



**GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD
(ROAD SECTION)**

WORKING PAPER

PART A

Date of receipt of PC-I in P&D Board: 14-03-2025

PROJECT PROFILE:

1. Project Title: **REHABILITATION OF ROAD FROM KASUR TO RAIWIND, LENGTH 25.48 KM IN DISTRICT KASUR.**
2. Location: District Kasur
3. Sponsoring Agency: Communication & Works Department
4. Executing Agency: Punjab Highway Department
5. Operation & Maintenance Punjab Highway Department
6. Name of the Relevant Communication & Works Department, Finance Department
Department (s) /Pre-PDWP meeting was held on **24.03.2025** under the
Stakeholder(s) invited in chairmanship of Member (ID)
Pre-PDWP
7. Name of the Sector's P&DB Road Sector, Economic Wing
specialist / consultants /
advisor / expert / invited
in Pre-PDWP
8. Cost:

(Rs. in million)

Original	1st Revised	2nd Revised	Increase
Rs. 1,932.775 (11.10.2022)	Rs. 2,095.294 (08.08.2024)	2,255.380 (Proposed)	160.086

9. Source of Financing Provincial ADP 2024-25 reflected at G. Sr. No. 1648
Expenditure up to 30.06.2024 is Rs. 1924.300 Million
10. Allocation (2024-25) Rs. 170.900 Million

11. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT:

Raiwind-Kasur Road is a vital transportation corridor in District Kasur, providing the shortest route to Raiwind. The road originates from Kasur City at Khara Chungi and traverses through the built-up areas of Naul, Atheel Pur, Rao Khan Wala, and Raja Jang. The existing 20-foot-wide metalled carriageway, constructed during 1987-88, has exceeded its design life and is inadequate to accommodate the current traffic volume. Additionally, the road is situated at a lower elevation than the adjacent plinth levels in built-up areas, leading to water stagnation on the pavement during rainfall, causing significant inconvenience to road users and local residents.

Considering these factors, the rehabilitation of this road was proposed. The scheme received technical sanction from the Chief Engineer (C.Z), Punjab Highway Department, vide letter No.

HD/Kasur/2021/1726/Plg, dated 25.11.2022, amounting to Rs. 1923.594 million, against the administrative approval of Rs. 1932.775 million issued by the Government of Punjab, Communication & Works Department, Lahore, vide letter No. SOH-VI(C&W)/6-5/2022(Kasur), dated 08-11-2022.

The first revision of the scheme was discussed in the 11th PDWP meeting held on 31.07.2024 and was approved at a revised cost of Rs. 2095.294 million. Consequently, the revised administrative approval was issued vide letter No. SOH-VI(C&W)/6-5/2024(Kasur), dated 08-08-2024. The primary reason for this revision was the provision of price variation. Subsequently, a second revised PC-I/Cost Estimate has been prepared, incorporating necessary changes and variations in quantities of roadwork and structural components, as advised by the consultant, M/s NESPAK.

Now, the C&W Department has submitted the revised PC-I / cost estimate amounting to **Rs. 2,255.380 Million** for consideration of PDWP.

REASONS OF REVISION:

- i. Due to change/actualization of quantities of roadwork and road structure items as per TS estimate.

DESIGN & SCOPE:

1	Formation Width	=	40 ft
2	Embankment Height	=	3 ft
3	Metalled Width	=	20ft Carriageway
4	Sub Base Course	=	10" thick (Relay under Rigid)
5	Base Course	=	6" thick Overlay
6	Surfacing	=	4" thick (2.5"+1.5") (Carpet)
7	RCC Rigid	=	9" thick

12. a) Sector Issues

Insufficient availability of funds against the ever-increasing demand of road infrastructure, resulting in generation of excessive throw forward

b) Sector Strategy

The provincial sectoral strategy envisages construction of a high quality infrastructure as planning, constructing and maintaining road network in public sector under need driven and cost effective regimes aiming at providing best possible means of communication to the general public

13. Relationship of the project with the Sectoral policy /Growth Strategy, 2023.

Project is aligned with the growth strategy, 2023

14. Alignment with the Punjab Spatial Strategy, 2047(Comments of urban unit)

N/A

15. Other major ongoing projects in the Sector

- i. REHABILITATION OF ROAD FROM KASUR TO RAIWIND, LENGTH = 25.48 KM IN DISTRICT KASUR (REVISED).

16. BREAK DOWN OF THE CAPITAL COST**(Rs. In Million)**

Sr.	Items	As per 1st Revised Cost	As per 2nd Revised PC-I	Difference
1.	Road Work	1313.691	1425.088	111.397
2.	Road Structure	414.668	448.658	33.990
3.	Road Furniture	12.785	12.930	0.145
4.	Surveying & Levelling	0.398	0.398	0.000
5.	Shifting of Utilities	19.000	19.000	0.000
6.	D/d of old material	-1.709	-1.709	0.000
7.	3% Contingency	52.182	56.549	4.367
8.	2% Consultancy	34.789	37.699	2.910
9.	5% Punjab Revenue Authority Tax (PRA)	86.971	94.248	7.277
10.	Price Variation	162.519	162.519	0.000
	Total	2095.294	2255.380	160.086

17. UNIT COST

Rs. 73.978 Million

18. PERIOD OF IMPLEMENTATION

36 Months (Till June 2025)

19. ANNUAL RECURRING EXPENDITURE

Rs. 10.12 Million per annum

20. ANNUAL INCOME AFTER COMPLETION

N/A

21. REQUIREMENT OF VEHICLES/STAFF/CONSULTANCY (WITH JUSTIFICATION)

N/A

22. EXISTING FACILITIES**PART – B****23. TECHNICAL APPRAISAL**

(Comments of R&B)

Pre-PDWP meeting was held on **24.03.2025** under the chairmanship of Member (ID), wherein project's salient features, design & scope was discussed. Imperative discussion was made on reasons of revision of this PC-1, Physical & financial progress of the scheme and details of price variations. Point wise discussion is listed as under:-

Sr. No.	Observation	Reply of the Department	Recommendations of pre-PDWP
1.	The 1 st revised PC-I of the instant scheme, amounting to Rs. 2131.803 million, was presented before the PDWP in its 11 th meeting held on 31.07.2024 under Agenda Item No. 03. During the meeting, the Chief Engineer (Central), Punjab Highway Department, apprised the house that the current revision (i.e., 1 st revision) was	The commitment of the department to complete the project to the extent of 1 st revision is based on the previous financial and codal formalities but due to the revision of financial and codal rules by the P&D department the scheme has not been finalised. Therefore, the forum has been approached to revise the project.	The matter be submitted before PDWP for consideration.

	<p>conclusive, with no subsequent revisions to be proposed in the future. After detailed deliberations, the house directed the C&W Department to implement necessary measures for the financial closure of the scheme, ensuring that the gestation period does not extend beyond June 2025.</p> <p>Accordingly, the scheme was approved at a rationalized cost of Rs. 2095.294 million, in line with Pre-PDWP recommendations, with the condition that the 1st revision would be considered final and no further revisions would be entertained under any circumstances.</p> <p>In view of the above, the sponsor is required to provide a detailed justification for the submission of the 2nd revised PC-I at this stage, along with the specific reasons necessitating the proposed revision despite the prior commitment of finality in the 1st revision.</p>		
2.	<p>In light of instructions issued by P&D Board vide No. 12(14)PO(COORD-II)P&D/2024 dated 19.07.2024, the sponsor is requested to inform about any audit observations related to the scheme that need to be regularized through the approval of the proposed PC-I, if any.</p>	<p>There is no such audit observations related to the scheme that needs to be regularized through the approval of the proposed PC-I</p>	Noted
3.	<p>Sponsor to share copies of all TS/Detailed estimates.</p>	<p>Compliance made.</p>	<p>During the meeting, it was observed that TS had been accorded multiple times even</p>

			after the award of the contract, which does not align with the intended use of delegated authority under DFR 2016 rules and also reiterated by the P&D Board vide No.35(231)PO(Coord-II)/P&D/2025 dated 09.01.2025.
4.	The sponsor is required to justify the reduction of 0.34 km in the rigid pavement section and the corresponding increase in the overlay portion in the instant estimate. A detailed technical rationale, along with site-specific conditions, traffic load analysis, and engineering considerations supporting this adjustment, must be provided.	The reduction of 0.34 Km in the rigid pavement section from Km 9.60 to 10.26 Km has been made as per site requirement where it is needed in populated area as per recommendations of M/s NESAPK resultantly Flexible pavement has been increased 0.34 Km in open area from Km 10.26 to 12.40 Km.	Noted
5.	Sponsor to technically justify the increase in item i.e. excavation of undressed material from 893,374 CFT to 2,305,610 CFT with a cost impact of Rs. 11.778 million in instant estimate.	When the scheme has been envisaged the site conditions were different. The inhabitants of vicinity dumped debris on the road self-help basis to use the populated area of Haveli Malkan Wali ,Mohallh Islamabd and Raja jang. (Pictorial evidence is provided for ready reference) .Due to this quantity of excavation of undressed material has been increased.	Noted Sponsor must also provide recommendations of RR&MTI regarding presence of unsuitable material on site.
6.	Justification for increase in quantity of earthwork from 5,677,023 CFT to 7,953,934 CFT with a cost impact of Rs. 33.411 million is to be provided.	When the scheme was conceived the dynamics were different. Mostly the Scheme is situated in open area with NSL differences more than 6 feet. Furthermore, The old road formation was as per 20' metal road but the proposed formation includes 4' Treated Shoulders on either side. Initially, the survey was conducted and E/W was measured mistakenly as per old	Not Accepted After detailed deliberations, it was noted that the quantity takeoff calculation for this item was aligned with the road cross-section in the original PC-I/estimate. The quantity was initially reduced to 4,623,823 CFT in the original TS estimate, which was based on a detailed

		formation. When the contractor started the work, levels / formations were jointly measured with dept. Consultants and contractor rep and style was worked out as per actual site conditions. Detail of quantity provided by the consultant has been attached.	survey. However, it was subsequently increased to 5,481,963 CFT in the 1 st revised TS and further raised to 7,953,934 CFT in the 2 nd revised TS estimate, which lacks justification. The sponsor is requested to provide a detailed explanation for the increase in earthwork quantity in the 2 nd revised TS estimate compared to the original TS estimate, given that such quantities should ideally be finalized during the initial planning stage of the scheme.
7.	<p>It has been observed that in the quantity take-off for the dismantling of the existing pavement structure, the length for the 14-inch thick pavement has been decreased, while the length for the 7.5-inch thick pavement has been increased, which is not justified.</p> <p>Sponsor to provide RD wise pavement evaluation report of RR&MTI in lieu of making this provision in instant estimate.</p>	The thickness of dismantling of the existing pavement structure has not been decreased. It is similar to original Approved PC-I. The quantity take-off for the dismantling of the existing pavement structure decreased to reduction in length 0.34 km in the rigid portion from Km 9.60 to 10.26 Km.	Sponsor to provide pavement evaluation report to justify the thickness provision of existing pavement structure taken in this item.
8.	<p>Sponsor to justify the new provision for construction of 7 No new approaches at a length of 100 ft each in instant estimate.</p> <p>Necessity of making this provision along with layout plan duly marked on google image may also be provided.</p>	In original estimate provision of approaches has not been incorporated due cost constraints. That's why new provision for construction of 7 No new approaches at a length of 100 ft each are incorporated in instant estimate.	Noted
9.	Sponsor to justify the new provision of 1.5"	Recambering layer has been provided in overlay portion	Noted

	<p>thick recambering layer throughout the length despite having provision of 06" thick overlay.</p> <p>Recommendations of RR&MTI is to be provided in lieu of making this provision.</p>	<p>for better riding quality after approval of the T.S estimate by the competent authority. T.S estimate has been attached.</p>	
10.	<p>Justification for increase in number of start and end approach from 01 No to 04 No in instant estimate is to be provided.</p> <p>Necessity of making this provision along with layout plan duly marked on google image may also be provided.</p>	<p>To meet the level of existing junction approaches has been increased from 01 No 04. Layout Plan has been attached for ready reference.</p>	Noted
11.	<p>It has been observed that new provision of 04 inch thick recarpeting is taken from KM No 12.40 to KM No 13.60 at stretch of Rao Khan Wala (Length = 1.20 Km) which was earlier declared as already rehabilitated portion in original PC-I.</p> <p>Furthermore, linear plan attached with PC-I and length statement of DOQ also depicts this said stretch as already rehabilitated portion but the quantity of carpet is calculated in DOQ of estimate.</p> <p>Sponsor to justify this discrepancy.</p>	<p>From KM No 12.40 to KM No 13.60 at stretch of Rao Khan Wala (Length = 1.20 Km) which was earlier declared as already rehabilitated portion in original PC-I .In this portion rigid pavement was constructed but during construction this road excessive movement of heavy traffic load the rigid was dilapidated and damaged .Therefore, new provision of 04 inch thick recarpeting is taken from KM No 12.40 to KM No 13.60 at stretch of Rao Khan Wala (Length = 1.20 Km) in this estimate.</p>	Sponsor to share pictorial evidence of site where instant provision is taken.
12.	<p>It has been observed that the composite rates for all road structure items in the instant estimate have been increased; however, the rate analysis attached with the PC-I corresponds to the originally approved scheme.</p> <p>The sponsor is required</p>	<p>The composite rates for road structure items in the instant estimate have been increased as per actual/finalized quantity of items in T.S estimate. The Rate Analysis of items have been attached.</p>	Noted

	to justify the item-wise increase in unit rates in the abstract of cost and provide a revised rate analysis accordingly.		
13.	Increase in provision of contingency and consultancy charges as proposed in instant revised estimate is not justified as it was already freezed during 1 st revision of scheme.	Increase in provision of contingency and consultancy charges increased as per revised estimated cost.	Sponsor to provide detail of actual expenditure incurred under contingency and consultancy head to actualize the provision.
14.	Year wise financial profile of the project depicting year-wise original allocation, revised allocation, bridge financing and expenditure incurred uptil now should be clearly furnished.	Attached	Noted
15.	Sponsor to share the physical progress/status of scheme.	Physically work has been completed	Noted

PART – C

24. ECONOMIC / FINANCIAL APPRAISAL

(Comments of Economic Appraisal Section and Finance Department)

PART – D

25. ENVIRONMENTAL APPRAISAL.

(Comments of Environment Department)

26. CONSIDERATION BY PRE-PDWP

The scheme is submitted by the C&W Department for revised approval at a cost of **Rs.2,255.380 (M)**.

27. RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. The scheme is placed before PDWP for consideration.
-