

## 9. BACK TO BACK TIE UP / AWARD ON NOMINATION BASIS

- (a) Back to Back Tie up by PSUs - instructions regarding (No. 06-03-02-CTE-34 Dated 20<sup>th</sup> Oct 2003) Page-1
- (b) Transparency in Works/Purchase/Consultancy contracts Awarded in nomination basis (No. 005//CRD/19 Dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2006) Page-2
- (c) Transparency in Works/Purchase/Consultancy contracts Awarded on nomination basis (No. 005//CRD/19 Dated 5<sup>th</sup> July 2007) Page-3
- (d) Transparency in Works/Purchase/Consultancy (005//CRD/19 dated 19.05.2010) Page-4

## 9. BACK TO BACK TIE UP / AWARD ON NOMINATION BASIS

### (a) Back to Back Tie up by PSUs- instructions regarding

It has been observed during intensive examination of various works/contracts awarded by construction PSUs on back to back basis that the works are being awarded in an ad-hoc and arbitrary manner without inviting tenders and ascertaining the performance, capability and experience of the tenderers. In some cases, the works were awarded on single tender basis/limited tender basis though sufficient time was available with the Organisation to invite open tenders.

2. Some of the common irregularities/lapses observed during the examination of works were as under:

- a) No transparency in selection of contractor for the back to back tie up which is the main source of corruption.
- b) Collusion among the contractors was observed where more than one contractor was involved at various stages.
- c) Ineligible contractor obtains the contract through the PSUs.
- d) Purchase preference misused by the PSUs.
- e) PSUs sublet the complete work to a private contractor without obtaining permission from the client which invariably put a condition insisting such permission since the client is generally not interested in such back to back sublet of the work.
- f) Infertuous work (to the exchequer) due to the involvement of intermediary PSUs and cost of project goes up ultimately.
- g) No supervision by the PSU as they put the staff mainly for coordination work.
- h) Quality ultimately suffers due to lack of supervision by the PSUs.

3. Commission is of the view that the practice of award of works to PSUs on nomination basis by Govt. of India/PSUs needs to be reviewed forthwith.

4. The irregularities observed during intensive examination of work and difficulties being faced by the PSUs in inviting tenders were considered and it has been decided that the procedure to be followed for award of work by Construction PSUs shall be authorized by taking into account the following points:

a) PSUs (when bag the contract from the client Department) as a contractor, has to execute the work by functioning like a contractor instead of sub-letting the 100% work on back to back basis.

b) Open tenders to be invited for selection of sub-contractors as far as possible.

c) In case, it is not possible to invite open tenders, selection should be carried out by inviting limited tenders from the panel approved in the following manner. Panel of contractors are to be prepared for different categories monetary limits, regions, in a transparent manner clearly publishing the eligibility criteria etc. The above panel is to be updated every year.

d) Tenders to be opened confidentially by a high level committee to maintain the secrecy of rates, if required. Tender opening register should be maintained in this regard duly signed by the officers opening the tender and kept confidentially. This should be available for perusal when required by audit/ vigilance.

e) The terms and conditions of the contract of the client especially those pertaining to subletting of works should be strictly adhered to by the PSUs.

f) Adequate staff to be deployed by the PSUs to ensure quality in construction etc.

g) The record of enlistment/updation of contractor and tender opening register shall be produced to the CTEO as well as audit officials when demanded for scrutiny.

h) It is, therefore, suggested that the procedure for award of work on back to back basis be authorized by keeping in view the above points and circulated amongst the concerned officials of your authorized for strict compliance in future works.

(No. 06-03-02-CTE-34 Dated 20<sup>th</sup> Oct 2003)

(b) Transparency in Works/Purchase/Consultancy contracts awarded on nomination basis

The Commission had, in it's OM No. 06-03-02-CTE-34 dated 20.10.2003 on back to back tie up by PSUs, desired that the practice of award of works to PSUs on nomination basis by Govt. of India/PSUs needed to be reviewed forthwith. It is observed that in a number of cases, Works/Purchase/Consultancy contracts are awarded on nomination basis. There is a need to bring greater transparency and accountability in award of such contracts. While open tendering is the most preferred mode of tendering, even in the case of limited tendering, the Commission has been insisting upon transparency in the preparation of panel.

2. In the circumstances, if sometimes award of contract on nomination basis by the PSUs become inevitable, the Commission strongly feels that the following points should be strictly observed.

- (i) All works awarded on nomination basis should be brought to the notice of the Board of the respective PSUs for scrutiny and vetting post facto.
- (ii) The reports relating to such awards will be submitted to the Board every quarter.
- (iii) The audit committee may be required to check at least 10% of such cases.

(No.005/CRD/19 Dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2006)

(c) Transparency in Works / Purchase / Consultancy Contracts awarded on nomination basis.

Reference is invited to the Commission's circular No.15/5/06 (issued vide letter No.005/CRD/19 dated 9.5.2006), wherein the need for award of contracts in a transparent and open manner has been emphasized.

2. A perusal of the queries and references pertaining to this circular, received from various organizations, indicates that several of them believe that mere post-facto approval of the Board is sufficient to award a contracts on nomination basis rather than the inevitability of the situation, as emphasized in the circular.

3. It is needless to state that tendering process or public auction is a basic requirement for the award of contract by any Government agency as any other method, especially award of contract on nomination basis, would amount to a breach of Article 14 of the Constitution guaranteeing right to equality, which implies right to equality to all interested parties.

4. A relevant extract from the recent Supreme Court of India judgement in the case of Nagar Nigam, Meerut Vs A1 Faheem Meat Export Pvt. Ltd. [arising out of SLP(civil) No.10174 of 2006] is reproduced below to reinforce this point.

"The law is well-settled that contracts by the State, its corporations, instrumentalities and agencies must be normally granted through public auction/public tender by inviting tenders from eligible persons and the notifications of the public-auction or inviting tenders should be advertised in well known dailies having wide circulation in the locality with all relevant details such as date, time and place of auction, subject matter of auction, technical specifications, estimated cost, earnest money deposit, etc. The award of Government contracts through public-auction/public tender is to ensure transparency in the public procurement, to maximize economy and efficiency in Government procurement, to promote healthy competition among the tenderers, to provide for fair and equitable treatment of all tenderers, and to eliminate irregularities, interference and corrupt practices by the authorities concerned. This is required by Article 14 of the Constitution. However, in rare and exceptional cases, for instance, during natural calamities and emergencies declared by the Government; where the procurement is possible from a single source only; where the supplier or contractor has exclusive rights in respect of the goods or services and no reasonable alternative or substitute exists; where the

auction was held on several dates but there were no bidders or the bids offered were too low, etc., this normal rule may be departed from and such contracts may be awarded through 'private negotiations'."

(Copy of the full judgement is available on the web-site of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, i.e., [www.supremecourtindia.nic.in](http://www.supremecourtindia.nic.in) )

5. The Commission advises all CVOs to formally appraise their respective Boards/managements of the above observations as well as the full judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court for necessary observance. A confirmation of the action taken in this regard may be reflected in the CVO's monthly report.

6. Further, all nomination/single tender contracts be posted on the website ex post-facto.

(No.005/CRD/19 Dated 5<sup>th</sup> Jul 2007 )

**(d)** Transparency in Works/ Purchase/Consultancy contracts awarded on Nomination basis.

Commission vide Circular No. 15/5/06 dated 09/05/2006 had prescribed certain measures to be followed on works/purchase/consultancy contracts awarded on nomination basis by PSUs. These instructions have since been reviewed in the Commission and The Commission is of the view that the Board of the PSU is not required to scrutinize or post facto vet the actions of the operational managers and their decisions to award work on nomination basis.

2 Therefore, the following amendment is being made in sub-para (i) of para of 2 of Commission's above circular:-

"All works awarded on nomination basis should be brought to the notice of the board of the respective PSUs for scrutiny and vetting post facto".

Read as

"All works awarded on nomination basis should be brought to the notice of the board of the respective PSUs for information". (CVC Circular No. 19/05/10 issued vide letter No.005/CRD/19 ( part ) dated:- 19<sup>th</sup>May 2010)