

**46**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2003)**

**THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
2003-2004**

**FORTY-SIXTH REPORT**



**Presented to Lok Sabha on 22.04.2003  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 22.04.2003**

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

## ***CONTENTS***

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

## ***REPORT***

CHAPTER I	Introductory
CHAPTER II	Rural Drinking Water Supply: Some pertinent issues
CHAPTER III	An overall analysis of Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply
CHAPTER IV	Rural Sanitation Programme

## **APPENDICES**

I	Statement indicating Plan outlays, Actual expenditure, Proposed outlay as agreed to by Planning Commission, Budget Estimates and Revised Estimates during 9 <sup>th</sup> and 10 <sup>th</sup> Plans
II	Financial progress under ARWSP and MNP during 2001-2002
III	Financial progress under ARWSP and MNP during 2002-2003
IV	Physical progress under ARWSP and MNP during 2001-2002
V	Physical progress under ARWSP and MNP during 2002-2003
VI	Rural Water Supply Programme: List of Sector Reform Projects
VII	Minutes of the Ninth and Tenth sittings of the Committee held on 26 <sup>th</sup> March, 2003
VIII	Minutes of the Thirteenth sitting of the Committee held on 3 <sup>rd</sup> April, 2003

**COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2003)**

**Shri Chandrakant Khaire - Chairman**

***MEMBERS***

**LOK SABHA**

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
4. Shri Ranen Barman
5. Shri Padmanava Behera
6. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Shriram Chauhan
9. Shri Shamsheer Singh Dullo
10. Shrimati Hema Gamang
11. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
12. Shri Jaiprakash
13. Shri Hassan Khan
14. Shri Basavanagoud Kolar
15. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
16. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
17. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
18. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
19. Shri Mahendra Singh Pal
20. Shri Chandresh Patel
21. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
22. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
23. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
24. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
25. Shri Maheshwar Singh
26. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
27. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
28. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
29. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma
30. Shri Pradeep Yadav

***RAJYA SABHA***

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
34. Shri N.R. Dasari
35. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
36. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
37. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
38. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
39. Shri Rumandla Ramachandraiah
40. Shri Harish Rawat
41. Shri Man Mohan Samal
42. Shri Rajnath Singh
43. Shri G.K. Vasani

**SECRETARIAT**

- |    |                        |   |                      |
|----|------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Shri P.D.T. Achary     | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. | Shri N.K. Sapra        | - | Joint Secretary      |
| 3. | Shri K. Chakraborty    | - | Deputy Secretary     |
| 4. | Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | - | Under Secretary      |

## ***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 Water 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
PRIs	-	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	-	Revised Estimates
TSC	-	Total Sanitation Campaign
UNICEF	-	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
Ut	-	Union Territory

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2003) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Forty-Sixth Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development).

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 Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on 26<sup>th</sup> March, 2003.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2003.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) 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 the Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

**NEW DELHI;**  
**21 April, 2003**  
**1 Vaisakha, 1925(Saka)**

**CHANDRAKANT KHAIRE**  
***Chairman,***  
***Standing Committee on***  
***Urban and Rural Development***

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTORY

1.1 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 1999 in order to give focussed attention towards attaining the goal of providing safe drinking water to all rural habitations in five years, i.e. by April, 2004, in consonance with the National Agenda for Governance (NAG) of the Government. At present, the following schemes are under implementation for the provision of drinking water supply and sanitation facilities to rural habitations:

- (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and State Sector Minimum Needs Programme (MNP);
- (ii) Sector Reform Projects;
- (iii) Swajaldhara;
- (iv) Sub-missions on control of fluorosis, brackishness and arsenic, removal of excess iron and ensuring sustainability;
- (v) Total Sanitation Campaign.

1.3 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry were laid in Parliament on 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2003.

1.4 The Demands for Grants of the Department were laid in the Parliament under Demand No.79.

1.5 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for 2003-04 is Rs.2751.38 crore for both Plan and Non-Plan.

1.6 In the present Report, the Committee have examined the implementation of Centrally sponsored schemes / programmes viz., (i) ARWSP and MNP; (ii) Sector Reforms; (iii) Swajaldhara; (iv) Sub-Missions and (v) Total Sanitation Campaign, in the context of overall budgetary allocation in the Demands for Grants for the year 2003-04.

## CHAPTER II

### RURAL DRINKING WATER SUPPLY: SOME PERTINENT ISSUES

2.1 Provision of safe drinking water to the vast majority of rural population has been a major challenge to the Government of the day. Right from the First Five Year Plan, funds have been provided in the budgets of the States towards achieving this aim. A national water supply and sanitation programme, started way back in 1954, has evolved over the years. In 1999, the Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) prepared on the basis of information furnished by the States/Union territories (Uts) in consonance with the National Agenda for Governance (NAG), aimed towards provision of safe drinking water to all rural habitations by 2004. Three important and inter-related objectives need to be addressed are:

- (i) To ensure coverage of all rural habitations with accessible source of drinking water;
- (ii) To ensure sustainability of sources and systems; and
- (iii) To ensure drinking water quality.

#### *Coverage*

2.2 The Annual Report (2002-2003) of the Ministry of Rural Development proclaims that the Central Government have achieved considerable success in meeting drinking water needs of the rural population over the years. With an investment of more than Rs.40,000 crore on rural drinking water supply, 91.06 per cent of rural habitations have been fully covered with drinking water facilities. The Government further informed that as of now, there are more than 3.7 million hand pumps installed in rural habitations across the length and breadth of the country. In addition, about 1.45 lakh piped water supply schemes have been installed. A comparative analysis of the status of coverage of habitations with drinking water supply during the Eighth, Ninth and the first year of the Tenth Five Year Plans as given below will give a clear picture.

#### **Eighth Plan Period (1992-1997)**

Number of habitations / villages covered: 3,39,705

#### **Ninth Plan Period (1997-2002)**

Year	Target (ARWSP + MNP) No. of villages / habitations	Achievement (ARWSP+MNP) No. of villages / habitations
1997-1998	99613	116994
1998-1999	104902	112933
1999-2000	90061	74636
2000-2001	79468	68618
2001-2002	45526	55593
<b>Total</b>	<b>419570</b>	<b>428774</b>

### Tenth Plan Period (2002-2007)

Year	Target (ARWSP + MNP) No. of villages / habitations	Achievement (ARWSP+MNP) No. of villages / habitations
2002-2003	63869	27668*

*provisional (as on 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2003)*

- 2.3 The Government have furnished the following figures regarding status of coverage as on 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2003.

Type of coverage	Number of habitations	Percentage of total habitations covered
Fully Covered (FC)	1295504	91.06%
Partially Covered (PC)	112804	7.93%
Not Covered (NC)	14356	1.01%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1422664</b>	

These remaining NC and PC habitations are proposed to be covered during 2003-04. During oral evidence taken by the Committee, the Secretary (Department of Drinking Water Supply) assured that despite all the difficulties, the target, i.e. 'as of today not covered' in the last three years would be covered by March, 2004. Thereafter, in consonance with the Tenth Plan Working Group agenda, the issue of slippage of FC habitations to PC and NC categories and PC habitations to NC category would be addressed along with sustainability of water sources.

### ***Sustainability***

2.4 The Secretary further stated that the slippage to PC and NC categories is primarily due to sources drying up. He expressed concern that the major challenge being faced at present is that of source unavailability. According to him water supply schemes so far have been supply-driven. The implementation is done by the State Governments, which take up easy to implement projects, i.e., where the source is easily available. But, ".....now we have come to a stage wherein sources are either just not available or, if available, are not adequate enough. So, we have been consistently saying one of the reasons why targets are not achieved, .....is that we have come to the most difficult areas." He further elaborated that water table has gone very low in certain parts of the country, "As per CGWB estimates, more than 580 blocks out of 5711 blocks in the country are either overexploited or dry, where the exploitation is over 80%, or have gone completely dry, i.e., discharge is more than the recharge that takes place." All the States throughout the country, in some degree or the other, are facing this problem of receding water table with aquifer 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. The Secretary assured that steps have been taken to tackle this situation.

2.5 Apart from source sustainability, the issue of system sustainability was also raised. The Secretary stated that Government driven programmes are not going to sustain the system. It has to be people centred and people should be involved right from the concept stage to implementation and finally O&M of the system.

2.6 In this context, it may be mentioned that as per the reply of the Government, the CAG Report for the year 2002 stated that in 19 States, implementing agencies abandoned 2371 schemes, in the course of their execution after incurring an aggregate expenditure of Rs.197.52 crore. It has been stated that these schemes failed due to various reasons such as sources drying up, failure of tube wells, low discharge of water, non-availability of ground and raw water, wrong selection of sites, non-availability of land, objections raised by local people, non-completion of dam work, non-construction of treatment plants, non-availability of critical material, errors in design, etc. Abandonment of other schemes has also been attributed to defects in planning and ineffective implementation.

2.7 It was to overcome all these lacunae that a major shift in approach has taken place in the water supply schemes, as proclaimed in the Annual Report of the Ministry. Sector Reform approach based on demand driven, community-led project mode has been adopted in 67 districts in the country and the Swajaldhara Programme launched in December 2002 expanded this principle as per which drinking water schemes will be implemented, maintained and owned by the community.

2.8 The Committee during the course of oral evidence also pointed at the recent United Nation's Report as per which India ranks 133<sup>rd</sup> out of 180 countries for its poor water availability and 120<sup>th</sup> out of 122 countries evaluated for drinking water quality. On the query of the Committee regarding this dismal performance by India as compared to other countries of the world, including some of the most underdeveloped countries, the Government replied that the reasons could be large size of the country, contamination of ground water with fluoride, arsenic, salinity, iron, etc. in a large number of habitations due to geo-hydrological factors like excess withdrawal of groundwater, and anthropogenic factors like industrial and environmental pollution. Further, indiscriminate exploitation of available water for agriculture and industry adds to overall shortage and contamination of drinking water. Increasing population has also contributed towards water shortage. While admitting the very low status of India as per the UN Report, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated as below:

“Admittedly India ranks very low in terms of quality, .....worst being Belgium.”

### ***Drinking water quality***

2.9 The Secretary further informed the Committee that one of the reasons for poor availability was quality. If the drinking water source is not safe, the habitation is considered as not covered or not fully covered habitation. In that case either contamination level has to be lowered to the accepted level or alternate source of supply has to be looked for. It was stated that fluoride is a major chemical contaminant. More than 15 States in the country are fluoride affected and about 5.4 million people in nine districts of West Bengal are bearing the brunt of arsenic affected drinking water.

2.10 Concern has been expressed in many other quarters about the pervasive contamination of the country's surface and groundwater. Use of pesticides and insecticides, in an uncontrollable manner much above their stipulated quantity ultimately find their way into surface and groundwater supply sources. Moreover, a substantial part of water supply goes waste due to mismanagement. Replying to a query on this aspect, the Department stated that since rural

drinking water supply is a State subject, the State Governments are responsible for providing safe drinking water to the people. Upto 15 per cent of the funds released to the States under ARWSP are earmarked for taking up projects for safe drinking water. Powers to take up such projects have been delegated to the State Governments. Other Ministries of the Government of India like Environment and Forests, Health, Agriculture, Water Resources, etc. also keep a watch to control environmental pollution.

**2.11 The Committee express a deep sense of outrage that 55 years after Independence, the respective Governments have not been able to provide safe drinking water to all people. The Committee find the Government's claim that more than 90 per cent of all rural habitations have been fully covered with drinking water facilities as completely unacceptable. The Committee wish to reiterate that coverage should not mean only accessibility, rather it should be redefined to include availability and quality of water along with accessibility. While the Committee have examined the issues of accessibility versus availability, contamination of water, sustainability of sources and systems etc., in detail in the succeeding chapters of the Report, they may like to highlight here that there is a hiatus between Government statistics regarding coverage and actual ground reality. In this context, the United Nation's survey report as per which India ranks 133<sup>rd</sup> out of 185 countries with regard to drinking water availability and 120<sup>th</sup> out of 122 countries in respect of drinking water quality, is very disturbing and poses a question on the authenticity of the Government's proclamation that 100 per cent coverage would be achieved by 2004. The Committee are of the view that rather than trying to portray favourable picture by manipulating data, the Government should concentrate on quality work, whereby the provision of safe and sustainable sources of drinking water is made to the rural masses. The Committee feel that focus should be on ensuring sustainability of sources and systems, so that once covered habitations do not revert back to not covered categories within a short span of time, thereby dissipating resources invested so far. Moreover, assessment of the actual ground position of NC, PC, and FC habitations should be made a regular and frequent feature with the help of latest information technology methods, whereby data is regularly updated and is easily made available.**

**2.12 The Committee feel that in the years to come, ensuring sustainability and quality of drinking water sources will be the biggest challenge before the country. While the concerns relating to adequate outlay to be provided during the Tenth Plan have been dealt with in the next chapter of the Report, the Committee seeing the overall position would like to recommend that substantial allocation should be made during the Tenth Plan period under Sub-Missions dealing with sustainability and water quality. Further, the Committee note with concern that while the Government have been stating time and again that groundwater sources are fast depleting causing serious environmental and health problems, various Centrally sponsored schemes focus on the utilisation of groundwater, for example, through installing hand**

pumps or digging bore-wells, which often go dry after a short span of time or become contaminated. Though the Committee understand that hand pumps or bore-wells are a cost-effective way to provide drinking water, in view of the consequent hazards, thought should be given towards developing some alternative and cost effective technology.

2.13 The Committee find that the problems of sustainability and water pollution are being addressed by different Central Ministries, which *inter alia* include, Rural Development, Agriculture, Water Resources, Environment and Forests, and Health. The Committee would like to recommend that a proper mechanism should be evolved to coordinate the functions of these various Ministries, when dealing with the same issues, under a nodal Ministry or Department. This would ensure concerted and well-planned efforts with centralised allocation of funds.

### **CHAPTER-III**

#### **OVERALL ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2003-2004) OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY**

3.1 Comparative position of outlay and expenditure of the rural water supply and rural sanitation programmes during the Ninth Plan period, proposed and agreed outlays for the Tenth Plan period, Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and Actual Expenditures for the last three years, i.e., 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03 and proposed outlay and BE for 2003-04, under both plan and non-plan heads are given at *Appendix-I*.

3.2 The following observations are made from the data indicated at *Appendix-I*:

- (i) There was an underspending of Rs.129 crore out of the total outlay of Rs.9098 crore earmarked for the Department for the Ninth Plan period.
- (ii) During the Tenth Plan, the proposal was for Rs.28463 crore and the outlay agreed to is Rs.14200 crore, which means that the Department has got almost half of what was proposed.
- (iii) In the year 2000-01, there was no reduction in outlay at the RE stage. However, there was an underspending of Rs.72.59 crore.
- (iv) In the year 2001-02, there was a difference of Rs.50 crore between BE and RE. The provisional expenditure figure has been given as Rs. 2000.38 crore, which is Rs. 109.62 crore less than the RE.
- (v) There is a huge gap of Rs.150 crore between BE and RE 2002-03. The actual expenditure upto February, 2003, has been given as Rs.1620.20 crore, which is Rs.629.8 crore less than RE.
- (vi) There is a huge difference of Rs.1033 crore between the outlay proposed and BE during 2003-04.
- (vii) Percentage increase in outlay as compared to previous year is 10.60% during 1999-2000, 9.95% in 2000-01, 2.86% in 2001-02, 11.11% in 2002- 03 and 14.58% in 2003-04.

**3.3 The Committee show their strong displeasure regarding the fact that funds allocated for the topmost priority programmes of rural drinking water supply and sanitation, could not be fully utilized even in a resource starved economy. They are distressed to note that during the Ninth Plan period, there was an underspending of Rs.129 crore out of the total outlay of Rs.9,098 crore earmarked for the Department. Moreover, the expenditure trend for the last three years indicate that whatever allocation was provided for the Department was not fully utilized. For 2000-01, there was an underspending of Rs. 72.59 crore; for 2001-02, the provisional expenditure figure show an underspending of Rs. 109.62 crore and for 2002-03, expenditure figure upto February show a huge shortfall of Rs. 629.8 crore. The Committee observe that despite this fact of underutilisation of available resources, the proposed**

allocation amount for the Tenth Plan period was Rs. 28463 crore, i.e., an increase of about 212.85 per cent over that of the Ninth Plan allocation. However, the Planning Commission agreed to an outlay of Rs. 14200 crore, which is approximately 56 per cent more than the Ninth Plan outlay. Moreover, there is a huge gap between outlay proposed and BE for 2003-2004. The Committee feel that underutilisation is the main reason for getting lesser allocation from Planning Commission / Ministry of Finance. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Government should take all necessary steps and gear up the State Governments / implementing agencies for the various water supply and sanitation schemes to ensure cent percent utilization of scarce resources. Moreover, Action Plans prepared by the Department should be strictly followed, so that there is minimum mismatch between allocation and expenditure. The Committee would also like that the Government should make an indepth analysis of the factors, which lead to underutilization of allocated funds. The States may not be well equipped to ponder over this aspect isolated; the Government hand is necessary to study the ground realities and come forward with a viable and effective solution.

#### Rural Drinking Water Supply

#### Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)

3.4 The Centrally Sponsored Scheme of ARWSP was initially launched in 1972-73 to assist the States and Union territories with 100 per cent grants-in-aid for the provision of safe drinking water to rural areas. The allocation of Central assistance under ARWSP is subject to the matching provision/expenditure by the States under the State sector MNP.

**Comparative position of outlay earmarked and expenditure made by the Department for the rural drinking water supply sector during the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Five Year Plans**

	(Rs. in crore)
Eighth Plan outlay	5100.00
Eighth Plan expenditure	4142.71
Ninth Plan outlay	8564.00
Ninth Plan expenditure	8455.00
Tenth Plan outlay (proposed)	24800.00
Tenth Plan outlay agreed to by the Planning Commission	13245.00

3.5 The following observations are made from the data given above:

- (i) There was an expenditure shortfall of Rs.957.29 crore during the Eighth Plan period;

- (ii) There was an increase of Rs.3464 crore in the Ninth Plan outlay as compared to Eighth Plan outlay. However, Ninth Plan expenditure is Rs.109 crore less than the outlay.
- (iii) In the Tenth Plan, the outlay agreed to by the Planning Commission is less than 50 per cent of what was proposed.
- (iv)

#### **Year-wise analysis of the performance of ARWSP**

<b>2001–2002</b>		<b>(Rs. in crore)</b>
Budget Estimate (BE)	Revised Estimate (RE)	Actual Expenditure
2010.00	1975.00	1943.05

3.6 It can be seen that there was a cut of Rs.35 crore in the RE stage. Moreover, there was an expenditure shortfall of Rs.31.95 crore as compared to RE. The Performance Budget shows a huge opening balance of Rs.297.25 crore as on 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2001.

3.7 When asked about the reasons for this gap between BE and RE of 2001-02, the Department stated that the provision of Rs.2010 crore for Rural Water Supply Programme was reduced to Rs.1975 crore as a part of the general cut effected by the Department of Expenditure in the allocations at the RE stage. Further, elaborating about expenditure shortfall, the Department stated that this is due to the State Governments not being able to utilise the amount because of their inability to match the allocation under ARWSP with State's share. In many cases, the State Finance Departments make available funds to the State Implementing Agencies very late resulting in shortfall in expenditure.

3.8 On a query regarding the huge opening balances with many States running into crores, implying underutilisation of funds released under ARWSP to the State Governments, the Department stated that opening balances with the State Governments resulting in underutilisation of funds are due to inability on their part to provide matching share, State Finance Departments release funds late to the implementing agencies, etc. Further, it has been stated that ARWSP Guidelines permit the State Governments to have 15 per cent of the allocation as opening balance.

3.9 Analysing State-wise performance, as per the data furnished in the Performance Budget (*Appendix II*), it was found that expenditure under ARWSP for the year 2001-02, is less than 50 per cent for the States of Goa (23.79 per cent), Manipur (48.11 per cent) and the Union territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli (17.18 per cent). Also, expenditure for the States of Bihar, Jharkhand, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh show a distressing gap with allocation. When asked for the reasons for this worrying state of affairs, whereby despite availability of funds and a persistent problem of potable water crises, the funds could not be optimally utilised, the Department furnished the following reasons:

- (i) State Finance Departments release funds late to the Implementing Agency;
- (ii) Non-furnishing of utilisation certificate and Audit Certificate delays release of second instalment;
- (iii) Information received from Bihar Government and AG revealed discrepancies; and
- (iv) Kerala and Goa had heavy opening balance

## 2002-2003

(Rs. in crore)

Budget Estimate	Revised Estimate	Actual Expenditure (upto February, 2003)
2235.00	2110.00	1513.67

3.10. On a query, as to why there was a difference of Rs.125 crore between BE and RE, the Department gave the same reply stating that the budget provision was reduced due to the cut imposed by the Department of Expenditure.

3.11 As per the data furnished by the Government in Performance Budget, it was shown that out of Rs.2110 crore available at RE stage, only Rs.1402.46 crore has been released till 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2003 and a staggering amount of Rs.832.54 crore remained to be released for the last two months. The Committee also observed during their study visit to Goa and Mumbai during February 2003, that it is a recurrent complaint of the State Governments/implementing agencies, that funds under the Centrally sponsored schemes are released late nearing the end of the financial year, making the State Governments unable to utilise funds thus rendering a huge opening balance for the next year.

3.12 When asked for the comments of the Department in this regard, the Department replied that the funds under ARWSP are released to the State Governments in two instalments. The first instalment is released in the beginning of the financial year. The second instalment is released on receipt of the proposals from the State Governments in the prescribed format along with necessary certificate including utilisation certificate, Auditor General's certificate, etc. The proposal received after 31<sup>st</sup> December is subject to cuts. More often the proposals received are incomplete. The State Governments are requested to furnish the required information and the mandatory certificates before considering the release of the second instalment. As a result, some cases for issuing second instalment could be finalised after January. Early release of funds can be possible if the State Governments furnish all relevant documents after completing the formalities in time.

3.13 The Secretary during oral evidence clarified that most of the States are afflicted with financial problems, due to which they cannot release their share of funds on time. They get the first instalment released without any problem from the Government of India. Although instructions are there that within 15 days of the receipt of Government of India funds, the State Governments must release their share, but in effect that does not happen. For these two reasons there was delay in the release of the second instalment.

3.14 Analysing State-wise performance (*Appendix III*), it is observed that the year 2002-03 also started with a huge opening balance of Rs.340.45 crore. Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Jharkhand topped the list for unutilised funds. Moreover, some of the States show appalling expenditure figures for the year 2002-03 as per data available upto 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2003. The States of Bihar, Nagaland, and Union territories of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Delhi and Pondicherry, show 'nil' expenditure. For 15 States, expenditure under ARWSP is shown as less than 50 per cent. When asked for the reasons for such low expenditure figures at the end of January, the Department replied that the low expenditure figures is due to the fact that many State Governments finalise their expenditure towards the end of the financial year. There is also delay in reporting of the figures by the State Governments.

**2003 - 2004**

**(Rs. in crores)**

<b>Outlay proposed</b>	<b>Budget Estimate</b>
3283.00	2585.00

3.15 There is a huge gap of Rs.698 crore between the proposed outlay and Budget Estimate. It was pointed out that as per the information furnished by the Department, under head '2215' for Rural Water Supply Programme, BE 2003-2004 is Rs.5.48 crore less than BE 2002-2003.

<b>Major Head of Account</b>	<b>Budget Estimate</b>	
2215	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2003-04</b>
	731.18	725.70

3.16 The Department was asked for the reasons for reducing financial allocation under head '2215' when as per National Agenda for Governance, the target of 100 per cent coverage was to be achieved by 2004.

3.17 The Department while clarifying the position as stated in the preceding para stated that only part of the Budget allocation under Major Head '2215' is meant for direct expenditure. Out of a total allocation of Rs.731.18 crore under BE 2002-03, Rs.700 crore is meant to be released to the State Boards/Nigams, which are the implementing agencies in the six States of Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh and Uttaranchal for rural water supply programmes. The funds meant for Sector Reform Projects (SRP) and Swajaldhara, which are released to the implementing agencies of SRP and Swajaldhara is also under '2215'. As major part of the allocation under '2215' is released to the States through the respective implementing agencies, there is no reduction in the grants-in-aid meant for the States taking into account the availability of funds under Major Head '2215' and Major Head '3601'.

### **State sector Minimum Needs Programme (MNP)**

3.18 As per the Guidelines, the allocation of Central assistance under ARWSP is subject to the matching provision/expenditure by the States under the State sector MNP. Releases under the ARWSP would not exceed the provision for Rural Water Supply made by the State Governments under their MNP. The shortfall in actual expenditure under the MNP *vis-à-vis* expenditure under the ARWSP during the previous year shall be deducted from the last instalment of the ARWSP funds from the current financial year.

3.19 As could be seen from the data given below, the allocation and expenditure reported by States/Union territories/implementing agencies under State sector Minimum Needs Programme show a steady decline:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Outlay</b>	<b>Release</b>	<b>(Rs. in crore) Expenditure</b>
2000-01	Rs.2696.33	Rs.2431.02	Rs.2366.41
2001-02	Rs.2517.25	Rs.2349.33	Rs.2149.61
2002-03	Rs.1975.68	Rs.1362.10	Rs.863.03

(as on December 2002)

3.20 When asked for the reasons for decrease in allocation and release under State share MNP, the Department stated that this is mainly due to poor financial status of the State Governments concerned. It was further stated that the shortfall in the matching share for water supply scheme under MNP is deducted from the release of next instalment of ARWSP funds. Moreover, the State Governments are requested repeatedly to provide matching share in time. This point was emphasized in the Conference of State Ministers of water supply and also in the review meetings taken for each State. The Secretary, during the oral evidence clarified that since water supply is a State subject, implementation is done through the agencies of the State Governments and Centre is not in any way involved in the implementation process. The States should have Action Plans in which the problem has to be stated very clearly and how the State Government plan to implement a scheme/project. Funds are sanctioned on the basis of these Action Plans.

**3.21 The Committee note with concern that the financial position of one of the top-most priority programmes of the Government, i.e., to provide potable water to the rural masses is plagued by various shortcomings:**

- (1) Underutilisation of available funds has become a regular feature. For the Eighth Plan period, underspending of about Rs. 957 crore has been reported, while for the Ninth Plan period, expenditure was 109 crore less than the outlay;**
- (2) Going by the Tenth Plan Working Group proposal, inadequate allocation has been made for rural drinking water supply, whereby around 50% of what was proposed has been finally sanctioned by the Planning Commission.**
- (3) There is huge underspending of the funds released by the Centre to State Governments under this Scheme.**
- (4) There is decrease in allocation, release and expenditure under the State sector Minimum Needs Programme.**

**The Committee find that whenever the attention of the Department is drawn towards underutilisation or huge opening balances with the different State Governments, a routine reply stating poor financial position of the State Governments, non furnishing of utilisation certificates, late release of funds to the implementing authorities etc., has been furnished. The Committee have been receiving the same type of reply for the last four-five years. The Committee are unhappy over the way the Department is giving reply to their recommendation relating to such a priority programme i.e., providing drinking water to rural masses. They feel that instead of analysing the State-wise position and finding the problems being faced by each of the State Governments, with regard to implementation of the programme, the Department is simply sidetracking the main issues by furnishing a routine reply. The Committee would like that the reasons for underutilisation should be analysed for each of the States and the Committee apprised about the details in this regard. Not only that, the Government should find different ways and means to ensure proper utilisation of scarce resources and efforts**

should be made to contain unspent balances. As regards the late release of funds, the Committee find that this is the problem being faced in almost all schemes of the Department of Rural Development. They find that late release of money lead to huge underspending and wastage of money and feel that this trend has to be checked to ensure proper utilisation of funds. As regards the problems with regard to providing matching share by some of the State Governments, the Committee would like that the position with regard to each of the States should be critically analysed and the information furnished to the Committee. By the mixed tactics of persuasion and compulsion, the State Governments should be impressed upon to properly utilise the resources. Innovative mechanism for cent percent utilization of the resources is not forthcoming from many States. Though they need money, but many of them do not know how to channelize them for a fruitful purpose. Underutilization makes it more pronounced. Many States require a direction from the Centre which is not forthcoming. There is no zeal either to do so. However, something needs to be done. In this context, the Committee would like the Union Government to play a more proactive role, with regular visits of the Central Government officials to monitor and evaluate the various schemes and also to assist and guide the State Governments in selection of viable projects. The Committee strongly feel that the Government cannot abdicate their responsibility by simply indicating the oft quoted causes. Much is expected out of them. The Committee hope to see something in the near future.

### **Physical progress under ARWSP**

3.22 When asked about the target set by the Department for coverage of habitations with drinking water facility for the year 2003-2004, it has been stated by the Department that as per the information received from the State Governments till 14<sup>th</sup> February, 2003, there are 14350 Not Covered (NC) and 112792 Partially Covered (PC) habitations, out of 1422664 habitations, which is around nine per cent. Some more habitations were expected to be covered during the current financial year. All the remaining NC and PC habitations were proposed to be covered during 2003-04. The actual break-up of NC and PC habitations to be covered would be finalised in April 2003, depending on the total habitations covered during 2002-03.

3.23 The Government further stated that the guidelines for conducting fresh survey to ascertain the latest status of rural habitations with regard to availability of drinking water supply as on 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2003 has been issued to all the States/Union territory Governments and they have been requested to complete the survey by 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2003.

3.24 The Secretary, during oral evidence, pointed out that whatever habitations remain to be covered are difficult source habitations or are situated in inhospitable terrain. He informed that State Governments have prepared their action plans for 2002-04, which would indicate the time frame within which the remaining habitations would be covered which have gone dry or are considered not covered under quality parameters. The Secretary submitted that the rural water supply scheme would be focussed on a project mode in the coming two years and expressed hope that the target would be achieved.

3.25 However, the data made available indicate a very serious situation, whereby in at least 14 States, the situation regarding water availability is quite grave. In coastal areas like Orissa, Tamil Nadu and also Andhra Pradesh, there is terrible scarcity of water, leading to water famine. The Secretary accepted that the situation in some States is serious. In Tamil Nadu, there is over-exploitation of drinking water sources along with dismal scenario in Rajasthan, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, among others. Moreover, drought-prone districts are in maximum numbers in this country.

3.26 During oral evidence, when the issue regarding overestimation of projects was raised, the Secretary accepted that this sort of overestimation has been noticed in many States and State Governments have thereafter been penalised.

3.27 The Committee in their earlier Report [refer para No.2.35 of 32<sup>nd</sup> Report (13<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha)] had recommended to revise the norms regarding ARWSP, which were fixed years back during 1972-73. The Department informed that based on the recommendations made at the State Ministers' Conference held under the Chairmanship of Minister of Rural Development, in October 2001, the Government of India decided to revise the said norms. It was stated that the present norms provide for 40 litres per capita per day (lpcd) with a source within 1.6 km in the plains and 100 metres elevation in the hills. The norms may be relaxed to provide for 55 lpcd with a source within 0.5 km in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills, after the coverage of all NC and PC rural habitations in that State is achieved, as per the existing norms of 40 lpcd. This relaxation is subject to the condition that beneficiaries of the relaxed norms share a part of the capital cost (which should not be less than 10 per cent) and shoulder full responsibility for subsequent operation and maintenance. It was also informed that the revised norms have been applied for allocation of funds under ARWSP during 2002-2003.

3.28 With regard to the application of the present norm, the Secretary, during the course of oral evidence stated:

“In certain parts of Rajasthan, we have been carrying water as far away from as 20-30 kilometres.”

### **State-wise coverage of habitations during 2001-02**

3.29 Analysing the State-wise coverage of habitations during 2001-02 (*Appendix IV*), as per the data given in the Performance Budget, it is observed that Jharkhand shows a dismal coverage percentage of habitations at 2.5 per cent, while for Goa it is 18 per cent. Besides, Jammu and Kashmir, Karnataka, Manipur and the Union territories of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Pondicherry show less than 50 per cent coverage as against target.

3.30 When asked about the reasons for such dismal performance of these States regarding coverage of habitations under ARWSP and MNP for the year 2001-02, the Government simply stated that as per the latest information received from the Government of Jharkhand, the State has covered 444 rural habitations out of a target of 500. The total number of habitations yet to be covered in the State is 235 Not Covered (NC) and 42 Partially Covered (PC) habitations. In Goa, the target was for eight NC habitations and 40 PC habitations.

3.31 Moreover, on a query as to why in a large State like Bihar, only two NC and two PC habitations were taken as target while for Uttar Pradesh, only two NC and 31 PC habitations were targeted, the Department replied that the targets have been fixed with reference to the NC and PC habitations to be covered in the respective States. As per the latest report, there are no NC and PC habitations in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. However, during the oral evidence, when pointed out that water table has gone down precariously in some parts of Uttar Pradesh, the Secretary confirmed that quantity of discharge or extraction of underground water, which has been going on in 19 Blocks in the State can result in serious consequences in the absence of proper technique of recharge of groundwater.

### **State-wise coverage of habitations during 2002-03**

3.32 As per the Performance Budget (*Appendix V*), out of a total target of 64474 habitations, only 17234 have been covered as per information upto 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2002, *i.e.*, a coverage percentage of 25.30. Moreover, Arunachal Pradesh (2.20 per cent), Kerala (0.88 per cent), Maharashtra (1.98 per cent), Meghalaya (7.89 per cent), Mizoram (3.89 per cent) and Punjab (7.85 per cent) show dismal performance upto December 2002. When the Department was asked to furnish the reasons for such slow pace of coverage, a routine reply came from the Department, that the State implementing agencies take time for completion of rural water supply schemes and reporting the coverage achieved. The correct position of coverage will become available only after the financial year is over. It is also stated that the habitations, which are left out are generally in difficult and inaccessible terrain and more efforts are required for coverage of these habitations.

**3.33 The Committee note with strong displeasure that the performance of many States with regard to the coverage of habitations with drinking water facility, as indicated in the preceding paras, is very dismal. However, as per the Government data, around nine per cent partially covered or not covered habitations remain to be covered and the Government target to cover these habitations by the year 2004. The Committee are concerned to find that during the year 2002-2003, the Government targeted to cover 64,474 habitations, but could cover only 17,234, *i.e.*, around 25.3 per cent. With this pace of achievement, the Committee seriously doubt the claim of the Department to cover the total habitations by the year 2004.**

**3.34 The Committee further note that besides the challenge of covering not covered or partially covered habitations, the main problem the country would face in the coming years is sustainability of sources. While this issue has been addressed in detail in the subsequent chapter, the Committee find that the Department is conducting a survey to ascertain the position of slippage of fully covered habitations into partially covered and not covered habitations. They also note that the State Governments have been requested to complete the survey by 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2003. They hope that the survey has been completed by now and would like to be apprised about the results, so as to know the ground situation in this regard in the country.**

**3.35 The Committee further find that the Department has proposed to revise the existing norms to provide 40 litres per capita per day (lpcd) with a source within 1.6 kilometers in the plains and 100 metres elevation in the hills to 55 lpcd with a source within 0.5 kilometers in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills after the coverage of all NC and PC rural habitations. They welcome the revised norms but express serious doubt about its feasibility, taking into account ground realities at present. In fact, during the course of oral evidence, the Secretary submitted that in certain parts of Rajasthan, water has to be carried from a distance of 20-30 kilometers. The Committee wish to emphasize that greatest priority must be accorded to ensure that every habitation and individual is covered in rural areas according to the revised norms.**

## Sector Reform and Swajaldhara

3.36 As per the Annual Report of the Ministry, it has been realised that for true socio-economic development to take place, people at the grassroots have to be involved and given a voice in developmental programmes aimed at their well being. Mere administrative decentralisation or increased investment is not enough. For instance, in the rural water supply sector, huge investment has been made over the years but satisfaction and actual accessibility to safe drinking water sources at the community level have remained low. Moreover, since the community was not involved in the planning or deciding about the source and systems, sustainability of already established sources has emerged as a significant problem over the years. Also, there is the widespread perception that water is a social right to be provided by the Government free of cost. To change this mindset and drive home the point that water is an economic and social good to be managed at the lowest appropriate level with users having stake in the planning and implementing process, ARWSP was revamped in April 1999 to include proposals to mobilise community participation in rural water supply programmes and 20 per cent of the annual outlay has since been earmarked for providing funds for such projects. The projects are based on a demand responsive and community participative approach whereby the partial cost share either in cash or kind or both and 100 percent responsibility of O&M by the users have been emphasized.

3.37 As per information furnished by the Government, the following table indicates the physical and financial performance of Sector Reform Pilot Projects.

(Rs. in crore)					
No. of projects sanctioned	Approved project cost	GOI share	Funds released	Reported expenditure	Community contribution
67	2060.45	1922.85	631.66	246.23	36.37

3.38 Project-wise details of funds released, status of utilisation and physical progress are given in *Appendix VI*. Analysing the data as given above, it can be seen that reported expenditure is about 39 per cent of the total funds released. Moreover, out of 67 projects initiated so far, 24 projects show less than 10 per cent expenditure.

3.39 Clarifying the reasons for such slackened pace of implementation, the Department stated that the project implementation in some districts is very slow. The Sector Reforms Projects are process projects. The main objective is to enhance the awareness among the rural people by demystifying various possible drinking water supply technological options, the merits and demerits of each option, their cost differences, the importance of peoples' participation, and to equip them to plan, sanction, partially fund, implement, operate, maintain and manage themselves the Rural Water Supply Scheme of their choice. Moreover, project implementation is being shouldered by Zilla Parishad/District Water and Sanitation Mission and District Water and Sanitation Committee and its core group. State Water and Sanitation Missions also review and guide the implementation. The Community mobilisation, participation at various levels through Information, Education and Communication (IEC) and Human Resource Development (HRD) programmes are time consuming processes and hence the project implementation process becomes slow.

3.40 The data made available indicate that out of 579 districts in the country, only in 67 districts, Sector Reforms Pilot Projects are being implemented on the principle of demand driven, community participation approach, though the Government have clearly stated that the present allocation based criteria of funds under ARWSP to the States should be replaced with a need based approach to achieve the objectives of coverage within the time frame set by the NAG.

3.41 When asked as to how the Government propose to extend these reform principles to more and more districts, so that, a paradigm shift may be brought into the water supply programme, it was stated that the Government of India funded Sector Reform Project have been under implementation since 1999. On the basis of reforms piloted in 67 projects, the new programme called 'Swajaldhara' was launched by the Government in December 2002, which as per Government statement is a rural water supply programme based on demand-driven, community participation approach, on the same principles of Sector Reforms Projects. The need for taking up community based rural water supply programmes in wider canvas and to open up the reform initiative in rural drinking water supply sector throughout the country, Swajaldhara was launched.

3.42 As per the Annual Report, Beneficiary Group, Gram Panchayats and Blocks adopting the reforms principles will be eligible for Swajaldhara Projects. 10 per cent community contribution of the estimated capital cost of the schemes (5 per cent in case of predominantly SC/ST habitations as per 2001 census) will be an integral part of the project. The cost of the project excluding community contribution will be fully met by Government of India. It has been emphasized that peoples' contribution is a non-negotiable part of Swajaldhara.

3.43 By 20<sup>th</sup> February, 2003, proposals of about Rs.241.43 crore with community contribution of about Rs.21.73 crore have been approved by the National Scheme Sanctioning Committee of the Department of Drinking Water Supply to the States of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, West Bengal, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Himachal Pradesh, Assam, Kerala, Karnataka and Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli.

The following is the State-wise detail of approved proposals under Swajaldhara:

<b>State</b>	<b>No. of Eligible proposals received</b>	<b>Approved by NSSC</b>
Andhra Pradesh	2576	976
Assam	38	38
Gujarat	30	30
Karnataka	98	60
Kerala	438	128
Haryana	2	2
Himachal Pradesh	250	473
Madhya Pradesh	44	44
Maharashtra	786	786
Orissa	309	309
Rajasthan	36	35
Tamilnadu	287	238
Uttar Pradesh	3033	666

West Bengal	111	5
Union territory of Dadar & Nagar Haveli	1	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8039</b>	<b>3791</b>

3.44 The Department stated in the reply that in the financial year 2002-2003, no separate State-wise financial allocation is made for Swajaldhara.

3.45 Further in replying to the query as to how the projects under this Scheme will be implemented and how the districts will be identified for this programme, the Department stated as under:

“Swajaldhara is implemented throughout the country in all the districts. Swajaldhara is to be implemented by the communities and their institutions, namely, Panchayats at village level. Technical details of any water supply scheme chosen by the community/Panchayat need to be worked out by the competent technical officials of the State Government Department dealing with Rural Water Supply. This service should be available free of cost to the community and Panchayats. Gram Panchayats are to choose the schemes to implement, undertake procurement of materials/services for execution of schemes and supervise the scheme execution. After completion of such schemes, the Panchayats will take over the O&M of the schemes.”

3.46 According to the Annual Report, the Swajaldhara Scheme is meant for taking up only simple and basically community oriented schemes. This is not meant for capital intensive, complex projects costing to the tune of several lakhs of rupees. The O&M of such heavy capital schemes will be beyond the wherewithal of the Gram Panchayats. Therefore as a general rule, such type of capital intensive schemes costing Rs. 25 lakh or more, for a single village can be taken up under ARWSP. In the recent study visit of the Committee to Maharashtra during the year 2003, they were apprised by the State Government, that with 25 lakh ceiling per project, only smaller habitations/villages can be covered. The Committee were informed that with per capita cost of about Rs.2000-2500, only those villages/habitations with 2500-3000 population can be brought under the purview of the Swajaldhara Projects. Therefore, it was requested that Rs.25 lakh ceiling should be done away with and funds should be sanctioned on a site-specific and project specific basis.

**3.47 The Committee find from what has been stated in the preceding paras that the Government propose to replace the allocation based criteria of funds under ARWSP with a need based approach to achieve the objectives of coverage within a time frame set by the National Agenda for Governance. At another place, it has been mentioned that Swajaldhara Scheme is meant for taking up only simple and basic community oriented schemes and not for capital intensive complex projects costing to the tune of several lakh of rupees. These types of projects would be taken under ARWSP. The Committee fail to comprehend the contradictory statements. On the one hand, it has been stated that ARWSP will be phased out and on the other hand, it is mentioned the capital-intensive schemes would be taken up under ARWSP, and simple schemes costing less would be taken up under Swajaldhara scheme. They would like the Department to clarify in this regard.**

**3.48 The Committee have further been informed that capital intensive schemes of less than Rs.25 lakh can be taken under Swajaldhara scheme, where the community share is 10 per cent of the cost. The Committee feel that in villages having less density of population, the bigger projects even costing less than Rs.25 lakhs cannot be taken up. They feel that the burden on the below poverty line person to bear the cost of the project should commensurate with his capacity and the Government has to think over this aspect. They would therefore like that the said ceiling should be reviewed. The Government should think over it and revise the said norms. The Committee further find that Swajaldhara is a project driven scheme. They fail to understand the fate of the districts, which do not send any projects to the Union Government. They also fail to understand how the Government would achieve the set target of covering the total not covered habitations by the year 2004 alongwith addressing the problems of sustainability and contamination during the remaining years of Tenth Plan.**

**3.49 The Committee further find from the progress of the Sector Reform Programme, that it could be implemented only in 67 districts. They also find that the programme was started in 1999 and during the four years of implementation, the progress is not very encouraging. They note the concern of the Department over the less satisfaction level in the community inspite of spending crores of rupees during different Five Year Plans, and feel that community participation is the main factor in making a programme successful. However, as admitted by the Department, changing the mindset of people who have been used to get water free of cost, is a bigger challenge. Keeping this in mind, the Committee feel that more has to be done for spreading awareness among the rural masses. They find that the Government propose to mobilise participation of community through Information, Education and Communication (IEC) and Human Resource Development (HRD), which have been addressed in detail in the later chapter of the Report. They would like that adequate separate allocation for IEC and HRD should be made.**

**3.50** The Committee note that in the Swajaldhara Programme, community contribution is a non negotiable aspect. However, they are concerned about whether people at the grassroots will be able to contribute their share, especially for O&M charges. It has been generally observed that though initial investment is enthusiastically done, main problem arises when the system falls into disrepair and the onus is on the local people to get it repaired. Due to mindset or poor economic condition, there is reluctance on the community's part to take responsibility of the system. The Committee are of the view that to deal with such apathy and to ensure O&M at the Panchayat level, a proper mechanism, for e.g., agreement, etc., should be evolved, by which the Panchayat members and community at large will be held responsible for the O&M of the installed system. In this manner, the sustainability of the system can be assured.

**3.51** The Committee also feel that to ensure proper maintenance of the systems provided under drinking water scheme, a procedure can be evolved, whereby revolving funds having some percentage of the total allocation under ARWSP, say 5% beneficiary contribution and 5% Government contribution can be made. The said fund can be deposited in a bank account of a Gram Panchayat in a specific branch or invested as per the prescribed guidelines to be issued in this regard. It should also be prescribed that the said fund could be used only for the maintenance of the specified systems provided under the scheme to the specific Panchayats. The Committee would like that the Government should consider this proposal to ensure proper maintenance of the various systems like hand pumps, etc. provided to community.

### **Coverage of Schools**

**3.52** As per the information furnished by the Government, 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. School coverage under ARWSP has been taken up with effect from 2000-2001. It has been proposed to cover 1.50 lakh rural schools under ARWSP during the period of five years starting from 2000-2001. As per the CAP the total requirement of funds was estimated to be Rs.900 crore, to be equally shared by the Centre and States. The annual requirement of fund was put at around Rs.225 crore, on a 50: 50 ratio between the Centre and States.

The Department has furnished the coverage figures upto 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2003.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target Number of schools</b>	<b>Achievement Number of schools covered</b>
2000-2001	44086	11879
2001-2002	39356	30251
2002-2003	35030	14331

3.53 Analysing the target vis-à-vis achievement for the last three years, it can be seen that for 2000-2001, coverage percentage was 27 per cent, for 2001-2002, it was 77.86 per cent and in 2002-03, 41 per cent schools have been covered with drinking water supply facilities as against the set target.

3.54 When asked for the reasons for such slackened pace of implementation of one of top-most priority, i.e., to provide drinking water to school children, the Department stated that in comparison to rural habitations to be covered, there is less pressure on the implementing agencies for coverage of schools, which results in low coverage.

3.55 Further, the Department stated that out of the 3.52 lakh rural schools which are yet to be provided with potable water, 1.50 lakh would be covered by ARWSP and the remaining 2.02 lakh schools would be covered with funds available under schemes of other Ministries including Elementary Education Department. On the query of the Committee regarding the coverage of those 2.02 lakh schools, which are to be covered under schemes of other Ministries, the Department replied that the Ministry of Human Resource Development propose to cover all the schools under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan within the period of 10 years. That Ministry has informed that they have targeted 34642 rural schools to be covered under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (SSA) during the current year. That Ministry fixes target under SSA on a year-to-year basis. It is also proposed to cover one lakh rural schools as per the announcement made by the Prime Minister on 15<sup>th</sup> August, 2002.

3.56 As per the written note of the Department, the Ministry of Human Resource Development is conducting the Seventh 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.

3.57 As stated in the Annual Report, providing water supply facilities in schools can also be implemented under the newly launched Swajaldhara Programme. In accordance with the principle of sector-reform, the users will implement the scheme and undertake its O&M, only when they contribute towards the project cost. The Government of India has decided to provide drinking water facilities on priority to those schools, where presently there is no such facility. The community, parents and teachers of the school can contribute towards 10 per cent of the capital expenditure of the Scheme. The local Member of Parliament can bridge the shortfall by contributing from MPLAD Programme, if there is genuine problem in mobilizing community contribution for providing drinking water in some schools. However, it should not be a general practice to provide 10 per cent from MPLAD fund to access Swajaldhara funds.

3.58 Elaborating further, the Secretary informed that a part of community contribution can be taken from MPLAD funds, for instance if the project cost is Rs.10,000, then Rs.1,000 is the part community has to pay. Out of this, MPLAD fund can contribute Rs.500 and the remaining Rs.500 can be collected from the users.

**3.59 The Committee find that even after five decades of planned development, provision of safe drinking water in schools in rural areas could not be ensured. Even taking the figures collected and compiled nearly ten**

years back regarding number of schools, it can be seen that 3.51 lakh rural primary and upper primary schools are yet to be provided with potable water supply. Moreover, analysing the performance of the Government in this respect, the Committee feel that they are not serious enough in fulfilling the target of school coverage. Every year there is a huge shortfall in the achievement of target. Moreover, the Committee find that out of the 2.02 lakh schools to be covered under schemes of other Ministries, the Ministry of Human Resource Development has proposed to cover all these schools under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan within a period of ten years, which is a long time period. The Committee are unhappy at this slackened pace of coverage of schools, and observe that if it continues in the same pace, many more years will be taken to make safe drinking water available to all school children. Therefore, the Committee recommend that Government should take up school coverage with utmost sincerity and work out a plan of action to provide drinking water in schools within a limited time-frame, as the school children cannot wait for a decade or so, to have drinking water in the schools, which is a basic necessity of life. Moreover, as done for other programmes under ARWSP, a certain percentage of ARWSP and MNP funds should be kept for this purpose.

**3.60** The Committee further observe that on the one hand, the Government propose to provide free primary education, but on the other hand, even for a basic amenity like drinking water in schools, students are being charged. The Committee, therefore, recommend that under the Sector Reform principle or Swajaldhara programme, guidelines should be made a little flexible regarding school coverage. Provision should be made so that the 10 per cent beneficiary share of funds can be contributed from the MPLAD funds. They would like that the Department should interact with the concerned authorities to make suitable amendment in the guidelines of MPLAD Scheme. Besides, the Committee are of the view that Government-aided schools should also be brought under the purview of the Government's school coverage programme.

**3.61** The Committee note that the Ministry of Human Resource Development is also dealing with providing drinking water to rural schools and it has also set some targets in this regard. The Committee would like that there should be some mechanism to coordinate with the Ministries involved in providing drinking water to schools, so that there is no duplication in this regard and there is proper channelization of funds to the areas where the same are urgently needed.

**3.62** The Committee, further, note that the Sixth All India Educational Survey was done during the year 1993 and after that the Seventh All India Educational Survey is being conducted at present, the results of which are still awaited. They find that such an important survey is conducted after an interval of ten years. They also note that actual estimation of ground situation is the basic factor on which implementation of a programme depends and for

such a priority sector like schools, ten years is a long period, because the number of schools changes from year to year. To overcome this problem, the Committee would like that some periodic State-wise survey should be conducted to have latest information about the number of schools, so that no school is deprived of the benefit of drinking water supply scheme.

### **Position in the North Eastern States**

3.63 The Annual Report of the Ministry states that as a part of the overall policy of the Government to pace up developmental work in the North-Eastern States, the Department of Drinking Water Supply has also given maximum financial flexibility in the guidelines for implementation of Rural Water Supply Programme in respect of North Eastern States. To ensure that 10 per cent of the total Central outlay for the programme earmarked for North-Eastern States is not lapsed, a non-lapsable Central pool of resources has been created. Any unutilised fund of Government of India share is credited into this pool under which the State Governments can take up various projects. From the data made available to the Committee, it is observed that every year out of funds earmarked for North-Eastern region, a huge amount has to be surrendered to the non-lapsable pool of resources for North-Eastern States, which also has a bearing on the overall releases under ARWSP. In 2001-02, an amount of Rs.31.31 crore had to be placed in this pool while in the year before that, i.e., 2000-2001, an amount of Rs.61.82 crore had to be surrendered.

3.64 The Secretary, informed during the oral evidence, that in the current year out of the total allocation of Rs. 225 crore, about Rs.18.57 crore is going to be the surrendered to the non-lapsable pool of resources for the North-Eastern States.

3.65 The reason stated by the Government for such anomaly is the non-receipt of adequate number of proposals from these States. When asked whether the Government have thought of finding any solution to this recurrent problem, like assisting these State Governments in identifying viable projects or involving international agencies in these activities, the Department has stated that the review of implementation of rural water supply schemes is carried out at frequent intervals in respect of all States including the North-Eastern States. During such review, States are repeatedly requested to enhance State share for rural drinking water supply schemes. At the National level Conference of State Ministers of Rural Water Supply, which is attended by Ministers from North-Eastern States, such messages are imparted. North-Eastern State representatives are also sensitized for giving focussed attention to drinking water sector in rural areas.

3.66 The status of coverage of habitations in these areas with drinking water supply facilities show that a long way has to be traversed to achieve 100 per cent coverage. As per the information furnished by the Government, the following data indicate the status of coverage as on 12<sup>th</sup> March, 2003.

States	Status of Coverage as on 12 <sup>th</sup> March, 2003			
	NC	PC	FC	Total
Arunachal Pradesh	309	847	3142	4298
Assam	425	17075	53169	70669
Manipur	4	183	2604	2791
Meghalaya	318	781	7540	8639

Mizoram	0	452	459	911
Nagaland	349	569	607	1525
Sikkim	0	290	1389	1679
Tripura	93	11	7308	7412
<b>Total</b>	<b>1498</b>	<b>20208</b>	<b>76218</b>	<b>97924</b>

3.67 The Department further stated that as per the information received from the North-Eastern States and Sikkim, upto 12<sup>th</sup> March 2003, 4380 and 3309 habitations were covered during 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 respectively. All the remaining 322 NC and 16876 PC habitations are proposed to be covered under drinking water supply programme during 2003-2004.

3.68 Moreover, the Committee had earlier in their recommendation [refer para No.2.58 of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Report (13<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha)] drawn the attention of the Government towards the variation between availability and accessibility of drinking water sources, especially in the hilly and difficult terrains of North-Eastern States. Pursuant to their recommendation, the Government had assured that this aspect would be taken care of in the survey that was being undertaken. Further, it was informed that guidelines for conducting fresh survey to ascertain the latest status of rural habitations with regard to availability of drinking water supply as on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2003 has been issued to all States/Union territory Governments. State/Uts have been requested to complete the survey by 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2003.

3.69 For sub-Mission projects under ARWSP, the funding pattern is in the ratio of 75:25 by the Central and State Governments. As the States of the North-East have been facing problems to meet the State matching share against Central releases in the past, arrears of matching share goes on accumulating. Keeping this in view, the Ministry put forward a proposal to the Planning Commission that the funding pattern in case of ARWSP should be changed from 50:50 to 90:10 for the North-Eastern States demanding a higher percentage of share from the Central Government. However, the Committee were informed that the Planning Commission has not agreed to the said proposal.

#### **Coverage of Schools in the North-Eastern States**

3.70 During the year 2001-02, 1673 schools in the North-Eastern States including Sikkim were set as target to be covered with potable water supply. However, as per figures available, only 280 schools were covered, *i.e.*, about 17 per cent. Similarly, for 2002-03, upto December 2002, out of the targeted 2121 schools, only 467 have been covered *i.e.*, nearly 22 per cent. When asked for the reasons for such dismal performance of North-Eastern region regarding provision of drinking water to school children, the Department stated that the performance of some of the North-Eastern States in respect of rural water supply is poor in respect of habitations covered and correspondingly coverage of schools is also less. Inadequate resources and technical capacity are reasons forwarded for such dismal performance.

3.71 When asked whether the Central Government have thought of taking any measures against non-performing State Governments in providing drinking water to schools, the Department simply stated that apart from its own efforts under the normal programme, it is also proposed to cover one lakh rural schools as per the announcement made by the Prime Minister on 15<sup>th</sup> August, 2002. The initiatives under Sarva Siksha Abhiyan of the Ministry of Human Resource Development also

target to cover a large number of schools. It is expected that the combined efforts will improve the situation.

3.72 The Committee note with concern that every year, out of the funds earmarked for North Eastern region, a huge amount has to be surrendered to the non-lapseable pool of resources for North-Eastern States, which also has a bearing on the overall releases under ARWSP. In 2001-02, an amount of Rs.31.31 crore had to be placed in this pool while in 2000-2001, an amount of Rs.61.82 crore had to be surrendered. As per the information furnished by the Department, for the current year, the surrendered amount is going to be Rs. 18.57 crore. Though the Committee appreciate the fact that as per Government statistic, there is a steady decline in the underutilisation of funds, a long way has to be traversed to deal with the grim situation of the North East. The Committee feel that instead of analysing the reasons as to why these States are unable to utilise funds released to them, the Department in a routine manner has stated that non-receipt of adequate number of proposals from these States is the main reason for this financial anomaly. The Committee recommend that keeping in view the specific environmental and socio-cultural conditions of these States, the Central Government should play a greater role to ensure that people here are not deprived of the benefits of the various developmental schemes that are being planned for these States. Merely sanctioning funds and leaving everything to the State Governments will not solve the problem. If non-receipt of project proposals is the main concern, then a proper mechanism should be evolved, whereby expertise, guidance and other necessary assistance can be given by the Central Government in identifying viable projects. Moreover, the Committee feel that involving local NGOs, and other such voluntary organisations will yield fruitful results. Moreover, State Governments should be asked to prepare Annual Action Plans well in advance, so that funds earmarked for them are meaningfully spent. Thus, a multi-pronged strategy has to be adopted by the Government to ensure cent per cent utilisation of funds earmarked for the North Eastern States.

**3.73 The Committee note that though the Government have portrayed a favourable picture regarding the status of coverage with drinking water facility, by stating that only 322 Not Covered and 16876 Partially Covered habitations are left, which would be covered by 2004, there is a great variation between availability and accessibility of drinking water sources, especially in these hilly and difficult terrain of the North East. Keeping this in view, the results of fresh surveys to ascertain the latest status of rural habitations with regard to availability of drinking water supply as on 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2003, should be compiled at the earliest and in the light of this, a fresh assessment of targets should be made. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the survey report, which all the States have been requested to complete by 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2003.**

**3.74 The Committee are concerned to note that in the absence of adequate number of project proposals, which as per the Government is the main problem plaguing the implementation of drinking water supply scheme in the North Eastern States, how the Government visualise that the community led, demand driven scheme of Swajaldhara, where project proposals are to come from the village level Panchayats, will ever take off in these States. The**

**Committee recommend that to generate demand from the grassroots and also to motivate the State Governments, extensive IEC programmes are needed, whereby the advantages of the various developmental schemes are impressed upon the potential beneficiaries.**

**3.75 The Committee find that provision of drinking water in the schools of the North Eastern States show a dismal scenario. In the year 2001-2002, only 280 schools were provided drinking water facility, i.e., 17 per cent of the set target, while upto December 2002, 22 per cent coverage has been achieved with 467 schools. The Committee are not convinced by the arguments put forth by the Department in this regard, that inadequate resources and lack of technical capacity are mainly responsible for such low coverage, especially in view of the fact that every year, a substantial amount is surrendered to the non-lapseable pool of resources due to underspending of available funds. The Committee recommend that first of all a proper assessment should be made regarding the number of schools, especially the terrain where they are located. Thereafter, the facts regarding coverage should be ascertained to find out the number of not covered schools and also whether sources and systems once installed are still sustainable or not. Only after getting the picture of actual ground reality, a practicable action plan within a time frame can be worked out. In this context, the Committee urge the Government that results of the Seventh All India Educational Survey, which is being conducted at present, should be compiled at the earliest and utilised to assess the actual ground reality.**

### **Sub-Missions**

3.76 As per the Guidelines of ARWSP, Sub-Mission projects are undertaken by the States for providing safe drinking water to the rural habitations facing water quality problems, like fluorosis, arsenic, brackishness, excess iron, etc. Sustainability of water sources is another important component of Sub-Mission, whereby projects are taken up for ensuring source sustainability through rain water harvesting, artificial recharge, etc.

3.77 The funding pattern for Sub-Mission projects is 75:25 between the Central and State Governments. 20 per cent of ARWSP funds are earmarked for new projects under the Sub-Mission activities. However, if the States/Uts have achieved full coverage of habitations as per the national norms, they may utilise more funds to tackle quality problems, subject to Government of India concurrence.

### **(i) Drinking Water Quality**

3.78 Ensuring drinking water quality is a challenging task being faced by the country today. During the oral evidence, the Secretary, referring to the recently concluded United Nations' survey, evaluating a number of countries for drinking water quality and its availability, stated that admittedly India ranks very low in terms of quality. Contamination of water sources can be attributed to both geo-hydrological, i.e., natural and anthropogenic or manmade reasons. On the

issue of groundwater depletion and contamination, the Secretary during the oral evidence stated that groundwater depletion has aggravated water quality problems due to excess fluoride, arsenic and brackishness in certain areas.

3.79 Year-wise details of funds released to States under Sub-Mission Programme to tackle quality problem in drinking water during the Ninth and the first year of the Tenth Plans are given below:

**Ninth Five Year Plan (Rs. In lakhs)**

1997-98	12200.410
1998-99	15622.689
1999-2000	6140.338
2000-2001	13209.625
2001-2002	7093.340

**Tenth Five Year Plan**

2002-2003	12966.65
-----------	----------

3.80 The figure furnished by the Department regarding number of quality affected habitations as on 1<sup>st</sup> April, 1999 is as given below:

<b>Quality Problem</b>	<b>Affected number of habitations</b>
Fluoride	36,988
Arsenic	3,553
Salinity	32,597
Iron	1,38,670
Nitrate	4,003
Other reasons	1,400
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,17,211</b>

3.81 The Department stated that in order to assess the actual scenario with regard to the quality problem, the State Governments are carrying out a 5-10 per cent stratified sampling survey, taking Block as a unit. On identification of the quality affected Blocks, 100 per cent survey of the sources in those Blocks would be carried out. The exact magnitude of the problem could be assessed only after the results of the survey are available.

3.82 When asked about the status of the said survey, the Department replied that the survey has not been completed till date. Andhra Pradesh, Punjab, Nagaland, Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan and Gujarat have submitted reports covering the entire State. The States of Himachal Pradesh and Uttaranchal have reported that the States are free from major quality problems in drinking water. Madhya Pradesh and Haryana Governments have also submitted the report covering the entire State for fluoride only. The survey is under progress in respect of Assam, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Sikkim, Orissa, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Tripura. The States, which have not completed the survey are advised to complete the same and submit the report early.

3.83 The Department further stated that upto 15 per cent of the ARWSP funds are earmarked for providing safe drinking water in quality affected habitations. However, during the review meetings held between May-September 2002, it was found that only eight States have been sanctioned projects under Sub-Mission. These are Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Haryana, Karnataka and Orissa.

3.84 As per the information furnished by the Department, powers have been delegated to States to sanction and implement Sub-Mission Projects and upto 15% of ARWSP funds can be used for providing safe drinking water in quality affected habitations.

3.85 When asked about the criteria for allocation of outlay under ARWSP, the Department has furnished the following criteria:

	<b>Weightage for</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
(i)	Rural population	40
(ii)	States under DDP, DPAP, HADP and special category hill States in terms of rural areas	35
(iii)	NC/PC villages	15
(iv)	Quality affected	10

It has also been mentioned that the weightage for quality problem has recently been increased from 5% to 10%. Besides, it has also been submitted that there is weightage for dealing with contamination by different types of contaminants, keeping in view the differential impact of chemicals such as fluoride, arsenic, brackishness and iron on human health. The weightage to different chemical contaminants is as per the following criteria:

Fluoride	40%
Arsenic	45%
Brackishness	15%
Iron	5%

3.86 External support agencies like UNICEF, World Bank, UNDP, DANIDA, etc. are also providing financial assistance for tackling drinking water quality problem in rural areas.

3.87 It has been stated that since there is no institutionalised quality monitoring and surveillance system in the country, the Department has been assisting all the States financially to strengthen the infrastructure of the States for water quality monitoring and surveillance. Establishing of water quality labs could be only one of the components of the programme. A "Catchment Area Approach" involving various educational and technical institutions has been envisaged. This Approach is being piloted in four districts (Sehore, Allahabad, Nellore and Kangra).

3.88 When asked about the steps regarding solving this problem, the Department stated that establishing water quality testing labs is an important component of the programme. All the State Governments have been asked to establish district level water quality testing laboratories. Total money on establishment of such laboratories is provided by Government of India amounting to Rs.4 lakh per lab as Central assistance from ARWSP allocation. It was further informed that there is no separate allocation for this purpose. Out of the Rs.4 lakh amount sanctioned, Rs.2 lakh is for acquisition of area and remaining Rs.2 lakh for equipments. Training to personnel who will operate these labs is given free. As per the figure submitted by the Government, 555 water quality testing labs have been sanctioned, out of which 346 were established, *i.e.*, about 62 per cent.

3.89 When enquired about the information regarding water treatment plants to tackle quality problem, the Department furnished the following figures:

<b>Type of treatment plants</b>	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Number of Plants installed</b>	<b>Functioning</b>
---------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

Defloridation plants	845	632	233
Desalination plants	194	150	77
Iron Removal Plants	16384	9524	5742

3.90 As far as mobile testing laboratories are concerned, 23 such labs have been provided in various States. On being asked that instead of providing one mobile lab for each district as was initially decided, why the number was so dismal, the Secretary, during oral evidence informed that it was found in a study that mobile laboratories are not put to effective use and a lot of cases of mismanagement and misutilisation have come up. For this reason, the Department has stopped sanctioning funds for mobile labs, rather the focus now is an establishment of stationary labs in each district of the country.

3.91 The Secretary further informed that 12 parametres have been fixed for testing water quality. Moreover, it has been decided that all resources at the disposal of the Government would be utilised, such as school laboratories, engineering colleges and other apex institutions. Teachers or personnel from these institutions would be trained, so that they could take up the job of quality testing and no extra personnel have to be employed. Thus, attempt is being made to evolve a system of water quality testing at various levels, so that a long distance does not have to be traversed from villages to get water quality tested.

### **Ensuring sustainability**

3.92 To provide sustainable sources and systems of drinking water is an important component of Sub-Missions for the success of water supply schemes on a long-term basis. The Ministry, in Annual Report has quoted that the Central Ground Water Board (CGWB) and National Geophysical Research Institute (NGRI) have been engaged in the programme since the inception of the Mission. Further, State Governments have been advised that upto 5 per cent of the fund released under ARWSP should be used for Sub-Mission on sustainability. In the Annual Report, the Government stated the various reasons for taking up sustainability on an urgent basis.

- (i) Fast depletion of groundwater level leading to quality problems like arsenic and fluorosis;
- (ii) Source go dry due to deforestation, leading to reduced recharge of aquifers;
- (iii) Poor maintenance of the existing water supply systems;
- (iv) Non-participation of people in the operations and maintenance of the systems; and
- (v) Neglect of traditional water management practices and systems

3.93 In order to overcome these problems, and to achieve the goal of providing safe drinking water to all rural habitations by 2004, Government of India aims to concentrate on (a) control on over extraction of groundwater; (b) funds for repairs and rehabilitation; (c) emphasis on community participation; (d) promotion of water as a socio-economic good; and (e) stronger links with watershed development programmes.

3.94 During the oral evidence, the Secretary informed that sustainability of sources and systems have emerged as a major problem. It was suggested that some mechanism should be evolved using latest technological innovations to figure out the level of underground water and whether it is contaminated or not, such as remote sensing underground water management technique. When asked whether the Department has thought of having an Atlas figuring the level of underground

water in different parts of the country, the Secretary stated that such mapping activity is done by the Central Ground Water Board under the Ministry of Water Resources.

3.95 Moreover, rejuvenation of traditional water sources was also referred to as a means to amend the situation. On a query regarding rainwater harvesting, the Secretary informed that such type of projects have been taken up in Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. Appreciating the work done in Karnataka, the Secretary stated that the State has a Rs.700 crore project taken up for rehabilitating old village tanks and ponds. Such type of projects also go a long way in recharging underground water table.

3.96 When the Department was asked to furnish figures regarding total funds spent during 2002-03 for the purpose of ensuring sustainability, it was stated that 5 per cent of ARWSP fund *i.e.*, Rs. 9225.90 lakh was earmarked for sustainability. States were required to contribute Rs. 3075.30 lakh from their own resources as matching shares. This was also brought to the notice of State Government on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2002. Exact status of expenditure is not available, as details have not been received so far from the States.

3.97 Further, the Department stated that as the programmes are implemented by the States, Government of India is not directly involved in project implementation. Centre has issued guidelines for involving NGOs, voluntary organisations and community based organisations for these programmes as without active participation of all stakeholders, sustainability cannot be achieved. NGOs are getting Government of India funds through CAPART.

3.98 Lack of potable water in coastal areas of the country is a major challenge being faced by the Government. On enquiring as to how many desalination plants have been installed in rural areas of the country, the Department replied that out of 195 desalination plants that have been approved, only 150 have been installed and 77 are functioning. The Department has also stated that these existing plants based on distillation technology are large scale plants involving substantial financial outlay, which is not cost-effective. The Government is promoting selective resin based technology, solar stills and thin film composite comprised membrane based technology for cost effective solution and desalination of drinking water.

3.99 Another important measure to ensure sustainability is by utilization of sea water for drinking purposes after proper desalination treatment has been carried out, as done in many other countries of the world. The Department has also stated that Tamil Nadu has done commendable work in implementing a few water supply schemes based on sea water and it is further going to set up more such plants based on BOOT principle. However, it has been stated that no other State seems to have implemented or is considering utilization of seawater for drinking purposes.

**3.100 The Committee find that as per the guidelines/directions issued by the Union Government, 20% of ARWSP funds are earmarked for new projects under the Sub Mission activities. Besides, even the States can utilise more funds to tackle quality problems after taking the concurrence of the Union Government in this regard. They further note that out of 20% of ARWSP funds, 15% explicitly has been earmarked for water quality. While going through the information furnished by the Department, they find that only**

eight States have sanctioned the projects under Sub Mission for water quality problems. Keeping in view the lack of interest taken by the various State Governments towards the quality problem in drinking water, the Committee feel that only earmarking funds under Sub-Mission will not be sufficient. The State Governments should be sensitised about the need to sanction more projects to tackle the quality problem in drinking water as analysed in the preceding para, this being the biggest challenge the country will be facing in the coming years.

3.101 The Committee find that as regards the assessment regarding quality affected habitations, a survey was done in April, 1999. Further, they also note that the State Governments are carrying out 5-10% stratified sampling survey taking block as a unit, the results of which are still awaited from most of the States. They also find that some of the States have completed the survey. The Committee would like to be apprised about the details/status of the findings of the said survey.

3.102 The Committee note with grave concern that most of the water treatment plants installed to deal with various quality problems are defunct. Out of 632 defloridation plants, which have been installed, only 233 are functioning. Similarly, out of 150 desalination plants installed, only 77 are functioning, while 5742 iron removal plants are functioning, out of 9524 installed plants. The Committee feel that the Government should conduct a thorough analysis to find out the reasons responsible for such large number of plants going defunct. Moreover, regarding the issue of water testing laboratories, which are to be established in each district of the country, the Committee find that a lot has to be done in this regard. Out of 555 water quality testing laboratories which have been sanctioned, only 346 have been established so far, *i.e.* about 62%. The Committee recommend that establishing these water quality testing laboratories should be given priority and a thorough accounting of the funds given to the State Governments for this purpose should be made by the Government. Moreover, the Committee feel that rather than depending solely on these water testing laboratories, all resources at the disposal of the State Governments should be utilised, such as school and college laboratories etc. The employees from these organisations may be trained to take up the job of quality testing.

3.103 The Committee further note that though it was initially decided to provide mobile water testing laboratories to each district of the country, so far only 23 such laboratories have been provided in various States. Though the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated that due to mismanagement and misutilisation, they have stopped sanctioning funds for mobile laboratories, the Committee feel that mobile laboratories are the most effective means to check water quality, especially in difficult and inhospitable terrain. Moreover, to keep a watch on the functioning of these mobile laboratories, the Committee feel that a proper monitoring mechanism should

be evolved at the Panchayat level to keep a tab on the number of water sample tested per day/year by these mobile laboratories.

**3.104** The Committee find that as admitted by the Secretary, sustainability is of two types, (i) sustainability of system and (ii) sustainability of source. The Committee note that the problem can be sorted out by having an inbuilt mechanism for maintenance of water systems *i.e.*, hand pumps, borewells, etc. provided under the scheme. The issue has been addressed in detail in preceding paras of the Report. On the issue of sustainability of sources, the Secretary admitted that the country would be facing a major problem in this regard in the coming years. The Committee also note that various Ministries, besides this Department, like Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Water Resources etc. are dealing with this issue. They would like the Department to act in coordination with the said Ministries while taking the desired steps to ensure sustainability of sources.

**3.105** The Committee find that the Government have not so far maintained any data with regard to the underground water table in different areas in the country. They note that Department of Land Resources has recently brought out the publication “ATLAS” by mapping the different types of wastelands in the country by remote sensing technology. They feel that to know the ground water table in respective areas, the Department can have a similar type of Atlas. They also stress that such mapping would not only help in having an idea of the problem as a whole in the country, that would need to be tackled in the coming years, but would also save wastage of money on providing the systems that go dry after a short span of time.

**3.106** The Committee further note that only 5% of the outlay has been earmarked for tackling the problem of sustainability. They find that although the Secretary has admitted that this has emerged as a major problem, adequate allocation has not been earmarked for the purpose. They also note that as per the 10<sup>th</sup> Plan projections, after tackling the problem of NC and PC habitations, stress would be given to water quality and sustainability. They further note that second year of 10<sup>th</sup> Plan is going on and as admitted by the Department given in the preceding paras of the Report, the tackling of NC and PC habitations would need more allocation and time due to being in difficult terrain areas. Keeping in view this overall scenario that is emerging, the Committee find that this is high time the Department should give priority to the issue of sustainability of sources without waiting for NC and PC habitations to be covered fully in the country.

**3.107** The Committee further feel that to tackle the problem of water table going down, a multi-pronged strategy should be adopted. While on the one hand the Government should give stress to rain water harvesting, on the other hand they should also encourage traditional sources of water like ponds etc. They also note that in India, there is no dearth of rain water, but the need is to

use the rain water for re-charging of water as well as for using the rain water after storage. They also note that in some States very good work has been done in this regard. They also find that the Ministry of Water Resources is mainly tackling this issue. They would like that in consultation with the concerned Ministries, the Department should chalk out some strategy to solve the issue of sustainability of sources.

**3.108** The Committee for the last two years have been drawing the attention of the Department, for the need of the hour to accept sea water for drinking and other purposes. They in their earlier recommendation (refer para 2.78 of 32<sup>nd</sup> Report) had drawn the attention of the Department about the need to explore cost effective technologies in this regard. From the data, the Department has given, the Committee find huge difference between the approved plants, installed plants and those that are functioning. They are appalled to know that only around 50% of the plants are functional. They would like to be apprised about the reasons for such a high percentage of plants going defunct. Besides, as recommended in their earlier Reports made during the last two years, the Committee would like to stress that Government should give more thrust on exploitation of seawater for drinking and other purposes.

### **Conservation of water**

3.109 When asked about the steps being taken to conserve every drop of drinking water, the Department has stated that through people's participation in implementing and maintaining water supply schemes, wastage is expected to go down.

### **Information Education and Communication (IEC)**

3.110 IEC Programme was launched in 1996, with the aim to educate the public and create awareness among them regarding safe drinking water and proper sanitation. An effective IEC campaign plays an important role in bringing success to Government projects, when the rural population is transparently sensitized about: (a) the project concept; (b) importance of water and its conservation; (c) importance of sanitation; (d) rural water supply technology; (e) water quality and its monitoring; and (f) need for community participation; involvement of the community in planning, implementation and maintenance of water supply systems and sanitation facilities. Under IEC Programme, Government of India provide 100 percent financial assistance to States w.e.f. 1.4.1999. Presently, IEC Programme has been launched in 63 districts under 100 percent assistance. Rs.1314.786 lakh have already been released to various State Governments against the total approved cost of Rs.2660.64 lakh.

**3.111** The Committee find that besides addressing the issues like accessibility, availability, contamination of water and sustainability of source, etc., as dealt in preceding paras of the Report, another issue need to be addressed, i.e., how to stop wastage of water. They find from the material furnished by the Department, that it has never thought of the necessity to maintain the data

with regard to wastage of water due to mismanagement and leakage. The Committee feel that since scarcity of water is going to be the biggest problem in the country as is repeatedly being highlighted in the respective chapters of the Report, more attention need to be given in this regard. To tackle this problem, the Committee feel that, besides, sensitizing the community about the need to conserve every drop of water, some punitive measures should be taken to tackle the issue. While appreciating that water management is a State subject, the Committee would like that necessary guidelines should be issued to the State Governments to take desired steps for conservation of water. Besides, to have an exact idea about the magnitude of the problem, the Department should include the factor regarding wastage and leakage of water in the survey being conducted by several State Governments.

3.112 The Committee note that children can play an important role in this regard. They feel that more has to be done to sensitize children about the need to conserve every drop of water. For this purpose, they feel that in the educational curriculum, conservation of water should also be included. The Department should consult the Human Resource Development Ministry in this regard.

### **Human Resource Development**

3.113 To build up a human resource base of trained personnel to serve the needs of the rural water supply and sanitation sector, the National Human Resource Development Programme (NHRDP) was launched by the Government in 1994. The programme aims at training beneficiaries, especially women at the grassroots level. It also aims at empowerment of Panchayati Raj Institutions to enable them to take up activities related to water supply. The Ministry of Rural Development has identified seven key institutes, namely ESI Ahmedabad, SJC Mysore, AIIH and PH Kolkata, CGRI Gandhigram, GJTI Gandhinagar, IRET Ahmedabad and MLNREC Allahabad. These key institutes develop and organise various professional training/capacity development courses.

3.114 The PHEDs/Water Boards in collaboration with NGOs undertake HRD activities in the States. Out of 28 States, 26 States have set up State HRD Cell so far. The HRD of professionals and Gram Panchayat level functionaries will be implemented by the State Governments fully and no funding exclusively would be available from the Central Government from 2003-2004.

3.115 Moreover, with the revamping of the water supply scheme towards a demand-oriented, participative approach, capacity building/training has to be given maximum attention. However, the expenditure figure for HRD/training during the year 2001-02 speak otherwise. As per the information furnished by the Department the funds available for HRD in the year 2001-02 was Rs.932.00 lakh against which Rs.1044.08 lakh was released, and the State Governments could utilize the released amount, during the year. For the year 2002-03, under HRD/training, it was found that while BE and RE show Rs.10 crore availability, expenditure as on 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2003 has been shown as nil. The Department pointed out that the existing HRD and IEC programmes for the Ministry were applicable only for the Ninth Plan period. Restructured HRD and IEC

programmes for capacity development of different stakeholders were under preparation by the Ministry. Thus, funds under HRD have not been spent.

3.116 As per the information furnished by the Department, an amount of Rs.200 crore has been estimated for HRD activities during the Tenth Plan period. The Department stated that the main objectives of the NHRDP in the Tenth Plan period would be:

- (i) Empowerment of Panchayati Raj Institutions/Local Bodies with the objective of enabling them to take up O&M activities relating to Rural Water Supply Systems.
- (ii) Capacity building of local communities by giving requisite training to mechanics/health motivators/masons etc. specially women to operate and maintain handpumps and the components of the water supply system as well as to generate demand for adequate sanitation facilities.
- (iii) To train at least one beneficiary especially women in each village through district level trainers who in turn may be trained at selected institutions forming the Indian Training Network (ITN).
- (iv) Improve the productivity of sector professionals through specialized courses.
- (v) To introduce rural orientation in technical education sector coupled with publication of manuals on rural water supply and rural sanitation.

**3.117 The Committee find that although the Department has agreed to give maximum attention to human resource management, the year-wise allocation, as could be seen from the data, made since 2001-02 when earmarking separate allocation was started, tells another story. They are stunned to note that during 2002-03 against the allocation of Rs.10 crore, the expenditure indicated under the programme is 'Nil'. They are not satisfied with the replies furnished by the Department that due to the restructuring of the programme, the funds could not be utilized. While expressing their unhappiness over such an attitude of the Department, the Committee would like that human resource management should be given priority and the allocation made for the programme should be meaningfully utilized.**

### **Role of Panchayati Raj Institutions**

3.118 With the shift in approach in the rural water supply and sanitation sectors with thrust on demand driven, community participative projects, Panchayati Raj Institutions have assumed a significant role. The Department stated that as per the 73<sup>rd</sup> Amendment to the Constitution of India, the subject of rural water supply vests with the PRIs. Moreover, with the revamping of water supply schemes, the Panchayats are to play major role in providing safe drinking water and managing the systems and sources in their respective areas. They can be involved in the implementation of schemes, particularly in selecting the location of handpumps, standposts and spot sources; in O&M, etc. Moreover, Government of India emphasise on empowering and capacity building of the PRIs to enable them for discharging their responsibilities in drinking water supply schemes.

3.119 Moreover, the guidelines for implementation of ARWSP provide for involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions in the implementation of various rural water supply schemes

particularly in the selection of standpost, spot sources, operation and maintenance, fixing of cess/water tariff, etc. The implementation of the Sector Reform Projects in the identified pilot districts, is also to be carried out either by the District Panchayats or through the District Water and Sanitation Missions, which are to be registered societies under the supervision, control and guidance of the District Panchayats (Zilla Parishad).

3.120 In respect of Sector Reform Pilot Projects, the project implementation at the district level is to be carried out by the District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM). The DWSM functions under the supervision, control and guidance of the District Panchayats. Wherever Panchayati Raj Institutions are themselves firmly in place and are ready and willing to take up the responsibility of effective implementation of Sector Reform Projects, and are strong enough to do so, they implement the projects themselves instead of the DWSM. Funds of the Sector Reform Projects are transferred direct to the District Panchayat/District Water and Sanitation Mission (DWSM). At the village level, the individual Rural Water Supply schemes are to be implemented through Village Water and Sanitation Committees (VWSC) which should be a Committee of the Gram Panchayat.

3.121 Under the Swajaldhara Scheme, Panchayats have been given substantial power. The Government stated that under this Scheme, people and their Gram Panchayat must shoulder fully the O&M responsibility. The working out of a project under this scheme requires the Gram Panchayat to convene a Gram Sabha Meeting, where the Drinking Water Supply Scheme of people's choice including design and cost etc. must be finalized. A resolution must be passed in the Gram Panchayat meeting calling for users/beneficiaries to contribute 10% or 5% of the capital expenditure. The Gram Panchayat shall maintain the record of the community contribution and issue necessary receipts to the contributor/users. The Gram Panchayat must also be willing to take up the operation and maintenance responsibility after the Scheme is completed and taken over by Gram Panchayat. The Executing Agency for the Scheme should also be decided in the Gram Panchayat meeting *i.e.* whether the Panchayat wants to execute the scheme on its own or wants the Government Agency to undertake the execution.

**3.122 The Committee find that as per the restructured programme, Swajaldhara, people and their Gram Panchayat must shoulder fully O&M responsibility. As regards the role of general public in maintenance, the issue has been addressed in detail in the preceding paras of the Report but with regard to Gram Panchayats handling O&M responsibility, the Committee find that while thrusting the responsibility in this regard upon Panchayats, the Department has not addressed the crucial issue of capacity building which includes financial capacity of Panchayats, the key issue in this regard. They would like that the Department should address the said issue also while giving the responsibility of O&M to Panchayats.**

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

3.123 The Department stated that the ARWSP and State Sector (MNP) programmes are being monitored regularly in the following manner:

- (a) Periodical progress reports;

- (b) Areas Officers visits;
- (c) Field visits by Government Officials and
- (d) Evaluation studies/sample survey etc.

3.124 The physical and financial progress reports relating to ARWSP and MNP are being furnished by the State Governments on monthly, quarterly and annual basis. The monthly progress report is received from all the States. At present, collection of information is through copies of the progress reports from the State Governments. Efforts are being made to get the on-line information directly from State Governments.

3.125 Also, Government of India takes up monitoring and evaluation studies through reputed organizations and institutions from time to time. State Governments also take up similar monitoring and evaluation studies. Government of India provides 100% financial assistance to States for taking up such studies.

3.126 As per the Annual Report, in 1997, it was decided to carry out evaluation studies on the impact of the drinking water supply programme. Accordingly, evaluation studies were carried out in 13 States – Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Haryana, Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal. The findings were sent to States for taking necessary action. The second phase of evaluation studies is in progress in selected 31 districts of 14 States.

3.127 However, when it was pointed out that as per the information furnished by the Department, for the year 2001-02, for monitoring and evaluation, though the BE was Rs. one crore, RE was reduced to Rs.24.66 lakh, the Department stated that no evaluation studies could be conducted during 2001-02, though the process of awarding the work of conducting evaluation studies was initiated from September, 2001. The evaluation studies in 31 districts of 14 States has been awarded during 2002-03.

**3.128 The Committee find that the Department of Drinking Water Supply has an effective monitoring mechanism. It has an exclusive monitoring cell and the officers of the Department undertake field visits to monitor the programmes being implemented in various States. They are surprised to note that with regard to the findings of the said visits, nothing is said in the Budget documents, viz., Performance Budget or Annual Report. The Committee would like that the Performance Budget should indicate the performance of the Area Officers Scheme in the last two or three financial years, in a specific chapter. They hope that the Department would take care of this aspect during the next financial year. Besides, the Committee would also like to be apprised about the details of the field visits made under the Area Officers Scheme during the last three years, their findings and corrective action taken thereof.**

**3.129 The Committee further find that the process of awarding the work of conducting evaluation studies on the impact of drinking water supply schemes was decided years back in 1997 and in thirteen States only, evaluation studies were carried out. Besides, they also note that no evaluation study could be**

conducted during the year 2001-2002, though the process of awarding the work of conducting such studies was initiated from September 2001. Thus the allocated amount remained unutilized. The Committee would like that the evaluation studies in the remaining States should be completed expeditiously. Besides, they would also like to be apprised of the results of such studies in the States where these have already been completed.

## **CHAPTER –IV**

### **RURAL SANITATION PROGRAMME**

4.1 Lack of adequate sanitation coverage in the rural areas of the country is a major cause of concern, posing serious health hazards and at the same time causing great inconvenience to the people, particularly women. The Department had stated that it was proposed to cover 35% rural population with sanitation facilities during the Ninth Plan, but due to financial crunch, the Planning Commission in its Draft Mid Term Appraisal, reduced the target to 25%. As per Economic Survey, coverage of rural population with sanitation facilities was estimated to be about 17% at the beginning of the Ninth Plan period, which has increased to 20% as on 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2002. The Government have stated that sanitation coverage in the current year has increased by about 2.5% taking the percentage to 22.5%. Moreover, the target for sanitation coverage in rural households is 35% for the Tenth Five Year Plan.

4.2 As per the Annual Report of the Ministry, Government of India had launched Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) in 1986. The programme was restructured as Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 1999, and made people oriented and demand-driven. These projects are being implemented in a campaign approach giving emphasis on social mobilization involving Panchayat Raj Institutions, NGOs and people from all walks of life.

4.3 The Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) focusses on awareness generation to create demand for sanitation facilities. Financial support is given for construction of individual household toilets to the below poverty line (BPL) people, school toilets for all government schools in the rural areas with emphasis on separate toilets for girls in all co-educational schools, toilets for anganwadis and balwadi centres, community sanitary complexes for women in villages where land availability with individuals is a problem and people are ready to own, operate and maintain such complexes. Moreover, alternative delivery mechanism in the form of Production Centres and Rural Sanitary Marts are being set up.

#### **Financial Progress under Rural Sanitation Programme during the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Five Year Plan periods**

4.4	(Rs. in crore)
<b>8<sup>th</sup> Plan outlay</b>	<b>380.00</b>
<b>8<sup>th</sup> Plan expenditure</b>	<b>233.77</b>
<b>9<sup>th</sup> Plan outlay</b>	<b>534.00</b>
<b>9<sup>th</sup> Plan expenditure</b>	<b>514.00</b>
<b>10<sup>th</sup> Plan outlay (proposed)</b>	<b>3663.00</b>

**10<sup>th</sup> Plan outlay agreed to by the Planning Commission****955.00**

The data given above reveal the following facts:

- (i) During the Eighth Plan period, there was an underspending of Rs.146.23 crore, *i.e.*, about 61.31% of the available funds remained unutilized.
- (ii) Ninth Plan outlay was Rs.154 crore more than that of the Eighth Plan, implying an increase of about 40.52%.
- (iii) Expenditure during the Ninth Plan period was Rs.20 crore less than that of the outlay, *i.e.*, about 3.75% of the outlay remained unspent.
- (iv) The outlay proposed for the Tenth Plan period show a staggering hike of Rs.3129 crore, *i.e.*, an increase of about 586%. However, the Planning Commission agreed to an outlay of Rs.955 crore, which is Rs.421 crore or about 79% more than that of Ninth Plan outlay.

**Year-wise analysis of the performance of Rural Sanitation Programme**

4.5

**(Rs. in core)**

	<b>Budget Estimate</b>	<b>Revised Estimate</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure</b>
2000-2001	140.00	140.00	130.86
2001-2002	150.00	135.00	57.33 (prov.)
2002-2003	165.00	140.00	106.53 (up to February, 2003)
2003-2004 (Outlay Proposed Rs.500.00 crore)	165.00	--	--

From the figure furnished by the Department, it can be seen that underutilization of funds is a recurrent feature under the rural sanitation programme. During the year 2000-2001, Rs.9.14 crore was the expenditure shortfall. Further, it can be seen that even after a lapse of two years, the Department is still furnishing provisional figures for 2001-02. For this year, against a RE of Rs.135 crore, only Rs.57.33 crore has been shown as actual expenditure, *i.e.* a shortfall of Rs.77.67 crore. In the year 2002-03, again provisional figure upto February 2003 show a huge gap of Rs.33.47 crore. Further against the proposed outlay of Rs.500 crore for the year 2003-04, only an amount of Rs.165 crore has been allocated, *i.e.*, a reduction of Rs.335 crore or 67%. Also, there has been no enhancement in the BE of 2003-04 which is the same as that of 2002-03.

4.6 The allocation based Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) has been phased out completely from the current financial year. In its place Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) approach has been adopted which is community led and demand driven

4.7 On a query as to why gaps crop up between BE and RE every year, even for such an important programme, the Department stated that the reduction was due to the cut imposed because of financial resource constraint. At present only TSC is under implementation, which is a

demand driven programme. Although intense monitoring during the year has led to improvement in the progress of implementation in many districts, still proposals for release of funds from many districts are awaited.

#### **Total Sanitation Campaign: Financial status as on March, 2003**

4.8

(Rs. in crore)

<b>No. of projects sanctioned</b>	<b>Government of India share</b>	<b>State Governments share</b>	<b>Beneficiary share</b>	<b>Total project outlay</b>
241	1498.99	531.55	459.54	2490.08

The total funds released so far is Rs.340.41 crore from Government of India share, Rs.69.07 crore from State Governments and Rs.43.11 crore is provided by community. Further expenditure reported is Rs.116.93 crore from Government of India share, Rs.38.48 crore from State Governments share and Rs.43.11 crore as beneficiary contribution. Further the Government stated that the National Scheme Sanctioning Committee (NSCC) in its last meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> March, 2003, has also approved TSC projects to additional 23 districts. In a phased manner, TSC will be sanctioned for all the rural districts in the country throughout the 10<sup>th</sup> Plan.

#### **Physical progress under Sanitation Programme**

4.9 The following figures furnished by the Department regarding number of latrines constructed in a year, gives a picture about the performance of Rural Sanitation Programme.

##### **Eighth Plan Period (1992-1997)**

<b>Target No. of latrines</b>	<b>Achievement No. of latrines constructed</b>
1459261	1404485

##### **Ninth Plan Period (1997-2002)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target No. of latrines</b>	<b>Achievement No. of latrines constructed</b>
1997-1998	970183	698178
1998-1999	862002	800458
1999-2000	*	575519
2000-2001	*	320788
2001-2002	*	600835
Total		2995778

### Tenth Plan Period (2002-2007)

Year	Target No. of latrines	Achievement No. of latrines constructed
2002-2003	*	1699143 <i>provisional (as on January, 2003)</i>

\* In view of the restructuring of the Rural Sanitation Programme with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 1999, the allocation based programme was phased out with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2002 and currently the Total Sanitation Campaign is being implemented as a community-led and demand driven one and project-wise-components are being sanctioned. Therefore, no annual target has been fixed since 1999-2000.

4.10 As per the reply of the Department, at present only Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) is under implementation in the Rural Sanitation Programme and allocation based Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) has been phased out completely from the current financial year. During Study visits to Mumbai during February, 2003, the Committee were apprised by State Government's representative of the State of Maharashtra, that the Government of India have stopped giving any funds under CRSP. The momentum created in the districts regarding sanitation programmes is now at a wane because of non-availability of funds. While the supply driven, high cost CRSP is gone, the low cost demand driven scheme is still not in sight. It was requested that till the new programme is implemented in all the districts, the allocation of a few lakh of rupees should be made per district to allow them to continue their old programmes.

### Coverage of schools

4.11 During the examination of Demands for Grants (2002-2003), the Department had stated that only 0.58 lakh out of a total of 6.37 lakh primary and upper primary schools (as per the Sixth All India Education Survey, 1993) had lavatory facilities, *i.e.*, around 9%.

Year	No. of schools covered
2001-2002	14058
2002-2003	15353

### Coverage of schools in the North-Eastern States

4.12

Year	No. of schools covered
2001-2002	147
2002-2003	281

As per the information furnished by the Department, 28 TSC projects have been approved for the North Eastern States. As part of these, 5852 school toilet complexes have been sanctioned, out of

which 630 have been constructed so far. Remaining 5222 toilets will be set up during the TSC Project period.

4.13 During the oral evidence, the Secretary emphasized that alongwith adopting a new people-centered approach for rural drinking water sector, the rural sanitation programme has also undergone a paradigm shift. In place of the earlier policy of providing latrines for each household, now-a-days focus is on the development of a holistic approach, by spreading awareness among the community, so that they can themselves take up and maintain sanitation facilities in their areas. He clarified that the Total Sanitation Campaign envisages taking up entire village as a whole, improving awareness, removing open defecation, keeping water sources clean and then installing sanitation facilities. In this context, it was also mentioned that drinking water quality depends on the type of sanitation habits of the people of that area and the type of sanitation units installed there.

4.14 The Secretary further informed that 16 models of different units have been prepared, any of which can be installed keeping in view the economic capacity of the individual beneficiary. The simplest and cheapest of the models cost Rs.625. The highest subsidy is available on the lowest cost unit, so that the Below Poverty Line population can utilize the benefits of the scheme. Moreover, construction of sanitary complexes for women, especially in public places is being stressed upon.

4.15 Besides, it was stated that since sanitation has an all-pervading effect on health and the general well-being of the individual as well as community, effort is on to involve other concerned Ministries, such as, Health, Education etc., so that the magnitude and impact of the programme can be enhanced.

4.16 Further, mention was made of Maharashtra where significant work has been done in encouraging community participation for the provision of sanitation facilities right from the planning and decision making stage to that of O&M. Also, States like West Bengal, Mizoram and some other smaller North Eastern States are doing very well in this regard. The Secretary stated as below:

“We are giving complete flexibility. ....The States are experimenting with newer models and there is elbowroom for accommodating different models and we propose to proceed like that.”

4.17 It was further stated that the physical target of the Department is to cover 2.7 crore household units. The target for schools is 2.11 lakh schools and 20,890 complexes for women would be constructed throughout the country, alongwith 19,000 Balwadis and Anganwadis.

4.18 Moreover, emphasis will be on building of production Centres, since demand for these sanitary products have to be urgently met. Otherwise the programme would be discredited and it would be difficult to generate demand again. There is a plan to put up 2000 rural sanitary Marts.

**4.19** The Committee note with shame that even after the completion of Nine Five Year Plans, only about 20-22% of the rural population have received sanitation coverage. Moreover, the Committee feel that adequate fund is not being allocated for this top-most priority programme of rural sanitation. During the Ninth Plan period, though it was proposed to cover 35% of the rural population with sanitation facilities, the target was reduced to 25% due to resource crunch. The Committee are astonished to find that though on the one hand, proposed target was reduced by nearly 10%, on the other hand, the Department could not even utilize the funds available with them during the Ninth Plan period, as expenditure during this period has been shown as Rs.20 crore less than that of the outlay, i.e. about 3.75% of the outlay remained unspent. Analysing the year-wise financial performance of the Rural Sanitation Programme, the Committee find that underutilization of funds has become a recurrent feature. For 2000-01, there is an expenditure shortfall of Rs.9.14 crore, in 2001-02, Rs.77.67 crore was the unspent amount and in the year 2002-03, provisional expenditure figure show Rs.33.47 crore underspending. The Committee are of the view that, besides asking for increase in allocation, the Department should try to concentrate on optimal utilization of funds available, in a meaningful manner. Moreover, financial allocation and expenditure should get reflected in the physical coverage, which is hardly found in case of Rural Sanitation Programme.

**4.20** The Committee note that the Department has phased out the allocation based CRSP in favour of demand driven, community participative projects under Total Sanitation Campaign. The Committee further note that as per the information furnished by the Department, only in 241 districts such projects are being run. They are worried about the position of the remaining districts, where such projects under TSC have not yet taken off. The Committee would like to be apprised whether such districts are getting any funds allocated under CRSP or have been left in the lurch. The Committee are of the view that the programme of TSC should be extended to the remaining districts expeditiously.

**4.21** The Committee note with serious concern that provision of sanitation facilities in schools is abysmally low. As per the Sixth All India Education Survey which was conducted about 10 years back in 1993, out of 6.37 lakh primary and upper primary schools, only 0.58 lakh have lavatory facilities, i.e. about 9%. The performance during the last two years is also not impressive, especially in the North-Eastern States, where only 147 schools were covered in 2001-02, and 281 schools in 2002-03. The Committee are of the view that proper attention should be given to the provision of sanitation facilities to the school children within a limited time frame, particularly focusing on provision of lavatory facilities for girls in co-educational schools. Fresh assessment regarding coverage of schools should be carried out and an Action Plan worked out in this regard. Further, the Committee would like to be apprised about how the projects under TSC would be implemented in schools. The

**Committee further feel that in the absence of allocation based CRSP, school coverage will suffer. They, therefore, recommend that alongwith projects under TSC, certain allocation should be made exclusively for provision of sanitation facilities in schools and till the time it is done, some allocation should be made for them to continue the already existing rural sanitation programmes in these areas.**

**4.22 The Committee are of the view that the success of any developmental programme/scheme depends on the mindset or attitude of the people for whom it is meant. The Committee feel that information, education and communication (IEC) activities assume significant role in the context of sanitation programme. Campaign to spread awareness among the rural people should be undertaken with special emphasis on educating school children. The Committee recommend that hygienic sanitation habits should be imparted to the younger generation through their school curriculum. Necessary steps should be taken in this regard to include lessons about hygiene and sanitation in school textbooks. In this regard, the Department of Drinking Water Supply should consult the concerned Ministry, i.e. the Ministry of Human Resource Development.**

### **Water Supply and Sanitation: An Integrated Approach**

4.23 It is a much acclaimed fact that availability of safe drinking water and access to hygienic sanitation facilities are the basic ingredients of individual as well as community well being. As per the Guidelines of the Central Rural Sanitation Programme (Total Sanitation Campaign), there is a direct relationship between water, sanitation and health. Consumption of unsafe drinking water, improper disposal of human excreta, improper environmental sanitation, lack of personal and food hygiene have been major causes of many diseases. Though the conventional concept of sanitation was limited to disposal of human excreta by cess pools, open ditches, pit latrines, etc., in the present day connotation, sanitation implies a comprehensive concept including personal hygiene, home sanitation, safe water, garbage disposal, excreta disposal and waste water disposal. During oral evidence, the Secretary stated that effort is on to adopt a holistic approach in the context of rural water supply and sanitation. He stated that:

“From our experience we had seen that providing latrine units is only a part of bringing about sanitation hygiene and sanitation is something which should be taken in its entirety. So the water has to be kept clean, so that water borne diseases are not there. It has got its health implications and other things. Sanitation has got a direct link with maintaining water quality in an area and the type of units one puts up.” The Total Sanitation Campaign “..... envisaged taking the district as a unit in which substantial effort will be made on improving the awareness of the local people. It has also envisaged taking entire villages, removing open defecation, keeping the water resources clean and then putting up units.” He further stated that “Sanitation has got an all-pervading influence on the health and various other aspects. So, we are involving all the Ministries concerned in this, starting with Health, Education, etc.....We want to cover providing drinking water facilities in schools and sanitation facilities available in all the schools by the end of this Plan.”

4.24 While discussing the concept of ‘model village’, the Secretary stated,  
“We are going to take a village and the entire village will sit together and plan it in such a way that there will not be open defecation and the units will be put up according to one’s own economics.”

When it was pointed out that comprehensive approach should be adopted in villages like garbage disposal, proper drainage system, etc., the Secretary stated that all these are covered in the concept of ‘model village’ scheme, which includes *inter alia* installing handpumps, drainage, solid waste management.

**4.25 The Committee appreciate the fact that the Government have identified the crucial interlinkage between access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation. However, analysing the performance of the Department with respect to various water supply and sanitation schemes under implementation, the Committee find that very little has been done till now to adopt a holistic approach to deal with the twin challenges of providing drinking water and sanitation. As per figures furnished by the Department, while on the one hand drinking water coverage is improving, sanitation coverage is much lower than the optimal. The Committee feel that even today, sanitation programme is given low priority as compared to drinking water supply projects. They are of the view that this sectoral approach has to be done away with and it should be replaced with a holistic, cost-effective and environment friendly approach, because if both the issues are not dealt simultaneously, the overall scenario will not improve. Positive effect of safe water on health is dissipated by inadequate sanitation. Contamination of drinking water by biological such as faecal matters and chemical wastes is a major problem being faced in many areas. Moreover, conventional waterborne sewage disposal systems add to the waste of precious drinking water by misusing it as a transport medium for solid and liquid wastes. In this context, the Committee would like to suggest that the ‘dual water policy’ should be adopted, so that precious drinking water is not wasted for other purposes. The Committee further recommend that appropriate technologies should be developed, whereby industrial or agricultural waste products can be optimally utilised. Innovative projects such as utilising the huge amount of waste heat generated from petrochemical or thermal plants for desalination plants, using renewable resources, such as solar energy or minerals like alum for disinfecting water in water treatment plants, etc., should be encouraged by the Government. The Committee feel that such projects will turn out to be economical in the long run and will also help in controlling environmental pollution. The Committee further recommend that private sector participation should be encouraged in this regard. Moreover, other stakeholders, such as communities, NGOs along with Government authorities should play a concerted role in adopting this holistic approach.**

**4.26 The Committee are of the view that effort should be made to develop a number of model villages with cost-effective and sustainable water supply and sanitation systems. They feel that such villages will serve as inspirational**

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY

Plan

Sl. No.	Name of the Schemes	9th Plan		10th Plan		2000-01			2001-02			2002-03	
		Outlay (B.E)	Actual expenditure	Proposed Outlay	Outlay agreed	B.E	R.E	Actual Expr.	B.E	R.E	Actual Expr.	B.E	R.E
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Rural Water Supply Program	8564.00	8455.00	24800.00	13245.00	1960.00	1960.00	1896.55	2010.00	1975.00	1943.05	2235.00	2110.00
2	Rural Sanitation	534.00	514.00	3663.00	955.00	140.00	140.00	130.86	150.00	135.00	538.34	165.00	140.00
	Total -Drinking Water Supply	9098.00	8969.00	28463.00	14200.00	2100.00	2100.00	2027.41	2160.00	2110.00	2481.39	2400.00	2250.00

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY

Non-Plan

Sl. No.	Name of the Schemes	9th Plan		10th Plan		2000-01			2001-02			2002-03	
		Outlay (B.E)	Actual expenditure	Proposed Outlay	Outlay agreed	B.E	R.E	Actual Expr.	B.E	R.E	Actual Expr.	B.E	R.E
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Headquarter's Estt. Of Dep'tment of Drinking Water Supply & ARWSP	6.20	5.40	Not applicable	Not applicable	1.29	1.22	1.13	1.35	1.31	1.31	1.27	1.27
	Total -Rural Development	6.20	5.40			1.29	1.22	1.13	1.35	1.31	1.31	1.27	1.27

models and the neighbouring villages and communities will be motivated to adopt the model practices.

NEW DELHI;  
21 April, 2003  
1 Vaisakha, 1925(Saka)

CHANDRAKANT KHAIRE  
Chairman,  
Standing Committee on  
Urban and Rural Development



# Appendix II

-Annexure-II

## FINANCIAL PROGRESS UNDER RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME (ARWSP & MNP) DURING 2001-2002

Sl. No.	State/UT	Month Code	Opening balance as on 1.4.2001	ARWSP+DDP					MNP		
				Allocation	Release	Total Availability	Expend.	%age Expend.	Provision	Expend.	%age Expend.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	ANDHRA PRADESH	03	580.50	13869.68	14277.64	14858.14	14047.34	94.54	13692.52	13692.52	100.00
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	03	19.05	4476.00	2455.91	2474.96	2365.67	95.58	2931.00	2490.96	84.99
3	ASSAM	03	1354.96	7561.00	5357.67	6712.63	5125.00	76.35	6181.00	5194.00	84.03
4	BIHAR	03	1370.12	7274.00	0.00	1370.12	932.28	68.04	1894.93	1894.93	100.00
5	CHHATTISGARH	03	0.00	3877.00	3977.00	3977.00	3977.00	100.00	4024.50	3981.08	98.92
6	GOA	03	175.97	1455.00	727.50	903.47	214.98	23.79	1227.00	1226.66	99.97
7	GUJARAT	03	1636.25	8237.00	9776.30	11412.55	11169.58	97.87	87520.00	14235.52	81.25
8	HARYANA	03	0.00	3108.64	3475.92	3475.92	3475.92	100.00	6766.71	6766.71	100.00
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	03	27.46	5559.41	6457.21	6484.67	6484.67	100.00	9001.10	8081.11	89.78
10	J & K	03	3075.16	10105.88	6292.10	9367.26	8157.16	87.08	9353.00	6200.20	66.29
11	JHARKHAND	03	4246.15	3619.00	1809.50	6055.65	3696.35	61.04	9000.00	2193.56	24.37
12	KARNATAKA	03	782.17	13547.74	13861.68	14653.85	12316.84	84.05	13000.00	12926.42	99.43
13	KERALA	03	2235.65	6331.00	5045.00	7280.65	4233.27	58.14	6545.00	4363.46	66.67
14	MADHYA PRADESH	03	0.00	8877.00	9077.00	9077.00	8438.42	92.96	14081.53	13310.48	94.52
15	MAHARASHTRA	03	69.25	19159.00	19659.00	19728.25	20467.22	103.75	10409.35	10251.00	98.48
16	MANIPUR	03	253.52	1643.00	821.50	1075.02	517.23	48.11	1473.15	1024.61	69.55
17	MEGHALAYA	03	456.49	1760.00	1215.51	1672.00	1518.38	90.81	2358.78	2358.78	100.00
18	MIZORAM	03	0.85	1257.00	1634.10	1634.95	1255.48	76.79	2055.00	1504.50	73.21
19	NAGALAND	03	0.00	1308.00	1700.40	1700.40	1308.00	76.92	1958.00	1947.55	99.47
20	ORISSA	03	2518.99	6522.00	4952.09	7371.08	6483.23	87.95	6442.92	5327.89	82.69
21	PUNJAB	03	256.14	2277.00	1985.50	2241.64	2085.73	93.04	7052.50	6383.67	90.66
22	RAJASTHAN	03	8154.84	24499.65	20713.73	28868.57	20526.57	71.10	18425.37	13335.22	72.37
23	SIKKIM	03	0.00	536.00	696.80	696.80	696.80	100.00	1558.00	1476.13	94.75
24	TAMILNADU	03	0.00	7956.00	8956.00	8956.00	8956.00	100.00	39600.00	34322.57	86.67
25	TRIPURA	03	0.00	1559.00	2026.70	2026.70	1578.94	77.91	1399.70	1399.70	100.00
26	UTTAR PRADESH	03	2196.00	13269.00	13063.35	15259.35	7750.17	50.79	22175.01	22175.01	100.00
27	UTTARANCHAL	03	0.00	3356.00	3447.88	3447.88	3117.39	90.41	9778.35	7260.13	74.25
28	WEST BENGAL	03	243.40	8773.00	8947.63	9191.03	8824.46	96.01	9380.65	7502.75	79.98
29	A&N ISLANDS	03	4.40	13.00	0.00	4.40	0.00	0.00	944.05	944.35	100.03
30	D&N HAVELI	03	58.45	7.00	0.00	58.45	10.04	17.18	250.00	77.01	30.80
31	DAMAN & DIU*	09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
32	DELHI	12	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	800.00	706.62	88.33
33	LAKSHADWEEP	02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	111.75	62.15	55.62
34	PONDICHERRY	03	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	334.19	334.19	100.00
Total			29725.77	191823.00	172310.62	202036.39	160730.12	83.51	251725.06	214961.24	85.40

\*The provision from Daman & Diu has not been received.

Note1: 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.

Note2: 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

Item	O.B.	B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Availability	Expend.	%age
ARWSP(SECTOR REFORM)				11188.90	11188.90	5757.42	51.46
ARWSP (NORMAL+DDP)	29725.77	196853.00	194155.00	172310.62	202036.39	163730.12	83.51
MONITORING & EVALUATION		100.00	24.66	24.66	24.66	24.66	100.00
ARWSP (M&I UNITS)	0.00	250.00	250.00	273.27	273.27	273.27	100.00
DPAP Areas		1.00			0.00		0.00
SUB-MISSIONS(ARWSP)**		1.00		7093.34	7093.34		0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES		400.00	495.00	495.00	495.00	495.00	100.00
RESEARCH		100.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	100.00
CAPART	870.65	0.00			870.65		0.00
HRD/TRAINING		750.00	932.00	1044.08	1044.08	301.95	28.82
IEC		650.00	800.34	1027.66	1027.66	17.98	1.75
MIS		1500.00	680.00	697.23	697.23		0.00
EXHIBITION		10.00	8.00	7.92	7.92	7.65	96.59
SEMINAR/CONFERENCE		25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	100.00
ASSISTANCE FROM WHO/ UNICEF ETC.		300.00	22.00	19.62	19.62	19.62	100.00
MISSION MANAGEMENT		50.00	20.00	16.50	16.50	16.50	100.00
OTHER CHARGES(CPMC MUMBAI)		10.00	3.00	1.68	1.68	1.68	100.00
GRAND TOTAL	30596.42	201000.00	197495.00	194305.48	224901.90	176760.85	78.15

\*\* Releases made under ARWSP head



## Annexure-IV

## FINANCIAL PROGRESS UNDER RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME (ARWSP &amp; MNP) DURING 2002-2003

(As on 31.1.2003)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Month Code	Opening balance as on 1.4.2002**	ARWSP+DDP				MNP	%
				Allocation	Release	Total Availability	Expend.	Provision	Expend.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	ANDHRA PRADESH*	10	810.80	14865.00	14173.92	14984.72	6963.40	46.47	13477.00
2	ARUNACHAL PRADESH*	11	109.29	4977.00	2488.60	2697.79	1323.31	50.94	1696.00
3	ASSAM*	10	1587.63	8407.00	5252.50	6840.13	2825.25	41.30	2117.00
4	BIHAR	07	437.84	7406.00	3703.00	4140.84	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	CHHATTISGARH*	10	0.00	2443.00	2443.00	2443.00	1221.50	50.00	7322.00
6	GOA*	09	688.49	122.00	0.00	688.49	10.21	1.48	1248.63
7	GUJARAT*	09	242.97	6699.00	3393.00	3635.97	3963.81	109.02	23535.00
8	HARYANA*	10	0.00	2946.00	1473.00	1473.00	1459.38	99.08	4189.80
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH*	10	0.00	5643.00	5639.00	5639.00	1065.93	18.90	7942.77
10	J & K	0	1210.10	12388.00	6194.00	7404.10	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	JHARKHAND	0	2359.30	3063.00	1631.60	3890.80	0.00	0.00	0.00
12	KARNATAKA*	09	2337.01	12313.00	11724.60	14061.51	4260.83	30.30	6158.08
13	KERALA*	10	3047.38	3698.00	1899.30	4946.68	856.23	17.31	6670.00
14	MADHYA PRADESH*	09	638.58	7159.00	7159.00	7797.59	3141.54	40.29	12438.27
15	MAHARASHTRA*	09	0.00	16829.00	8414.60	8414.60	6257.12	74.36	12112.23
16	MANIPUR	09	567.79	1826.00	913.00	1470.79	388.82	27.12	356.18
17	MEGHALAYA*	09	163.62	1967.00	1967.00	2110.82	638.91	25.53	2060.00
18	MIZORAM*	09	378.47	1398.00	699.00	1076.47	426.24	39.52	1696.00
19	NAGALAND	09	392.40	1454.00	1236.00	1628.40	0.00	0.00	1236.00
20	ORISSA	06	887.85	6225.00	3112.50	4000.35	636.00	15.90	0.00
21	PUNJAB*	10	155.91	2581.00	2581.00	2736.91	1344.92	49.14	7593.00
22	RAJASTHAN*	09	8342.00	26750.00	22385.96	30727.96	8745.27	28.46	14628.01
23	SIKKIM*	11	0.00	697.00	607.00	607.00	298.40	68.86	800.00
24	TAMILNADU*	10	1000.00	6358.00	6358.00	7358.00	4178.00	66.80	41100.00
25	TRIPURA*	09	447.76	1734.00	867.00	1314.76	907.91	69.06	1846.60
26	UTTAR PRADESH*	10	7609.18	13022.00	6611.00	14120.18	3804.20	26.94	16633.00
27	UTTARANCHAL	0	330.48	3083.00	1541.50	1871.98	0.00	0.00	0.00
28	WEST BENGAL*	10	366.57	8545.00	4272.50	4639.07	1802.00	38.84	11600.00
29	A&N ISLANDS	0	4.40	13.00	0.00	4.40	0.00	0.00	0.00
30	D&N HAVELI*	06	48.41	7.00	0.00	48.41	0.00	0.00	250.00
31	DAMAN & DIU	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
32	DELHI	06	0.00	8.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	224.44
33	LAKSHADWEEP	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
34	PONDICHERY	07	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Total			34048.24	184518.00	128830.18	162576.42	56430.18	34.71	197568.01

\*\* Provisional

\* Only from these States the provision has been received.

Note1: In month code column the number 0 shown against some States means no report received from these States.

Item	O.B.	B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Availability	Expend.	%age
ARWSP(SECTOR REFORM)				8403.30	8403.30		0.00
ARWSP (NORMAL+DDP+DROUGHT)	34045.24	218940.00	208440.00	130256.19	164301.43	56430.18	34.35
MONITORING & EVALUATION		100.00	100.00		0.00		0.00
ARWSP (M&I UNITS)	0.00	250.00	250.00	80.09	80.09		0.00
GPAP Areas					0.00		0.00
SUB-MISSIONS(ARWSP)**				650.53	650.53		0.00
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES		500.00	500.00	382.73	382.73	31.70	8.28
RESEARCH		100.00	86.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	100.00
CAPART	870.65				870.65		0.00
HRED/TRAINING		1000.00	1000.00		0.00		0.00
IEC		850.00	850.00	322.49	322.49		0.00
MIS		1212.00	1212.00	87.55	87.55		0.00
EXHIBITION		10.00	10.00		0.00		0.00
SEMINAR/CONFERENCE		25.00	25.00	16.46	16.46	2.25	13.87
ASSISTANCE FROM WHO/UNICEF ETC.		438.00	438.00	12.49	12.49	9.74	77.98
MISSION MANAGEMENT		65.00	67.00	41.29	41.29	33.56	81.26
OTHER CHARGES		10.00	10.00	0.26	0.26	0.15	57.69
GRAND TOTAL	34916.89	223600.00	211000.00	140246.39	176162.27	56820.68	32.27

\*\*\* Releases made under ARWSP head

# Coverage of Habitations under Rural Water Supply during 2002-2003

(Upto 12th, December, 2002)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Month Code	Target				Coverage								
			Number of Habitations			Number of Schools	Number of Habitations								
			NC*	PC	Total		ARWSP			MNP			Total (ARWSP+MNP)		
			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	Andhra Pradesh	10	0	8012	8012	1951	0	818	818	0	813	813	0	1631	
2	Arunachal Pradesh	11	327	446	773	11	4	10	14	0	3	3	4	13	
3	Assam	10	600	5000	5600	1200	38	1121	1159	24	335	359	62	1456	
4	Bihar	07	0	0	0	686	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5	Chhattisgarh	10	0	0	0	1448	0	793	793	0	1062	1062	0	1855	
6	Goa	09	8	4	12	37	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	
7	Gujarat	09	70	918	988	800	21	148	169	3	81	84	24	229	
8	Haryana	10	0	48	48	76	0	55	55	0	135	135	0	190	
9	Himachal Pradesh	10	500	1360	1860	350	108	420	528	61	324	385	168	744	
10	Jammu & Kashmir	0	850	1644	2494	381	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11	Jharkhand	0	200	100	300	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12	Karnataka	08	3	7400	7403	1500	0	358	358	0	411	411	0	769	
13	Kerala	10	400	2000	2400	114	1	6	7	0	14	14	1	20	
14	Madhya Pradesh	09	0	0	0	5000	0	685	685	0	687	687	0	1372	
15	Maharashtra	09	1000	11810	12810	2287	7	88	95	13	146	159	20	234	
16	Manipur	09	15	115	130	440	7	14	21	4	13	17	11	27	
17	Meghalaya	09	180	200	380	70	10	3	13	1	16	17	11	15	
18	Mizoram	09	0	180	180	100	0	5	5	0	2	2	0	7	
19	Nagaland	06	195	50	245	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
20	Orissa	0	0	0	0	1500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
21	Punjab	10	750	1097	1847	1650	62	12	64	46	36	81	97	48	
22	Rajasthan	09	1896	9105	11000	2500	322	2530	2852	20	1287	1307	342	3817	
23	Sikkim	11	0	130	130	50	0	22	22	0	34	34	0	56	
24	Tamilnadu	10	0	0	0	6000	0	606	606	0	1457	1457	0	2062	
25	Tripura	09	53	355	425	200	0	90	90	0	55	55	0	145	
26	Uttar Pradesh	10	0	0	0	3811	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
27	Uttaranchal	0	34	500	534	229	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
28	West Bengal	10	0	6650	6650	2000	0	282	282	0	1493	1493	0	1775	
29	A&N Islands	0	0	46	46	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
30	D&N Haveli	06	31	110	141	38	0	0	0	8	5	13	8	5	
31	Daman & Diu	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	
33	Lakshadweep	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
34	Pondicherry	07	40	26	66	24	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	8	
35	Total		7191	57283	64474	35030	570	8065	8635	179	8420	8599	749	16485	

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

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

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



**Rural Water Supply Programme**  
**List of Sector Reform Projects**

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No	District	State	Approved Project Cost	GOI Share	Funds released	Community Contribution	No. contributors	%age expenditure
1	Chittoor	Andhra Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	29.55		69.13
2	Khammam	Andhra Pradesh	3753.00	3509.00	2052.70	212.89	227432.00	55.77
3	Nalgonda	Andhra Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	234.66	95000.00	9.57
4	Nellore	Andhra Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	1.25	498.00	6.94
5	Prakasam	Andhra Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	287.36	0.00	37.13
6	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	114.65	24006.00	0.92
7	East Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	374.00	15.36		2.81
8	Lohit	Arunachal Pradesh	900.00	841.50	252.45	58.50		1.32
9	West Siang	Arunachal Pradesh	700.00	654.50	392.70	43.59		56.29
10	Jorhat	Assam	1275.00	1188.60	356.58	12.20	7500.00	11.87
11	Kamrup	Assam	1000.00	935.00	280.50	8.57	3290.00	48.36
12	Sonitpur	Assam	1181.00	1103.49	331.04	13.26	5500.00	16.98
13	Vaishali	Bihar	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	5.70		3.05
14	Durg	Chattisgarh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	5.39	5598.00	11.64
15	Mehsana	Gujarat	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	34.00	13500.00	2.63
16	Rajkot	Gujarat	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	45.00	105500.00	2.42
17	Surat	Gujarat	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	59.00	10200.00	3.08
18	Karnal	Haryana	1507.00	1409.05	422.71	32.33	3840.00	83.71
19	Yamuna Nagar	Haryana	986.18	922.08	276.62	39.96	8346.00	63.55
20	Sirmour	Himachal Pradesh	2005.00	1857.50	557.25	20.00	29058.00	38.21
21	Srinagar	Jammu & Kashmir	2511.00	2347.79	704.33	38.63		65.12
22	Udhampur	Jammu & Kashmir	2500.00	2250.00	675.00	45.40	11801.00	74.72
23	Dhanbad	Jharkhand	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	1.24	486.00	2.47
24	Bellary	Karnataka	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	49.15	22238.00	6.87
25	Mangalore	Karnataka	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	195.55	248778.00	11.07
26	Mysore	Karnataka	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	54.28	14400.00	1.35
27	Kasaragod	Kerala	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	16.08	0.00	8.01
28	Kollam	Kerala	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	7.06		2.91
29	Gwalior	Madhya Pradesh	2927.94	2737.62	821.29	6.40		9.24
30	Hoshangabad	Madhya Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	11.90	0.00	9.84
31	Narsinghpur	Madhya Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	50.25		19.08
32	Raisen	Madhya Pradesh	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	28.25	18800.00	13.65
33	Sehore	Madhya Pradesh	1795.00	1678.15	503.44	16.07	5940.00	25.6
34	Amravati	Maharashtra	2126.00	1973.50	592.05	14.41	16952.00	29.01
35	Dhule	Maharashtra	3952.78	3692.96	1107.88	0.00		10.01
36	Nanded	Maharashtra	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	14.14		16.89
37	Raigad	Maharashtra	3793.00	3473.80	1042.14	14.60	4377.00	5.32
38	Ri-Bhoi	Meghalaya	975.11	907.01	272.10	14.49	8551.00	38.11
39	Serchhip	Mizoram	268.98	248.17	223.35	19.65	28071.00	74.86
40	Dimapur	Nagaland	594.00	555.39	166.61	7.89	102549.00	101.33

Appendix VI (contd.)

Annexure V (contd.)

**Rural Water Supply Programme  
List of Sector Reform Projects**

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No	District	State	Approved Project Cost	GOI Share	Funds released	Community Contribution	No. of contributors	%age expenditure
41	Balasore	Orissa	4000.00	3740.00	1122.00	27.52	0.00	18.88
42	Ganjam	Orissa	4000	3740	1122	21.79	4500	13.28
43	Sundergarh	Orissa	4000	3740	1122	21.6	4251	46.94
44	Bhatinda	Punjab	752.19	700.95	210.28	13.5		93.23
45	Moga	Punjab	344	321.44	96.43	13.2		178.49
46	Muktsar	Punjab	3992.8	3733.27	1119.93	2.67	0	4.84
47	Alwar	Rajasthan	4000	3740	1122	110.44	32110	99.83
48	Rajsamand	Rajasthan	4000	3740	1122	7.97	3528	1.11
49	Jaipur	Rajasthan	4000	3740	1122	75.53	10110	40.11
50	Sikkar	Rajasthan	2171	1986.05	595.81	21.27	2200	71.03
51	Sikkim South	Sikkim	1322.48	1210.07	363.02	7.97	3528	0
52	Sikkim West	Sikkim	892.35	816.5	244.95	0		0
53	Coimbatore	Tamilnadu	4000	3740	2244	315	93183	101.07
54	Cuddalore	Tamilnadu	4000	3740	1122	201.27	141600	86.66
55	Perambalur	Tamilnadu	4000	3740	1122	243.27	24609	96.93
56	Vellore	Tamilnadu	4000	3740	2244	314.28	253986	103.85
57	Kancheepuram	Tamilnadu	4000	3740	374	0		4.38
58	Virudhunagar	Tamilnadu	4000	3740	374	0		4.98
59	West Tripura	Tripura	2819.4	2566.9	770.07	64.57	130320	67.96
60	Agra	Uttar Pradesh	3000	2805	841.5	10.13	11585	13.2
61	Chandauli	Uttar Pradesh	2500	2337.5	701.25	3.53		22.35
62	Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh	4000	3740	1122	7.81	4580	28.81
63	Mirzapur	Uttar Pradesh	3000	2805	841.5	2.96	657	13.75
64	Sonebhadra	Uttar Pradesh	2500	2337.5	701.25	20.17	6433	36.39
65	Midnapur	West Bengal	4000	3740	1122	60	38500	84.93
66	N. 24 Parganas	West Bengal	4000	3740	1122	55.17		68.95
67	Haridwar	Uttaranchal	4000	3740	1122	0		1.19
	Total		206045.21	192285.3	59030.79	3500.27	1787891	

**APPENDIX VII**  
**COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(2003)**

**MINUTES OF THE NINTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY,  
THE 26<sup>th</sup> MARCH, 2003.**

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1315 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annex, New Delhi.

***PRESENT***

**Shri Chandrakant Khaire -      *Chairman***

***MEMBERS***

**LOK SABHA**

2. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
3. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
4. Shri Shriram Chauhan
5. Shri Jaiprakash
6. Shri Hassan Khan
7. Shri Basavanagoud Kolur
8. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
9. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
10. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
11. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
12. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
13. Shri Maheshwar Singh
14. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
15. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
16. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

***RAJYA SABHA***

17. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
18. Shri N.R. Dasari
19. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
20. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
21. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
22. Shri Rumandla Ramachandraiah
23. Shri Man Mohan Samal

***SECRETARIAT***

1. Shri K. Chakraborty - Deputy Secretary
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - Under Secretary
3. Shri N.S. Hooda - Under Secretary

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

1. Shri Palat Mohandas, Secretary
2. Shri Lalit Mathur, Additional Secretary & Financial Advisor
3. Dr. Ramesh Chandra Panda, Joint Secretary
4. Shri R.P. Nath, Director (Fin.)
5. Smt. P.V. Valsala G. Kuty, Director (TM)
6. Shri A.K. Singh, Director (SW)

**Representative of the Ministry of Environment and Forests**

1. Ms. Sanchita Jindal, Joint Director

**Representatives of the Bureau of Indian Standards**

1. Shri O.N. Srivastava, Director
2. Ms. Madhulika Prakash, Director

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 (2003-2004).

[The representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development), Ministry of Environment and Forests and Bureau of Indian Standards were then called in.]

3. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development), Ministry of Environment and Forests and Bureau of Indian Standards, 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 on Demands for Grants (2003-2004). The members raised various clarificatory queries and made their observations. The representatives of the Department were asked to send written replies to the queries, which could not be answered during the sitting.

A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

*The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 1500 hrs.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPENDIX VII (Contd.)**

**COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(2003)**

**MINUTES OF THE TENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY,  
THE 26<sup>th</sup> MARCH, 2003.**

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1710 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

***PRESENT***

**Shri Chandrakant Khaire -      *Chairman***

***MEMBERS***

**LOK SABHA**

2. Shri S. Ajaya Kumar
3. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
4. Shri Shriram Chauhan
5. Shri Jaiprakash
6. Shri Hassan Khan
7. Shri Basavanagoud Kolur
8. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
9. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
10. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
11. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
12. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
13. Shri Maheshwar Singh
14. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
15. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
16. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

***RAJYA SABHA***

17. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
18. Shri N.R. Dasari
19. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
20. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
21. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
22. Shri Man Mohan Samal

***SECRETARIAT***

1. Shri K. Chakraborty - Deputy Secretary
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra - Under Secretary
3. Shri N.S. Hooda - Under Secretary

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

1. Shri Palat Mohandas, Secretary
2. Shri Lalit Mathur, Additional Secretary & Financial Advisor
3. Dr. Ramesh Chandra Panda, Joint Secretary
4. Shri R.P. Nath, Director (Fin.)
5. Smt. P.V. Valsala G. Kuty, Director (TM)
6. Shri A.K. Singh, Director (SW)

**Representative of the Ministry of Environment and Forests**

1. Ms. Sanchita Jindal, Joint Director

**Representatives of the Bureau of Indian Standards**

1. Shri O.N. Srivastava, Director
2. Ms. Madhulika Prakash, Director

2. The Committee resumed discussion on the Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) and took further oral evidence of the representatives of the said Department. The members raised various clarificatory queries and made their observations. The representatives, who could not reply to certain queries at that time, were asked to send their replies thereto in writing at the earliest.

A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **APPENDIX VIII**

### **COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

#### **MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 3<sup>RD</sup> APRIL, 2003**

The Committee sat from 1530 hrs. to 1710 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

#### **PRESENT**

Shri Chandrakant Khaire - *Chairman*

#### **MEMBERS *LOK SABHA***

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Ranen Barman
4. Shri Padmanava Behera
5. Shri Shriram Chauhan
6. Shrimati Hema Gamang
7. Shri Jaiprakash
8. Shri Gutha Sukender Reddy
9. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
10. Shri V.M. Sudheeran
11. Shri Ravi Prakash Verma

#### ***RAJYA SABHA***

12. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
13. Shrimati Prema Cariappa
14. Shri N.R. Dasari
15. Shri Ramadhar Kashyap
16. Shrimati Gurcharan Kaur
17. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
18. Shri Harish Rawat
19. Shri Man Mohan Samal
20. Shri G.K. Vasan

#### ***SECRETARIAT***

- |                        |   |                      |
|------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary  | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. Shri K. Chakraborty | - | Deputy Secretary     |
| 3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra  | - | Under Secretary      |
| 4. Shri N.S. Hooda     | - | Under Secretary      |

2. The Committee took up for consideration the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development).
3. The Committee adopted the said draft Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) with certain modifications as indicated in the *Annexure*.
4. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the said Report after getting it factually verified from the concerned Department and present the same to both the Houses of the Parliament.
5. The Committee, thereafter, desired that the subject of 'Rural Drinking Water Supply' selected by the Committee for examination during the year 2003, should be given priority and all the related issues examined in detail.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## ANNEXURE

(See Para 3 of Minutes dated 03.04.2003)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5

1. 9 2.11 -

For :

'The Committee have examined the issues raised in the preceding paras of the Report viz., accessibility versus availability, contamination of water, sustainability of sources and systems etc., in detail in the succeeding chapters of the Report. However, with regard to overall scenario, the Committee find from whatever has been said above, while on the one hand, the Government claim that more than 90 per cent of all rural habitations have been fully covered with drinking water facilities, on the other hand, they accept that the status with regard to slippage of habitations from covered to not covered categories is not reflected in the coverage. This implies that there is a hiatus between Government statistics regarding coverage and actual ground reality. In this context the United Nation's survey report is also disturbing and poses a question on the authenticity of the Government's proclamation that 100 percent coverage would be achieved by 2004. The Committee are of the view that rather than chasing figures, effort should be on quality work, whereby the provision of safe and sustainable sources of drinking water is made to the rural masses.'

Substitute :

'The Committee express a deep sense of outrage that 55 years after Independence, the respective Governments have not been able to provide safe drinking water to all people. The Committee find the Government's claim that more than 90% of all rural habitations have been fully covered with drinking water facilities as completely unacceptable. The Committee wish to reiterate that coverage should not mean only accessibility, rather it should be redefined to include availability and quality of water along with accessibility. While the Committee have examined the issues of accessibility versus availability, contamination of water, sustainability of sources and systems etc., in detail in the succeeding chapters of the Report, they may like to highlight here that there is a hiatus between Government statistics regarding coverage and actual ground reality. In this

context, the United Nation’s survey report as per which India ranks 133<sup>rd</sup> out of 185 countries with regard to drinking water availability and 120<sup>th</sup> out of 122 countries in respect of drinking water quality, is very disturbing and poses a question on the authenticity of the Government’s proclamation that 100 per cent coverage would be achieved by 2004. The Committee are of the view that rather than trying to portray favourable picture by manipulating data, the Government should concentrate on quality work, whereby the provision of safe and sustainable sources of drinking water is made to the rural masses.’

2. 14 3.3 -

For :

“The Committee find that during the Ninth Plan period, there was an underspending of Rs.129 crore out of the total outlay of Rs. 9098 crore earmarked for the Department, implying that for one reason or another, the allocated funds could not be utilised fully even in a resource starved economy. The expenditure trend for the last three years indicate that whatever allocation was provided for the Department was not fully utilized.”

Substitute :

“The Committee show their strong displeasure regarding the fact that funds allocated for the topmost priority programmes of rural drinking water supply and sanitation, could not be fully utilized even in a resource starved economy. They are distressed to note that during the Ninth Plan period, there was an underspending of Rs.129 crore out of the total outlay of Rs. 9098 crore earmarked for the Department. Moreover, the expenditure trend for the last three years indicate that whatever allocation was provided for the Department was not fully utilized.”

3. 26 3.21 4 from below

*Add after* “However, something needs to be done”

“In this context, the Committee would like the Union Government to play a more proactive role, with regular visits of the Central Government officials to monitor and evaluate the various schemes and also to assist and guide the State Governments in selection of viable projects. The Committee strongly feel that the Government cannot abdicate their responsibility by simply indicating the oft quoted causes.”

4. 31 3.33 -

For :

“The Committee find that as per the Government data around nine per cent partially covered or not covered habitations remain to be covered and the Government target to cover these habitations by the year 2004. They further find that during the year 2002-2003, the Government targeted to cover 64474 habitations, but could cover only 17234, i.e., around 25.3 per cent. Besides, the performance in many States as indicated in the preceding paras is very dismal. With this pace of achievement, the Committee doubt the claim of the Department to cover the total habitations by the year 2004.”

Substitute :

“The Committee note with strong displeasure that the performance of many States with regard to the coverage of habitations with drinking water facility, as indicated in the preceding paras, is very dismal. However, as per the Government data, around nine per cent partially covered or not covered habitations remain to be covered and the Government target to cover these habitations by the year 2004. The Committee are concerned to find that during the year 2002-2003, the Government targeted to cover 64474 habitations, but could cover only 17234, i.e., around 25.3 per cent. With this pace of achievement, the Committee seriously doubt the claim of the Department to cover the total habitations by the year 2004.”

5. 32 3.35 8 from  
below

For :

“They welcome the said move of the Department, but they are worried about the condition of the existing covered habitations, whereby as the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted that in certain parts of Rajasthan, water has to be carried from a distance of 20-30 kilometers. The Committee would like that before making a move to revise the said norms, it should be ensured that within the existing norm, every habitation and individual is covered in rural areas.”

Substitute :

“They welcome the revised norms but express serious doubt about its feasibility, taking into account ground realities at present. In fact, during the course of oral evidence, the

Secretary submitted that in certain parts of Rajasthan, water has to be carried from a distance of 20-30 kilometers. The Committee wish to emphasize that greatest priority must be accorded to ensure that every habitation and individual is covered in rural areas according to the revised norms.”

6. 38 3.48 2 from below

*Delete :*

“Further, they also fail to understand the justification for considering a project costing upto Rs.25 lakh for a small village, having very less population.”

7. 40 3.50 -

*Delete the following:*

“Moreover, stakeholders may be included in the Panchayat Committees looking after the implementation and maintenance of these Schemes. Awareness should be spread among the masses that if the system falls into disrepair or is not properly maintained by the community, the scheme/project would be given over to some other village/community.”

8. 66 3.102 1

For :

“The Committee note with concern”

Substitute :

“The Committee note with grave concern”

9. 70 3.108 7 from below

For:

“They are sorry to know”

Substitute:

“They are appalled to know”

10. 76 3.117 -

For:

“The Committee find that although the Department has agreed to give the maximum attention to human resource management, the year-wise allocation, as could be seen from the data, made since 2001-02 when earmarking a separate allocation was started, speaks another side of the picture. They are surprised to note that during 2002-03 against the allocation of Rs.10 crore, the expenditure indicated under the programme is ‘Nil’.”

Substitute :

“The Committee find that although the Department has agreed to give maximum attention to human resource management, the year-wise allocation, as could be seen from the data, made since 2001-02 when earmarking separate allocation was started, tells another story. They are stunned

to note that during 2002-03 against the allocation of Rs.10 crore, the expenditure indicated under the programme is 'Nil'."

11. 79 3.122 5 from below

For :

"...the Department has not addressed the issue of..."

Substitute :

"...the Department has not addressed the crucial issue of..."

12. 82 3.129

For :

"The Committee further find that the process of awarding the work of conducting evaluation studies on the impact of drinking water was decided years back in 1997 and finally the process of awarding the work of conducting such studies was initiated from September, 2001. Till date in thirteen States only evaluation studies were carried out. Besides, they also note that no evaluation study could be conducted during the year 2001-2002."

Substitute :

"The Committee further find that the process of awarding the work of conducting evaluation studies on the impact of drinking water supply schemes was decided years back in 1997 and in thirteen States only, evaluation studies were carried out. Besides, they also note that no evaluation study could be conducted during the year 2001-2002, though the process of awarding the work of conducting such studies was initiated from September, 2001."

13. 92 4.19 1

For :

"The Committee note with concern that"

Substitute :

"The Committee note with shame that"