

**VIGILANCE DEPARTMENT**  
**New Delhi Municipal Council**  
**Palika Kendra, New Delhi**

26. 2718/vij./Imp./TC-I/14

Dated:- 28/11/14

**Minutes of meeting regarding "Finalisation of Pre-Contract Integrity Pact" agreement and discussion of cases.**

**Title** : Meeting with IEMs regarding  
"Pre-Contract Integrity Pact &  
discussion of tender cases".

**Date:** 19<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2014

**In-time** : 3:30 P.M.

**Venue:** Council Room, NDMC.

**Out-time** : 4:30 P.M.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

| S. No. | IEMs                  | NDMC Members    | Designation/Organization              |
|--------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1.     | Sh. V.K. Gupta<br>IEM | Sh. S.K. Arora  | Jt. Director (Vigilance)              |
| 2.     |                       | Sh. A.W. Ansari | Dy. Director (Vigilance)              |
| 3.     |                       | HOD's           | Concerned HOD's from concerned Deptt. |

In continuation to earlier meeting, another meeting was held in the Council Room on dated 19<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2014 at 3:30 PM with Independent External Monitor (IEM) and HODs of Civil, Electrical & IT Deptt. and GA Department, regarding " Execution of works/procurement of threshold value Rs. 50 Lacs or above & related other works" and the following points were deliberated upon during the session:

1. In the meeting, it was observed that only limited no. of HODs were having list of works executed for threshold value of Rs.50 lacs and above but soft copy was not provided except Electricity Deptt.
2. IEMs have also observed that the correct agreement is not being attached with the NITs. Moreover, a special condition in Form 6 of NIT/RFP linking IP agent & giving names of IEMs is not being given. Without link, the IP agreement may not be usually binding. He advised, all present in the meeting to take note of it & ensure compliance.
3. The matter of replacement of HPSV fitting with LED fitting of Street Light tender was also discussed with the CE (E-I), CE (E-II) and Director (Projects). It

*[Signature]*  
28/11/2014



was decided that CE's Elect/Director (Projects) be requested to examine the following and work out:

- The compulsion of awarding the work on nomination basis without calling tenders vis a vis CVC guidelines/directions on the subject. Whether any exercise has been done to ascertain the availability of vendors/competition.
  - When IP has not been signed with main vendor by NDMC, IP can not be signed with sub-vendors. Once IP is signed with main vendor, the entire procurement procedure of vendor would need scrutiny, to ensure transparency, including the pre qualification criteria, the evaluation criteria and the specifications of luminaires etc.
  - It would be advisable to call the reputed manufacturers as well as local manufacturers to present their products for testing and preliminary evaluation and then taking up a pilot project using such preferred luminaires to determine actual power savings, their efficacy in power fluctuations/spikes/surge, illumination levels, comfort/discomfort to users, and other parameters etc.
  - Do we have any other option than to replace all the street lights in one go? Is there enough justification and need? Can it be done in phases ?
  - What would happen to existing lights – financial implications – storage problems till disposal – damages during handling and storage etc. To avoid any controversy would it not be advisable to go in phases. The existing lamps would also complete their life cycles by then. The experience gained in Phase 1 shall be useful for phase II and so on. NDMC may get advantage of added competition and new innovations/ new technology for every new phase.
  - Replacement: If NDMC go for total replacement in one go, it will have to incur huge capital expenditure once again when all the lamps would complete their life cycles at the same time. In phases the replacement cost would be manageable.
  - Maintenance: The annual cost of AMC after initial five years, dependence on OEM etc. may be examined.
  - The effect of voltage fluctuation, surge, temperature, weather, rains, dust storms etc on such lamps also be examined.
  - Possibility of thefts, being costly fittings.
  - Actual data and experience of others in surrounding areas having similar weather conditions.
4. IEMs shown displeasure with the HODs due to non-compliance of MOMs and not providing the tender/work details more than 50 Lacs and it was advised to submit the same.
5. It was also desired that the progress report of the work may also be uploaded on the web portal of NDMC which was created and shown in the Council Room in the presence of IEMs in earlier meetings.
6. The detail of the works submitted to Vigilance Deptt. Should be routed through HODs of the Deptt. along with the date and signature in the prescribed format atleast 3 days before the commencement of the meeting.
7. On dated 13.11.2014 certain cases were also discussed with IEM in the Chamber of Director (Vigilance), wherein Sh. Gauri Shankar, EE (RIP), was also called for discussion related to tender floated by him. The following points were discussed:

  
25/11/2014

Mechanical Sweeping: The concerned EE accepted that IP agreement was not included in the tender document at the time of loading on the e portal. However the same has been included now, after the pre bid meeting.

He further clarified that tender is only for 3 months, it was erroneously mentioned 3 years at one place in the tender documents, the same has been corrected now.

EE was advised to bring the tender document to verify whether names of IEMs have been given in the tender document or not. It was found that names of IEMs and their email id was not mentioned anywhere in the NIT. He was advised to add one additional clause under heading Integrity Pact and the same was dictated to him. He promised to add this additional clause now.

8. It was observed by the IEMs that all SEs/EEs are still not aware that a new clause for IP is to be inserted in form 6 of NIT/RFP mentioning the names of IEMs and their email id in addition to IP agreement.
9. It was advised by the IEMs that a fresh circular be issued in continuation of earlier circulars giving clear directions for action to be taken in respect of tenders of Rs 50 L and above. A draft be prepared and shown to IEMs before issue to bring clarity.
10. Further, it was also advised that it would be advisable that in next few meetings, in addition to HOD's their SEs/EEs/JDs/DDs may also be called in the meeting so that they be once again explained the requirements of IP.

Meeting ended with thanks to Chair and all the participants.

  
25/11/2014

**(S.K. Arora)**

Jt. Director (Vigilance)