ALL INDIA INSTITUTE OF SPEECH AND HEARING

LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CENTRE

SH/LIC/ARF-69/2019-20 15.04.19

Submitted to the Director.

Sub: Claim for release of payment by M/s FocuzInfoTech-reg.

Ref: 1. Work Order No. SH/Pur/355/ARF-LIC/2018-19 dated 16.05.18.

2. SH/Pur/355/ARF-LIC/2018-19 dated 26.02.19

 3. SH/LIC/ARF-/2018-19 dated 18.03.19

 4.Focuz/mgr/ab/5/93 dated 11.03.19 from M/s FocuzInfoTech

 5. Focuz/mgr/ab/2019/242 dated 02/04.19 from M/s FocuzInfoTech

Respected Madam,

A work order was issued to M/s Focuz InfoTech, Kochi, Kerala for the Design, Development and Validation of Open Source Platform for AIISH Digital Repository and Online Public Access Catalogue vide reference cited (1) above for a period of four months. However, the firm could not complete the work on time and sent a letter on 8th February 2019 requesting for an extension of the work order till 15th March 2019 citing the reason that a few of the firm’s employees got affected by the August-2018 flood that hit across the state. Considering the request, we gave an extension to the work order till 15th March 2019 vide reference cited (2) above.

During the extended period also, the firm could not depute appropriate technical personnel to do our work which was supposed to carry out in our server through remote login. The technicians were kept on changing and most of the time novice persons were attending the project. Each time we had to brief the technician about the nature of work and provide examples of similar works already done. It was evident that the firm did not resolve the manpower problem, the reason mentioned for the extension of the work order in their e-mail dated 8th February (*Copy of the email enclosed as Appendix-I*).

Meanwhile, we identified some errors in the first item of work carried out earlier by the firm as per our work order. Hence, the firm was instructed to re-installthe software applications and error checking on the re-installation was in progress. Simultaneously, they initiated item 2 of the work order. However, even on 7th March 2019,just 8 days short of the completion of the entire work, the firm could not successfully complete any one of the 3 items mentioned in our work order.

On 7th March, we expressed our dissatisfaction regarding the accuracy of work done already and concern about the completion of the entire work by 15th March 2019 over phone with the Mr. Dixon, the senior technician who was coordinating our work. Surprisingly, the firm sent a letter (No. Focuz/mgr/ab/5/93 dated 11.03.19) claiming the completion of the entire work, with a request to enter data into the new systems developed, provide feedback and suggestion for further improvement and release of payment. The URLs of the installations on our server with IP addresses were also mentioned in the letter (*Copy of the letter enclosed as Appendix-II*).

Of the three applications with IP addresses and URLs mentioned in the letter, only one is actually available/installed in the specified location on our server. But as indicated in the previous para, that also is showing error while accessing and hence, needs re-installation. (*Screen shot of the application available in our server is enclosed as Appendix-Ia and that of error as Appendix-IIb*.). Thus, the item no. 1 in the work order cannot be considered as completed unlike it is claimed by the firm.

The item no. 2 of our work order was to customize the front-ends of the Digital repository and OPAC applications as per the design we provided along with the work order. (*Copies of the designs in the work order enclosed as Appendix III-a & III-b*). However, front-end customizations as per our requirement were not carried out in our server.

The firm did not take up Item No. 3 of the work order. Even then, it is requesting our suggestion and feedback. Our requirements with respect to the item no. 3 were clearly and comprehensively mentioned in the work order communicated to the firm on 16th May 2018 (*Copy of the relevant portion of our work order enclosed as Appendix-IV*). Hence, the question of ‘suggestion’ will not arise at all. It may please be noted that item no. 3 of the work order needs more effort including coding and programming.

Needless to say, the firm sent such as letter with an ulterior motive of misleading the authority and grab money. The firm was sure that it cannot complete the task within the stipulated period of 15thMarch 2019.

Realizing the above facts, we made a request to cancel the work order vide letter no. SH/LIC/ARF-/2018-19 dated 18.03.19. It was approved and the work order was cancelled vide SH/Pur/293/ELE/2018-19 dated 29.03.19 and the same was communicated to the firm.

In response to our work order cancellation, the firm again sent a letter (No. Focuz/mgr/ab/2019/242 dated 02/04.19) claiming the completion of the Item no. 1 & 2 of the work order, suggestion for the customization of item no. 3 and release of payment of Rs. 1,20,000/- against the Item No. 1 & 2 in the work order. Also, the firm sent a few images as proof of their work.

It may please be noted that the firm is again trying to mislead us by sending incorrect images, which cannot be accepted. The images provided along with the letter no. Focuz/mgr/ab/2019/242 dated 02/04.19 might have prepared in the firm’s computer. The title ‘root@focuz’ visible at one of the minimized windows and the URL, ‘localhost:8080’ and the name ‘dixon rodriges**’** on the first image provided by the firm (*Copies of the images are enclosed as Appendix-V and marked in blue for reference*) are clear evidence for it. They are not the images of the applications installed in our server.

Hence, it is kindly suggested to reject the firm’s claim for money and issue a strict warning to abstain from such unethical deeds or else to face dire consequences including legal action.

Thank you,

Yours faithfully,

 Dr. Shijith Kumar C

 Library and Information Officer & Principal Investigator of the Project