Circular No. 02/01/2017

Subject: Adoption of Integrity Pact – Revised Standard Operating Procedure – regarding.

The Commission has reviewed the Standard Operating Procedure for adoption of Integrity Pact issued vide Circular No. 10/5/09 dated 18.5.2009 and has formulated a revised Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for adoption of Integrity Pact in Government Departments / Organisations. A copy of the same is enclosed for information and necessary action.

1. All Secretaries of Ministries/Departments.
2. All CMDs/Heads of CPSUs/Public Sector Banks/Organisations.
3. All CVOs of Ministries/Departments/ CPSUs/Public Sector Banks/Organisations.

(J.Vinod Kumar)
Director
1.0 **Background**

1.1 In order to ensure transparency, equity and competitiveness in public procurement, the Commission has been recommending the concept of Integrity Pact (IP) for adoption and implementation by Government organizations.

1.2 CVC through its office orders No. 41/12/07 dated 04.12.2007 and 43/12/07 dated 28.12.2007 as well as Circulars No. 18/05/08 dated 19.05.2008 and Circular No. 24/08/08 dated 05.08.2008 recommended adoption of Integrity Pact to all the organizations and provided basic guidelines for its implementation in respect of major procurements in Government Organisations. A Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) was issued by the Commission vide order No. 10/5/09 dated 18.05.2009. The Commission issued clarifications regarding the appointment, tenure and eligibility criteria of IEMs vide Circular dated 11.8.2009 and 19.4.2010. The review system for IEMs was modified vide circular dated 13.8.2010 and clarification regarding tenure of IEMs was issued by the Commission vide its circular dated 23.7.2012.

1.3 Deptt. of Expenditure vide OM dt. 19.7.2011, issued guidelines to all Ministries/Departments/Organizations including their attached/subordinate offices and autonomous bodies for implementation of IP. Also, vide OM dated 20.7.2011 Deptt. of Expenditure requested Department of Public Enterprises for directions to Central Public Sector Enterprises for use of IP.

1.4 Further, in view of the increasing procurement activities of Public Sector Banks (PSBs), Insurance Companies (ICs) and Financial Institutions (FIs), the Commission vide Circular No. 02/02/2015 dated 25.02.2015 advised that all PSBs, PSICs and FIs shall also adopt and implement the Integrity Pact.

2.0 **Integrity Pact**

2.1 The Pact essentially envisages an agreement between the prospective vendors/bidders and the buyer, committing the persons/officials of both sides, not to resort to any corrupt practices in any aspect/stage of the contract. Only those vendors/bidders, who commit themselves to such a Pact with the buyer, would be considered competent to participate in the bidding process. In other words, entering into this Pact would be a preliminary qualification. The essential ingredients of the Pact include:

- Promise on the part of the principal not to seek or accept any benefit, which is not legally available;
- Principal to treat all bidders with equity and reason;
- Promise on the part of bidders not to offer any benefit to the employees of the Principal not available legally;
- Bidders not to enter into any undisclosed agreement or understanding with other bidders with respect to prices, specifications, certifications, subsidiary contracts, etc.
• Bidders not to pass any information provided by Principal as part of business relationship to others and not to commit any offence under PC/ IPC Act;
• Foreign bidders to disclose the name and address of agents and representatives in India and Indian Bidders to disclose their foreign principals or associates;
• Bidders to disclose the payments to be made by them to agents / brokers or any other intermediary;
• Bidders to disclose any transgressions with any other company that may impinge on the anti corruption principle.

2.2 Integrity Pact, in respect of a particular contract, shall be operative from the date IP is signed by both the parties till the final completion of the contract. Any violation of the same would entail disqualification of the bidders and exclusion from future business dealings.

3.0 Implementation procedure

3.1 As stated in Department of Expenditure's O.M. dated 20.7.2011, Ministries/Departments may, in consultation with the respective Financial Adviser and with the approval of the Minister-in-charge, decide on and lay down the nature of procurements/contracts and the threshold value above which the Integrity Pact would be used in respect of procurement transactions/contracts concluded by them or their attached/sub-ordinate offices.

3.2 The above provision is also applied for procurements made by autonomous bodies for which also the concerned administrative ministry / department may lay down the nature of procurements/contracts and the threshold value above which the Integrity Pact would be used.

3.3 The provision for the Integrity Pact is to be included in all Requests for Proposal/Tender documents issued in future in respect of the procurements/contracts that meet the criteria decided in terms of para 3.1 and 3.2 above.

3.4 Tenders should specify that IEMs have been appointed by the Commission. In all tenders, particulars of all IEMs should be mentioned instead of nominating a single IEM in the tender as far as possible.

3.5 The Purchase / procurement wing of the organization would be the focal point for the implementation of IP.

3.6 The Vigilance Department would be responsible for review, enforcement, and reporting on all related vigilance issues.

3.7 It has to be ensured, through an appropriate provision in the contract, that IP is deemed as part of the contract so that the parties concerned are bound by its provisions.
3.8 IP would be implemented through a panel of Independent External Monitors (IEMs), appointed by the organization. The IEM would review independently and objectively, whether and to what extent parties have complied with their obligations under the Pact.

3.9 Periodical Vendors' meets, as a familiarization and confidence building measure, would be desirable for a wider and realistic compliance of the principles of IP.

3.10 A clause should be included in the IP that a person signing IP shall not approach the Courts while representing the matters to IEMs and he / she will await their decision in the matter.

3.11 In case of sub-contracting, the Principal contractor shall take the responsibility of the adoption of IP by the sub-contractor.

3.12 Information relating to procurements/contracts covered under IP and its progress/status would need to be shared with the IEMs on monthly basis.

3.13 The final responsibility for implementation of IP vests with the CMD/CEO of the organization.

4.0 **Role and Duties of IEMs**

4.1 The IEMs would have access to all contract documents, whenever required.

4.2 It would be desirable to have structured meetings of the IEMs with the Chief Executive of the Organisation on a quarterly basis including an annual meeting to discuss / review the information on tenders awarded during the previous quarter. Additional sittings, however, can be held as per requirement.

4.3 The IEMs would examine all complaints received by them and give their recommendations/views to the Chief Executive of the organization, at the earliest. They may also send their report directly to the CVO and the Commission, in case of suspicion of serious irregularities requiring legal/administrative action. IEMs are expected to tender their advice on the complaints within 10 days as far as possible.

4.4 For ensuring the desired transparency and objectivity in dealing with the complaints arising out of any tendering process, the matter should be examined by the full panel of IEMs jointly as far as possible, who would look into the records, conduct an investigation, and submit their joint recommendations to the Management.

4.5 IEM should examine the process integrity, they are not expected to concern themselves with fixing of responsibility of officers. Complaints alleging malafide on the part of any officer of the organization should be looked into by the CVO of the concerned organisation.
4.6 The role of IEMs is advisory, would not be legally binding and it is restricted to resolving issues raised by an intending bidder regarding any aspect of the tender which allegedly restricts competition or bias towards some bidders. At the same time, it must be understood that IEMs are not consultants to the Management. Their role is independent in nature and the advice once tendered would not be subject to review at the request of the organization.

4.7 Issues like warranty / guarantee etc. should be outside the purview of IEMs.

4.8 All IEMs should sign non-disclosure agreements with the organization in which they are appointed. They would also be required to sign a declaration of absence of conflict of interest.

4.9 A person acting as an IEM shall not be debarred from taking up other assignments such as consultancy with other organizations or agencies subject to his declaring that his / her additional assignment does not involve any conflict of interest with existing assignment. In case of any conflict of interest arising at a later date from an entity wherein he is or has been a consultant, the IEM should inform the CEO and recuse himself/herself from that case.

4.10 All organizations may provide secretarial assistance to IEM for rendering his/her job as IEM.

4.11 In case of any misconduct by an IEM, the CMD/CEO should bring it to the notice of the Commission detailing the specific misconduct for appropriate action at the Commission’s end.

4.12 The role of the CVO of the organization shall remain unaffected by the presence of IEMs. A matter being examined by the IEMs can be separately investigated by the CVO in terms of the provisions of the CVC Act or Vigilance Manual, if a complaint is received by him/her or directed to him/her by the Commission.

5.0 Appointment of IEMs

5.1 The IEMs appointed should be eminent personalities of high integrity and reputation. The Commission would invite applications from willing interested persons and maintain a panel of persons eligible to be appointed as IEM. The Commission may make independent and discreet background check before including a name in the panel.

5.2 The choice of IEM should be restricted to officials from the government and public sector undertakings who have retired from positions of the level of Additional Secretary to the Government of India and above or equivalent pay scale, and for Public Sector Undertakings, Board level officers in Schedule A Companies, Public Sector Banks, Insurance Companies and Financial Institutions. Officers of the Armed Forces who have retired from the rank equivalent of Lt. General and above may also be considered for appointment.
5.3 For appointment as IEM the Organisation has to forward a panel of suitable persons to the Commission. This panel may include those who are in the panel maintained by the Commission or they may propose names of other suitable persons for appointment as IEM. While forwarding the panel of suitable persons, the Organization would enclose detailed bio-data in respect of all names proposed. The details would include postings during the last ten years before superannuation, special achievements, experience, etc., in Government sector. It is desirable that the persons proposed possess domain experience of the PSU activities or the relevant field with which they may be required to deal.

5.4 The Commission would not consider the name of an officer / executive who is either serving or who has retired from the same organization to be an IEM in that organization, although they may have served in the top management.

5.5 A maximum of three IEMs may be appointed in Navratna PSUs and a maximum of two IEMs in other Public Sector Undertakings, Public Sector Banks, Insurance Companies and Financial Institutions.

5.6 A person may be appointed as an IEM in a maximum of three organizations at a time.

5.7 The appointment of IEM would be for an initial tenure of three years and could be extended for another term of two years on a request received by the Commission from the organization appointing the IEM. An IEM can have a maximum tenure of 5 years in an organization with an initial term of three years and another term of two years.

5.8 Age should not be more than 70 years at the time of appointment/extension of tenure.

5.9 Remuneration payable to the IEMs by the organization concerned would be equivalent to that admissible to an Independent Director in the organization and in any case should not exceed Rs. 20,000/- per sitting. Remuneration being paid to existing IEMs may not be changed to their detriment for the duration of their tenure.

5.10 The terms and conditions of appointment, including the remuneration payable to the IEMs, should not be included in the Integrity Pact or the NIT. This may be communicated individually to the IEMs concerned.

6.0 **Review System**

All organizations implementing IP would undertake a periodical review and assessment of implementation of IP and submit progress reports to the Commission. CVOs of all organizations would keep the Commission posted with the implementation status through their annual reports and special reports, wherever necessary.

7.0 All organizations are called upon to make sincere and sustained efforts to imbibe the spirit and principles of the Integrity Pact and carry it to its effective implementation.