

Lr. # NRRDA-PO11(11)/2/2021-Dir(Tech)
National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency
Ministry of Rural Development, GoI

Date: 10.06.2022

To,
All Engineer-in-Chief/ Chief Engineers, SRRDAs,
All STAs & PTAs.

Subject: PMGSY-III – Scrutiny of DPRs by PTAs – scrutiny format -
Regarding.

Sir/ Madam,

Principal Technical Agencies (PTAs) are premier technical institutions with comprehensive knowledge of the technology of road design and construction. PTAs are expected to oversee the activities of the State Technical Agencies (STAs) in the region and advise/ assist in resolving issues that may arise at the time of the scrutiny of Project Proposals of the States.

As per PMGSY guidelines, PTAs are expected to scrutinize at least 10% of the DPRs scrutinized by STAs on a sample basis to identify systemic issues. This scrutiny will be carried out parallel to the approval process and this will be used mainly to improve the quality of DPRs and to guide the STAs/ PIUs to use new materials/ technologies and locally available materials in the DPRs to construct cost-effective and durable roads.

It is to inform you that NRIDA had circulated an updated DPR template for the preparation of DPRs of road works, Proforma C for scrutiny of DPRs of Road works, and Proforma C for scrutiny of DPRs of Bridgeworks as per PMGSY-III guidelines for the use of PIUs and STA vide letter no. NRRDA-PO14(17)/3/2019-Dir (Tech) (EFMS No. 368200) dated 18.11.2019. In continuation, the updated scrutiny formats for the use of PTAs for road and bridge works proposed under PMGSY-III have been prepared and enclosed.

It is requested to kindly arrange to send these updated PTA scrutiny formats to all the PIUs and empanelled DPR consultants of the State. PTAs are requested to make use of these formats while scrutinizing the DPRs of roads and bridges under PMGSY-III with immediate effect. After signing, the format should be scanned and uploaded on OMMAS by the respective PIUs along with the STA signed Proforma C under the proposal module. PTAs are requested to ensure that the PTA signed format is uploaded on OMMAS in the proposal module while doing online scrutiny on OMMAS.

Enclosure: As above



(B. C. Pradhan)
Director (Technical)
Tel No: 26716930

Copy to Empowered Officer, SRRDA, all States.
Copy to PPS to JS (RC) & DG, NRIDA for kind information, please

To be Filled by the PTA- For Roads		
Name of the PTA:		
Name of the STA who scrutinised the DPR:		
Road Name :		
Package No. :		
Length of Road (km):		
Cost of road after STA scrutiny (Rs in Lakhs) :		
Sl No	Description	To be filled by PTA (Yes/No)
1.	Is the proposal entered on the OMMAS with adequate details?	
2.	Is the transect walk summary provided in the DPR along with geo-tagged photographs taken at every 100m interval and/or at important changes in features?	
3.	In case of upgradation projects, whether inventory of the existing road, Existing pavement details including construction history, Cross Drainage structures, and protection works provided in the DPR?	
4.	Whether the prescribed Proforma C has been properly filled up by the concerned PIU / STA. If not, comment please.	
5.	Are you satisfied with the	
a.	Subgrade Soil Investigation Report Have all the four necessary tests on subgrade soil been conducted at specified frequencies, and results presented? If Not, comment:	
b.	Whether Traffic Survey Report and the design traffic recommended for the pavement design are in order? If Not, comment:	
c.	Whether Traffic survey using ATCC and Axle load survey have been carried out if design traffic is more than 1 MSA? Have these reports been reviewed by STA?	
d.	Whether Pavement Design has been carried out as per IRC SP:72 (2015) for flexible pavement and IRC SP:62 (2014) for rigid pavement? If Not, comment:	
e.	Location & Design of CD Works (Supported by photographs, L and X section drawings) If Not, comment:	
f.	Whether provision of Protection Works and lined Drains has been supported by photographs and justified through adequate data (levels, location, site survey drawings, etc) If Not, comment:	
g.	Different types of Drawings are appended to DPR (Plan, L-Sec, CD Works, Junction, Road Furniture, Protection work etc.)? If Not, comment:	
6.	a. Whether any New Technology or New Material usage proposed? If yes, the name of the New Technology/ Material _____	

	b. Whether the requisite test results (for the new technology / material) approved by the competent authority of State is attached for New technology work?	
7.	a. Whether Road Safety Audit has been Carried out and report enclosed with DPR? b. Whether PIU has enclosed 'Action Taken Report' on Road Safety Audit Report? c. Any Comments on Road safety Audit Report or Action Taken Report?	
8.	Major deficiencies found in the DPR during scrutiny and suggestions given	
9.	Have you satisfied with the compliance submitted and corrections made by the PIU?	
10.	Are you satisfied with the overall scrutiny done by the STA? If Not, comment:	
11.	Project cost approved by PTA after scrutiny (Rs in Lakhs)	
12.	Any Other Comments/ Suggestions for Improvement of DPR	

Scrutinised by

**Signature
Name:
Member (PTA)**

**Signature
Name:
Co-ordinator (PTA)**

To be Filled by the PTA		
Name of the PTA:		
Name of the STA scrutinised the DPR:		
Name of the Road:		
Name and location of the Bridge:		
Pkg. No. :		
Cost of Bridge as per STA scrutiny (Rs in Lakhs) :		
Total Length of the Bridge: _____ m Span Arrangement: _____ Type of Foundation: _____ Type of Super Structure: _____		
SI No	Description	To be filled by PTA (Yes/No)
1.	Is the Proposal entered in the OMMAS with adequate details?	
2.	Is the bridge location appropriate as per the photographs provided in the DPR?	
3.	Whether the prescribed Proforma C has been properly filled up by the concerned PIU / STA. If not, comment please.	
4.	<i>Are you satisfied with the</i>	
a.	Sub-Soil Investigation Report If Not, comment: (Please examine adequacy of boreholes made, sub-soil sampling and testing)	
b.	Hydraulic Calculations (Toposheet should be attached) If Not, comment: (Please examine HFL and flood return period considered, whether topography of the catchment area has been properly taken into account, etc)	
c.	Foundation type and depth If Not, comment: (Please examine design of foundation, sufficiency of scour protection measures, etc)	
d.	Span Arrangement If No, comment: (Vertical clearance, number of spans, diameter of pipes, etc)	

e.	Drawings (L-Sec, Plan, GAD and Structural drawings and detailing, etc.) If Not, comment:	
f.	Structural design If Not, comment: (Whether IRC Guidelines have been properly followed or not to be examined)	
5.	Whether a Joint (by STA & SE or SE & CE) Site Inspection Report (Format as per NRRDA Circular No H-11020/2/2012-Tech dated 25 Oct 2012) is provided in the DPR?	
6.	(a) Are the provisions made by PIU and recommended by STA are sufficient & essential from economy point of view. If not, comment	
	(b). Are you satisfied with the overall scrutiny done by the STA? If Not, comment:	
7.	Major deficiencies found in the DPR during PTA scrutiny and suggestions given	
8.	Have you satisfied with the compliance submitted and corrections made by the PIU after PTA Scrutiny?	
9.	Project cost approved by PTA after scrutiny (Rs in Lakhs)	
10.	Any Other Comments/ Suggestions for Improvement of DPR	

Scrutinised by

Signature
Name:
Member (PTA)

Signature
Name:
Co-ordinator (PTA)