

Goa

1. STATE FACTSHEET

State Chief Information Commissioner	A. Venkatratnam (during 2008)
State Information Commissioners	Late G.G. Kambli
Pendency as on January 1, 2008	58
Pendency as on December 31, 2008	112
Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing	3 months
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Rs. 61,17,000

2. STATE OF RECORDS:

They said all there orders on website. We found 275 orders on their site.

3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) DISPOSALS: An average of 11 cases per commissioner per month.

- Pendency is 112 cases by the end of year 2008 i.e on 31.12.2008
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is not available

b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 62.2

Rank: 21

Total Number of Orders Analysed	254
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	158 (62%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	79 (31%)
Remanded Back	17(7%)
Rank	21

c) EFFECTIVENESS: 30 to 40%

How many of the pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 30 to 40% orders were complied with.
- Compliance, same as the national average 30 to 40% is much less than the best, i.e. 90 to 100%.

d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 8.9%

Rank: 5

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 42
- 9 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 21% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in 18 cases (i.e. 9% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Show cause notices remained pending in 36% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 158 cases. However, it asked for the reasons for this delay only in 42 cases. In rest of the cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 10 to 20%

So, if 100 people approach Punjab Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were done in 62 cases. Out of these, 10 to 20% people finally got information.

4. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS

Name	Pro-disclosure Factor (Rank)	Effectiveness (Band)	Deterrent Impact (Rank)	Overall Public Satisfaction (Band)
A.Venkataratnam	58% (76th)	70 to 80%	8.70% (10 th)	40-50%
Late G.G Kambli	80% (59 th)	Inadequate Feedback received	5% (16 th)	Inadequate Feedback received
Combined Benches of Goa	58% (75th)	20 to 30%	10% (6 th)	10-20%

INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS (Goa)

1. A.Venkataratanam

Disposals: Roughly 146 per month

- Pendency was 56 cases as on 31.12.2008.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 3 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 58%

Rank: 76

Total Number of Orders Analysed	40
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	23 (58%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	16 (40%)
Remanded Back	1
Rank	76

Effectiveness: 70 to 80%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 70 to 80% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is above national average of 30 to 40% but less than the best 90 to 100

Deterrence Impact: 9%

Rank: 10

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 5
- Of this 1 (20%) cases were dropped after hearing.
- Penalty was imposed by the commissioner in 2(~9%) of the cases.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 23 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 5 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 40 to 50%

- So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 58 cases. Out of these, 40 to 50% finally got information.

2. Late G.G. Kambli

Disposals: Roughly 4 cases per month

- Pendency was 56 cases by the end of year 2008 i.e as on 31.12.2008
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 3 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 80%

Rank: 59

Total Number of Orders Analysed	49
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	39 (80%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	7 (14%)
Remanded Back	3
Rank	59

Effectiveness:

The effectiveness could not be calculated due to insufficient data.

Deterrence Impact: 5

Rank: 16

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 10
- Of this 0 cases were dropped after hearing.
- Penalty was imposed by the commissioner in 4 (5%) cases.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 39 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 10 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction

- The overall public satisfaction could not be calculated due to insufficient feedback.

3. Combined Benches of Goa

Pro-disclosure Factor: 58%

Rank: 75

Total Number of Orders Analysed	165
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	96 (58%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	56 (34%)
Remanded Back	13
Rank	75

Effectiveness: 20 to 30%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 20 to 30% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is below national average (30 to 40%) and much less than the best (90 to 100)

Deterrence Impact: 10

Rank: 6

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 27
- Of this 8 (30%) cases were dropped after hearing.
- Penalty was imposed by the commissioner in 12(~10%) of the cases.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 96 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 27 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 10 to 20%

- So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 58 cases. Out of these, 10to 20% finally got information.