

## Review of Performance Audit Report

Name of the Institution	:	PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka	Sub-component	:	
Name of Performance Auditor of the institution	:	PROF. ROHIT SHARMA			
Name of Data Auditor of the institution	:				
<b>Date of completion of Review</b>	:				
<b>CRITERIA</b>	Rating (A, B, or C)	Comments to assist NPIU in handling the report. <sup>1</sup>			
i. Completeness	A	Yes. All component have been covered and evidences are taken. The auditor has assessed the TEQIP progress as per the performance audit format.			
ii. Consistency and relevance	A	Yes. The relevant information has been cited in the report.			
iii. Details and specificity	A	Yes.			
iv. Meticulousness	A	Quite acceptable.			
v. Feedback clarity	A	Yes.			
<b>Overall rating for the report</b>	A	Overall a good report			

<sup>1</sup> The Evaluators should indicate changes needed to be made to the report before it can be sent back to the institution. For good reports (rated 'A'), these can be sent to the institution formally as a completed report. For average reports (rated 'B'), the evaluators should provide guidance on what needs to be done: such as providing more evidence in particular sections, clarifying some points, or some quick editing of the report. For poor reports (rated 'C'), the performance auditor may need to substantially revise the report, or, if too much time has passed, conduct the audit visit again and write the report.