

Central University of Punjab, Bathinda

Ref. No.: EUPB/CC/VC/12/BAC

Date: 4.10.2012

Proceedings of the meeting of Building Advisory Committee held on 4.10.2012 in the Conference Room, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda to discuss the progress regarding the preparation of Master Plan of the University by M/s C.P. Kukreja Associates.

The following members are present

1. Ar. Charanjit Singh
2. Ar. S.L. Kaushal
3. Er. A.N. Chowdhary
4. Prof. P. Ramarao
5. Prof. R.G. Saini
6. Prof. P. S. Ramana
7. Er. G.S. Sra
8. Col. (Retd.) Jagdev Kartar Singh

Ar. Subhash Kapoor and Mr. Rajesh Pandita, the representatives of M/s C.P. Kukreja Associates came to make the presentations in front of the committee and Ar. Subhash Kapoor made the presentation regarding the progress about the Master Plan. Mr. Kapoor started the presentation with the remark "that the requirements of the university have been changed and information on the entrance to the campus was never provided to them till now".

His arguments were countered by providing various evidences (CD, email and other details which were sent to all the original competitors and also to M/s C.P. Kukreja). To this Ar. Kapoor admitted that he was not aware of these and showed his ignorance over the fact that even their Firm had earlier submitted two models showing the defined entrance corridor. He further admitted that he visited the site of the main campus for the first time on 3rd October 2012 to acquaint himself with the contours of the site.

Ar. Kapoor presented three bubble diagrams of very primitive nature which were similar to the ones sent earlier by him through email on 28th September 2012 and these clearly indicated that neither the site plan, the site topography nor the client's brief had been taken into consideration. The Firm failed to provide before the committee any evidence in support of any progress towards the preparation of Master Plan.

The committee also observed that

1. It has become a routine practice of the Architect Consultant to resort to his old tactics of blaming the University to cover up his short comings. The way the Firm has been corresponding with the University on various occasions is not in good taste and the University has repeatedly informed the Firm of the same in writing.
2. During the Building Advisory Committee meeting held on 10.07.2012 at New Delhi to discuss the draft MOU, with M/S C.P. Kukreja Associates, the Firm was clearly informed that the University has done lot of spade work by calling expert committees to refine the requirements of the university and that the Firm should come and discuss these to incorporate in the Master Plan. These refinements though essential in no way changed any basic requirement of the University as defined in Client's Brief. However, M/s C.P. Kukreja Associates never consulted the university for these inputs.

Ar. Charanjit Singh
Ar. S.L. Kaushal
Prof. P. Ramarao

Prof. R.G. Saini
Prof. P. S. Ramana
Er. G.S. Sra
Col. (Retd.) Jagdev Kartar Singh
(23)

Ar. Subhash Kapoor
Mr. Rajesh Pandita

Ar. Subhash Kapoor
4.10.

Prof. P. Ramarao
Prof. R.G. Saini
Prof. P. S. Ramana
Er. G.S. Sra
Col. (Retd.) Jagdev Kartar Singh
11/11/12 (18)


3. On 27th July 2012 in a meeting called by the University, details about the draft MoU were discussed with the M/s C.P. Kukreja and they were advised to start the work as per the draft MoU already approved by the statutory bodies of the University. The Firm was again reminded that the University has done lot of spade work by calling expert committees to refine the requirements of the university (as mentioned in Serial No. 2). The Firm agreed to comply but after going back the Firm sent purported minutes of the meeting prepared by them which was not the prerogative of the Firm.
4. As per the MoU signed on 22nd August 2012, the Architect Consultant was to provide three alternatives of the Master Plan within two months from the issue of letter of award. Since nothing was heard from the architect consultant till 20th September 2012, the University wrote a letter showing concern about the delay towards achieving the target. And, consequently this meeting was convened.


The committee is of the opinion that the M/s C.P. Kukreja should be conveyed serious concern of the university and be informed that:


- i. The Architect Consultant is taking the assignment very casually.
- ii. The Firm should clearly state name of the nodal officer (Chief Architect).
- iii. As required under Clause 3.2 of MoU, the overall project schedule has not been submitted by the Firm. Therefore, the monitoring could not be done. The Firm be asked to submit it immediately.
- iv. Time schedule mentioned in Clause 5 of MoU is not being followed. Only a period of three weeks is left and it is very doubtful that the work can be completed within the defined time schedule.


The concern of the University was made clear to the representatives of M/s C.P. Kukreja who had come for presentation. It was made clear that if the dead line is not met no alternative shall be left with the university than to take action under Clause 10 and Clause 15.2 and 15.3 of the contract agreement.



Ar. Charanjit Singh 4/10/12
Member


Ar. S.L. Kaushal
Member


Mr. A. N. Chowdhary
Member


Prof. P. Ramarao
Member


Prof. R.G. Saini 4/10/2012
Member


Prof. P. S. Ramana
Member


Er. Gurtej Singh Sra
Member


4/10/12
Col. (Retd) Jagdev Kartar Singh
Member