



National Federation of Indian Railwaymen

3, CHELMSFORD ROAD, NEW DELHI - 110 055

**Affiliated to : Indian National Trade Union Congress (INTUC) &
International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF)**

No. IV/DAC/7 CPC/2016

Dated: 16/08/2017

The Secretary (E),
Railway Board,
New Delhi
Dear Sir,

Sub: Departmental Anomaly Committee to settle the anomalies arising out of the implementation of 7th Central Pay Commission's recommendations-reg.

Ref: (i) Railway Board's letter No. PC-VII/2016/DAC/1 dated 05/10/2016, 29/03/2017, 18/04/2017, 03/05/2017, 25/05/2017 & 06/06/2017
(ii) NFIR's letter No. IV/DAC/7 CPC/2016 dated 09/06/2017.

In continuation of discussions in the first Departmental Anomaly Committee Meeting held on 20th June 2017 in the Railway Board on NFIR's Note dated 09/06/2017 containing anomalies, the Federation furnishes additional issues vide Annexures to this letter (Item 1 to Item 3 in 5 pages) which are required to be dealt by DAC for rectification so far as Railway employees are concerned.

DA/5 Pages

Yours faithfully,

(Dr. M. Raghavaiah)
General Secretary

Copy to the Addl. Member (Staff) & Chairman/DAC, Railway Board, New Delhi for information and necessary action please.

✓ Copy to the General Secretaries of affiliated Unions of NFIR.
Media Centre/NFIR.

File No. IV/NAC/7 CPC /2016.

Item No.1 MACPS anomaly as a result of implementation of 7th CPC Pay Matrix levels.

NFIR gives below an illustration relating to no benefit in certain situations where the employee is granted MACP – rectification requested.

In the existing pay matrix the stages of pay are same in most of the levels such as level 2& 3, 6&7 , 7&8 etc. In this situation, if an employee is upgraded under MACP from one level to another level, his pay will be almost (Exactly) same as he may have drawn even without receiving the benefit under MACP.

Illustration:

Existing pay level	7
Existing pay in pay level 7 (cell 11)	60400
MACP Pay level	8
MACP Pay fixed in level 8 (cell 10)	62200
Pay in level 7 with one inc. (Cell 12)	62200

Item No.2 Anomaly in Pay Matrix levels of 7th CPC

NFIR points out that an anomaly has arisen due to non-grant of 3% of pay towards annual increment, pursuant to implementation of 7th CPC pay matrix levels as explained below:-

- (a) Clause (c) of terms of reference of the National Anomaly Committee says that the Official Side and Staff Side are of the opinion that any recommendation is in contravention of the principle or the policy enunciated by the 7th CPC itself without the commission assigning any reason, constitutes an anomaly.
- (b) The recommendations of 7th CPC regarding Annual Increment are as follows:
 - (i) 7th CPC Report –Highlights of recommendations-
Annual Increment- The rate of annual increment is being retained at 3%.
 - (ii) 7th CPC Report Forward:-
Para 1.19- The prevailing rate of increment is considered satisfactory and has been retained.
 - (iii) 7th CPC Report –Chapter 4.1-Principles of pay determination :-
Para-4.1.17 –The various stages within a pay level moves upwards at the rate of 3% per annum.
 - (iv) 7th CPC Report -Chapter -5.1 –Pay structure (Civilian employees)
Para 5.1.38-Annual Increment.

“The rate of annual increment is being retained at 3% “

Para 5.1.21-The vertical range of each level denotes pay progress within that level. That indicates steps of annual financial progression of 3% within each level.

However, contrary to the above principle laid down by 7th CPC, the actual increment rate in the following pay level of the pay matrix are less than 3% as illustrated in the following table.

(c)

Pay level	S. No. in the pay level (Cell)	Basic pay in the revised scale	Next above basic pay after adding 3% increment	Next above basic pay after fixed as per pay matrix	Amount of loss to the employee	Actual increment rate 3%
1	12	24900	25647	25600 (Cell13)	47	2.81
2	2	20500	21115	21100 (Cell 3)	15	2.92
3	9	27600	28428	28400 (Cell10)	28	2.89
4	11	34300	35329	35300 (Cell12)	29	2.91
5	10	38100	39243	39200 (Cell11)	43	2.88
6	9	44900	46247	46200 (Cell10)	47	2.89
7	13	64100	66023	66000 (Cell14)	23	2.96
8	9	60400	62212	62200 (Cell10)	12	2.98
9	18	87700	90331	90300	31	2.96

(d) From the above table it can be concluded that:

1. The recommendations of 7th CPC regarding increment rate is in contravention of the principle or policy enunciated by 7th CPC, hence it constitutes an anomaly.
2. In many stages even though the increment rate shown is 3%, it is rounded off to next below amount causing financial loss to the employees.
3. In the 6th CPC, while calculating increment, if the last digit is one or above, it used to be rounded off to next 10. So in this pay matrix, if the amount is 10 and above, it should be rounded off to next 100.

NFIR, therefore, requests the Railway Board to take necessary action for rectification of anomaly so as to ensure that the increment @ 3% of pay is granted to employees in whose cases where the actual amount is less than 3%.

Item No. 3 Sub: Seventh CPC pay structure – grave injustice done to Graduate Engineers and Diploma Engineers in Railways – Review urged.

NFIR invites kind attention of the Railway Board to Para 11.40.104 to 11.40.115 of the 7th CPC report (Page No. 747 to 749).

Vide Para 11.40.109 of the 7th CPC report, it has been stated that “the next post in the hierarchical structure for Technical Supervisors is the post of Assistant Engineer. There is a 1:1 ratio between the posts of Assistant Engineer filled by Direct Recruitment and those filled through promotion”.

In this connection, Federation points out that no promotions are presently available for SSEs on the basis of 1:1 ratio. The ground reality is that directly recruited Graduate Engineers to the post of SSE (6th CPC GP 4600/-) continued to remain in the same Grade Pay/Pay Level for not less than 15 to 20 years. Federation also conveys that it would be incorrect to call them “Technical Supervisors” while their official designations are Sr. Section Engineers or Jr. Engineers.

It is further learnt that the 7th Central Pay Commission had relied upon the study report given by Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad for denying the improved pay matrices for Graduate Engineers as well Diploma Engineers. Para 6.16.2 of the study report of IIM, Ahmedabad submitted to the 7th CPC is reproduced below:

“6.16.2 Sector-Wise Career Progression and Promotion Rules:

Table 6.16.2: Career Progression for Graduate Engineer through RRB in Railways		
Job Role: Graduate Engineer	Designation/Post	Promotion Criteria
Entry Level	Graduate Engineer through RRB in Railways	
Entry + 1 Level	Assistant Engineer	Period prescribed for promotion to this level as per R/Rs is 2 years in the previous level. Actual average period of promotion is 4 years.
Entry + 2 Levels	Divisional Engineer	Period prescribed for promotion to this level as per R/Rs is 4 years in the previous level. Actual average period of promotion is 6 years.
Entry + 3 Levels	Sr. Divisional Engineer	Period prescribed for promotion to this level as per R/Rs is 4 years in the previous level. Actual average period of promotion is 4 years.
Source: Based on data provided by the Seventh Central Pay Commission		

NFIR hopes that the Railway Board admits the truth that never promotions have been granted to the Graduate Engineers on completion of 4-years period to the post of Assistant Engineer and to the post of Divisional Engineer on completion of 4-years in the previous pay level. The IIM’s distorted study report has done grave damage to the career growth of directly recruited Graduate Engineers in Railways. The wrong information given to the 7th CPC with regard to career progression and salary details of Graduate Engineers recruited through RRB in Railways through IIM’s study report has caused severe damage to their career resulting around resentment among them.

It is sad to state that the Pay Commission has deviated its own principle as enumerated vide Para 4.1.19 of its report, which is reproduced below:-

“Historically, the qualification and skill set required as well as roles and responsibilities discharged at various levels in the overall hierarchy have been central to the basis for pay grading. The rationalization index has been applied keeping this principle in mind”.

It is surprising to note that the Railway Ministry (as recorded vide Para 11.40.112 of the 7th CPC report) had strongly defended the continuation of existing arrangements on functional grounds, ignoring the reality that the Railway Ministry in the year 2010 had proposed replacement of GP 4600/- with GP 4800/- for improving the career growth of SSEs etc. The Railway Board also failed to mention before 7th CPC of its decision to upgrade Apex Level (GP 4600/-) posts to Group ‘B’ Gazetted (which is yet to be finalized). A serious anomaly has arisen as a result of misleading facts placed by Railway Ministry before 7th CPC and also the totally incorrect study report of IIM, Ahmedabad presented to the 7th CPC as sought by the Commission.

NFIR, therefore, urges upon the Railway Ministry to review de-novo the entire issue and rectify all aberrations and anomalies arisen consequent upon the denial of improved pay structure and status to the Graduate Engineers as well as Diploma Engineers in Railways and also accord approval for time bound promotions to them.
