

FIRST REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004-2005)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2004-2005)

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 18 August, 2004
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 18 August, 2004*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

August, 2004/Sravana, 1926 (Saka)

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE.....	()
ABBREVIATIONS.....	()
INTRODUCTION.....	()

REPORT

CHAPTER I Introductory.....	1
CHAPTER II Overall analysis of Demands for Grants 2004-2005 of the Department of Drinking Water Supply.....	3
CHAPTER III Rural Sanitation Programme.....	47

APPENDICES

I. Statement indicating plan outlays, actual expenditure proposed outlay as agreed to by Planning Commission, Budget Estimates and Revised Estimates during 9th and 10th Plans.....	53
II. Status of coverage of habitations under Rural Water Supply (as on 30 April, 2004).....	55
III. State-wise coverage of habitations and rural schools under Rural Water Supply during 2002-2003.....	57
IV. State-wise coverage of habitations and rural schools under Rural Water Supply during 2003-2004.....	60
V. State-wise Financial Progress under Rural Water Supply Programme during 2002-2003.....	63

VI. State-wise Financial Progress under Rural Water Supply Programme during 2003-2004.....	68
VII. Details of Swajaldhara Scheme (2002-2003) as on 21 July, 2004.....	73
VIII. Details of fund allocated to the States/UTs, funds released, expenditure and Schemes completed under Swajaldhara during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005.....	75
IX. Position of enactment of legislation on control and development of ground water resources in various States as on 12 March, 2003.....	78
X. Minutes of the second Sitting of the Committee held on 11 August, 2004.....	82
XI. Minutes of the third Sitting of the Committee held on 13 August, 2004.....	85
XII. Statement of observations/recommendations.....	87

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004-2005)

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri L. Ganesan
5. Shri Mohan Jena
6. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
7. Shri Subhash Maharia
8. Shri Hannan Mollah
9. Shri Dawa Narbula
10. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
11. Shri K.C. Palanisamy
12. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
13. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
14. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
15. Shri S. Sudhakar Reddy
16. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
17. Shri Mohan Singh
18. Shri Sita Ram Singh
19. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
20. Shri Bagun Sumbrai
21. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

Rajya Sabha

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar
24. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
25. Shri Penumalli Madhu
26. Shri Stephen Marandi
27. Shri Kalraj Mishra
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Shri Keshubhai S. Patel
30. Dr. Faguni Ram
31. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary	— <i>Additional Secretary</i>
2. Shri V.K. Sharma	— <i>Joint Secretary</i>
3. Shri K. Chakraborty	— <i>Director</i>
4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra	— <i>Deputy Secretary</i>

ABBREVIATIONS

ACA	—	Additional Central Assistance
ARWSP	—	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
BE	—	Budget Estimates
BMS	—	Basic Minimum Services
CGWB	—	Central Ground Water Board
CRSP	—	Central Rural Sanitation Programme
DWSC	—	District Water and Sanitation Committee
DWSM	—	District Waters and Sanitation Management
FC	—	Fully Covered
HRD	—	Human Resource Development
IEC	—	Information Education and Communication
MIS	—	Management Information System
MNP	—	Minimum Needs Programme
NAG	—	National Agenda for Governance
NC	—	Not Covered
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organization
NHRDP	—	National Human Resource Development Programme
O&M	—	Operation and Maintenance
PC	—	Partially Covered
PRI	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	—	Revised Estimates
SWSM	—	State Water Sanitation Management
TSC	—	Total Sanitation Campaign
UNICEF	—	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UT	—	Union Territory

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2004-2005) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the First Report on Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply).

2. Demands for Grants have been examined by the Committee under Rule 331E(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply) on 11 August 2004.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 13 August, 2004.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Drinking Water Supply) for placing before them the requisite material and their considered views in connection with the examination of the subject.

6. They would also like to place on record their deep sense of appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;

17 August, 2004

26 Sravana, 1926 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,

Chairman,

Standing Committee on Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The Ministry of Rural Development consists of three Departments: (i) Department of Rural Development (ii) Department of Land Resources and (iii) Department of Drinking Water Supply.

1.2 The Department of Drinking Water Supply was created in October 1999 to focus attention on the goal of providing safe drinking water to all the rural villages in the next five years, as contained in the National Agenda for Governance of the Government of India (1999). As per the Tenth Five Year Plan document, highest priority is to be accorded to the coverage of 'Not Covered' (NC) habitations followed by the 'Partially Covered' (PC) ones by 2004, while the remaining period of the Tenth Plan is to be utilised for coverage of newly emerged habitations and those that have slipped back to PC or NC status. At present, the following Schemes are being implemented by the Department.

- (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme or ARWSP;
- (ii) Sector Reform Programme, which has been expanded as the Swajaldhara Programme;
- (iii) Three Programmes of the Prime Minister; and
- (iv) Rural Sanitation Programme, which was earlier implemented as Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) launched in 1986 and subsequently, restructured in 1999. Finally, the provision for allocation based component of CRSP has been phased out in 2002. The Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) under restructured CRSP was launched w.e.f. 1.4.1999 following community led and people-centric approach.

1.3 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry were laid in Parliament on 22 July 2004.

1.4 The Demand for Grants of the Department was laid in the Parliament under Demand No.82.

1.5 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for 2004-05 is Rs. 3301.39 crore for both plan and non-plan heads.

1.6 In the present Report, the Committee have examined the implementation of respective Centrally Sponsored Schemes as indicated in para 2 above in the context of overall budgetary allocation in the Demands for Grants for the year 2004-2005.

CHAPTER II

OVERALL ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 2004-2005 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY

2.1 The position of outlay and expenditure of the rural water supply and rural sanitation programmes during 9th Plan period, pro-posed and agreed outlay for 10th Plan, BE, RE and actuals for the years 2000-2001, 2001-2002, 2002-2003, 2003-2004 and proposed outlay, Budget Estimates and actual expenditure (upto 30 June 2004) during 2004-2005 under both plan and non-plan heads are given in Appendix-I.

2.2 Comparative position of plan outlay earmarked and expenditure made by the Department for the rural drinking water supply sector during 8th, 9th and 10th Five Year Plans is as under:

(Rs. in crore)

8th Plan Outlay	5100.01
8th Plan Expenditure	4142.71
9th Plan Outlay	8564.00
9th Plan Expenditure	8455.00
10th Plan Outlay proposed	24800.00
Outlay agreed	13245.00

Budget estimates for the first three years of the 10th Plan for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation is Rs. 8450 crore.

2.3 Further, analyzing the data in the respective Plans, the following observations can be made:—

- (i) Corresponding data for rural water supply programmes during 8th, 9th and 10th Plan indicate that during

9th Plan, the outlay was almost doubled as compared to 8th Plan expenditure but during 10th Plan, the said increase is about 60 percent.

- (ii) Underspending is a recurring feature with shortfall of Rs.957.29 crore during 8th plan, Rs.109 crore during 9th plan.
- (iii) The Department has been allocated almost half of what was proposed to Planning Commission during 10th Plan.

2.4 When asked how the Government propose to arrange for the funds keeping in view the wider difference between the required allocation and the allocation made during 10th Plan, the Department has stated that Planning Commission reassesses the outlays during Mid-term review of the Plan. Any gap in the resources can also be bridged through extra budgetary assistance from external agencies like World Bank. Further, as per the details given with regard to World Bank assisted rural water supply and environment sanitation projects, the Committee are informed that in Karnataka and Maharashtra one project in each of the States has been completed and further, one project in each of the States is undergoing. Besides, in Uttar Pradesh one project has been completed, in Kerala one project is undergoing. The data indicated show that the assistance for these projects is by way of donor's contribution/loan and the details of the estimated cost of the projects and the IDA loan is as below:

Completed World Bank assisted rural water supply and environment sanitation projects

State	Estimated Cost	Donor's contribution
Karnataka	117.8 million dollar	92 million dollar
Maharashtra	140.8 million dollar	97.5 million dollar
Uttar Pradesh	71.0 million dollar	52.4 million dollar

On-going World Bank assisted rural water supply and environment sanitation projects.

State	Project Cost	IDA loan
Kerala	89.8 million dollar	65.5 million dollar
Karnataka	193.44 million dollar	151.6 million dollar
Maharashtra	268.65 million dollar	181.00 million dollar

The analysis of Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and Expenditure position since 2000-01.

2.5 By analyzing the data given in Appendix-I, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- (i) Percentage increase during 2001-02 as compared to the previous year is 2.55 percent and in 2002-03 the increase is 11.19 percent. Further, in 2003-04 the percentage increase is 15.66 percent and in 2004-05 the said increase is 12.19 percent.
- (ii) Underspending is the recurring feature if we analyze the position of expenditure as compared to Budget Estimates for each of the year. During the year 2001-02 there was underspending of 66.95 crore. Further, during 2002-03 Rs.134.30 crore remained unspent. During 2003-04, although there is decrease in underspending as compared to the previous years, the underspending was Rs. 21 crore.
- (iii) If we see the releases during the first two years and three months of the 10th Plan, Rs. 5525.05 crore could be released so far. This is Rs. 7719.95 crore less than half the total allocation during the 10th Plan.

As per the information furnished by the Department, Scheme-wise allocation for the last five years is as given below:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Rural Drinking Water Supply	Rural Sanitation
1999-2000	1800	110
2000-01	1960	140
2001-02	2010	150
2002-03	2235	165
2003-04	2585	165
2004-05	2900	400

During the oral evidence, the Secretary stated that though allocation for the rural water supply sector has increased over the years, the actual allocation for major Scheme of ARWSP has not been raised substantially.

Physical progress under ARWSP

2.6 The latest position with regard to fully covered, partially covered and not covered habitations is as below:

Type of coverage	No. of habitations	Percentage of total
Not Covered (NC)	6782	0.48
Partially Covered (PC)	73273	5.15
Fully Covered (FC)	1342238	94.37
Uninhabited/migrated	371	
Total	1422664	

2.7 As regards coverage of habitations, the Government claims that 94 per cent rural habitations have already been covered with drinking water

facilities. The partially covered habitations are more than 5 per cent and the not covered habitations are less than one per cent.

2.8 As regards the State-wise position of coverage of all habitations, the position has been given in Appendix – II. It can be seen therefrom that in 14 States/UTs, not covered habitations still exists. As regards the position of partially covered habitations, barring 13 States/UTs, partially covered habitations exists in every State/UT.

Coverage of habitations since 8th Plan

2.9	Number of habitations covered
8th Plan (1992-97)	3,39,705
9th Plan (1997-2002)	4,28,774
10th Plan (During the first two years i.e. 2002-03 and 2003-04)	78,543

2.10 The comparative position with regard to targets and achievements since 1997-98 is as indicated below:

Year	Target			Achievement		
	NC	PC	Total	NC	PC	Total
1997-98	30552	69061	99613	31584	85410	116994
1998-99	31535	73367	104902	19008	93925	112933
1999-2000	17329	72732	90061	11866	62770	74636
2000-01	14270	65198	79468	8673	61975	68648
2001-02	8143	37383	45526	3909	40830	44739
2002-03	7125	56744	63869	4388	34852	39240
2003-04	9652	101399	111051	3903	35400	39303
2004-05 (till June)	30423	40061	70484	35	1345	1380

The targets of coverage of 70484 habitations (30423 NC + 40061 PC) have been fixed during 2004-05. It has been mentioned by the Department that scheme-wise break-up is not available.

2.11 After analyzing the aforesaid data, it is seen that during the years 1997-98 and 1998-99 the achievement exceeded the targets. However since 1999-2000 there is shortfall in achievement as compared to targets in each of the years. Further, during the years 2002-03 and 2003-04, the achievement as compared to targets is very low. During the years 2002-03 and 2003-04, the achievement is 61.44 per cent and 35.33 per cent respectively.

2.12 The Committee have been informed that the Department of Drinking Water Supply in the Ministry of Rural Development was created in October 1999 to focus attention on the goal of providing safe drinking water to all the rural villages in the next five years as contained in the National Agenda for Governance. During 10th Plan it is proposed to accord the highest priority to providing the not covered habitations with sustainable and stipulated supply of drinking water followed by coverage of other partially covered and the quality affected habitations by 2004. The remaining period of the 10th Plan would be utilized for coverage of the newly emerged habitations and those which have slipped back to PC or NC status. The habitations that could not be covered are mainly located in difficult areas with no source of drinking water e.g. in States like Rajasthan and Maharashtra. Some of the States for example Punjab and Kerala are to review the basis of original classification. Further, it has been stated that at the time of finalisation of 10th Five Year Plan, the Working Group on Rural Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation set up by Planning Commission came to the conclusion that about 2 lakh habitations would slip back to PC or NC categories. Indicating the challenge before the country in respect of providing drinking water to each and every habitation, Finance Minister in his Budget Speech stated that the biggest crisis the world would face in the 21st Century would be the crisis of water.

Survey to know the status of FC habitations converting back to NC & PC habitations.

2.13 The Committee have been informed that all the State Governments were asked to conduct fresh habitation survey in February 2003 to assess the actual ground position regarding NC/PC/FC habitations. The survey data has been received from 24 States. On being asked

as to how the Department would explain the slippage of targets, it has been stated that the data with regard to partially covered habitations which might have slipped back to partially covered and not covered ones is based on the data compiled from the fresh survey.

2.14 When asked about the findings of the fresh results obtained from 24 States, the Government have informed that the survey results received from the States have some data entry problems which are to be rectified and validated by an independent agency. As such it is not possible to do comparison with earlier data. Further, when asked about the process regarding valuation through independent evaluator, the Committee have been informed that the independent evaluator is being engaged and it is expected that about eight months would be required for facilitation of data.

2.15 The Committee find from the position of data as indicated above that the Department has been allocated almost half of what has been proposed by Planning Commission during 10th Plan. Similar trend has been noticed while analyzing the outlay position during 2004-2005. Out of the proposed allocation of Rs. 3142 crore, the Department has been sanctioned BE for Rs. 2900 crore. Further, the Committee find that the various aspects covered while proposing the outlay for 10th Plan viz. the position of slippage of FC category of habitations into PC and PC into NC habitations has not been taken into account. The Committee also note that the gap in the resources is proposed to be bridged through extra budgetary assistance like World Bank assistance. While analyzing the position of World Bank assistance coming in the field of drinking water, the Committee note that only in four States, one or two projects could be taken up by donor assistance/loan. The said aspect of getting lesser outlay as proposed by Planning Commission has repeatedly been taken up while analyzing the Demands for Grants of previous years and the Committee have repeatedly been emphasizing to take up the matter with Planning Commission in view of the top most priority accorded by the Government to provide drinking water to rural areas. While appreciating the resource constraints, the Committee would again like to recommend to take up the matter with the Planning Commission for adequate allocation for drinking water with convincing reasons and commensurate with ground realities. Allocation of lesser amount by Planning Commission shows that the Ministry has not been able to plead their case forcefully for optimum amount. The Committee feel that the Ministry has not done their homework properly before going to Planning Commission for enhanced amount. The Ministry should be able to convince the Planning Commission that shortfall in allocation in such a vital area affects the quality

of life and involves great risk.

The Committee also note that the Secretary of the Department has stated that though overall allocation for rural water supply sector has increased over the years, the actual allocation for the main programme of ARWSP has not increased to that extent as a substantial part of the total outlay is diverted for other programmes and activities such as Swajaldhara, Sector Reforms, etc. In this context, the Committee recommend that outlay for both the programmes should be increased and fund constraint should not hinder the implementation of any of the rural drinking water supply schemes.

The Committee appreciate that World Bank has been approached in the field of drinking water. The Committee would like to recommend that the Government should endeavour to get World Bank assistance for taking up more projects in remaining States so as to bridge the gap between the required outlay and the Government resources in hand. The issue regarding involving corporate sector in the field of drinking water has been analyzed in the succeeding chapters of the Report. Here the Committee would like to emphasize that the Government should endeavour to chalk out an effective and result oriented strategy to motivate and convince the corporate/private sector in fulfilling their social responsibility i.e. providing drinking water to rural masses.

2.16 While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee are constrained to note the position of underspending during the different plans. Although they note that during 9th Plan the underspending was lesser as compared to the previous plan, the Committee feel that in this resource starved economy, every single rupee meant for such a priority area should be timely and meaningfully utilized and the Government should chalk out a clear cut strategy to ensure cent percent utilization of the valuable resources. The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the serious issue of underutilization of resources in their previous Reports also. However, they note with constraint that nothing fruitful has come out and this has become a recurring feature every year. The Committee would again emphasize that much is required to be done in this direction and they should be informed about the concrete steps taken or proposed by the Government in this respect.

2.17 The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants had expressed their concern over the dichotomy in the data with regard to accessibility and availability of drinking water. The Committee have been informed that the Government is commissioning a survey to analyze the position

with regard to slippage of habitations from FC to PC and PC to NC categories. They note that the survey results could be received from 24 States/UTs. Further, they also note that after the survey results are received, the same would be re-evaluated through an independent evaluator. The Committee find that State/UT Governments are taking long time in finalization of the survey. They are unable to comprehend how planning on the part of the Government is made without having a clear picture of the slippage of habitations thereby indicating the actual position with regard to availability of drinking water to rural masses. In this scenario, the Committee feel that there should be some inbuilt mechanism in the monitoring system of the Government to know about the position of slippage of targets at a regular interval and the same should be indicated every year in the Performance Budget.

2.18 The Committee further find that the Government on the one hand claims coverage of 94 per cent rural habitations. On the other hand, they find that by their own admission 2 lakh habitations are estimated to slip back from FC to PC and PC to NC habitations by the end of the 10th Plan. The position may be further alarming when the survey is completed and evaluated by the independent evaluator. Further, the Committee also find that during every year, the Government claims to cover all the NC habitations, but the final result is slippage of targets. The Government propose to cover 70,484 habitations (30,423 NC + 40,061 PC) during the year 2004-2005. During the first three months of the financial year, the Government could cover only 1,380 habitations that speaks volume of the dim possibility of covering the target habitations during the said year. The Committee fail to understand how the Department would address the remaining issues of sustainability, quality and sector reforms, etc. The Committee are deeply concerned over the unrealistic projections being made by the Department which on paper reflect a bright picture with regard to implementation of drinking water schemes. The Committee also feel that the ground reality in this regard is not so optimistic as could be seen from the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister whereby he has stated that the biggest crisis that the world will face in the 21st Century will be crisis of water. In this scenario, the Committee would like to strongly recommend to the Government to project realistic targets during each Plan.

2.19 The Committee find from the data made available to them that there is a mismatch between physical and financial achievement under ARWSP. During the year 2003-04 financial achievement has been shown as 83.67 per cent. However, the position of achievement of NC and PC targets indicate 35.33 per

cent. The Committee also note that there is a declining trend, if we analyse the data with regard to achievement of NC and PC habitations. The achievement during the year 2003-04 is around 35 per cent, if compared with the achievement during the year 1998-99. The Committee would like the Department to explain the specific reasons for mismatch between targets and achievements and the declining trend in achievement in the coverage of NC and PC habitations.

State-wise achievement under ARWSP during the years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004

2.20 The data with regard to physical achievement in different States/Union Territories under ARWSP during the years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 has been given in Appendices-III & IV.

2.21 State-wise data reflects overall 61.44 per cent coverage of habitations during the year 2002-2003. In 11 States/Union Territories, the percentage of coverage of habitation is less than 50 per cent which includes Lakshadweep where the performance is 0 per cent. Besides, in 8 States/Union Territories, no data has been indicated. Similarly, during the year 2003-2004, in 17 States/Union Territories, the percentage of habitations covered is less than 50 per cent which includes Lakshadweep where the performance is 0 per cent. In 10 States/Union Territories, no data has been indicated. When asked for the reasons for such a dismal performance, the Government has furnished a routine reply stating that the uncovered habitations are generally in difficult and inaccessible areas. As such, it becomes difficult and expensive to cover the left out habitations. Similar reply is being furnished by the Government year after year as reflected in the Committee's Reports on Demands for Grants.

Financial Achievement during the years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004

2.22 The overall financial performance during the year 2002-2003 has been indicated as 88.80 percent (Appendix-V). Similarly, during the year 2003-2004, the overall percentage of achievement is 85.46 percent (Appendix-VI).

Financial Progress in DDP States during 2002-2003

2.23 Excepting Jammu & Kashmir where the performance is 24.62 percent, the physical achievement is very good in other DDP States. While in Karnataka, the achievement is 82.94 percent, in other States such as Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana and Rajasthan, the achievement is 100 percent. Himachal Pradesh has achieved a percentage achievement of 137.5 percent. As regards

the reasons for dismal performance in Jammu & Kashmir, the Committee have been informed that DDP areas of Jammu & Kashmir are in Leh and Kargil areas. The works in those areas are disrupted due to inclement weather conditions.

2.24 The Committee find that year after year the physical performance of ARWSP in certain States/UTs is not up to the mark. The attention of the Government has repeatedly been drawn towards this aspect in the previous Reports on Demands for Grants. However, nothing concrete seems to have been done. While admitting that implementation of ARWSP is the responsibility of State Governments, the Committee feel that the Union Government have to play a pro-active role so as to ensure that different Centrally Sponsored Schemes are successfully implemented. The Committee would like the Department to find out States-wise/UT-wise, reasons for under achievement of physical targets in ARWSP in certain States/UTs and inform the Committee accordingly.

2.25 The Committee further find that in DDP areas in J&K, the performance of the programme is very poor. While admitting the fact that difficult geographical conditions and militancy hinder the implementation of the programme, the Committee feel that the steps taken by the Union Government and State Governments to ensure proper implementation of the programme are not adequate which result in almost one-fifth physical achievement. The Committee would like the Department to analyse the reasons and take corrective steps in this regard. Besides the outlay earmarked should be realistic so that huge underspending does not occur every year.

Norms for Drinking Water Supply

2.26 The existing norms for coverage of habitations under ARWSP are as below:

- (i) 40 lpcd of drinking water for human beings;
- (ii) 30 lpcd of additional water for cattle in areas under the DDP;
- (iii) One handpump or standpost for every 250 persons; and
- (iv) Availability of water source in the habitation or within 1.6 km in the plains and 100 metres elevation in hilly areas.

The guidelines of ARWSP introduced in 1977-78 prescribe the drinking water norms.

2.27 The Committee have been informed that there is a provision in the guidelines for relaxation of norms to provide for 55 litres per capita per day with a source within 0.5 km in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills after the coverage of all NC & PC habitations in the State is done as per the aforesaid existing norms. The relaxation is subject to 10 percent beneficiary contribution and shouldering full responsibility for O & M.

2.28 The Committee find that the aforesaid norms with regard to supply of drinking water in rural areas were fixed in 1977-78. They also note that in the guidelines there is a provision for relaxation of norms to provide for 55 litres per capita per day with a source within 0.5 kilometers in the plains and 50 meters elevation in the hills. They further find that the said relaxed norms were applicable in case of States where coverage of all NC and PC rural habitations have been completed. Further relaxation is subject to 10 per cent beneficiary contribution and shouldering full responsibility for O&M. The Committee would like to be informed about the names of States/UTs who are enjoying the relaxed norms.

2.29 The Committee in their preceding Chapter have analysed the position of slippage of FC & PC habitations into NC habitations and had concluded that there is no clear picture available with the Union Ministry with regard to slippage of habitations. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee feel that the Government should, first of all, ascertain the position of full coverage in different States/UTs and then only the revised norms to the States having full coverage should be applied.

2.30 The Committee further note that the relaxed norms are applicable on the condition that 10 per cent beneficiary contribution and shouldering full responsibility for O&M by the community has been achieved. They find that while under ARWSP, there is no condition of 10 per cent beneficiary contributions, the said beneficiary contribution is applicable in case of Swajaldhara since Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme. The Committee fail to understand how the said criteria would be applicable to States/Districts where although the full coverage as per the Government's criteria is achieved but no Swajaldhara project is there. The Committee would like the Government to ponder over the aforesaid position and clarify the position accordingly.

Involvement of Corporate Sector in the field of Drinking Water Supply

2.31 When asked about the role of Corporate Sector in the field of Drinking Water Supply, the Committee have been informed that in different Conferences/Seminars, Corporate Sector through CII or ASSOCHAM etc. are

requested to come forward and contribute towards drinking water supply in rural areas.

2.32 The Committee find that the Government have been requesting corporate sector to come forward in the field of drinking water supply in rural areas in different conferences, seminars through CII and ASSOCHAM. The Committee would like to be informed about the reaction of the corporate sector in this regard.

2.33 The Committee further feel that adequate and effective steps to motivate the corporate sector/private sector to fulfill their social obligations like provision of drinking water for rural areas have not been made by the Government. Instead of delving deep into the matter, a very casual approach has been made through conferences and seminars. To motivate the corporate sector, concerted efforts and skills are essential. In this regard, the Committee feel that the Government should explore all possibilities of involving the private/corporate sectors in the field of rural infrastructure development like rural drinking water supply. However, at the same time the, Committee show their apprehension that development of such an important sector as drinking water supply should not be left to the mercy of the private/corporate bodies and the Government should be able to generate enough funds for investment in the rural drinking water supply sector.

Keeping these varied aspects in view, the Committee would like to recommend that the Government should chalk out a comprehensive strategy so that the corporate and private sector could be convinced and motivated to come forward for participation.

Evaluation of the three Programmes of the Prime Minister

2.34 The then Prime Minister in his Independence Day address on 15th August, 2002, announced three Programmes. The programmes were initiated to address the problems arising out of unprecedented drought of 2002. The Programmes are as under:

- (i) Installment of one lakh handpumps;
- (ii) Providing drinking water facilities to one lakh primary schools; and
- (iii) Revival of one lakh traditional sources of water.

Thereafter EFC Memo for the Programmes was prepared and the case was processed for Cabinet approval. CCEA gave approval in June 2003. The Committee have been informed that guidelines for implementation of the Programmes have been prepared and circulated to all the States.

2.35 As per the information furnished by the Government, the said Programmes are to be completed in two years, i.e. 2003-2005. The total cost involved is Rs. 800 crore. Rs. 80 crore, i.e. 10 percent will be the community contribution Rs. 700 crore have been earmarked in the Budget. The remaining Rs. 20 crore are to be met from the ARWSP fund.

Performance of the Scheme during 2003-2004

2.36 When asked about the need for starting a new Programme in view of the fact that the comprehensive Programme ARWSP covered all the aspects related to drinking water, the Committee have been informed that the amount provided to the States under these Programmes was in addition to the normal allocation and releases made under ARWSP and expected to help solving the drinking water problem through short term low cost schemes.

2.37 However, on the other hand, the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech has stated that in recent years, new programmes have sprung up obscuring the original mission. Government intend to bring all drinking water schemes under the umbrella of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM).

2.38 As per the figures furnished by the Government in the Performance Budget as on 31.3.2004, total allocation to the tune of Rs. 30,375.02 lakh have been made to the State/UTs while total release of Rs. 31,007.15 lakh has been made. However, as per the expenditure reported by the States/UTs, only an amount of Rs. 10,882.53 lakh has been made. As regards physical achievement under the Programme, 25,356 hand pumps have been installed of the total one lakh to be installed in two years, 11,739 traditional sources of water have been revived while 29,087 schools have been covered with drinking water supply.

2.39 The Committee in their respective Reports have been stressing to bring the different programmes meant for same purpose under one umbrella. However, the Committee feel that the policy of the Government is to start a plethora of schemes to achieve a single objective. ARWSP covers all the aspects for which Three Programmes of the Prime Minister were started on 15th August

2002. The Committee further note that as per the policy of UPA Government, they intend to bring all drinking water schemes under the umbrella of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM). The Committee would like to be informed about the status of different programmes meant for drinking water and the steps taken to bring them under the same RGNDW Mission.

2.40 The Committee find that the Three Programmes of the Prime Minister were initiated with the noble objective to address the problem arising out of unprecedented drought of 2002. The programme was to be implemented in two years 2003-2005 and Rs. 800 crore were earmarked for the programme. From the financial and physical achievements as reported above, the Committee find that there is a huge gap between release and expenditure reported by the State Government. Almost 70 per cent of the funds released are lying unspent with various State Governments. The Committee are constrained to note the position of expenditure reported by the States and would like the Government to explain the reasons for such a huge underspending. The Committee observe that the physical achievement in three sectors for which the programme was meant is as below :

- (i) Number of hand pumps installed around 25 per cent of the target.
- (ii) Number of traditional sources revived around 10 per cent of the target.
- (iii) Number of schools covered around 30 per cent of the target.

The Committee conclude that the position of physical achievement is worse than the financial achievement. The Committee are disappointed to note the physical and financial achievement of the programme and would like an explanation from the Government in this regard.

Progress of Implementation of the Swajaldhara Scheme

2.41 In the year 2002-03, proposals for undertaking Swajaldhara Projects were obtained from the States/UTs and cleared by Government of India. From the year 2003-04, State-UT wise allocations are made by Government of India as per the inter State Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) allocation ratio fixed for the year and communicated to the States and Union Territories which, in turn, are required to make the district-wise allocations. The power to sanction schemes has also been delegated to the District Water and

Sanitation Committee (DWSC) which also maintains the details of proposals cleared.

2.42 Under Swajaldhara 2002-03, 4,734 proposals were cleared by Government of India. The State-wise details of proposals cleared, funds released and utilised and schemes completed are at Appendix VII.

2.43 Analysing the information regarding details of Swajaldhara Schemes as implemented in the various States during 2002-03, it can be seen that except for Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu, none of the States show completion of even a single project taken up under this scheme. Also, second instalment of funds has only been released for Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu.

2.44 The latest figures as furnished by the Government for the years 2003-04 and 2004-05 (Appendix VIII) show that though allocation has been made to all the 28 States, except for Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu, none of the States show completion of even a single project under this scheme.

2.45 Further observation reveals that expenditure has been reported only from Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland, Orissa, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. All other States show '0' expenditure figure.

2.46 The position is far more worrisome in the Union Territories. Except for Dadra & Nagar Haveli, funds have not been released for any of the UTs. Consequently, the expenditure reported in all these UTs is nil with non-completion of any scheme.

2.47 On being asked in case the State Governments do not come up with adequate number of project proposals, whether the Union Government have thought about any alternative measure, since 90 per cent of the funds under this programme would be borne by them, the Department has replied that with a view to institutionalize reforms initiative, Swajaldhara guidelines were issued in June 2003. This provides for a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Government of India and the State Government and future funding to be contingent upon signing of the MoU. The Department of Drinking Water Supply has prepared a draft model MoU which was circulated to all the States in November, 2003. There are six steps in the MoU process which are as under:—

- (i) Conducting Sector Status Study of the State
 - Preparation of Terms of Reference
 - Hiring of Consultant/Agency by the State Government
 - Finalisation of Sector Status Study
- (ii) Preparation of State Vision Statement.
- (iii) Preparation of comprehensive Water & Sanitation Policy by the State Government.
- (iv) Preparation of Agreed Action Framework and signing of the MoU with the Government of India.
- (v) Preparation of detailed Annual Action Plan by the State Governments.
- (vi) Monitoring of the MoU process.

2.48 The Department of Drinking Water Supply has prepared and circulated the Terms of Reference of the proposed Sector Status Study to all the States and all States have initiated action in respect of the Sector Status Study which is to be conducted for the State. So far MoU has not been signed with any State. However, it is expected that several States will be ready to sign the MoU with Government of India during the course of this financial year.

2.49 As per Para 15.5 of the Swajaldhara guidelines, if progress under Swajaldhara is found to be unsatisfactory in a State by the Department of Drinking Water Supply, it would be free to reallocate the savings of a State in December among better performing States. In the year 2003-04, the release of 1st instalment could be made to only 21 States and one Union Territory since the remaining States/UTs could not furnish the requisite details as stipulated in Para 15.6.2 of the Swajaldhara Guidelines.

Progress of Sector Reform Projects in different States

2.50 While taking a look at the overall position of the Sector Reform Projects in different States, the Government furnished the following figures:

(Rs. in Lakh)

Approved Project Cost	206045.21
Government of India share	192285.28
Funds released	105882.07
Reported expenditure	77616.97
Community contribution	11700.53
No. of contributors	41828.25

2.51 When asked about the reasons for this huge shortfall in expenditure, the Government replied that they had launched the Sector Reform Project in 67 districts of 26 States on a pilot basis between 1999-2002. The pilot projects were to be implemented over a period of three years and had an approved outlay of Rs. 2,06,045.21 lakh out of which Government of India's share was Rs. 1,92,285.28 lakh. However, the projects took some time to take off and the expenditure upto 31 March 2004 remained below the approved project cost. With the launching of Swajaldhara in December 2002, it was decided to close the on-going Sector Reform Pilot Projects by 31 March, 2004 and conclude final audit of all schemes, whether complete or incomplete, by 30 June 2004. Incomplete schemes, if any, are to be completed under Swajaldhara. The revised estimated cost of schemes under implementation is expected to be around Rs.1,32,728.57 lakh and the total available funds with the Project Authorities is estimated to be Rs. 1,26,429.75 lakh and the reported expenditure is about Rs. 97,708.06 lakh. Full details will become available once the final audit of all schemes is completed and are made available to Government of India.

2.52 The Department has further informed that so far no instance of any difficulty in mobilizing community, contribution has been reported by the Project Authorities under the Sector Reform Project. However, due to a variety of factors, the project could not take off in Sikkim and accordingly two Sector Reform Pilot Projects in the States were closed during 2003.

Phasing out of ARWSP & its replacement with the Swajaldhara Scheme and the related issues of sustainability.

2.53 As per Annual Report 2003-04 of the Ministry of Rural Development, it has been realized that to strengthen the socio-economic conditions of rural India, mere administrative decentralisation or increased investment is not

enough. Despite good investments and improvement in the rural water supply and increased outlay by the Government, particularly in the last one decade, general satisfaction is rather limited at the community level. Systems are lying idle and falling into disrepair. The Government tried to drive home the principle that water is an economic and social good and should be treated as such. It should be managed at the lowest appropriate level with users involved in the planning and implementation of projects. With this aim in view, Government of India has brought about policy changes by introducing reforms in the rural water supply sector. ARWSP was improved in April 1999 to include proposals to mobilise community participation. On a pilot basis, Sector Reform Projects have been under implementation in 67 districts in 26 States. This reform process has been subsequently extended to the entire country by launching Swajaldhara Programme in December 2002, the main principles of which can be summed up as below:

- (1) adoption of demand responsive approach alongwith community participation in the planning, design, implementation of the project;
- (2) full ownership of the drinking water assets;
- (3) panchayats/communities to have the powers to plan, implement, operate, maintain and manage all water supply and sanitation schemes;
- (4) partial capital cost sharing either in cash or kind and 100 percent responsibility of O&M by the users; and
- (5) Shifting the role of Government from direct service delivery to that of planning, policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation and partial financial support.

2.54 The Economic Survey (2003-2004) mentions that it is envisaged that gradually the entire rural water supply sector will switch over to the Swajaldhara mode with prime focus being sustainability of the water supply systems. The paradigm shift will enable the Government to play the role of a facilitator rather than being the service provider.

2.55 On being asked about the Union Government's plan to phase out the allocation based ARWSP and to replace it with the demand driven, community participation approach as envisaged by the Swajaldhara programme,

the Department replied as below:

“Having achieved almost full coverage, in order to ensure source and system sustainability, the supply driven ARWSP was first being replaced by the demand driven community oriented and decentralized programmes with the introduction of the Sector Reform Pilot Project in 1999. In the meeting of the National Development Council held on 21 December 2002, Government decided that priority agenda of action for the year 2003-2004 would be drawn up taking into account the specific directions contained in Tenth Plan document. Accordingly, the Planning Commission prepared a list of priority/thrust items, which were endorsed by the Union Cabinet in its meeting held on 23 July 2003. One of the three thrust area items identified for the Department of Drinking Water Supply related to conversion of the present Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) to community level participatory reforms oriented programme. This would entail preparation of EFC Memo and its circulation to concerned Ministries and preparation and approval of Cabinet Note on the subject after obtaining approval of the EFC. The Department is presently in the process of preparing the Memorandum of the EFC on the subject.”

2.56 Further, the Department stated that the challenge in the sector now primarily relates among other things, to promoting systems and source sustainability to ensure supply of safe drinking water in the concerned habitations. Experience gathered in implementation of the Sector Reform Pilot Projects as well as similar projects within the country as well as in other countries indicate that the reforms principles introduced in the water sector could play an effective role in addressing these challenges.

2.57 The Annual Report (2002-2003) stated that Swajaldhara scheme is meant for taking up only simple and community oriented schemes. This is not meant for the capital intensive complex projects costing to the tune of several lakh of rupees. When it was asked that in case ARWSP is phased out, how do the Government propose to take up these capital intensive complex projects, the Department replied as below:

“Swajaldhara is ideally suited for small village based schemes. However, in some districts there may be need to go in for capital intensive regional/multi-panchayat/village schemes on account of

water quality problems like excess fluoride, arsenic, brackishness etc. and distant location of drinking water sources. Para 11.3 of the Swajaldhara guidelines stipulates that water could be supplied to the Gram Panchayat/community at the village entry point and the community bearing the cost of distribution system within the village/habitation subject to the condition that community contribution is not less than 10 percent of the scheme cost within the village/habitation. Thus, it is visualized that the cost of bringing water from a distant source to the village entry point will remain the responsibility of the State Government. The State Government is expected to formulate a suitable policy in respect of capital intensive multi-village schemes relating to capital cost sharing, operation and maintenance, water tariffs for bulk water supply, etc. These issues are likely to be addressed as a part of the MoU process.”

2.58 On being asked about the distinct funding patterns of ARWSP and Swajaldhara, the Committee have been informed that under Swajaldhara Programme, funds are provided upto 90 percent of the capital cost by the Government of India and at least 10 percent by the communities. Under ARWSP, the States contribute an amount at least equal to the funds released by the Government of India. Inter-State allocation of ARWSP funds is made as per the following criteria:

Weightage for	Percentage
Rural population	40%
States under DDP/DPAP/HADP	35%
NC/PC	15%
Quality	10%

As per the Annual Report of the Department, keeping in view the concept of decentralization of power, the powers to sanction Swajaldhara Projects have now been delegated to District Water and Sanitation Committee (DWSC) as envisaged in the revised guidelines issued in June 2003.

Funds under Swajaldhara are now allocated to the States/UTs and the allocated amount is intimated to the States/UTs. The States/UTs make district-

wise allocation and furnish the details to the Department of Drinking Water Supply. On receipt of such information, the funds are released directly to SWSM/DP/DWSM by Department of Drinking Water Supply.

2.59 The Committee find that the implementation of sector reform projects and Swajaldhara Scheme is not very satisfactory. As could be seen from the data made available to them, there is huge underspending under each of the programmes. They also note that some of the projects are being closed due to variety of factors as in the case of Sikkim reported by the Government. Further, the position is alarming in many of the States where the expenditure has been indicated as nil and in all the Union Territories except Dadra and Nagar Haveli where no funds have been released so far. Further, no scheme could be completed in Union Territories and in most of the States, no project could be completed. The Committee also note that the Department has initiated certain steps to ensure the implementation of the Swajaldhara. However, they note that the steps to be initiated by the Department at this stage like preparation of State vision statement, detailed annual action plan by the State Governments, etc. should have been ensured before launching of the said Scheme. It appears that proper planning has not been made by the Department before starting Swajaldhara.

2.60 The Committee note that as per the Union Government's Policy, ARWSP would be replaced by Swajaldhara scheme gradually. They also note that whereas ARWSP is applicable to each and every State and District, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme. The Committee appreciate the fact that sustainability of drinking water resource can be ensured only when people realize that water is an economic and social good and should be treated as such. Providing drinking water free of cost has created a mindset in the rural masses that water is a social right to be provided by the Government. There is an urgent need to change the mindset of the people. However, there are certain concerns as indicated below to be addressed before ARWSP is replaced by Swajaldhara:

- (i) As has been highlighted in the previous chapters, the position of NC habitations is not clear with the Government. Unless the results of the recent survey being undertaken by the various States are analysed, the clear picture with regard to NC and PC habitations would not emerge;
- (ii) During Tenth Plan, Rs. 24,800 crore have already been earmarked under ARWSP, but how the Government would

ensure utilisation of resources is not clear; and

- (iii) Since Swajaldhara scheme is a demand driven scheme, how the Government would address the problems with regard to accessibility, availability, sustainability and quality etc. especially for the States/Districts which are not up to the mark and could not be motivated to come forward with the projects;
- (iv) In case ARWSP is phased out, how the Government would achieve the objective of full coverage is not clear;
- (v) The position of implementation of Swajaldhara is also not very encouraging. Excepting Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu, none of the States show completion of even a single project taken up under the scheme;
- (vi) As per Government's reply, there is no problem of community contribution under Swajaldhara. However, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme and hence, the projects are demanded from areas where people have the mindset to bear the cost of the projects and owe the responsibilities of operation and maintenance. However, since Swajaldhara is applicable to few of the districts and few areas in the country what will be the position of community contribution is not clear;
- (vii) Under ARWSP some inter-sector allocation according to a fixed criteria has been made. However, Swajaldhara does not have any such prescribed weightage;
- (viii) How the Government would take care of the capital intensive complex projects costing to the tune of several lakhs of rupees under Swajaldhara is not clear; and
- (ix) Whether the rural masses have enough resources and are ready to bear the cost of drinking water from a distant source to the village entry point is not clear as per the replies of the Government.

In view of the aforesaid concerns, the Committee feel that a hurried approach to switch over to Swajaldhara mode will not be prudent. A move with caution and introspection is necessary. A demand driven approach by a

community calls for education, proper appraisal of the needs and clear cut understanding with sufficient alertness and eagerness to shoulder the responsibilities matched by adequate financial support. That Swajaldhara initiative has not received wider acclaim from many areas shows that proper endeavour is yet to come and as such making haste to replace ARWSP with this initiative could be fatal. Too much haste in reforms is not prudent. The Government should wait and watch before arriving at any final conclusion. The Committee would, therefore, like that before taking any action to replace ARWSP by the demand driven scheme of Swajaldhara, all the issues referred to above should be addressed carefully and after interacting with the State Governments and Gram Panchayats and thereby people at large, the Government should carefully draft the guidelines of Swajaldhara. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken.

The Committee are also of the opinion that a streamlined monitoring mechanism should be in place so that the implementing agencies of Swajaldhara Projects can be made accountable. Moreover, data should be maintained regarding the number of DWSCs constituted in the various States of the country, the number of projects implemented by them, the amount of funds at their disposal, among other things. The Committee feel that adopting a strict vigilance and monitoring mechanism on the part of the States/Union Government would go a long way in proper implementation of the projects while also ensuring that community contribution is optimally utilized without any risk of its squandering.

Sustainability of drinking water sources

2.61 Apart from the issue of system sustainability, the issue of source sustainability also came up as an important issue.

2.62 The Annual Report of the Ministry of Rural Development (2003-2004) has elaborated the reasons for which sustainability has emerged as an important issue :

- (i) Fast depletion of ground water level leading to quality problems like arsenic and fluorosis;
- (ii) Sources go dry due to deforestation leading to reduced recharge of aquifers;
- (iii) Poor maintenance of existing water supply systems;
- (iv) Non-participation of people in the O & M of the systems; and

- (v) Neglect of traditional water management practices and systems.

2.63 The Finance Minister in his Budget Speech has spoken a great deal about the various issues related to sustainability, for example, lot of stress was given to restoring water bodies. The Finance Minister proposed a scheme to repair, renovate and restore all the water bodies that are directly linked to agriculture at an estimated cost of Rs.100 crore. Further, it has been stated that once the pilot projects taken up under this scheme are completed and validated, Government will launch the National Water Resources Development Project and complete it over a period of 7-10 years. The Finance Minister went on to state the following:

“... by the beginning of the next decade all water bodies in India will be augmented by at least 100 percent”.

2.64 Water harvesting came up as another major issue, which needs to be taken up by the Government as well as public in all urgency. It was proposed that the Government would launch a nationwide water harvesting scheme for which NABARD would lend money on easy terms. Government would provide a 50 percent capital subsidy through NABARD and the estimate for the scheme is Rs. 100 crore.

2.65 The Department of Drinking Water Supply on being asked as to whether it proposes to launch a new scheme to cover water harvesting programme, replied that the Department was formulating a new scheme for extending loan from NABARD for constructing rainwater harvesting structures at individual households, community and institution levels in rural areas. Further, it has been stated that this scheme will be applicable in DDP, HADP, DPAP areas and North-Eastern States.

2.66 In replying to another query as to why the Government have taken such a long time to launch a nationwide water harvesting scheme, the Department has stated that as that as the water table has been going down progressively, this issue has assumed importance and Government is trying to promote rain water harvesting in a big manner.

2.67 ARWSP guidelines provide for allocation of funds for Sub-Mission on sustainability, which inter-alia includes water conservation, rainwater harvesting & artificial recharge & revival of rainwater harvesting structures. With

effect from 1 April 1998, full powers have been delegated to the State Governments to sanction & implement Sub-Mission projects. The funding pattern is 75:25 between the Centre and the States. 5 percent of the ARWSP funds have been earmarked for tackling sustainability issues. On being asked as to whether the Government have thought about coordinating with NGOs/VOs for working out schemes on rain water harvesting, the Department replied that a Manual on rainwater harvesting was prepared by the Department and distributed to all stakeholders. As per this Manual, NGOs and voluntary organisations are encouraged to work on the scheme on rainwater harvesting.

2.68 On the issue of sustainability, the Government have informed that a model Bill to regulate and control the extraction of ground water drafted by the Ministry of Water Resources has been circulated to all the State Governments for enactment by their respective legislatures. But very few States have enacted such legislation to date.

2.69 When asked to explain the reasons for the hesitant attitude shown by the States to enact the legislation, the Department has stated that legal formalities are still in process in most of the States for modifying the Groundwater Model Bill to suit area specific requirements. The status of the enactment of this particular legislation as furnished by the Department is given in Appendix-IX.

Utilisation of Sea Water

2.70 Utilisation of sea water can go a long way in solving the acute water crisis. When asked as to whether the Government have taken any step towards effective utilisation of sea water, it has been informed that the Government have been requesting the State Governments to utilise sea water. However, the response of the State Governments is not very encouraging. Capital cost of the desalination plants is prohibitive. O&M cost is also very high. Frequently, interrupted supply of electricity and non-availability of skilled personnel also contributes to the unwillingness of the State Governments to install such plants.

2.71 As per the information furnished by the Department, 194 desalination plants based on membrane technology were approved by the Mission for various States to provide water free from excess brackishness in the affected habitations. 150 such plants have been established out of which 77 are functional.

Establishment of desalination plants

2.72 The Finance Minister proposed in the Budget Speech establishment of the first large desalination plant near Chennai in the State Sector and he stated that more such plants will be installed along the Coromandel coast. A desalination plant with a capacity of 300 million litres per day (MLD) is estimated to cost Rs.1000 crore and there will be other costs for transmission pipelines and a captive plant. It is proposed to implement the project through public-private partnership.

2.73 On a query in this regard, the Ministry has replied that according to the Common Minimum Programme (CMP) under drinking water and sanitation in urban areas, desalination plants will be installed in Chennai to start with and then in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Orissa which have been requested to submit proposals for setting up of desalination plants in coastal cities/towns.

2.74 According to the Project concept note by Tamil Nadu Government, the proposal envisages to set up 300 mld capacity desalination plants as long term solution to solve drinking water problem of Chennai city. By extracting seawater at Minjur based on Reverse Osmosis Technology and transforming the water to Redhills Reservoir by 37 kms long transmission main. Project is joint venture between Tamil Nadu Government and Tamil Nadu Investment Company Ltd. and Infrastructure Leasing Financial Services Ltd.

During the oral evidence, the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply have informed that another such desalination plant, on a smaller scale, has been proposed for Lakshadweep.

Conservation of Water

2.75 Another major issue that has sprung up of late is the wastage of water through improper management and lack of awareness. A substantial part of water supply goes waste. On being asked as to whether the Department has any policy guidelines to ensure that dual water supply, i.e., one for drinking water purpose and other for toilet, etc. is operated in different States/UTs, the Department replied that the guidelines issued by the Government of India stipulate that the State Governments should follow the dual water policy, which is regularly reiterated during review of quality related problems in drinking water, with the States.

2.76 Further, the Department has informed that community involvement in management of drinking water supply where they plan, design, implement, operate and maintain is expected to check water wastage by the people. No statistics regarding wastage of water is available with the Government.

2.77 On being asked as to whether the Department has paid any attention for water saving flush devices, it has been stated that usually in the rural areas, mechanical flushing system in the toilets is not installed. However, hand flush system is used in the pour flush toilets being constructed in the rural areas. Water consumption in the pour flush toilets varies with the design of pan and water closet. In order to save water in flushing the excreta, "rural pan" is being promoted. The "rural pan" is characterized by high gradient of the pan and low diameter of the water closet so that with as little as one litre of water, flushing can take place. Under TSC, rural pans are being promoted and project districts are advised to educate the people about using such pans which will lead to water conservation. Ministry of Finance has also been approached to reduce excise duty on such pans. It has also been realised of late that altering the design of flushes so that they become less water-intensive would be an important step.

2.78 On being asked as to whether the Union Government have taken any concrete step to ensure concerted efforts of all the Ministries/Departments which are tackling the problem of sustainability of water resources, it has been stated that:—

"The Union Government has taken some concrete steps to ensure concerted efforts of all the Ministries/Departments, which are tackling the problem of sustainability of water sources. Ministry of Water Resources being the nodal Ministry for sustainability have already set up an Inter-Ministerial Working Group for effective coordination on water sharing issues/policies. This Department has already nominated an office for this Working Group. This Working Group has been apprised of the Sub-Mission on Sustainability for which 5 percent of the ARWSP funds have been earmarked. The Department has also drafted a Model Bill for Water (Regulation for Conservation and Protection of Drinking Water Sources) 2004. The same is under examination of Ministries of Water Resources and Law and Justice. This Department has also prepared a Manual on Rainwater Harvesting & Artificial Recharge for facilitating the State

Governments to take up such projects. A CD on rainwater harvesting technologies has also been prepared by this Department for disseminating information all over the country.”

2.79 The Committee note that after achieving substantial coverage of habitations with provision of drinking water, the issue of sustainability – both of the source and system – has emerged as the most pertinent issue. As focussed in the President’s address to the Parliament and also in the Finance Minister’s Budget speech, various measures for conservation of water are the need of the day. In this context, the Committee also feel that maximum stress should be given to the conservation of water resources by adopting such measures as:

- (1) Control on over extraction and exploitation of ground water sources. The Committee note that a model Bill to regulate and control the development of ground water drafted by the Ministry of Water Resources has been circulated to all the State Governments for enactment by their respective legislation. The Committee strongly recommend that the legal formalities in most of the States should be completed expeditiously and Ground Water Model Bill with area specific requirements should be implemented at the earliest.
- (2) Further, the Committee feel that water harvesting schemes should be given priority by the Department. It has been stated by the Ministry that State Governments have been advised that up to 5 percent of the fund released under ARWSP should be used for Sub-Mission on sustainability. The Committee feel that mere allocation of funds for taking up sustainability issues will not serve the purpose. The Finance Minister proposed that Government would launch a nationwide water harvesting scheme with 50 percent capital subsidy to NABARD by which one lakh irrigation units at an average cost of Rs.20,000 per unit will be covered. The Committee would like to know the details of the said Scheme and further recommend that such schemes should be started in the drinking water supply sector. Involving the community in setting up such conservation structures will be a positive step in this direction.
- (3) The Committee are of the view that partial treatment of the

problem will not serve any purpose. All the issues pertaining drinking water availability, sustainability of sources and systems drinking water quality are interrelated and cannot be addressed in isolation. The need of the hour is adopting a holistic approach on water management issues. In this context, the Committee feel that experts in the relevant fields should be involved to discuss these issues so that an objective and acceptable solution can be reached.

2.80 The Committee in their earlier reports had drawn the attention of the Department to the need of the hour to accept sea water for drinking water and other purposes (refer para no.3.108, 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha). They had also drawn the attention of the Department about the need to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. The Committee had recommended to stress that the Government should give more thrust for exploration of sea water for drinking water and other purposes. The Committee are pleased to note that the Government has finally agreed to install a desalination plant with a capacity of three hundred million per day (mld). The approximate cost of which is Rs. 1,000 crore as Finance Minister stated in his Budget Speech. They also appreciate that under the Common Minimum Programme, the Government propose to install desalination plants in States of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Orissa.

The Committee were informed the project to install a smaller desalination plant has been proposed for Lakshadweep. The Committee would like to know the details of said Project. They feel that since resource constraint is a major issue, stress should be more on installing such smaller plants which need lesser capital investment.

The Committee feel that the steps ensured by the Government in this regard would go a long way in providing drinking water in coastal areas as recommended by them in their earlier reports. The Committee would like that more projects should be launched in other States. Besides, as recommended by them earlier Government should pay more attention to R&D to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. The Committee would also like to recommend to study the technologies used in other countries where water for drinking water and other purposes is provided by desalination projects.

2.81 The Committee feel that the most important issue that has been more or less neglected so far is to make the masses aware about the precious resource

of water and how its wastage can bring about acute water scarcity disturbing environmental and ecological balance. Most disturbing is the fact that the Government do not think it necessary to maintain any data with regard to the wastage of water. Mismanagement of water resources and lack of proper awareness result in the wastage of millions of gallons of water per day. In this context, the Committee are of the view that the Government should give focussed attention to their IEC Programme teaching the masses about their duties to conserve water sources. Mass media can be used extensively, like giving advertisements in newspapers, slide shows in theatres etc. to educate the masses.

2.82 The Committee also feel that a holistic approach in treating the drinking water and sanitation issues is the best solution in the modern day context. People should be taught not to dump sewerage and other pollution in the water sources which give rise to a vicious cycle of pollution feeding back in to the system.

Drinking Water Quality

2.83 The issue of source sustainability is closely related to that of drinking water quality. The Annual Report (2003-04) of the Ministry states that groundwater depletion has aggravated water quality problems due to excess fluoride, arsenic and brackishness in certain areas. During the examination of Demands for Grants (2003-04), the Secretary of the Department had stated that all the States in the country, in some degree or the other, are facing the problem of receding water table with aquifers getting dried. The problem does not end here, as water level goes low, it gets contaminated and many safe sources of drinking water turn polluted.

2.84 As per the data furnished by the Ministry, the break-up of quality-affected habitations as on 1.4.1999 is as follows:

Fluoride	—	36,988
Salinity	—	32,597
Iron	—	1,38,670
Arsenic	—	3,136
Nitrate	—	4,003

Other problems	—	1,400
----------------	---	-------

2.85 Replying to a query in this regard, the Department has stated that a fresh survey of quality affected habitations was ordered in March 2000, which was to be carried out in two phases. In the first phase, 5-10 percent stratified sampling was to be done block-wise. In the second phase, 100 percent sources were to be tested wherever quality problem was found in the first phase. This survey was to be completed by March 2001. However, States have so far completed only the first phase of the survey. Some of the States like Bihar and West Bengal have not done 5-10 percent sampling as directed. Only one source per habitation or one per cent sources have been tested so far by some of the States. Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu have furnished data for the second phase of the survey as well. Rajasthan emerges as the worst sufferer in terms of number of affected habitations with major drinking water quality problems. West Bengal and Orissa have maximum number of quality affected habitations with iron. Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu have drawn up Action Plan for coverage of quality-affected habitations.

2.86 Further, elaborating on this issue, it has been stated that amongst the identified quality problems, the most widespread problem causing maximum suffering to a large segment of rural population is fluoride. Arsenic is another problem which also causes suffering to the people, but is still confined to West Bengal with eight districts and has also recently been confirmed in some districts of Bihar and one district of Jharkhand. The Government have been taking steps at national level for addressing these problems. 20 projects were sanctioned between 1992-1993 and 100 Sub-Mission projects were sanctioned between 1994-1998. With effect from 1 April 1998, full powers were delegated to the States Governments for sanctioning and implementing Sub-Mission projects. 15 percent of ARWSP funds are earmarked for tackling quality problems. Fully covered States can utilise more than 15 percent of the ARWSP funds with the specific approval of Government of India. It is now proposed to enhance the earmarked funds for water quality from 15 percent to 30 percent. It is also proposed to sanction Sub-Mission projects after approval from National Scheme Sanctioning Committee of this Department.

2.87 The Ministry has intimated that as per reports received from the States, 252 district level water quality-testing laboratories have been established out of 430 sanctioned so far in the country from Government of India funds.

In addition, 158 laboratories have been established by State Governments. Funds for establishment of district level water quality testing labs are released under ARWSP funds.

2.88 Further, the Government have stated that for improving water quality monitoring & surveillance, a 'Catchment Area Approach' involving various educational & technical institutions has been envisaged. States are being given financial assistance to strengthen their infrastructure for this purpose. Pilot projects have been taken up in four districts, one each in Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh & Uttar Pradesh. Elaborating on the said information, the Department has further stated that Government of India have sanctioned four Pilot Projects in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh namely, in Nellore, Sehore and Allahabad respectively at Rs.32.00 lakh for each district amounting to Rs.96.00 lakh. Pilot project of Kangra in Himachal Pradesh was approved at Rs.29.50 lakh during 2002-2003.

Details of projects are as under:—

1. Coverage of all the villages/habitations of selected districts and testing of water quality from all public drinking water sources for water quality monitoring and surveillance on quarterly basis for a period of one year;
2. To conduct awareness campaign and train resource persons from schools, colleges, health centers, panchayats for sample collection/testing;
3. To test water on regular basis and prepare quarterly report on water quality testing results and disseminate the information to all concerned for generating awareness to facilitate action taken for corrective measures; and
4. To provide water testing kits at grassroot level (Panchayat level functionaries) laboratories etc. for implementing Water Quality Monitoring & Surveillance Programme.

2.89 The pilot projects in Sehore and Nellore have been implemented by testing quality of water from 10 percent of public drinking water sources while in Allahabad, the testing has been done only for less than 5 percent of public drinking water sources which needs investigation for verifying working of the

system at grassroot level. Kangra project is still continuing with water quality testing from public sources and only interim reports are coming.

2.90 The Committee note that as per the guidelines of ARWSP, 20 percent of its funds are earmarked for sub-Mission activities, out of which 5 percent is for tackling sustainability issues and 15 percent is for taking care of quality problems. Fully covered States can utilize more than 15 percent of the ARWSP funds with specific approval of the Government of India. The Committee further observe that the Government have proposed to enhance the earmarked funds for water quality from 15 percent to 30 percent, which is a positive step. The Committee feel that in the recent times, the problem of sustainability alongwith quality has emerged as one of the challenges to be tackled in this field, which should be given maximum priority. Earmarking of more funds for the sector will go a long way in dealing with the problem of drinking water quality. Further, since the Government have identified the main causes responsible for drinking water contamination, i.e. fluoride and arsenic, proper technical know-how should be developed to deal with these problems and at the same time some immediate action plan should also be drawn.

2.91 The Committee further note that the survey regarding quality affected habitations with 5-10 percent stratified sampling in the first phase, which was commissioned way back in March 2000 has not been taken up seriously by majority of the States. Further, very few States like Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu have furnished data for the second phase of the survey. While taking a serious note of this attitude of the State Governments, the Committee strongly recommend that the Union Government should take a pro-active step and issue directions to all the State Governments to complete the aforesaid survey within a stipulated time frame. Independent evaluators should be engaged to complete the survey with a thorough scrutiny so that it is carried out in an efficient manner.

Coverage of schools with drinking water supply sources

2.92 As per the information furnished by the Government, during the examination of Demand for Grants (2003-2004), out of 6.37 lakh rural primary and upper primary schools in the country (as per the Sixth All India Educational Survey, September 1993), 2.85 lakh have drinking water facilities and 3.51 lakh schools are yet to be provided this facility. Further, it has been stated that the Ministry of Human Resource Development was conducting the 7th All India

Educational Survey and once the results of the survey are available in the next few months, it would be possible to make a fresh assessment of the total number of schools without basic drinking water and sanitation facilities (para 3.56 of 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha). However, on a query regarding the status of the survey, it has been informed that as informed by the Department of Elementary education, 7th All India Educational Survey has been completed but the results are being compiled by the NCERT. The compiled results are still to be declared. At present, the Department has the available figure for rural schools based on 6th All India Educational Survey. As per this, under ARWSP so far, 1,42,415 number of schools have been provided with water supply, which also includes those number covered under Prime Minister's announcement since 2000-01.

2.93 No separate evaluation study has been carried out to assess slippages in status of water supply schemes in rural schools. However, an evaluation study for TSC project has been awarded to Agricultural Finance Corporation where this aspect will also be studied.

2.94 On a query regarding the Government's plan of action regarding coverage of rural schools with drinking water supply facilities in view of the fact that the Government are phasing out the supply driven, allocation-oriented ARWSP, the Department has informed that coverage of schools with drinking water facilities can be taken up under Swajaldhara also which is a community led demand driven and decentralized form of implementing rural water supply scheme. Besides, programmes of other Departments like Sarva Siksha Abhiyan of the Ministry of Human Resource Development also provide for drinking water facilities in schools.

2.95 The Department has also informed that the States have been requested to cover all schools by 2005-06. The efforts made by other Ministries like Ministry of Human Resource Development are coordinated to give thrust to the coverage of schools.

2.96 On analyzing the figures pertaining to target and coverage of schools during the year 2002-03, it is found that many of the States are way behind the target, e.g. Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, etc. Eight States show 0 percent coverage of schools, while the corresponding figures for Andhra Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram are 2.41%, 10.68% & 16.00% respectively. However, some of the States show a coverage percentage of more than 100 percent showing a very lopsided picture.

2.97 Similarly, for 2003-04 (as per the reports received from States/UTs till 25.06.2004), total school coverage has been shown as 51.97% percent with five States showing 0 percent coverage. Further, eight States show a percentage coverage of less than 50 percent.

2.98 The Committee in their respective reports had repeatedly been recommending to the Government to give topmost priority to provide drinking water to schools in rural areas. In spite of that, the physical achievement of the programme indicate that serious attention has not been paid towards this programme. It is really a matter of concern that even after more than five decades of planned development, provision of drinking water to schools is a distant dream. The Committee are really disturbed to note the position of coverage of schools in various States. In several States, the coverage has been indicated as 0 percent. While appreciating the fact that the responsibility of implementation of ARWSP and of school coverage is with the State Governments, the Committee feel that adequate efforts to sensitize the various State Governments about the urgency of providing drinking water to schools are not being made by the Union Government. The Committee would like the Department to coordinate with other Ministries/Departments involved in this regard as well as the respective Departments of various State Governments so that all the schools can be covered within a stipulated time frame. The Committee further find that Seventh All India Educational Survey has been completed and the results are being compiled by the NCERT. The Committee would like to be apprised of the results when available. Besides, they would also like that the future planning to be made with regard to providing drinking water to rural schools should be made according to the recent data that would be made available as per the Seventh All India Educational Survey. The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) [refer para 3.60 of 46th Report and para 25 of 52nd Report, 13th Lok Sabha] had recommended that under the Sector reform project or Swajaldhara programme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. Provision should be made so that the 10 per cent of beneficiary funds could be contributed from the MPLAD funds. As per the action taken reply, the Government could not agree to the recommendation on the plea that community is an essential ingredient in the successful implementation, operation and maintenance of rural water supply schemes, hence Swajaldhara guidelines provide for 10 per cent contribution by the community. The Committee, while taking up the issue again would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and again emphasize that school coverage should not be treated at par with coverage of habitations as per normal programme. So far as 10 per cent community contribution is concerned, as a special case for school coverage,

Swajaldhara guidelines should be made flexible so that 10 per cent community contribution could be provided from MPLAD funds.

2.99 On the issue to ensure drinking water in privately managed schools, the Committee in their earlier Report had recommended that Government aided schools should also be brought under the purview of Government school coverage programme (refer para 3.60 of 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha). The Government in their action taken reply had stated that it is responsibility of private management to provide drinking water in privately managed schools. The Committee while examining the action taken reply had desired to be apprised about the overall position of drinking water in such Government aided schools in order to assess position in the right perspective. The Committee would like to be apprised about the specific steps taken by the Department with regard to coverage of privately managed schools.

In this context, the Committee would like to recommend that all these categories of schools, viz., Government schools, Government-aided and recognized schools and private schools should be covered under the rural drinking water supply programme, so that the supply of potable drinking water can be made available to each and every school of the country thereby ensuring health and well-being of school children.

Further, the Committee feel that the provision of potable drinking water should be extended to local primary health centres and dispensaries thus benefiting a large number of people.

Position in the North Eastern States

2.100 The Annual Report (2003-2004) of the Ministry identifies the problem with the North-Eastern States. It states that the North-Eastern States have been facing problems to meet State's matching share against Central releases in the past. The Department of Drinking Water Supply has given maximum financial flexibility in the guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme in respect of North-Eastern States in view of the fact that 10 per cent of the total Central outlay for the programme is earmarked for North-Eastern States. Any unutilized funds of Government of India share are credited into the non-lapsable pool, under which State Governments can take up various projects.

2.101 In their earlier Reports (para 3.68 of the 46th Report,

13th Lok Sabha), the Committee had dealt with in detail, the issue of variation between availability and accessibility of drinking water sources especially in the hilly and difficult terrains of North-Eastern States. When asked as to whether any survey has been conducted in recent times to evaluate the implementation of ARWSP in the North-Eastern States, the Department has stated that all the seven States of North-East and Sikkim were requested to conduct a fresh survey during 2003 to ascertain the latest status of rural habitations. The data furnished by 7 States of North-East are to be examined and validated by an independent agency. The habitation survey results have not been received from Sikkim. So far, 15,160 habitations (1642 NC + 13518 PC) have been covered in these States during the last three years.

2.102 Further, the Department has stated that the concerned State Governments have repeatedly been requested to give high priority to this sector. The performance of the States is also reviewed and guidance/support be given whenever necessary. Increased focus on rainwater harvesting and other water conservation measures have also been suggested for implementation in the North-Eastern States which have sufficient rainfall.

2.103 As per the reports received from the States till 25 September 2004, the expenditure figure for the North-Eastern States under ARWSP show dismal coverage, as shown below:—

States	Percentage coverage
1	2
Arunachal Pradesh	9.30
Assam	27.4
1	2
Manipur	14.85
Meghalaya	46.07
Mizoram	61.42
Nagaland	8.09
Sikkim	55.56

Tripura

Also, as per the Performance Budget of the Department, project proposals have been received only from Assam out of the seven States of the North-East & Sikkim.

2.104 The Committee note that pursuant to their recommendation made in their earlier Reports (refer 3.60 of 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha), seven States of North East and Sikkim were requested to conduct a fresh survey during 2003-2004 to ascertain latest status of rural habitation and they have already furnished the data which have been examined and evaluated by an independent agency. The Committee also find that survey results from Sikkim are still awaited. The Committee would like to be apprised about the latest position with regard to coverage of habitations in North Eastern States as per the survey after valuation by an independent agency. Besides, they would also like that Sikkim should be impressed upon to complete the survey without any further delay. The Committee are constrained to note the position of expenditure under ARWSP in North Eastern States. The position of coverage in all the States is very poor. Only Mizoram and Sikkim could achieve 60 per cent and 55 per cent coverage respectively. The status of implementation of Swajaldhara Scheme indicate that project proposals have been received only from Assam. All the other North Eastern States have failed to come up with any proposed project under the Swajaldhara Scheme. The Committee would like the Department to interact with the North Eastern States to know about their specific problems with regard to non-furnishing of projects under Swajaldhara.

Human Resource Development (HRD) and Information, Education and Communication Programme (IEC)

2.105 As per the information furnished by the Government, during the 10th Plan period, National Human Resource Development (NHRD) programme implementation was discontinued. During the 9th Plan period when NHRD programme was under implementation, 24 States had set up HRD cells. During 2002-03 and 2003-04 only Rs. 128.23 lakh was spent on HRD programme to meet the committed liabilities of the 9th Plan period. Now, revised guidelines for communication and capacity development unit have been adopted in the 10th Plan period and States will be supported for taking up HRD and IEC activities under this programme. In the current financial year, Rs.14.90 crore has been proposed to be allocated for

HRD activities.

2.106 Regarding the IEC Programme, the Department has stated that the earlier IEC programme also has been discontinued in the 10th Plan period. The earlier HRD and IEC programmes have been restructured and State Governments are being supported for setting up Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU). During 2002-03 and 2003-04, Rs.16.53 crore was spent for IEC to meet the IEC expenditure at the Central Government level as well as the committed liabilities of 9th Plan. In the current year 2004-05, an allocation of Rs.10.10 crore has been made for IEC.

2.107 With the change in the policy perspective of the Government to make the rural water supply & sanitation programmes more demand responsive with prime focus on community participation in planning, design, implementation and subsequent O&M of the system, spreading awareness among the masses as well as educating them on these issues have become an imperative issue. The Ministry in its Annual Report has stated that HRD Programme aims at training beneficiaries, especially women at the grassroot level. It also aims at empowerment of PRIs to enable them to take up activities related to water supply. Further, 7 key institutes, namely ESI Ahmedabad, SJC Mysore, AIH & PH Kolkata, GGRI Gandhigram, GJTI Gandhi Nagar, IRET Ahmedabad & MLNREC Allahabad, which develop and organise various professional training / capacity development courses.

2.108 Similarly, the IEC Programme was launched in 1996 with the aim to educate public and create awareness among them regarding safe drinking water & proper sanitation. It is now intended to establish and support Communication and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) in each State to carry out an effective IEC Programme. The CCDU guidelines have been framed and are awaiting approval of the competent authority. IEC campaign through electronic media are also being carried out.

2.109 The Committee note that during 10th Plan period, National Human Resource Development Programme (NHRDP) implementation was discontinued. However, during the 9th Plan period when the programme was under implementation, 24 States had set up HRD cells. The Committee would like to know the fate of these cells on which large amount of funds have been spent so far. Further, it has been stated that in the current financial year, Rs.1,490 lakh has been proposed to be allocated for the HRD activities. The Committee

would like to know the actual status regarding allocation, release and expenditure of funds for HRD activities.

2.110 Further, the Committee note that IEC Programme has also not received due attention from the Government. During 2002-03 and 2003-04, only Rs.16.53 lakh was spent for IEC whereas for the current year 2004-05, an allocation of Rs.10.10 lakh has been made. The Committee feel that in the prevailing scenario, when the Government's policy focus has changed to make the Schemes demand responsive and participative, HRD&IEC Programmes should receive maximum attention. Efforts should be made to use modern information technology methods to promote mass awareness and also for capacity development of the community so that they are able to participate in a more productive manner.

CHAPTER III

RURAL SANITATION PROGRAMME

3.1 The Annual Report of the Ministry has stated that in the rural India, the low levels of households sanitation (only about 22 per cent of households are estimated to have toilet facilities as per Census 2001) along with haphazard provision of environmental sanitation infrastructure render the settlements in the villages as potential sites for a host of diseases.

Further, as per the information furnished by the Government, 64 per cent of the population in the country defecates in the open, resulting in 20,000 MT of excreta every day endangering drinking water sources.

3.2 Focusing on rural sanitation, the Economic Survey states that the Central Government supplements the efforts of the States in the field of rural sanitation under the Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP). This programme was restructured in 1999 and Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) introduced. TSC envisages a synergised interaction between the Government, people and active NGO participation, besides intensive Information, Education & Communication (IEC) campaigns, provision of an alternative delivery system and more flexible, demand oriented construction norms. The revised Tenth Plan strategy envisages a shift from allocation based programme to a demand-based project mode. Besides, the paradigm shift envisages a greater household involvement, intensive IEC campaigns and stress on software and emphasis on school sanitation. Projects at a total cost of Rs. 3,375 crore have been sanctioned for 350 identified districts. Under TSC, projects in 398 districts covering 29 States/UTs have so far been sanctioned with an approved outlay of Rs. 3,744 crore.

3.3 Central, State and beneficiary shares of the projects are about Rs. 2,214 crore, Rs. 827 crore and Rs. 704 crore respectively. An amount of Rs. 621 crore has already been released by the Government of India for the implementation of these projects. The main physical components sanctioned in the 398 projects to be achieved over a period of four years are as follows:—

- (i) Construction of 3.23 lakh individual household latrines;
- (ii) 3.53 lakh toilets for schools;
- (iii) 25,236 sanitary complexes for women;
- (iv) 59,562 toilets for Balwadis/Anganwadis; and
- (v) 2,942 Rural Sanitary Marts/Production Centres.

3.4 Of the 138.2 million rural households in India as per Census 2001, nearly 6.75 millions have constructed household toilets with support from the TSC. Besides, 2,688 women's complexes, 80,674 school toilets, 11,958 anganwadi toilets and 2,002 production centres/rural sanitary marts have been set up. To achieve the Millennium Development Goal of reducing by half the number of people without access to sanitation by 2015, TSC is being scaled up with an effort to sanction TSC projects in all the districts by 2005-06 to avoid the time constraint in its effective and sustainable implementation as per the target laid down.

3.5 Performance of the Programme during 2002-03 show that out of an allocated provision of Rs. 165 crore, Rs. 141.10 crore was released. However, Rs. 94.32 crore has been shown as the provisional expenditure figure. Analysing the State-wise financial performance, 12 States/UTs show nil expenditure. Similarly, during the same period, 24,41,636 sanitary latrines were constructed under Total Sanitation Campaign. Moreover, 15 States/UTs show the number of sanitary latrines constructed as 'Nil'.

3.6 During the year 2003-04, out of an allocated amount of Rs. 205 crore, Rs. 202.43 crore was released while Rs. 165.61 crore has been shown as the expenditure figure. Analysing the State-wise performance figures, under TSC during the year 2003-04, it can be seen that Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Uttaranchal, Daman & Diu and Pondicherry show negligible expenditure. Moreover, HRD and IEC programmes show nil expenditure though funds have been released for these programmes. Similarly, for 2003-04, 45,13,884 sanitary latrines have been constructed under TSC. However, 11 States show that no such construction has taken place during the year.

3.7 The Department has stated that as per the Sixth All India Education

Survey conducted in 1993, there were 5,07,581 rural primary and 1,29,246 upper primary schools. Out of these, 32,463 rural primary schools and 25,812 upper primary schools were covered with sanitation facilities. Further, it has been stated as below:—

“Under demand-driven Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) programme, sanitation facility in all rural schools are to be provided. The fund sharing pattern for construction of the sanitation block in schools is 60:30:10 among Centre, State and community respectively. In each co-educational schools separate toilet block for girl students is to be constructed. The average unit cost for this purpose is taken as Rs. 20,000 per sanitation block. So far under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC), 3,53,041 toilets have been sanctioned out of which 96,258 have been constructed.”

As per the information furnished by the Government, incentives are proposed to be given in the field of rural sanitation. PRIs, individuals, organizations are eligible to get the Nirmal Gram Puraskar for achieving the following objectives:—

- (i) Full coverage at household and school level;
- (ii) Free from open defecation;
- (iii) Free from practice of manual scavenging; and
- (iv) Clean environmental maintenance.

3.8 The Committee have been repeatedly bringing to the notice of the Government that the percentage coverage of rural household with sanitation facilities show a dismal picture. The Committee note with dismay that the Census 2001 found that only 22 per cent rural households have been covered with sanitation facilities. Further, the Committee find that underutilisation of funds has become a recurrent feature. For 2002-03, the provisional expenditure figure shows an underspending of Rs. 70.68 crore while for the year 2003-04, the provisional figure 36.82 crore in respect of the State of Bihar, Jharkhand, Odisha, Jharkhand, Bihar performance in both financial and physical aspects, in a number of States show an alarming situation. In such a scenario, the Committee strongly recommend that the Department should optimize expenditure of the available funds. The Committee further find that the Department is providing provisional

expenditure figure even for the year 2002-03 which should have been updated by mid 2004 at the time of preparing the Performance Budget (2003-04). Further, the Committee feel that the Government should ensure that project proposals are forthcoming from all the States so that lopsided coverage does not take place. Till now 398 projects in the country are under implementation with a number of remaining districts, where such projects under TSC have not yet taken off. The Committee would again like to know whether these left out districts are getting any funds for sanitation programmes especially when TSC projects are not being forwarded by them.

3.9 The Committee are concerned to note that no updation of data regarding coverage of rural schools with sanitation facilities have been done so far. During the examination of Demands for Grants (2003-04), the same figures from the Sixth All India Education Survey were quoted by the Department. The Committee feel that in the absence of regular evaluation of the actual work done in the field, the ground reality will not be clear. In such a scenario, the fixing of targets or its subsequent achievement lose their meaning and the figures remain only on paper. The Committee have been informed that the Seventh All India Education Survey has been completed and the results are being compiled at present. The Committee strongly recommend that the survey results should be made available expeditiously and the statistics emerging from it should be meaningfully used to set targets and achievement.

Further, the Committee are of the opinion that school sanitation should be given topmost priority with special attention for provision of lavatory facilities for girls. It has been stated by the Department that under TSC, 10 percent of the total funds is to be provided by the community. The Committee urge the Government to look into the feasibility aspect of this Scheme, and further recommend that under this Scheme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. There should be the provision that 10 percent community contribution of funds can be made from the MPLAD Scheme. The Committee also feel that along with encouraging community participation, there should be some provision for Central allocation to be given to each State for providing sanitation facilities to rural schools.

In this context, the Committee would like to recommend that construction of sanitary toilets in schools should be of standard quality with provision of adequate supply of water, so that these do not fall into disuse after a certain point of time thus rendering the entire amount invested on these a wastage.

Further, the Committee feel that the provision of hygienic sanitation facilities should be extended to local primary health centres and dispensaries thus benefiting a large number of people.

3.10 The Committee find that the focus of policy in the drinking water supply and sanitation sectors is to encourage community participation. However, it is a matter of serious concern that no such change in policy orientation is reflected in IEC or HRD Programmes of the Government. The Committee feel that if the Government want to make the demand-driven Schemes successful, proper attention should be given to spread awareness among the rural masses with special emphasis on educating school children regarding adoption of hygienic sanitation habits. Involvement of NGOs/VOs in this regard will go a long way in such interaction with the grassroots to encourage and motivate them to take responsibility of their community assets.

The Committee find that another important issue that needs to be addressed is the problem of open defecation. As the figure furnished by the Department shows that 64 percent of the population in India defecates in open, resulting in 20,000 MT of excreta everyday, the Committee feel that alongwith providing sanitation facilities to rural masses, awareness should be spread among them so that sanitary latrines constructed are used to the optimum. It has been observed though sanitary latrines/complexes are in place, those often fall into disuse, thus rendering the entire amount spent on them a wastage. The Committee strongly recommend that all means at the disposal of the Government right to the grassroot level should be utilized to educate the masses against open defecation and adopting hygienic sanitation habits.

3.11 The Committee note with appreciation that incentives in the field of rural sanitation has been started for PRIs, individuals, organisations for adopting hygienic sanitation practices. The Committee feel that such incentive Schemes should be encouraged in all villages/districts of the country so that people come forward and participate enthusiastically in the implementation and O&M of the sanitation projects.

APPENDIX I										
MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT										
DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY										
PLAN										(Rs. in Crores)
Sl.No.	Name of the Schemes	9th Plan	Outlay	Actual Expenditure	Proposed Outlay	Outlay Agreed	Total Release	Total Expr.	B.E.	R.E.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Rural Water Supply Prog.	8564.00	8455.00	24800.00	13245.00	4939.02	3684.07	1960.00	1960.00	1896.55
2.	Rural Sanitation	534.00	514.00	3663.00	955.00	471.09	373.75	140.00	140.00	130.86
	Total	9098.00	8969.00	28463.00	14200.00	5410.11	4057.82	2100.00	2100.00	2027.41
Sl. No.	Name of the Schemes	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		
		B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expr.	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expr.	B.E.	Outlay	Actual Expr.
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
					(Upto 30.6.04)					
1.	Rural Water Supply Prog.	2010.00	1975.00	1943.05	2235.00	2110.00	2100.70	2585.00	2565.01	2564.90
2.	Rural Sanitation	150.00	135.00	538.34	165.00	140.00	141.10	165.00	205.00	623.00
	Total	2160.00	2110.00	2481.39	2400.00	2250.00	2241.80	2750.00	2770.01	2769.90
										3300.00
										985.44

APPENDIX I Contd.
(Rs. in Crores)

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE SCHEMES NON-PLAN	9TH PLAN		10TH PLAN		TOTAL RELEASE EXPR.	TOTAL EXPR.	B.E.	R.E.	ACTUAL EXPR.
		OUTLAY	ACTUAL EXPR.	PROPOSED OUTLAY	OUTLAY AGREED					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	HEADQUARTER'S ESTT. OF DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY & ARWSP	6.20	5.40	NOT APPLICABLE (Upto 30.6.04) TO Non-PLAN	3.16	NOT APPLICABLE TO Non-PLAN	1.29	1.22	1.13	
	Total	6.20	5.40		3.16		1.29	1.22	1.13	

Sl. No.	Name of the Schemes	2001-02			2002-03			2003-04			2004-05		
		B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expr.	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expr.	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expr.	Prop. Outlay	R.E.	Actual Expr.
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1.	Headquarter's Estt. of Department of Drinking Water Supply & ARWSP	1.35	1.31	1.36	1.33 (Upto 30.6.04)	1.38	1.39	1.38	1.39	1.38	1.98	1.39	0.39
	Total	1.35	1.31	1.36	1.33	1.38	1.39	1.38	1.39	1.38	1.98	1.39	0.39

APPENDIX II

STATUS OF COVERAGE OF HABITATIONS
UNDER RURAL WATER SUPPLY
(AS PER INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM
STATES/UTs TILL 30.4.2004)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Status of habitations			
		NC	PC	FC	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0	1042	68690	69732
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	263	742	3293	4298
3.	Assam	326	12588	57641	70555
4.	Bihar	0	0	105340	105340
5.	Chhattisgarh	0	0	50379	50379
6.	Goa	3	29	363	395
7.	Gujarat	14	569	29686	30269
8.	Haryana	0	0	6745	6745
9.	Himachal Pradesh	97	7912	37358	45367
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	925	2829	7430	11184
11.	Jharkhand	27	2	100067	100096
12.	Karnataka	0	10394	46288	56682
13.	Kerala	75	7576	2112	9763
14.	Madhya Pradesh	0	0	109489	109489
15.	Maharashtra	430	25646	59854	85930
16.	Manipur	0	86	2705	2791

1	2	3	4	5	6
17.	Meghalaya	151	566	7919	8636
18.	Mizoram	0	152	655	807
19.	Nagaland	40	726	759	1525
20.	Orissa	0	0	114099	114099
21.	Punjab	1042	1476	10931	13449
22.	Rajasthan	3326	0	90620	93946
23.	Sikkim	0	198	1481	1679
24.	Tamil Nadu	0	0	66631	66631
25.	Tripura	0	0	7412	7412
26.	Uttar Pradesh	0	0	243508	243508
27.	Uttaranchal	44	471	30469	30984
28.	West Bengal	0	0	79036	79036
29.	A&N Islands	0	110	394	504
30.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	19	41	456	516
31.	Daman & Diu	0	0	32	32
32.	Delhi	0	0	219	219
33.	Lakshadweep	0	10	0	10
34.	Pondicherry	0	108	159	267
35.	Chandigarh	0	0	18	18
Total		6782	73273	1342238	1422293
Percentage		0.48	5.15	94.37	100.00
Number of habitations uninhabited/unpopulated/migrated/urbanised.					371
Grand Total					1422664

NC : Not Covered, PC : Partially Covered, FC : Fully Covered.

APPENDIX III
COVERAGE OF HABITATIONS AND RURAL SCHOOLS UNDER
RURAL WATER SUPPLY DURING 2002-2003

Sl. No. Against (Col.7)	State/UT Code	Month No. of Habitatis	Target No. of Habitatis	Coverage				Coverage				%age coverage No. Against					
				Number of Habitatis				Number of Habitatis				Target Target Schools(Col.6)					
				ARWSP of Schools				State Sector				Total (ARWSP+ State Sector)					
				NC*	PC	Total	NC	Total	NC	PC	Total	NC*	PC	Total			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	19		
1. Andhra Pradesh	03	0	8012	8012	1951	0	1614	1614	0	1610	1610	0	3224	3224	47	40.24	241
2. Arunachal Pradesh	03	327	446	773	11	23	71	94	5	15	20	28	86	114	125	14.75	1136.36
3. Assam	03	536	5000	5536	1200	107	2966	3073	53	665	718	160	3631	3791	2123	68.48	176.92
4. Bihar	03	0	0	0	686	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	0.00
5. Chhattisgarh	03	0	0	0	1448	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1137	—	78.52
6. Goa	03	8	4	12	37	0	7	7	4	3	7	4	10	14	—	116.67	0.00
7. Gujarat	03	70	430	500	800	62	309	371	5	255	260	67	564	631	600	126.20	75.00
8. Haryana	03	0	48	48	76	0	24	24	0	24	24	0	48	48	100	100.00	131.58

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
9.	Himachal Pradesh	03	500	1350	1850	350	387	867	1254	113	508	621	500	1375	1875	350	101.35	100.00
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	03	850	1644	2494	381	625	657	1282	99	50	149	724	707	1431	—	57.38	0.00
11.	Jharkhand	03	200	49	249	500	81	14	95	119	14	133	200	28	228	444	91.57	88.80
12.	Karnataka	03	1	7400	7401	1500	1	3848	3849	0	2288	2288	1	6136	6137	—	82.92	0.00
13.	Kerala	03	400	2000	2400	14	277	6	283	278	14	292	555	20	575	86	23.96	75.44
14.	Madhya Pradesh	03	0	0	0	5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4010	—	80.20
15.	Maharashtra	03	1000	11810	12810	2287	104	407	511	53	878	931	157	1285	1442	2875	11.26	125.71
16.	Manipur	03	15	115	130	440	11	28	39	4	72	76	46	100	115	47	88.46	10.68
17.	Meghalaya	03	180	200	380	70	136	116	252	23	100	123	159	216	375	—	98.68	0.00
18.	Mizoram	03	0	180	180	100	0	100	100	0	80	80	0	180	180	16	100.00	16.00
19.	Nagaland	03	195	50	245	50	155	14	169	122	15	137	277	29	306	125	124.90	250.00
20.	Orissa	03	0	0	0	1500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6000	—	400.00
21.	Punjab	03	750	1097	1847	1650	131	70	201	190	319	509	321	389	710	1023	38.44	62.00
22.	Rajasthan	03	1895	9105	11000	2500	1125	5856	6981	31	3578	3609	1168	9434	10590	2500	96.27	100.00
23.	Sikkim	03	0	130	130	50	0	55	65	0	65	65	0	130	130	40	100.00	80.00
24.	TamilNadu	03	0	0	0	6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6064	—	101.07	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
25. Tripura	03	93	332	425	200	0	184	184	0	148	148	0	332	332	467	78.12	233.50	
26. Uttar Pradesh	03	0	0	0	3811	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	0.00
27. Uttaranchal	03	34	500	534	229	40	135	175	16	216	232	56	351	407	—	76.22	0.00	
28. West Bengal	03	0	6650	6650	2000	0	3051	3051	0	3488	3488	0	6539	6539	1800	98.33	90.00	
29. A&N Islands	03	0	46	46	27	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	10	10	—	21.74	0.00	
30. D&N Haveli	06	31	110	141	38	0	0	0	8	5	13	8	5	13	38	9.22	100.00	
31. Daman & Diu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	—	
32. Delhi	03	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	—	
33. Lakshadweep	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	—	—	
34. Pondicherry	03	40	26	66	24	0	0	0	23	23	0	23	23	—	34.85	0.00		
Total		7125	56744	63889	35030	3265	20409	23674	1123	14443	15566	4388	34852	39240	30017	61.44	85.69	

* Includes the following N-Cat. PVs of 1985 list.

State	Target	Coverage	:	o	.
Assam	2	0			
Gujarat	3	3			
J&K	12	0			
Rajasthan	3	0			
Total	20	3			

APPENDIX IV
COVERAGE OF HABITATIONS AND RURAL SCHOOLS UNDER
RURAL WATER SUPPLY DURING 2003-2004

Sl. No.	State/UT	Month	Yearly Target	Cumulative Coverage upto the month during the year**												%age coverage No. Against							
				Number of Habitations				ARWSP				State Sector				Total (ARWSP+ Target)							
(Col.7)														Schools		ARWSP		State Sector		Total (ARWSP+ Target)		Schools (Col.6)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19					
1. Andhra Pradesh	02	0	12799	12799	1951	0	6189	6189	0	5878	5878	0	12067	12067	1768	94.28	90.62						
2. Arunachal Pradesh	02	301	807	1108	80	37	62	99	1	3	4	38	65	103	100	9.30	125.00						
3. Assam	01	376	16088	16464	2123	71	4358	4429	0	105	105	71	4463	4534	714	27.54	33.63						
4. Bihar	12	0	0	0	686	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	0.00						
5. Chhattisgarh	01	0	0	0	5328	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3401	—	57.37						
6. Goa	12	3	37	40	100	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	8	8	0	20.00	0.00						
7. Gujarat	02	29	1213	1242	600	26	1022	1048	2	133	135	28	155	1183	645	95.25	107.50						
8. Haryana	02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	—						

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
9.	Himachal Pradesh	02	574	8877	9451	350	402	569	971	172	508	680	574	1077	1651	300	1747	85.71
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	12	985	2869	3854	381	156	56	212	52	39	91	208	95	303	153	7.86	40.16
11.	Jharkhand	02	105	21	126	9527	105	10	115	0	11	11	105	21	126	2334	100.00	24.50
12.	Karnataka	09	0	13637	13637	11889	0	4079	4079	0	1923	1923	0	6002	6002	10516	44.01	88.45
13.	Kerala	02	228	7444	7672	114	151	183	334	77	37	114	228	220	448	76	5.84	66.67
14.	Madhya Pradesh	02	0	0	0	12000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9188	—	76.57
15.	Maharashtra	02	525	26121	26646	2287	54	485	539	78	1548	1626	132	2033	2165	2533	8.13	110.76
16.	Manipur	06	0	101	101	440	0	10	10	0	5	5	0	15	15	0	14.85	0.00
17.	Meghalaya	01	184	617	801	70	135	83	218	36	115	151	171	198	369	50	46.07	71.43
18.	Mizoram	02	0	267	267	583	0	99	99	0	65	65	0	164	164	96	61.42	16.47
19.	Nagaland	12	72	744	816	100	32	17	49	0	17	17	32	34	66	26	8.09	26.00
20.	Orissa	11	0	0	0	10000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	0.00	
21.	Punjab	02	1189	1808	2997	1200	95	123	218	167	361	528	262	484	746	397	24.89	33.08
22.	Rajasthan	01	4960	0	4960	2500	1534	0	1534	452	0	452	1986	0	1986	2092	40.04	83.68
23.	Sikkim	08	0	216	216	50	0	50	50	0	70	70	0	120	120	40	55.56	80.00
24.	TamilNadu	02	0	0	0	5358	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3780	—	70.55	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
25. Tripura	02	0	0	0	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395	—	79.00
26. Uttar Pradesh	01	0	0	0	3811	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	0.00
27. Uttarakhand	11	51	550	601	3852	5	37	42	2	42	44	7	79	86	357	14.31	9.27	
28. West Bengal	03	0	6752	6752	2000	0	4403	4403	0	2349	2349	0	6752	6752	1859	100.00	92.95	
29. A&N Islands	08	0	111	111	12	0	0	0	0	9	9	0	9	9	0	8.11	0.00	
30. D&N Haveli	07	30	241	271	38	5	145	150	6	57	63	11	202	213	8	78.60	21.05	
31. Daman & Diu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	
32. Delhi	06	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	
33. Lakshadweep	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	—	
34. Pondicherry	01	40	69	109	24	0	0	0	40	81	121	40	81	121	0	111.01	0.00	
Total		9652	101399	111051	78554	2808	21980	24788	1085	13364	14449	3893	35344	39237	40828	35.33	51.97	

*Includes the following N-Cat. PVs of 1985 list.

State	Target	Coverage	**	***	****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****	*****
Assam	2	0																
J&K	12	0																
Rajasthan	3	0																
Total	17	0																

/ 25.06.2004.

o

APPENDIX V

**FINANCIAL PROGRESS UNDER RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME
(CENTRAL & STATE SECTOR) DURING 2002-2003**

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Month Code	Central Sector - ARWSP (Normal+DDP)+ Natural Calamities				State Sector			
			O.B. as Allocation 1.4.2002	Release [ARWSP (Normal+ DDP)]	Total Availa- bility	Expend.	%age Expend.	Provision Expend.	%age Expend.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Andhra Pradesh	03	810.80	14865.00	17823.92	18634.72	14984.72	80.41	16117.89	16117.89
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	03	109.29	4977.00	3650.00	3759.29	2597.79	69.10	2896.00	2896.00
3.	Assam	03	1589.84	8407.00	5252.50	6842.34	6096.34	89.10	2616.00	2541.00
4.	Bihar	03	437.83	7406.00	3703.00	4140.83	3309.23	79.92	5200.00	3821.68
5.	Chhattisgarh	03	133.40	2443.00	2943.00	3076.40	2602.92	84.61	7322.00	6922.97
6.	Goa	03	662.24	122.00	0.00	662.24	23.62	3.57	1248.63	858.61
										68.76

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
7.	Gujarat	03	242.97	6699.00	9997.75	10240.72	9491.48	92.68	26635.00	15623.92	58.66
8.	Haryana	03	0.00	2946.00	3346.00	3346.00	3346.00	100.00	9422.13	9422.13	100.00
9.	Himachal Pradesh	03	0.00	5643.00	8229.00	8229.00	7677.10	93.29	10275.55	9855.62	95.91
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	03	1196.56	12388.00	11196.39	12392.95	6126.58	49.44	8084.90	8084.59	100.00
11.	Jharkhand	03	1572.65	3063.00	1949.80	3522.45	3369.46	95.66	8000.00	3941.78	49.27
12.	Karnataka	03	2337.01	12313.00	14355.36	16692.37	13070.34	78.30	11216.04	11216.04	100.00
13.	Kerala	03	3047.38	3698.00	1899.30	4946.68	4252.69	85.97	6670.00	4747.66	71.18
14.	Madhya Pradesh	03	638.53	7159.00	9586.08	10224.61	8594.90	84.06	12696.27	12275.08	96.68
15.	Maharashtra	03	500.00	16829.00	19336.24	19836.24	16842.07	84.91	14116.89	14115.89	100.00
16.	Manipur	03	577.79	1826.00	947.00	1524.79	1193.41	78.27	1958.25	1896.45	96.84
17.	Meghalaya	03	156.96	1957.00	2935.50	3092.46	1635.32	52.88	2260.00	2360.65	104.45
18.	Mizoram	03	379.47	1398.00	2097.00	2476.47	1773.69	71.62	1696.00	1396.59	82.35
19.	Nagaland	03	392.40	1454.00	2181.00	273.40	1628.78	63.29	2221.50	2221.50	100.00
20.	Orissa	03	738.55	6225.00	5829.80	6568.35	6568.35	100.00	5851.94	5822.97	99.50
21.	Punjab	03	155.91	2581.00	3081.00	3236.91	3236.91	100.00	9775.00	9048.00	92.56
22.	Rajasthan	03	8820.35	26750.00	23595.96	32416.31	29881.02	92.18	13304.30	12001.97	90.21
23.	Sikkim	03	0.00	597.00	895.50	895.50	639.06	71.36	1270.20	1270.20	100.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
24.	Tamil Nadu	03	1000.00	6358.00	7558.00	8558.00	7358.00	85.98	45495.46	45495.46	100.00
25.	Tripura	03	467.70	1734.00	2427.60	2895.30	1335.82	46.14	2013.60	1471.25	73.07
26.	Uttar Pradesh	03	4525.84	13022.00	11349.46	15875.30	12683.40	79.89	20204.15	18748.51	92.80
27.	Uttaranchal	03	330.49	3083.00	3683.00	4013.49	3169.75	78.98	6138.50	4306.37	70.15
28.	West Bengal	03	366.57	8545.00	10115.00	10481.57	7930.44	75.66	12003.00	8043.33	67.05
29.	A&N Islands	03	4.40	13.00	0.00	4.40	0.00	0.00	900.00	898.28	99.81
30.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	03	0.45	07.00	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	165.00	165.00	100.00
31.	Daman & Diu	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—
32.	Delhi	03	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1406.26	1406.26	100.00
33.	Lakshadweep	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—
34.	Pondicherry	03	40.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	322.21	322.21	100.00
<hr/>											
Total											
		31195.38	184518.00	189964.16	221159.54	181419.19	82.03	269501.36	239320.86	88.80	

Note 1 : In month code column the number 0 shown against some States means no report received from these States.

Note 2 : In case of ARWSP the figures relating to opening balance and expenditure are likely to be revised as and when revised figures become available from State Govts.

Note 3 : In case of State Sector programme the figures relating to provision and expenditure are likely to be revised as and when revised figures become available from State Govts.

Item	O.B.	B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Availability	Expenditure	%age
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ARWSP (Sector Reform)				10220.52	10220.52		0.00
ARWSP (Normal+Natural Calamities+DDP	31195.38	218940.00	206440.00	195015.32	226210.70	181419.19	80.20
Swajaldhara+Other)**							
Monitoring & Evaluation	100.00	100.00		5.33		5.33	100.00
ARWSP (M&I Units)	250.00	250.00	244.63	244.63		244.63	100.00
DPAP Areas				0.00			
Sub-Missions (ARWSP)*				3333.50	3333.50		0.00
Professional Services	500.00	500.00	362.73	362.73		362.73	100.00
Research	100.00	98.00	58.40	58.40		58.40	100.00
HRD/Training	1000.00	1000.00	147.47	147.47		147.47	100.00
IEC	850.00	850.00	515.93	515.93		515.93	0.00

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
MIS		1212.00	1212.00	58.60	58.60			0.00
Exhibition	10.00	10.00			0.00			
Seminar/Conference	25.00	25.00	24.77	24.77	24.77	24.77	100.00	
Assistance from WHO/ UNICEF etc.	438.00	438.00	20.56	20.56	20.56	20.56	100.00	
Mission Management	65.00	67.00	62.16	62.16	62.16	62.16	100.00	
Other Charges	10.00	10.00	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	100.00	
Grand Total	31195.38	223500.00	211000.00	210070.18	241265.56	182345.50	75.58	

*Releases made under ARWSP head.

**Other Releases made under ARWSP normal head to different States are as under:

1. Rs. 8 lakh and Rs. 14 lakh released to Mizoram and West Bengal respectively for setting up of district level laboratories.
2. Rs. 15.75 lakh released to Himachal Pradesh for preparation of appraisal report for NC/PC habitations.
3. Rs. 60.00 lakh released to U.P. transferred from IEC head.
4. Rs. 24.42 lakh and Rs. 83.04 lakh released to Rajasthan and U.P. respectively transferred from HRD head.

APPENDIX VI

FINANCIAL PROGRESS UNDER RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME
(CENTRAL & STATE SECTOR) DURING 2003-2004

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	State/UT Code	Month Code	Central Sector (ARWSP+DDP+Natural Calamities)				State Sector				
			O.B. as on Allocation	Release	Total	Expend.* Availa- bility	%age Expen.	Provision	Expend.* Expen.	%age Expen.	
		1.4.2003** (Normal+ DDP)									
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
										12	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	03	3650.00	13112.00	13112.00	16762.00	100.00	18239.81	18239.81	100.00	
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	02	1161.50	4962.00	4102.40	5263.90	2478.79	47.00	2031.30	1142.56	56.25
3.	Assam	03	746.00	8403.00	5772.62	6518.62	5490.00	84.22	5661.00	5466.58	96.57
4.	Bihar	01	831.60	6319.00	3159.50	3991.10	2805.16	70.29	5962.30	2257.33	37.86
5.	Chhattisgarh	02	473.48	1901.00	2574.00	3047.48	1945.88	63.85	7275.00	6352.65	87.32
6.	Goa	12	638.62	105.00	0.00	638.62	11.04	1.73	1242.96	606.77	48.82

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
7.	Gujarat	03	749.24	5690.00	8458.00	9207.24	11980.57	130.12	24062.00	12149.92	50.49
8.	Haryana	03	0.00	2662.00	2662.00	2662.00	2662.00	100.00	10832.15	10832.15	100.00
9.	Himachal Pradesh	03	553.40	4927.00	5137.00	5690.40	5539.42	97.35	7731.86	7731.86	100.00
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	03	6266.37	10898.00	12850.63	19117.00	15542.77	81.30	16212.64	16212.64	100.00
11.	Jharkhand	03	152.99	2575.00	2060.00	2212.99	1419.53	54.15	6500.00	5019.65	77.23
12.	Karnataka	03	3622.03	11312.00	12062.00	15684.03	14463.33	92.22	11633.36	11168.78	96.01
13.	Kerala	03	693.99	3645.00	4268.71	4962.70	4197.43	84.58	4242.61	4242.61	100.00
14.	Madhya Pradesh	03	1629.71	6079.00	7310.00	8939.71	8939.71	100.00	11471.85	11193.45	97.57
15.	Maharashtra	03	2994.17	15710.00	15710.00	18704.17	13867.96	74.14	19385.89	22031.50	113.65
16.	Manipur	06	331.38	1833.00	1624.15	1955.53	11.10	0.57	1573.15	133.04	8.46
17.	Meghalaya	03	1457.14	1967.00	1811.73	3268.92	2119.70	64.84	2925.00	2597.53	88.80
18.	Mizoram	03	702.78	1386.00	1386.00	2088.78	2085.52	99.84	1755.96	1755.96	100.00
19.	Nagaland	12	944.02	1453.00	1626.73	2571.35	1671.12	64.99	1561.00	1096.81	70.26
20.	Orissa	11	0.00	5303.00	4713.81	4713.81	3151.50	66.86	6080.00	2904.72	43.48
21.	Punjab	03	0.00	2269.00	2269.00	2269.00	1972.25	86.92	7093.00	5951.33	83.90
22.	Rajasthan	03	2535.29	22028.00	23368.51	25903.80	25686.36	99.16	18232.20	13502.28	74.06

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
23.	Sikkim	03	256.44	603.00	763.00	1019.44	1005.32	98.61	1200.00	1098.28	91.52
24.	Tamil Nadu	03	1200.00	4859.00	6269.00	7469.00	7469.00	100.00	39180.15	39180.15	100.00
25.	Tripura	03	1559.48	1743.00	1903.00	3462.48	2438.07	70.41	2020.75	530.61	26.26
26.	Uttar Pradesh	12	3191.90	11086.00	10457.00	13648.90	9284.11	68.02	20508.51	10384.90	50.64
27.	Uttaranchal	11	843.74	2635.00	2371.50	3215.24	1299.35	40.41	7400.00	4218.50	57.01
28.	West Bengal	03	2551.13	6827.00	6827.00	9378.13	8362.04	89.17	6936.63	6936.63	100.00
29.	A&N Islands	03	4.40	5.63	0.00	4.40	0.00	0.00	700.00	636.20	90.89
30.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	03	0.45	3.75	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	170.00	165.00	97.06
31.	Daman & Diu	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
32.	Delhi	06	0.00	2.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	74.85	74.85	100.00
33.	Lakshadweep	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
34.	Pondicherry	03	0.00	2.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	615.08	740.99	120.47
Total		39741.85	162315.00	164629.34	204371.19	174656.03	85.46	271111.01	226556.04	83.57	

*From these States/UTs the provision has not been received so far

**Provisional

Item	O.B.**	B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Availability	Expenditure	%age
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ARWSP (Normal+DDP+ Natural Calamities+ Swajaldhara+Other***)	39741.85	218490.00	218490.00	180064.89	219806.74	174656.03	79.46
ARWSP (Sector Reform)	—	—	0.00	36497.16	36497.16	0.00	0.00
ARWSP (PM's Schemes)	—	36000.00	36000.00	31007.15	31007.15	10649.74	34.35
Monitoring & Evaluation	—	75.00	75.00	24.30	24.30	24.30	100.00
ARWSP (M&I Units)	—	260.00	260.00	248.89	248.89	248.89	100.00
Sub-Missions (ARWSP)*	—	—	—	6987.37	6987.37	—	—
Professional Services	—	500.00	500.00	350.00	350.00	350.00	100.00
Research	—	75.00	75.00	65.58	65.58	65.58	100.00
HRD/Training	—	600.00	600.00	0.16	0.16	0.16	100.00
IEC	—	950.00	950.00	423.56	423.56	423.56	100.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
MIS		1000.00	1000.00	692.41	692.41	40.39	5.83
Exhibition	25.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Seminar/Conference	30.00	30.00	19.31	19.31	19.31	19.31	100.00
Assistance from WHO/ UNICEF etc.	400.00	400.00	28.95	28.95	28.95	28.95	100.00
Mission Management	90.00	90.00	79.80	79.80	79.80	79.80	100.00
Other Charges	5.00	5.00	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.61	100.00
Grand Total	39741.85	258500.00	258500.00	256490.14	296231.99	186587.32	62.99

*Releases made under ARWSP head.

**Grand total in O.B. column is the unspent balance from ARWSP (Normal+DDP+Natural Calamities) funds available in the previous year.

Note : An amount of Rs. 256.67 lakh re-appropriated from NE head of CRSP also released to Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura.

***Other Releases made under ARWSP normal head to different States are as under:

1. Rs. 20.00 lakh released to Chhattisgarh for setting up of 10 laboratories.
2. Rs. 66.00 lakh released to Bihar for setting up of 33 laboratories.
3. Expenditure as per the information received from States/UTs till 25-06-2004.

APPENDIX VII

DETAILS OF SWAJALDHARA SCHEME – 2002-03

(As on 21-7-2004)

Sl. No.	Name of State/ UT	No. of Proposals approved	Total outlay	GOI share	Funds released		Expenditure	No. of Schemes completed
					1st install.	2nd install.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1660	9134.33	7994.04	4002.56	1338.99	1695.90	248
2.	Assam	54	812.98	740.25	370.12		5.35	0
3.	Chhattisgarh	102	283.10	263.00	131.50		105.83	43
4.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	9.98	9.48	4.74		0.00	0
5.	Gujarat	30	184.42	167.97	83.99		184.42	0
6.	Haryana	2	24.55	21.95	10.98		0.00	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7.	Himachal Pradesh	471	714.66	652.78	335.79	0.00	0	
8.	Karnataka	55	246.09	218.14	109.07	25.91	0	
9.	Kerala	116	616.33	535.72	272.84	106.23	0	
10.	Madhya Pradesh	87	563.85	529.01	264.49	143.75	6	
11.	Maharashtra	782	8261.52	7427.66	3722.09	0.00	0	
12.	Orissa	287	725.39	671.68	335.84	95.58	9	
13.	Rajasthan	35	412.52	374.52	187.26	371.48	10	
14.	Tamil Nadu	389	1521.07	1399.54	702.04	677.78	838.82	387
15.	Uttar Pradesh	655	1236.79	1132.05	565.98	0.00	0	
16.	West Bengal	8	52.19	47.77	23.88	0.00	0	
Total		4734	24799.76	22185.55	11123.16	2016.77	3573.27	703

APPENDIX VIII

DETAILS OF FUNDS ALLOCATED TO THE STATES/UTs, FUNDS RE-LEASED, EXPENDITURE REPORTED AND SCHEMES COMPLETED UNDER SWAJALDHARA DURING 2003-04 AND 2004-05

(As on 21-7-2004)
(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	State/UT	2003-04			2004-05	
		Allocation	Funds released	Expenditure	No. of Schemes completed	Allocation
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1616.07	808.00	205.42	79	1632.65
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	447.41	223.71	0	0	473.76
3.	Assam	754.59	377.30	40.71	0	797.36
4.	Bihar	873.73	0.00	0	0	923.98
5.	Chhattisgarh	262.80	0.00	0	0	332.20
6.	Gujarat	765.56	765.56	591.57	21	826.42
7.	Goa	14.55	0.00	0	0	15.04
8.	Haryana	234.23	117.12	0	0	246.48
9.	Himachal Pradesh	680.19	340.10	0	0	677.16
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	1497.90	748.95	0	0	1560.02
11.	Jharkhand	356.02	178.01	0	0	368.12
12.	Karnataka	1397.03	698.52	142.92	0	1253.54

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Kerala	504.03	252.02	151.51	2	492.54
14.	Madhya Pradesh	840.54	420.27	206.63	64	966.49
15.	Maharashtra	2172.15	1086.07	0	0	1992.80
16.	Manipur	153.59	0.00	0	0	162.86
17.	Meghalaya	176.96	0.00	0	0	186.12
18.	Mizoram	126.88	0.00	0	0	133.25
19.	Nagaland	130.22	65.11	17.80	0	137.48
20.	Orissa	733.28	366.64	187.60	46	865.23
21.	Punjab	313.79	156.90	0	0	351.11
22.	Rajasthan	2191.77	1095.50	682.98	455	2544.51
23.	Sikkim	53.42	0.00	0	0	57.11
24.	Tamil Nadu	673.22	625.18	432.89	442	889.10
25.	Tripura	156.93	78.47	0	0	164.97
26.	Uttar Pradesh	1532.91	766.46	0	0	1621.06
27.	Uttaranchal	364.33	182.00	0	0	378.67
28.	West Bengal	943.90	471.50	0	0	1064.06
Total		19968.00	9823.39	2660.03	1109	21114.09
29.	A&N Islands	12.00	0.00	0	0	12.69
30.	Chandigarh	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00
31.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	8.00	4.00	0	0	8.46

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	Daman & Diu	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00
33.	Delhi	6.00	0.00	0	0	6.35
34.	Lakshadweep	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00
35.	Pondicherry	6.00	0.00	0	0	6.35
	Total	32.00	4.00	0	0	33.85
	Grand Total	20000.00	9827.39	2660.03	1109	21147.94

APPENDIX IX

POSITION OF ENACTMENT OF LEGISLATION ON CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT OF GROUND WATER RESOURCES IN VARIOUS STATES AS ON 12.03.2003

States/UTs where Legislation Enacted and being Implemented

Sl. No.	States/UTs	Status of implementation
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Andhra Pradesh Water, Land and Trees Act, 2002 covering whole State has been enacted with effect from 19.04.2002.
2.	Goa	The “Goa Ground Water Regulation Act, 2002” has already been enacted by the State Legislature on 25.01.2002.
3.	Tamil Nadu	The Chennai Metropolitan Area Ground Water (Regulation) Amendment Act, 1987 has been enacted to regulate ground water development in Chennai and some of the nearby revenue villages. The President has assented to the Tamil Nadu Ground Water (Development & Management) Bill, 2002.
4.	Lakshadweep	Lakshadweep Ground Water (Department & Control) Regulation, 2001 has been enacted with effect from 01.11.2001.
5.	Kerala	“The Kerala Ground Water (Control and Regulation) Act, 1997” has since been passed by the State Legislative Assembly.

States/UTs where Bills Passed but not Enacted

1.	Gujarat	Has enacted legislation on 1987 as “Bombay Irrigation (Gujarat Amendment) Act, 1976 by amending the “Bombay Irrigation Act, 1976. The legislation is applicable only to nine identified districts in the Gujarat State.
----	---------	---

1	2	3
2. Maharashtra	The Maharashtra Ground Water (Control and Regulation of Development and Management) Bill, 2000 has been sent for assent of Hon'ble President of India.	
3. West Bengal	“West Bengal Water Resources Conservation, Protection and Development Management, (Control and Regulation) Bill, 2000” has been received for assent of the Hon'ble President of India. Some changes are proposed to be incorporated in the Bill.	
4. Pondicherry	Pondicherry Ground Water (Control and Regulation) Bill, 2002 has been passed by the State Legislature and referred to the Ministry of Home Affairs for President's assent.	
States/UTs which have initiated action for preparing Legislations		
1. Assam	Model Bill to regulate and control the development of ground water has been framed by the State Government and is sent to Committee Members for comments.	
2. Bihar	The State Government has set up a Committee to consider the matter and decision will be taken as per recommendations of the Committee.	
3. Haryana	Draft Bill is under preparation by the State Government.	
4. Himachal Pradesh	The Draft Bill is under consideration of the State Government.	
5. J&K	The Draft Bill is being examined by the State Government.	

1	2	3
6.	Karnataka	The Karnataka Ground Water (Regulation and Control) Bill, 2002 is under consideration of State Government.
7.	Mizoram	Preparation of Draft Bill for regulating ground water with reference to Model Bill for the State is under process in PHED.
8.	Orissa	The matter is under consideration of Government of Orissa.
9.	Punjab	The Government of Punjab has prepared a draft on “Punjab Ground Water (Control and Regulation) Act, 1998” and sent it to CGWA for comments.
10.	Rajasthan	Rajasthan Ground water (Regulation) Bill, 1997 is under consideration of the State Government.
11.	Uttar Pradesh	Draft Bill on U.P. Ground Water (Control and Regulation) Act, 1997 has been prepared and circulated to Members of State Water Council for suggestions and modifications.
12.	Daman & Diu	Ground Water (Control & Regulation) Act, 2002 has been prepared and referred to the Ministry of Rural Development for concurrence.
13.	NCT Delhi	The State Government proposes to amend the Delhi Water Board Act to accommodate concerns expressed in the Model Bill, draft of which has since been prepared and at consultation stage.

States/UTs which feel it not necessary to enact Legislation

1.	Nagaland	In view of State Government at this stage it may not be necessary to enact any law.
----	----------	---

1	2	3
2.	Sikkim	In view of State Government enactment of

legislation to control the extraction of ground water considered not necessary in the State.

3. Tripura	In view of the State Government it is felt not necessary to make legislation to regulate ground water development in the State at this stage.
4. Chandigarh	In UT of Chandigarh, there is already a bye-law requiring permission of Chandigarh Administration for withdrawal of ground water in Capital Project Areas. No action was required.

States/UTs which have not responded yet

1. Arunachal Pradesh	No response.
2. Chhattisgarh	A copy of Model Bill was sent to the State Government as requested by them.
3. Jharkhand	Letter from Hon'ble Minister (WR) acknowledged.
4. Madhya Pradesh	Madhya Pradesh Peyjal Parirakshan Adhiniyam, 1986 for protection of drinking water sources exists.
5. Manipur	No response.
6. Meghalaya	No response.
7. Uttaranchal	No response.
8. Andaman & Nicobar	No response.
9. Dadra & Nagar Haveli	No response.

APPENDIX X

MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005) HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 11 AUGUST, 2004

The Committee sat from 1600 hrs. to 1745 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annex, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Mohan Jena
5. Shri Subhash Maharia
6. Shri Hannan Mollah
7. Shri Dawa Narbula
8. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
9. Shri K.C. Palanisamy
10. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
11. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
12. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
13. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
14. Shri Mohan Singh
15. Shri Sita Ram Singh
16. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
17. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

Rajya Sabha

18. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
19. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya

20. Shri Penumalli Madhu
21. Shri Kalraj Mishra
22. Dr. Faguni Ram
23. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri V.K. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Director*
4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
5. Shrimati Veena Sharma — *Under Secretary*

Representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development
(Department of Drinking Water Supply)

1. Shri V.K. Duggal, Secretary
2. Shri P.P. Mathur, Additional Secretary and Finance Advisor
3. Shri Rakesh Behari, Joint Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2004-2005).

[The representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development), were then called in.]

3. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply to the sitting. He then drew their attention to Direction 55(1) of the 'Directions by the Speaker'.

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2004-2005). The Secretary, Drinking Water Supply, then in brief explained to the Committee the overall position with regard to

allocation and expenditure of the Department as well as the projections of the Department during 10th Plan period. He also explained about the features and problems being faced with regard to the implementation of various schemes of the Department. The Committee then discussed in detail the various issues related to the examination of the Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department with special attention to major Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Department. The representatives of the Department clarified the queries of the Members.

The Committee then adjourned.

A record of the verbatim proceedings has been kept.

APPENDIX XI

MINUTES OF THE THIRD SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005) HELD ON FRIDAY, THE 13 AUGUST, 2004

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1345 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annex, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Subhash Maharia
5. Shri Hannan Mollah
6. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
7. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
8. Shri Mohan Singh
9. Shri Sita Ram Singh
10. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

Rajya Sabha

11. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
12. Dr. Faguni Ram
13. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary	—	<i>Additional Secretary</i>
2. Shri V.K. Sharma	—	<i>Joint Secretary</i>
3. Shri K. Chakraborty	—	<i>Director</i>
4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra	—	<i>Deputy Secretary</i>
5. Shrimati Veena Sharma	—	<i>Under Secretary</i>
6. Shri A.K. Shah	—	<i>Assistant Director</i>

At the outset, the Chairman, welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration the draft Report on Demand for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) and adopted the draft Report with some modifications.

3. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the aforesaid Draft Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministry/Department and present the same to both the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

***Minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.

APPENDIX XII

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

Sl.No.	Para	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.15	<p>The Committee find from the position of data as indicated above that the Department has been allocated almost half of what has been proposed by Planning Commission during 10th Plan. Similar trend has been noticed while analyzing the outlay position during 2004-2005. Out of the proposed allocation of Rs. 3142 crore, the Department has been sanctioned BE for Rs. 2900 crore. Further, the Committee find that the various aspects covered while proposing the outlay for 10th Plan <i>viz.</i> the position of slippage of FC category of habitations into PC and PC into NC habitations has not been taken into account. The Committee also note that the gap in the resources is proposed to be bridged through extra budgetary assistance like World Bank assistance. While analyzing the position of World Bank assistance coming in the field of drinking water, the Committee note that only in four States, one or two projects could be taken up by donor assistance/loan. The said aspect of getting lesser outlay as proposed by Planning Commission has repeatedly been taken up while analyzing the Demands for Grants of previous years and the Committee have repeatedly been emphasizing to take up the matter with the Planning Commission in view of the top most priority</p>
1	2	3

accorded by the Government to provide drinking

water to rural areas. While appreciating the resource constraints, the Committee would again like to recommend to take up the matter with the Planning Commission for adequate allocation for drinking water with convincing reasons and commensurate with ground realities. Allocation of lesser amount by Planning Commission shows that the Ministry has not been able to plead their case forcefully for optimum amount. The Committee feel that the Ministry has not done their homework properly before going to Planning Commission for enhanced amount. The Ministry should be able to convince the Planning Commission that shortfall in allocation in such a vital area affects the quality of life and involves great risk.

The Committee also note that the Secretary of the Department has stated that though overall allocation for rural water supply sector has increased over the years, the actual allocation for the main programme of ARWSP has not increased to that extent as a substantial part of the total outlay is diverted for other programmes and activities such as Swajaldhara, Sector Reforms, *etc.* In this context, the Committee recommend that outlay for both the programmes should be increased and fund constraint should not hinder the implementation of any of the rural drinking water supply schemes.

1

2

3

The Committee appreciates that World Bank has been approached in the field of drinking water. The Committee would like to recommend that the Government should endeavour to get World Bank

assistance for taking up more projects in remaining States so as to bridge the gap between the required outlay and the Government resources in hand. The issue regarding involving corporate sector in the field of drinking water has been analyzed in the succeeding chapters of the Report. Here the Committee would like to emphasize that the Government should endeavour to chalk out an effective and result oriented strategy to motivate and convince the corporate/private sector in fulfilling their social responsibility *i.e.* providing drinking water to rural masses.

2. 2.16 While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee are constrained to note the position of underspending during the different plans. Although they note that during 9th Plan the underspending was lesser as compared to the previous plan, the Committee feel that in this resource starved economy, every single rupee meant for such a priority area should be timely and meaningfully utilized and the Government should chalk out a clear cut strategy to ensure cent percent utilization of the valuable resources. The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the serious issue of underutilization of resources in their previous Reports also.

1

2

3

However, they note with constraint that nothing fruitful has come out and this has become a recurring feature every year. The Committee would again emphasize that much is required to be done in this direction and they should be informed about the concrete steps taken or proposed by the

Government in this respect.

3. 2.17 The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants had expressed their concern over the dichotomy in the data with regard to accessibility and availability of drinking water. The Committee have been informed that the Government is commissioning a survey to analyze the position with regard to slippage of habitations from FC to PC and PC to NC categories. They note that the survey results could be received from 24 States/UTs. Further, they also note that after the survey results are received, the same would be re-evaluated through an independent evaluator. The Committee find that State/UT Governments are taking long time in finalization of the survey. They are unable to comprehend how planning on the part of the Government is made without having a clear picture of the slippage of habitations thereby indicating the actual position with regard to availability of drinking water to rural masses. In this scenario, the Committee feel that there should be some inbuilt mechanism in the monitoring system of the Government to know about the position of slippage of targets at a regular interval and the same should be indicated every year in the Performance Budget.

1	2	3
---	---	---

4 2.18 The Committee further find that the Government on the one hand claims coverage of 94 percent rural habitations. On the other hand, they find that by their own admission 2 lakh habitations are estimated to slip back from FC to PC and PC to NC habitations by the end of the 10th Plan. The position may be further alarming when the survey is completed and evaluated by the independent evaluator. Further, the Committee also find that during every

year, the Government claims to cover all the NC habitations, but the final result is slippage of targets. The Government propose to cover 70,484 habitations (30,423 NC + 40,061 PC) during the year 2004-2005. During the first three months of the financial year, the Government could cover only 1,380 habitations that speaks volume of the dim possibility of covering the target habitations during the said year. The Committee fail to understand how the Department would address the remaining issues of sustainability, quality and sector reforms, etc. The Committee are deeply concerned over the unrealistic projections being made by the Department which on paper reflect a bright picture with regard to implementation of drinking water schemes. The Committee also feel that the ground reality in this regard is not so optimistic as could be seen from the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister whereby he has stated that the biggest crisis that the world will face in the 21st Century will be crisis of water. In this scenario, the Committee would like to strongly recommend to the Government to project realistic targets during each Plan.

1	2	3
5.	2.19	<p>The Committee find from the data made available to them that there is a mismatch between physical and financial achievement under ARWSP. During the year 2003-04, financial achievement has been shown as 83.67 per cent. However, the position of achievement of NC and PC targets indicate 35.33 per cent. The Committee also note that there is a declining trend, if we analyse the data with regard to achievement of NC and PC habitations. The achievement during the year 2003-04 is around 35 per cent, if compared with the achievement during</p>

the year 1998-99. The Committee would like the Department to explain the specific reasons for mismatch between targets and achievements and the declining trend in achievement in the coverage of NC and PC habitations.

6. 2.24 The Committee find that year after year the physical performance of ARWSP in certain States/UTs is not up to the mark. The attention of the Government has repeatedly been drawn towards this aspect in the previous Reports on Demands for Grants. However, nothing concrete seems to have been done. While admitting that implementation of ARWSP is the responsibility of State Governments, the Committee feel that the Union Government have to play a pro-active role so as to ensure that different Centrally Sponsored Schemes are successfully implemented. The Committee

1	2	3
---	---	---

would like the Department to find out State-wise/UT-wise reasons for under achievement of physical targets in ARWSP in certain States/UTs and inform the Committee accordingly.

7. 2.25 The Committee further find that in DDP areas in J&K, the performance of the programme is very poor. While admitting the fact that difficult geographical conditions and militancy hinder the implementation of the programme, the Committee feel that the steps taken by the Union Government and State Governments to ensure proper implementation of the programme are not adequate which result in almost one-fifth physical achievement.

The Committee would like the Department to analyse the reasons and take corrective steps in this regard. Besides the outlay earmarked should be realistic so that huge underspending does not occur every year.

8. 2.28 The Committee find that the aforesaid norms with regard to supply of drinking water in rural areas were fixed in 1977-78. They also note that in the guidelines there is a provision for relaxation of norms to provide for 55 litres per capita per day with a source within 0.5 kilometers in the plains and 50 meters elevation in the hills. They further find that the said relaxed norms were applicable in case of States where coverage of all NC and PC rural habitations have been completed. Further relaxation is subject to 10 per cent beneficiary

1	2	3
---	---	---

contribution and shouldering full responsibility for O&M. The Committee would like to be informed about the names of States/UTs who are enjoying the relaxed norms.

9. 2.29 The Committee in their preceding Chapter have analysed the position of slippage of FC & PC habitations into NC habitations and had concluded that there is no clear picture available with the Union Ministry with regard to slippage of habitations. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee feel that the Government should, first of all, ascertain the position of full coverage in different States/UTs and then only the revised norms to the States having full coverage should be applied.

10. 2.30 The Committee further note that the relaxed norms are applicable on the condition that 10 per cent beneficiary contribution and shouldering full responsibility for O&M by the community has been achieved. They find that while under ARWSP, there is no condition of 10 per cent beneficiary contribution, the said beneficiary contribution is applicable in case of Swajaldhara since Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme. The Committee fail to understand how the said criteria would be applicable to States/Districts where although the full coverage as per the Government's criteria is achieved but no Swajaldhara project

1	2	3
---	---	---

is there. The Committee would like the Government to ponder over the aforesaid position and clarify the position accordingly.

11. 2.32 The Committee find that the Government have been requesting corporate sector to come forward in the field of drinking water supply in rural areas in different conferences, seminars through CII and ASSOCHAM. The Committee would like to be informed about the reaction of the corporate sector in this regard.

12. 2.33 The Committee further feel that adequate and effective steps to motivate the corporate sector/ private sector to fulfil their social obligations like provision of drinking water for rural areas have not been made by the Government. Instead of delving deep into the matter, a very casual approach has been made through conferences and seminars. To motivate the corporate sector, concerted efforts

and skills are essential. In this regard, the Committee feel that the Government should explore all possibilities of involving the private/corporate sectors in the field of rural infrastructure development like rural drinking water supply. However, at the same time the, Committee show their apprehension that development of such an important sector as drinking water supply should not be left to the mercy of the private/corporate bodies and the Government should be able to generate enough funds for investment in the rural drinking water supply sector.

1

2

3

Keeping these varied aspects in view, the Committee would like to recommend that the Government should chalk out a comprehensive strategy so that the corporate and private sector could be convinced and motivated to come forward for participation.

13. 2.39 The Committee in their respective Reports have been stressing to bring the different programmes meant for same purpose under one umbrella. However, the Committee feel that the policy of the Government is to start a plethora of schemes to achieve a single objective. ARWSP covers all the aspects for which Three Programmes of the Prime Minister were started on 15th August 2002. The Committee further note that as per the policy of UPA Government, they intend to bring all drinking water schemes under the umbrella of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM). The Committee would like to be informed about the status of different programmes meant for drinking

water and the steps taken to bring them under the same RGNDW Mission.

14. 2.40 The Committee find that the Three Programmes of the Prime Minister were initiated with the noble objective to address the problem arising out of unprecedented drought of 2002. The programme was to be implemented in two years 2003-2005 and Rs. 800 crore were earmarked for the programme. From the financial and physical

1	2	3
---	---	---

achievements as reported above, the Committee find that there is a huge gap between release and expenditure reported by the State Government. Almost 70 per cent of the funds released are lying unspent with various State Governments. The Committee are constrained to note the position of expenditure reported by the States and would like the Government to explain the reasons for such a huge underspending. The Committee observe that the physical achievement in three sectors for which the programme was meant is as below:—

- i. Number of hand pumps installed around 25 per cent of the target;
- ii. Number of traditional sources revived around 10 per cent of the target;
- iii. Number of schools covered around 30 per cent of the target

The Committee conclude that the position of physical achievement is worse than the financial

achievement. The Committee are disappointed to note the physical and financial achievement of the programme and would like an explanation from the Government in this regard.

15. 2.59 The Committee find that the implementation of sector reform project and Swajaldhara Scheme is not very satisfactory. As could be

1	2	3
---	---	---

seen from the data made available to them, there is huge underspending under each of the programmes. They also note that some of the projects are being closed due to variety of factors as in the case of Sikkim reported by the Government. Further, the position is alarming in many of the States where the expenditure has been indicated as nil and in all the Union Territories except Dadra and Nagar Haveli where no funds have been released so far. Further, no scheme could be completed in Union Territories and in most of the States, no project could be completed. The Committee also note that the Department has initiated certain steps to ensure the implementation of the Swajaldhara. However, they note that the steps to be initiated by the Department at this stage like preparation of State Vision statement, detailed annual action plan by the State Governments, etc. should have been ensured before launching of the said Scheme. It appears that proper planning has not been made by the Department before starting Swajaldhara.

16. 2.60 The Committee note that as per the Union Government's Policy ARWSP would be replaced

by Swajaldhara scheme gradually. They also note that whereas ARWSP is applicable to each and every State and district, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme. The Committee appreciate the fact that sustainability of drinking water resource can

1

2

3

be ensured only when people realize that water is an economic and social good and should be treated as such. Providing drinking water free of cost has created a mindset in the rural masses that water is a social right to be provided by the Government. There is an urgent need to change the mindset of the people. However, there are certain concerns as indicated below to be addressed before ARWSP is replaced by Swajaldhara:

- (i) As has been highlighted in the previous chapters, the position of NC habitations is not clear with the Government. Unless the results of the recent survey being undertaken by the various States are analysed, the clear picture with regard to NC and PC habitations would not emerge;
- (ii) During Tenth Plan, Rs.24,800 crore have already been earmarked under ARWSP, but how the Government would ensure utilisation of resources is not clear;
- (iii) Since Swajaldhara scheme is a demand driven scheme, how the Government would

address the problems with regard to accessibility, availability, sustainability and quality etc. especially for the States/ Districts which are not up to the mark and could not be motivated to come forward with the projects;

1	2	3
(iv)	In case ARWSP is phased out, how the Government would achieve the objective of full coverage is not clear;	
(v)	The position of implementation of Swajaldhara is also not very encouraging. Excepting Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu, none of the States show completion of even a single project taken up under the scheme;	
(vi)	As per Government's reply, there is no problem of community contribution under Swajaldhara. However, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme and hence, the projects are demanded from areas where people have the mindset to bear the cost of the projects and owe the responsibilities of operation and maintenance. However, since Swajaldhara is applicable to few of the districts and few areas in the country what will be the position of community contribution is not clear;	
(vii)	Under ARWSP some inter-sector allocation according to a fixed criteria has been made. However, Swajaldhara does not have any	

such prescribed weightage.

(viii) How the Government would take care of the capital intensive complex projects costing to the tune of several lakhs of rupees under Swajaldhara is not clear;

1

2

3

(ix) Whether the rural masses have enough resources and are ready to bear the cost of drinking water from a distant source to the village entry point is not clear as per the replies of the Government.

In view of the aforesaid concerns, the Committee feel that a hurried approach to switch over to Swajaldhara mode will not be prudent. A move with caution and introspection is necessary. A demand driven approach by a community calls for education, proper appraisal of the needs and clear cut understanding with sufficient alertness and eagerness to shoulder the responsibilities matched by adequate financial support. That Swajaldhara initiative has not received wider acclaim from many areas shows that proper endeavour is yet to come and as such making haste to replace ARWSP with this initiative could be fatal. Too much haste in reforms is not prudent. The Government should wait and watch before arriving at any final conclusion. The Committee would, therefore, like that before taking any action to replace ARWSP by the demand driven scheme of Swajaldhara, all the issues referred to above should be addressed carefully and after interacting with the State Governments and Gram Panchayats

and thereby people at large, the Government should carefully draft the guidelines of Swajaldhara. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken.

1

2

3

The Committee are also of the opinion that a streamlined monitoring mechanism should be in place so that the implementing agencies of Swajaldhara Projects can be made accountable. Moreover, data should be maintained regarding the number of DWSCs constituted in the various States of the country, the number of projects implemented by them, the amount of fund at their disposal, among other things. The Committee feel that adopting a strict vigilance and monitoring mechanism on the part of the States/Union Government would go a long way in proper implementation of the projects while also ensuring that community contribution is optimally utilized without any risk of its squandering.

17.

2.79

The Committee note that after achieving substantial coverage of habitations with provision of drinking water, the issue of sustainability — both of the source and system—has emerged as the most pertinent issue. As focussed in the President's address to the Parliament and also in the Finance Minister's Budget speech, various measures for conservation of water are the need of the day. In this context, the Committee also feel that maximum stress should be given to the conservation of water resources by adopting such measures as:

(1) Control on over extraction and exploitation

of ground water sources. The Committee note that a model Bill to

1

2

3

regulate and control the development of ground water drafted by the Ministry of Water Resources has been circulated to all the State Governments for enactment by their respective legislation. The Committee strongly recommend that the legal formalities in most of the States should be completed expeditiously and Ground Water Model Bill with area specific requirements should be implemented at the earliest.

(2) Further, the Committee feel that water harvesting schemes should be given priority by the Department. It has been stated by the Ministry that State Governments have been advised that up to 5 percent of the fund released under ARWSP should be used for Sub-Mission on sustainability. The Committee feel that mere allocation of funds for taking up sustainability issues will not serve the purpose. The Finance Minister proposed that Government would launch a nationwide water harvesting scheme with 50 per cent capital subsidy to NABARD by which one lakh irrigation units at an average cost of Rs. 20,000 per unit will be covered. The Committee would like to know the details of the said Scheme and further recommend that

such schemes should be started in

1	2	3
the drinking water supply sector. Involving the community in setting up such conservation structures will be a positive step in this direction.		
	(3)	The Committee are of the view that partial treatment of the problem will not serve any purpose. All the issues pertaining drinking water availability, sustainability of sources and systems drinking water quality are interrelated and cannot be addressed in isolation. The need of the hour is adopting a holistic approach on water management issues. In this context, the Committee feel that experts in the relevant fields should be involved to discuss these issues so that an objective and acceptable solution can be reached.
18.	2.80	The Committee in their earlier reports had drawn the attention of the Department to the need of the hour to accept sea water for drinking water and other purposes (refer para no. 3.108, 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha). They had also drawn the attention of the Department about the need to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. The Committee had recommended to stress that the Government should give more thrust for exploration of sea water for drinking water and other purposes. The Committee are pleased to note that the Government has finally agreed

1

2

3

to install a desalination plant with a capacity of three hundred million per day (mld). The approximate cost of which is Rs.1,000 crore as Finance Minister stated in his Budget Speech. They also appreciate that under the Common Minimum Programme, the Government propose to install desalination plants in States of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Orissa.

The Committee were informed the project to install a smaller desalination plan has been proposed for Lakshadweep. The Committee would like to know the details of said Project. They feel that since resource constraint is a major issue, stress should be more upon installing such smaller plants which need lesser capital investment.

The Committee feel that the steps ensured by the Government in this regard would go a long way in providing drinking water in coastal areas as recommended by them in their earlier reports. The Committee would like that more projects should be launched in other States. Besides, as recommended by them earlier, Government should pay more attention to R&D to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. The Committee would also like to recommend to study the technologies used in their countries where water for drinking water and other purposes is provided by desalination projects.

1

2

3

19. 2.81 The Committee feel that the most important issue that has been more or less neglected so far is to make the masses aware about the precious resource of water and how its wastage can bring about acute water scarcity disturbing environmental and ecological balance. Most disturbing is the fact that the Government do not think it necessary to maintain any data with regard to the wastage of water. Mismanagement of water resources and lack of proper awareness result in the wastage of millions of gallons of water per day. In this context, the Committee are of the view that the Government should give focussed attention to their IEC Programme teaching the masses about their duties to conserve water sources. Mass media can be used extensively, like giving advertisements in newspapers, slide shows in theatres etc. to educate the masses.

20. 2.82 The Committee also feel that a holistic approach in treating the drinking water and sanitation issues is the best solution in the modern day context. People should be taught not to dump sewerage and other pollution in the water sources which give rise to a vicious cycle of pollution feeding back in to the system.

21. 2.90 The Committee note that as per the guidelines of ARWSP, 20 per cent of its funds are earmarked for sub-Mission activities, out of which 5 per cent is for tackling sustainability

than 15 per cent of the ARWSP funds with specific approval of the Government of India. The Committee further observe that the Government have proposed to enhance the earmarked funds for water quality from 15 per cent to 30 per cent, which is a positive step. The Committee feel that in the recent times, the problem of sustainability alongwith quality has emerged as one of the challenges to be tackled in this field, which should be given maximum priority. Earmarking of more funds for the sector will go a long way in dealing with the problem of drinking water quality. Further, since the Government have identified the main causes responsible for drinking water contamination, *i.e.* fluoride and arsenic, proper technical know-how should be developed to deal with these problems and at the same time some immediate action plan should also be drawn.

22. 2.91 The Committee further note that the survey regarding quality affected habitations with 5-10 per cent stratified sampling in the first phase, which was commissioned way back in March, 2000 has not been taken up seriously by majority of the States. Further, very few States like Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu have furnished data for the second phase of the survey. While taking a serious note of this

attitude of the State Governments, the Committee strongly recommend that the Union Government should take a pro-active step

and issue directions to all the State Governments to complete the aforesaid survey within a stipulated time frame. Independent evaluators should be engaged to complete the survey with a thorough scrutiny that it is carried out in an efficient manner.

23. 2.98 The Committee in their respective reports had repeatedly been recommending to the Government to give top most priority to provide drinking water to schools in rural areas. In spite of that, the physical achievement of the programme indicate that serious attention has not been paid towards this programme. It is really a matter of concern that even after more than five decades of planned development, provision of drinking water to schools is a distant dream. The Committees are really disturbed to note the position of coverage of schools in various States. In several States, the coverage has been indicated as 0 per cent. While appreciating the fact that the responsibility of implementation of ARWSP and of school coverage is with the State Governments, the Committee feel that adequate efforts to sensitize the various State Governments about the urgency of providing drinking water to schools are not being made by the Union Government. The Committee would like the Department to coordinate with

1

2

3

other Ministries/Departments involved in this regard as well as the respective Departments of various State Governments so that all the schools can be covered within a stipulated time

frame. The Committee further find that Seventh All-India Educational Survey has been completed and the results are being compiled by the NCERT. The Committee would like to be apprised of the results when available. Besides, they would also like that the future planning to be made with regard to providing drinking water to rural schools should be made according to the recent data that would be made available as per the Seventh All-India Educational Survey. The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) [Prefer para 3.60 of 46th Report and para 25 of 52nd Report, 13th Lok Sabha] had recommended that under the sector reform project or Swajaldhara programme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. Provision should be made so that the 10 per cent of beneficiary funds could be contributed from the MPLAD funds. As per the action taken reply, the Government could not agree to the recommendation on the plea that community is an essential ingredient in the successful implementation, operation and maintenance of rural water supply schemes, hence Swajaldhara guidelines provide for 10 per cent contribution by the community. The Committee, while taking up the issue

1

2

3

again would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and again emphasize that school coverage should not be treated at par with coverage of habitations as per normal programme. So far as 10 per cent community contribution is concerned, as a special case for school coverage, Swajaldhara

guideline should be made flexible so that 10 per cent community contribution could be provided from MPLAD funds.

24. 2.99 On the issue to ensure drinking water in privately managed schools, the Committee in their earlier Report had recommended that Government aided schools should also be brought under the purview of Government school coverage programme (refer para 3.60 of 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha). The Government in their action taken reply had stated that it is responsibility of private management to provide drinking water in privately managed schools. The Committee while examining the action taken reply had desired to be apprised about the overall position of drinking water in such Government aided schools in order to assess position in the right perspective. The Committee would like to be apprised about the specific steps taken by the Department with regard to coverage of privately managed schools.

1

2

3

In this context, the Committee would like to recommend that all these categories of schools, *viz.*, Government schools, Government-aided and recognized schools and private schools should be covered under the rural drinking water supply programme, so that the supply of potable drinking water can be made available to each and every school of the country thereby ensuring health and well-being of school children.

Further, the Committee feel that the provision of potable drinking water should be extended to local primary health centres and dispensaries thus benefiting a large number of people.

25. 2.104 The Committee note that pursuant to their recommendation made in their earlier Reports (refer 3.60 of 46th Report, 13th Lok Sabha), seven States of North-East and Sikkim were requested to conduct a fresh survey during 2003-2004 to ascertain latest status of rural habitation and they have already furnished the data which have been examined and evaluated by an independent agency. The Committee also find that survey results from Sikkim are still awaited. The Committee would like to be apprised about the latest position with regard to coverage of habitations in North-Eastern States as per the survey after valuation by an independent agency. Besides, they would also like that Sikkim should be

1

2

3

impressed upon to complete the survey without any further delay. The Committee are constrained to note the position of expenditure under ARWSP in North Eastern States. The position of coverage in all the States is very poor. Only Mizoram and Sikkim could achieve 60 percent and 55 percent coverage respectively. The status of implementation of Swajaldhara Scheme indicate that project proposals have been received only from Assam. All the other North Eastern States have failed to come up with any proposed project under the Swajaldhara Scheme. The Committee would like the Department to interact with the North Eastern States to

know about their specific problems with regard to non-furnishing of projects under Swajaldhara.

26. 2.109 The Committee note that during 10th Plan period, National Human Resource Development Programme (NHRDP) implementation was discontinued. However, during the 9th Plan period when the programme was under implementation, 24 States had set up HRD cells. The Committee would like to know the fate of these cells on which large amount of funds have been spent so far. Further, it has been stated that in the current financial year, Rs.1,490 lakh has been proposed to be allocated for the HRD activities. The Committee would like to know the actual status regarding allocation, release and expenditure of funds for HRD activities.

1	2	3
27.	2.110	Further, the Committee note that IEC Programme has also not received due attention from the Government. During 2002-03 and 2003-04, only Rs.16.53 lakh was spent for IEC whereas for the current year 2004-05, an allocation of Rs.10.10 lakh has been made. The Committee feel that in the prevailing scenario, when the Government's policy focus has changed to make the Schemes demand responsive and participative, HRD&IEC Programmes should receive maximum attention. Efforts should be made to use modern information technology methods to promote mass awareness and also for capacity development of the community so that they are able to participate in a more productive manner.

28. 3.8 The Committee have been repeatedly bringing to the notice of the Government that the percentage coverage of rural household with sanitation facilities show a dismal picture. The Committee note with dismay that the Census 2001 found that only 22 percent rural households have been covered with sanitation facilities. Further, the Committee find that under utilisation of funds has become a recurrent feature. For 2002-03, the provisional expenditure figure show an underspending of Rs.70.68 crore while for the year 2003-04, the provisional figure show Rs. 36.82 crore as shortfall in expenditure. Further, the performance in both financial and physical aspects,

1

2

3

in a number of States show an alarming situation. In such a scenario, the Committee strongly recommend that the Department should optimize expenditure of the available funds. The Committee further find that the Department is providing provisional expenditure figure even for the year 2002-03 which should have been updated by mid 2004 at the time of preparing the Performance Budget (2003-04). Further, the Committee feel that the Government should ensure that project proposals are forthcoming from all the States so that lopsided coverage does not take place. Till now 398 projects in the country are under implementation with a number of remaining districts, where such projects under TSC have not yet taken off. The Committee would again like to know whether these left out districts are getting any funds for sanitation programmes especially

when TSC projects are not being forwarded by them.

29. 3.9 The Committee are concerned to note that no updation of data regarding coverage of rural schools with sanitation facilities have been done so far. During the examination of Demands for Grants (2003-04), the same figures from the Sixth All India Education Survey were quoted by the Department. The Committee feel that in the absence of regular evaluation of the actual work done in the field, the ground reality will not be clear. In such

1	2	3
---	---	---

a scenario, the fixing of targets or its subsequent achievement lose their meaning and the figures remain only on paper. The Committee have been informed that the Seventh All India Education Survey has been completed and the results are being compiled at present. The Committee strongly recommend that the survey results should be made available expeditiously and the statistics emerging from it should be meaningfully used to set targets and achievement.

Further, the Committee are of the opinion that school sanitation should be given topmost priority with special attention for provision of lavatory facilities for girls. It has been stated by the Department that under TSC, 10 percent of the total funds is to be provided by the community. The Committee urge the Government to look into

the feasibility aspect of this Scheme, and further recommend that under this Scheme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. There should be the provision that 10 percent community contribution of funds can be made from the MPLAD Scheme. The Committee also feel that along with encouraging community participation, there should be some provision for Central allocation to be given to each State for providing sanitation facilities to rural schools.

1

2

3

In this context, the Committee would like to recommend that construction of sanitary toilets in schools should be of standard quality with provision of adequate supply of water, so that these do not fall into disuse after a certain point of time thus rendering the entire amount invested on these a wastage.

Further, the Committee feel that the provision of hygienic sanitation facilities should be extended to local primary health centres and dispensaries thus benefiting a large number of people.

30. 3.10 The Committee find that the focus of policy in the drinking water supply and sanitation sectors is to encourage community participation. However, it is a matter of serious concern that no such change in policy orientation is reflected in IEC or HRD Programmes of the Government. The Committee feel that if the Government want to make the

demand-driven Schemes successful, proper attention should be given to spread awareness among the rural masses with special emphasis on educating school children regarding adoption of hygienic sanitation habits. Involvement of NGOs/VOs in this regard will go a long way in such interaction with the grassroots to encourage and motivate them to take responsibility of their community assets.

1

2

3

The Committee find that another important issue that needs to be addressed is the problem of open defecation. As the figure furnished by the Department shows that 64 percent of the population in India defecates in open, resulting in 20,000 MT of excreta everyday, the Committee feel that alongwith providing sanitation facilities to rural masses, awareness should be spread among them so that sanitary latrines constructed are used to the optimum. It has been observed though sanitary latrines/complexes are in place, those often fall into disuse, thus rendering the entire amount spent on them a wastage. The Committee strongly recommend that all means at the disposal of the Government right to the grassroot level should be utilized to educate the masses against open defecation and adopting hygienic sanitation habits.

31.

3.11

The Committee note with appreciation that incentives in the field of rural sanitation has been started for PRIs, individuals, organizations for adopting hygienic sanitation practices. The Com-

mittee feel that such incentive Schemes should be encouraged in all villages/districts of the country so that people come forward and participate enthusiastically in the implementation and O&M of the sanitation projects.
