC)
Sh. B. C. Pradhan	Director (Technical), NRIDA
Dr. I.K. Pateriya	Director (P-II), NRIDA
Sh. Pradeep Aggarwal	Director (P-I) & P-III, NRIDA
Sh. Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Sh. P. Mohanasundaram	Joint Director (Technical), NRIDA
Sh. Harsh Nisar	Data Scientist, NRIDA
<b>State Govt. Representatives</b>	
Sh. Rajshekhar Reddy	Chief Engineer (PMGSY), Telangana
Sh. B. Srihari	EE, TSRRDA, Telangana
Sh Ravi Kumar	ITNO, TSRRDA, Telangana
Smt. Sumedha B	DEE, SQC

**2. Current Proposal of the State Govt. under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2019-20**

A presentation on the proposal submitted by the State was made by NRIDA before the Pre-Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

As per State's proposal dated 04.03.2020					As per OMMAS as on 05.03.2020			
Item	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)
Up-Gradation - Roads	179	1207.82	868.65	71.92	193	1,317.55	950.85	72.17
<b>Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>1207.82</b>	<b>868.65</b>	<b>71.92</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>1,317.55</b>	<b>950.85*</b>	<b>72.17</b>

\*MoRD Share: Rs. 563.01 Crores                      State Share: Rs. 387.84 Crores

State Target for PMGSY III: 2,427.50 kms Sanctioned: Nil

3 roads of 16.33 km are 7 m wide with average cost of Rs. 75.75 lakhs/Km, 31 roads of 323.92 km is 5.5 m wide with average cost of Rs. 87.58 lakhs/Km and 159 roads of 977.32 km are 3.75 m wide with average cost of Rs 67 lakhs/km. Out of 193 proposals of 1317.55 km uploaded on

OMMAS, 498.31 km is BT, 112.46 km is WBM, 503.97 km is gravel and 202.8 km is track. State needs to correct RQI length which is wrongly entered on OMMAS.

### 3. Planning Related Compliances

Equity	<p>It has been found that some blocks have been portioned a high number of proposals vis-à-vis their DRRP length, whereas some blocks with a large rural road network have been portioned no proposals.</p> <p>It was recorded the state has allocated the target at the level of political boundaries and not at the level of districts or blocks.</p> <p>It was recorded that this has led to many blocks or geographies not receiving any proposal while certain clusters have accorded a large number of targets.</p> <p>If the proposals uploaded in OMMAS for Batch-I and Batch-II are combined, 183 mandals out of 541 will not receive a single proposal. That is 33 percent of the State.</p> <p>Districts Rajanna Sircilla, Komrambheem Asifabad, Jangaon and Mancherial have the highest percentage (&gt;5%) of proposals as a percentage of the road density in the districts. At the same time, districts such as Sangareddy, Nirmal, Bhadradi Kothagudem and Jayashankar Bhoopalapally have the lowest percentage (&lt;2%) of proposals as a proportion to their rural road density.</p>																																				
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>District</th> <th>Block</th> <th>% of DRRP</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mancherial</td> <td>Bheemaram*</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Warangal</td> <td>Nadikuda</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jangaon</td> <td>Palakurthi*</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nirmal</td> <td>Dasturabad*</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Karimnagar</td> <td>Karimnagar Rural</td> <td>19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medak</td> <td>Narsingi</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rajanna Sircilla</td> <td>Veernapalli</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Komrambheem Asifabad</td> <td>Kerameri*</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nizamabad</td> <td>Balkonda</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medchal Malkajgiri</td> <td>Kapra</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rajanna Sircilla</td> <td>Vemulawada Rural</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	District	Block	% of DRRP	Mancherial	Bheemaram*	26%	Warangal	Nadikuda	21%	Jangaon	Palakurthi*	20%	Nirmal	Dasturabad*	20%	Karimnagar	Karimnagar Rural	19%	Medak	Narsingi	18%	Rajanna Sircilla	Veernapalli	18%	Komrambheem Asifabad	Kerameri*	17%	Nizamabad	Balkonda	16%	Medchal Malkajgiri	Kapra	16%	Rajanna Sircilla	Vemulawada Rural	15%
District	Block	% of DRRP																																			
Mancherial	Bheemaram*	26%																																			
Warangal	Nadikuda	21%																																			
Jangaon	Palakurthi*	20%																																			
Nirmal	Dasturabad*	20%																																			
Karimnagar	Karimnagar Rural	19%																																			
Medak	Narsingi	18%																																			
Rajanna Sircilla	Veernapalli	18%																																			
Komrambheem Asifabad	Kerameri*	17%																																			
Nizamabad	Balkonda	16%																																			
Medchal Malkajgiri	Kapra	16%																																			
Rajanna Sircilla	Vemulawada Rural	15%																																			

Above is the list of Blocks with a large number of targets as percentage of their block's rural road density.

At the same time, below is the list of Blocks which have above average rural road network density but have not been proportioned any targets.

District	Block
Nalgonda	Devarakonda
Mahabubabad	Mahabubabad
Nalgonda	Kangal
Ranga Reddy	Farooqnagar
Mahabubabad	Gudur
Nalgonda	Peddavoor
Vikarabad	Kulkacharla
Bhadradi Kothagudem	Aswaraopeta
Jogulamba Gadwal	Itikyal
Vikarabad	Vikarabad
Mahabubabad	Kuravi

The State will have minimal targets left in Batch-III and hence the state is requested to assess the allocation of targets at this level itself. This may require dropping of roads from the blocks with high level of targets and further portioning them to the remaining blocks with no targets.

**Action:** Submit an ATR affecting the current batch and the subsequent plan for the remaining batch.

**Aspirational Districts** Khamman, Jayashankar Bhoopalapally and Komrambheem Asifabad are the 3 Aspirational Districts. In **Jayashankar Bhoopalapally** the blocks aren't adequately saturated prima-facie with only 3 out of the 11 Blocks have received proposals.

**Action:** As part of the previous ATR, assess the requirement of the District to see why a high number of blocks from **Jayashankar Bhoopalapally** haven't received proposals.

**Inadequate Planning and Prioritisation** The following Blocks have not followed the guidelines for planning with regards to selecting continuous candidate roads and mapping of habitations in the 3 km area. Proposals from these block stand rejected from this Batch. The proposals will be

deleted from OMMAS and the PIU will be requested to redo habitation mapping of existing roads under the supervision of SRRDA. Further, high trace map rank roads which were rejected because they weren't merged need to be relooked.

PRE-EC took strong objection to deviation in the processes followed and requests SRRDA to ensure monitoring in-place to avoid such cases being found in the upcoming batches.

Once, the planning is sufficiently completed, fresh CUCPL will be generated and proposals have to be made with regards to that the freshly generated CUCPL.

**All the proposals from these blocks are rejected and fresh proposals to be made based on the new CUCPL generated. NRIDA will unscrutinize the proposals and SRRDA will need to delete the entries from OMMAS. Further, SRRDA may submit list of Blocks apart from this to NRIDA if they require regeneration of CUCPL on the basis of norms not being followed.**

Sr	District Name	Block name
1	Suryapet	Thunga Thurthy
2	Ranga Reddy	Ibrahimpitam
3	Ranga Reddy	Shabad
4	Ranga Reddy	Yacharam
5	Mahaboobnagar	Mahabubnagar Rural
6	Wanaparthi	Ghanpur
7	Jogulamba Gadwal	Undavelly
8	Adilabad	Utnur
9	Jangoan	Palakurthi
10	Mulugu	Mulug
11	Nirmal	Dasturabad
12	Nizamabad	Bheemgal
13	Jogulamba Gadwal	Undavelly
14	Yadadri Bhongiri	Adda Gudur
15	Rajanna Sircilla	Chandurthi
16	Karimnagar	Veenavanka

Individual Cases	Individual cases which need to be inspected:			
	District	Road	Remark	Action
	Kamareddy	T02-Gudimet	to Y Shaped	SRRDA to study the case

(Gandhari)	Panthulnaik Tanda via Karakwadi, Burgul.		vis-a-vis the DPR and ensure the actual proposal is linear.
Vikarabad (Pargi)	MRL03-Ravulapally to Polkampally via Narsaiguda	Not continuous candidate road and MDR is more than 500m	Proposal may be accepted conditional it is only of one the two parts.
Warangal (Nadikuda)	MRL03-Narlapur to Vemulapally via Varikole	Not continuous, incorrectly mapped and terminating bits	SRRDA to submit the actual alignment vis-a-vis proposal in report and decision to be taken thereafter.
Rangareddy (Shamshabad)	MRL10-Jukal Road to Muchintal via Alikole Thanda and Madhanpally	PCI=2	To be inspected by team of senior official in SRRDA to ensure DPR treatment is correct vis-a-vis pavement condition and availability of width in portions passing through village. Corrected DPR to be submitted to NRIDA for approval.
Bhadradi (Kothagudem)	T01-Mutyalampadu X road to Station Thadikalapudi		No problem with selection. Central surface may not require scarification. DPR to be checked at the SRRDA level and then submitted to NRIDA for checking after compliance.
Medchal Malkajiri (Medchal)	MRL04-Medchal to Nutankal Road via Barmajiguda, Lingapur		Same as above
Sangareddy (Nagiligidda)	T04-Road from Karasguthy PWD Road to Karnataka Border via Morgi Shapur	Y shaped proposal with part earthen and other part inter-state road	DPR to be submitted to NRIDA for scrutiny.
Inter-Block Roads and high traffic	The average block size in Telangana is small geographically. The SRRDA is requested to ensure the adequate inter-mandal/inter-block roads are being considered and not limit to intra-block/intra-mandal roads. These may be the roads		

BT roads	<p>which actually fit the objective of the program.</p> <p>It was again clarified to the SRRDA to OMMAS accepts inter-mandal candidate roads together as long as they are in the same District. Inter-District Roads need to be proposed separately or as permissible excess length with due notification to NRIDA.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The SRRDA request to PIUs to freshly assess such is requirements to strengthen/upgrade existing inter-mandal roads and thereon request NRIDA for inclusion of such roads in Candidate Roads if not already considered or unfairly rejected. NRIDA will re-open candidate roads if required by the State.</p>
Earthen Roads	<p><b>70%</b> of the proposals are either mooram, track or gravel. The percentage under Batch-1 is for other States is as follows: Rajasthan (5%), MP (3%), TN(3%) and CG(~0%). PMGSY-III is a program for consolidating <b>existing</b> rural road network and missing links are permitted as an exception and not norm. The focus of the program is to ensure existing all-weather rural road network is preserved and upgraded to ensure connectivity to the higher order facilities as targeted by the program and thereby consolidating gains from existing through routes with proven traffic. This needs to be viewed against the Unsatisfactory rating trend of 20-29% against the existing roads constructed under PMGSY as per NQM inspection reports.</p> <p>Certain Districts have only proposed fresh mooram/track/gravel roads and not taken any existing BT road for strengthening/upgradation/widening. Eg. Karimnagar, Komrambheem Asifabad, Nagarkurnool, Narayanpet, Peddapalli and Warangal Urban have not proposed a single BT road.</p> <p>Eg. Wanaparthi (Ghanpur) road proposed runs parallel to an existing BT road and doesn't prima-facie provide additional gains vis-a-vis proving new connectivity.</p> <p>Mahaboobnagar (Mahaboobnagar Rural) MRL01 two parallel tracks are being converted to BT – whereas one may be sufficient.</p> <p>Many of these virgin connectivity proposals further have been accorded traffic category which preliminarily don't seem to be proportional to requirement.</p> <p>Further small tracks may have been added unnecessary links to be fit into PMGSY-III's eligibility.</p> <p><b>Prima-facie, all the proposals belong to this category not accepted under PMGSY-III.</b></p> <p>SRRDA has to review every single road proposed at this level through GIS/Satellite/PIU Inputs and pre-emptively drop the proposals which don't meet the objective of the programme or routes which are not part of existing Through Routes/Major Rural Links. A tabulated case against each road accepted will be required and certified by Senior Officers in Department. <b>Only exceptional earthen Through Routes/MRL proposals meeting programme guidelines may be</b></p>

	<p><b>considered.</b> For example, small short-cuts, parallel routes to existing BT routes, routes catering to small population etc will not meet the objectives. The case by case consolidated report on the importance of proposed gravel/mooram/track roads will be signed off by CE, SRRDA.</p> <p>Further, these proposals will be on sample analyzed at the level of STANQM and 100% by NRIDA. At the same time, SRRDA is requested to ensure important existing BT roads in each District are being covered in CUCPL such that the space created by removing ineligible earthen proposals is utilized in consolidating existing BT roads.</p>
Quality Checks SRRDA	The SRRDA is requested to ensure the proposals remaining in the upcoming Batch are inspected on GIS to weed out issues of proposed lengths, T/Y shapes etc.
Skipping of Roads	<p>“Land availability” is the most common reason against exclusion of roads. Details provided against these exclusions have not found to be satisfactory.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> SRRDA has to compile the exact reasoning in detailed manner and ensure the reasons provided for excluding the road match the ground reality.</p>
e-MARG	Payments need to be made for one package in all the Districts in the State before EC.

#### 4. Common issues

- i. State should reconcile the sanction details on OMMAS as per clearance letters for the year 2000-01, 2001-02, 2003-04, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 & 2010-11.
- ii. State needs to provide mandatory certificates prescribed for PMGSY-III.
- iii. 21 roads are having average cost more than 80 Lakhs/km for 3.75 m carriageway width. Site verification report of CE/SE needs to be provided with detailed justifications.
- iv. Around 60% of the roads proposed from earthen surface which indicates that the selection of candidate roads questionable.
- v. 3rd party traffic verification as per IRC guidelines needs to be provided by the State for traffic considered more than 1 MSA.
- vi. State needs to ensure that the required land width is available to provide 9 m top width as per IRC guidelines. The roads proposed with 5.50 m carriageway width do not qualify based on PCU consideration (TS16PAIII A11, TS08KAIII A31)
- vii. Earthwork quantity is on higher side. It cannot be verified without L & X section drawings.
- viii. Test results for GSB materials not attached with the DPRs.
- ix. In many DPRs, state has proposed GSB rate more than Rs. 2500/cum by using 65% metal. In some DPRs state proposed GSB rate as Rs. 1,900/cum by using stone dust (52.5%). To make the design economical, it is preferable to go for GSB with 52.5% stone dust.
- x. Agency area allowance for labours at the rate of 25% included in the rate analysis needs to be deleted.
- xi. Road safety Audit report needs to be attached with the DPRs.



- xii. Roads proposed with 7 m carriageway and Bituminous Concrete (BC) for low volume roads, the pro-rata cost beyond 5.50 m carriageway and difference in cost of PC&SC and BC (TS17GHIIIA02) should come from the State share.
- xiii. Bituminous Macadam (BM) proposed in majority of the roads where the traffic is less than T8, which is against IRC:SP:72:2015.
- xiv. CC pavement should be proposed in habitation area only. Higher length of CC pavement proposed i.e. more than 15% length. In some DPRs, CC road is proposed on existing good condition BT road. (e.g. TS12BHIIIA01, TS08KAIIIA31)
- xv. As per MoRD data book, tractor with grader required for 0.5 hrs only but in rate analysis of all DPRs, 4hrs is considered. Hence, material used for embankment obtained from borrows pits and lead up to 1km, rate analysis needs to be corrected.

## 5. DPR Issues

- i. L and X section drawings attached with the DPRs are not legible.
- ii. Provision made in the DPRs with carted earth for construction of sub grade. However, the pavement has not been designed based on proposed sub-grade CBR (e.g. TS24CHIIIA04).
- iii. Traffic seems to be overestimated. In some DPRs, traffic considered for design of Pavements is different from the traffic survey report attached. (TS12LOIIIA05)
- iv. Width of Base course should be restricted to proposed carriageway width only. (e.g. TS12BHIIIA01 extra width is considered).
- v. Carriageway width for CC pavement needs to be restricted to 3.75m and 5.5m for single lane and intermediate lane respectively. (TS01GUIIIA13)
- vi. As per IRC: SP: 76-2008, wherever existing pavement surface is CC, white topping could be proposed from 120mm to 150mm depending upon the intensity of the cracks in the existing surface. Also in some DPR, mild steel mesh over the existing CC pavement proposed which is only required for heavy traffic roads (>1500 CVPD) hence needs to be removed.
- vii. Pavement quantities of existing & proposed bridges, RCC culverts portions have not been deducted from the total pavement quantity. Needs to be deducted.
- viii. Overlay thickness over existing BT layer should be proposed as per Clause 2.2.3 of IRC: SP:72:2015. The State has removed entire crust and constructed right from sub grade construction (e.g. TS12BHIIIA01, TS12LOIIIA05 and TS16PAIIIA11), which is not acceptable.
- ix. As the State has proposed BM of 50 mm thickness, the tack coat proposed on primed granular surface should be deleted as per DO letter no. NRRDA-PO14 (11)/1/2018-JD (Tech) dated 23.03.2018.

State has submitted incomplete proforma C signed by STA where CBR has not been mentioned, Post 5 year Maintenance not considered, Checklist Not filled etc.

## 6. Status of Marketing Reforms

Out of 9 reforms, state has completed 6 reforms namely Declaring warehouse/cold storages as deemed market, Private wholesale market, Direct Marketing, E-trading, Single unified trading license, Singles point levy of market fee. State should comply with rest of the reforms before sanctioning of the proposals.

## 7. Maintenance

State has proposed Rs 5,113.05 lakhs (5.38% of Construction Cost) for 5 years Routine Maintenance and Rs 16,516.19 lakhs (17.37% of Construction Cost) for 6<sup>th</sup> year's renewal to be borne by State Govt. State was advised to increase the 5 years Routine Maintenance cost to 6 to 6.5% and 6<sup>th</sup> year's renewal cost to 18 to 20%. State should also include 5 years routine maintenance cost after 6<sup>th</sup> year's renewal. State has to propose separate maintenance head in the State Budget as pre-requisite of PMGSY III.

## 8. R&D technology

Committee has agreed to the State's proposal of 147.12 km (11.17%) under Technology with IRC Specification (Mainstreaming of Technology) and 255.07 km (19.36%) under IRC Accredited Materials/Technologies. DPRs prepared using IRC Accredited materials needs to be verified at NRIDA at least one in each technology. State should specify the name of technology to be adopted for 23 roads proposed under R&D without specifying the name of technology.

## 9. Progress of PMGSY works

### Roads

S. No	SCHEME	SANCTIONED		COMPLETED		BALANCE ROAD LENGTH (Km)	UNAWARDED BALANCE LENGTH (Km)
		Nos.	LENGTH (Km)	Nos.	LENGTH (Km)		
1	PMGSY I	2,924	10,191.85	2,814	9,639.93	343.01 (110 Nos.)	43.17 (7 Nos.)
2.	PMGSY-II	114	944.075	113	894.541	2.91 (1 No.)	-
3.	RCPLWE	60	705.21	01	132.30	572.15 (59)	253.84 (40 Nos.)

### Bridges

S.No	SCHEME	SANCTIONED (NOs.)	COMPLETED (NOs.)	BALANCE (NOs.)	UNAWARDED (NOs.)
1	PMGSY I	284	251	33	02
2.	PMGSY-II	17	16	01	-
3.	RCPLWE	34	-	34	16

## Habitation Coverage

Category	Eligible Habitations	Habitations Cleared	Habitations Connected	% of Habitations Connected w.r.t cleared
250+	767	595	592	99.50
100-249	181	109	76	69.72
<b>Total:</b>	<b>948</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>94.89%</b>

State should expedite the progress on balance works in hand and complete the remaining habitation coverage and length within the targeted time period. Works of more than four years old which are no longer feasible may be proposed for dropping by the State.

## Maintenance under DLP – Financial (As per Manual Report)

Year (s)	Amount required as per Contract	Amount Credited in account of SRRDA	Amount Utilized by SRRDA	% Expenditure w.r.t maintenance funds Required	Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections ( Under DLP )		
					Total Nos.	“U” Nos.	U %
2014-15	12.38	6.42	5.46	44%	0	0	0.00%
2015-16	5.71	5.71	1.32	23%	7	1	14.29%
2016-17	5.28	5.28	1.24	22%	24	5	20.83%
2017-18	4.67	0.00	3.20	69%	30	6	20.00%
2018-19	12.49	0.00	2.45	20%	21	12	57.17%
<b>2019-20 (4.3.20)</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9.62%</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>44.47</b>	<b>17.41</b>	<b>16.46</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>21.64%</b>

State has not uploaded renewal length and expenditure on OMAAS against the renewal target of 9002 km since 2014-15 under Post Defect Liability Period (DLP). State was advised to update OMMAS at the earliest.

### 10. Status of Schedule of Rates (SoR)

SoR for 2015-16 has been approved for the State. For 2019-20, Observation has been sent to State and compliance is awaited.

### 11. e-MARG Status

There are total 32 workable packages and only 10 have been locked, out of this only 5 have made Manual Entry of expenditure and payment made only for one district. State was advised to ensure payments in all districts with locked packages that are getting proposals in the first batch by the time of EC and all workable packages be locked.

### 12. Quality Control

Out of 148 no. of ongoing packages, labs have not been established in 50 packages and 44 of them are of more than 6 months. Out of 540 completed and ongoing works, 60 have not been inspected by SQM. Out of 181 contractors' works, works of 13 contractors have not been inspected by NQMs even once. 6 ATRs against completed work and 22 ATRs against ongoing work are pending with state which needs to be submitted by the State immediately. Unsatisfactory grading in the maintenance works is high at 29.06 % which should be improved on priority.