

Reinforced Cement Concrete Work

Sample Audit Report

Name of Client : ABC

Name of Site : XYZ

Building/Bungalow No. : 1

Report No. :

Date : DD-MM-YY

Report Duration : DD-MM-YY To DD-MM-YY

Stage :

Score	Rating
0.0 to 4.0	Poor
4.01 to 6.0	Average
6.01 to 8.0	Good
8.01 to 9.0	Very Good
9.01 to 10.0	Excellent

Quality Score : 7.24

Quality Performance : Good

Description	Quality Score	Quality Performance
Resources Mobilized	10.00	Excellent
Raw Materials	10.00	Excellent
Equipments Used	10.00	Excellent
Formwork Material Quality	10.00	Excellent
Procedures Followed & Documentation	7.06	Good
Formwork Workmanship	6.99	Good
Steel Placement	6.24	Good
Procedures Followed Before Concreting	4.30	Average
Procedures Followed During Concreting	6.99	Good
Procedures Followed After Concreting	8.92	Very Good
Testing and Documentations	8.92	Very Good
Finished Product Quality	5.94	Average
Aesthetics	5.90	Average
Geometry	Less than 2	Poor
Compressive Strength	10.00	Excellent

Comment : Annexure for non-conformities is enclosed.

Note : This report is generated using Benchmark Version 1.0 with tree 1.1R0 using calibration reference C1

(Abbreviation : N/A - Data not available/applicable for generation of this report)

Approved By

(Authorized Signatory)

Reinforced Cement Concrete Work

Annexure for Non - conformities Observed

Name of Client : ABC

Name of Site : XYZ

Building/Bungalow No. : 1

Report No. :

Date : DD-MM-YY

Report Duration : DD-MM-YY To DD-MM-YY

Stage :

Nonconformities Observed	Nature of Penalty	Frequency
Procedures Followed & Documentation		
Formwork Workmanship		
1) Gaps in the formwork were not sealed as per QP.	Mild	1/9
2) Formwork for column topi was not as per QP.	Moderate	2/7
Procedures Followed & Documentation		
Steel Placement		
1) Local gutti (sudden 90 degree bend) in column bars provided.	Mild	1/4
2) Extra rings above slab in columns were not provided before slab casting.	Mild	1/6
3) Minimum distance between the bars observed less than 25mm.	Moderate	4/8
Procedures Followed & Documentation		
Procedures Followed Before Concreting		
1) Structural members were found to be damaged in the course of the works.	Moderate	1/1
2) Uniform covers to starter rebars were not observed.	Moderate	1/1
3) Condition, thickness and spacing of cover blocks were not as per QP.	Mild	1/10
4) Cleaning of area to be cast was not done properly.	Moderate	1/10
Procedures Followed & Documentation		
Procedures Followed During Concreting		
1) Slump exceeding by 25 mm was observed than the designed slump.	Moderate	1/9
2) Minor grout leakages were observed through gaps in the formwork.	Mild	5/9
Procedures Followed & Documentation		
Procedures Followed After Concreting		
1) Cleaning of reinforcement after concreting was not done.	Mild	3/9
Procedures Followed & Documentation		
Testing and Documentations		
1) Cube register was found to be 50 to 90 % filled.	Mild	

Finished Product Quality

Aesthetics - Slab

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1) Rebars were exposed upto 5cm length in 5 to 10 % slab panels. | Mild |
| 2) Wooden pieces / debris were found to be embedded in concrete upto 5 % of the slab panels. | Mild |

Finished Product Quality

Aesthetics - Beam

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1) Aggregates were exposed in 1" - 6" length in 10 to 26 % beams. | Mild |
| 2) Rebars were exposed upto 5cm length in 5 to 10 % beams. | Mild |
| 3) Rebars were observed to be exposed greater than 10 cm in upto 5 % beams. | Mild |
| 4) Wooden pieces / debris were found to be embedded in concrete in 5 to 10 % of the beams. | Moderate |

Finished Product Quality

Aesthetics - Columns

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1) Aggregates were exposed in more than 12" length in upto 5 % column tops. | Mild |
|---|------|

Finished Product Quality

Aesthetics - Shear Walls

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1) Aggregates were exposed in 1" - 6" length in 10 to 26 % shear walls. | Mild |
| 2) Wooden pieces / debris were found to be embedded in concrete in upto 5 % of the shear walls. | Mild |

Finished Product Quality

Aesthetics - Staircase

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1) Aggregates were exposed in 1" - 6" length in 10 to 26 % of staircase beams. | Mild |
|--|------|

Finished Product Quality

Geometry - Slab

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1) More than 20mm difference in the bottom level was observed in 26 to 51 % of the slabs sampled. | Moderate |
| 2) 15 to 20mm difference in the top level was observed in 26 to 51 % of slabs sampled. | Moderate |
| 3) More than 20mm difference in the top level was observed in 26 to 51 % of the slabs sampled. | Severe |

Finished Product Quality

Geometry - Beam

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1) 10 to 15 mm difference in the bottom level was observed in 10 to 26 % of the beams sampled. | Mild |
| 2) More than 15 mm difference in the bottom level was observed in 10 to 26 % of the beam sampled. | Mild |

Finished Product Quality

Geometry - Column

- 1) 5 - 10mm difference in plumb was observed in 10 to 26 % of the columns sampled. Mild
- 2) 5 - 10 mm difference in grid distance was observed in 26 to 51 % of the columns sampled. Moderate
- 3) More than 10 mm difference in grid distance was observed in 5 to 10 % of the columns sampled. Mild

Finished Product Quality

Geometry - Lift Pardi

- 1) 5 to 10 mm difference in Dimension / Internal diagonal was observed in 10 to 26 % of the lift pardis sampled. Mild
- 2) 5 - 10mm difference in plumb was observed in more than 51 % of the lift pardis sampled. Moderate

Finished Product Quality

Geometry - Shear Walls

- 1) 5 - 10mm difference in plumb was observed in more than 51 % of the shear walls sampled. Moderate

Finished Product Quality

Geometry - Staircase

- 1) Thickness of waist slab was not as per drawing / within tolerance in 10 to 26 % of site observations. Mild
- 2) Riser height was not as per drawing / within tolerance in 26 to 51 % of site observations. Mild
- 3) 5 - 10mm difference in plumb of staircase columns was observed in 10 to 26 % of staircase columns. Mild

Note

- 1) This Audit Report is generated based on data collected from work site on "as is - where is" basis.

Approved By

(Authorized Signatory)