

**WATER POLLUTION IN INDIA**

[Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their 8<sup>th</sup> Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha)]

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
(2020-21)**

**TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT**

---

**SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

PAC NO. 2234

# **TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT**

## **PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE** **(2020-21)**

(SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA)

### **WATER POLLUTION IN INDIA**

[Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their 8<sup>th</sup> Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha)]



*Presented to Lok Sabha on:* .....

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on:* .....

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**  
**NEW DELHI**

February, 2021/Magha, 1942 (Saka)

**COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**  
**(2020-21)**

**Shri Adhir Ranjan Chowdhury - Chairperson**

**MEMBERS**

**LOK SABHA**

2. Shri T. R. Baalu
3. Shri Subhash Chandra Baheria
4. Shri Sudheer Gupta
5. Smt. Darshana Vikram Jardosh
6. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
7. Shri Ajay (Teni) Misra
8. Shri Jagdambika Pal
9. Shri Vishnu Dayal Ram
10. Shri Rahul Ramesh Shewale
11. Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh alias Lalan Singh
12. Dr. Satya Pal Singh
13. Shri Jayant Sinha
14. Shri Balashowry Vallabhaneni
15. Shri Ram Kripal Yadav

**RAJYA SABHA**

16. Shri Rajeev Chandrasekhar
17. Shri Naresh Gujral
18. Shri C. M. Ramesh
19. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Ray
20. Shri Bhupender Yadav
21. Vacant
22. Vacant

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri T. G. Chandrasekhar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri M.L.K Raja - Director
3. Shri U. C. Bhardwaj - Additional Director
4. Shri Alok Mani Tripathi - Deputy Secretary

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2020-21)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(iv)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II* Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government .....	
CHAPTER III* Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the replies received from the Government .....	
CHAPTER IV* Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration .....	
CHAPTER V* Observations/Recommendations in respect of which the Government have furnished interim replies .....	

## APPENDICES\*

- I Minutes of the 10<sup>th</sup> sitting of the Public Accounts Committee (2020-21) held on 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2021
- II Analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their Eighth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha)

---

*\*Not appended to the cyclostyled copy of the Report*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson, Public Accounts Committee (2020-21), having been authorised by the Committee, do present this Twenty-sixth Report (Seventeenth Lok Sabha) on Action Taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Eighth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) on **'Water Pollution in India'** relating to the Ministry of Jal Shakti.

2. The Eighth Report was presented to Lok Sabha/laid in Rajya Sabha on 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2014. Replies of the Government to all the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Report were received. The Public Accounts Committee considered and adopted the Twenty-sixth Report at their Sitting held on 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2021. Minutes of the Sitting are given at Appendix I.

3. For facility of reference and convenience, the Observations and Recommendations of the Committee have been printed in **bold** in the body of the Report.

4. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in the matter by the Committee Secretariat and the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

5. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in the Eighth Report (Sixteenth Lok Sabha) is given at *Appendix-II*.

NEW DELHI;  
February, 2021  
Magha, 1942 (Saka)

ADHIR RANJAN CHOWDHURY  
Chairperson,  
Public Accounts Committee

**APPENDIX-II**  
(Vide Paragraph 5 of Introduction)

**ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE  
OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
CONTAINED IN THEIR EIGHTH REPORT (SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

(i)	<b>Total number of Observations/Recommendations</b>	<b>24</b>
(ii)	<b>Observations/Recommendations of the Committee which have been accepted by the Government: Para Nos. 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 19, 20 and 24</b>	<b>Total : 08 Percentage: 33.33%</b>
(iii)	<b>Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the reply of the Government:  Para Nos. - 3, 4, 9, 12, 15, 21 and 23</b>	<b>Total : 07 Percentage: 29.167%</b>
(iv)	<b>Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:  Para Nos. - 6, 7, 13 and 17</b>	<b>Total : 04 Percentage: 16.67%</b>
(v)	<b>Observations/Recommendations in respect of which the Government have furnished interim replies:  Para Nos. - 10, 14, 16, 18 and 22</b>	<b>Total : 05 Percentage: 20.834%</b>

## CHAPTER - I

### REPORT

This Report of the Public Accounts Committee deals with the Action Taken by the Government on the Observations and Recommendations of the Committee contained in their Eighth Report (16<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) on "**Water Pollution in India** " based on the C&AG Report No. 21 of 2011-12, Union Government for the year ended March, 2012 relating to the Ministry of Jal Shakti.

2. The Eighth Report was presented to Lok Sabha/ laid in Rajya Sabha on 11.12.2014. It contained Twenty Four Observations/Recommendations. The Action Taken Notes on all the Observations/Recommendations have been received from the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change, which informed that the matter now comes under the purview of Ministry of Jal Shakti and are categorized as under:

(i) Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:

Para Nos. 1,2,5,8,11,19, 20 and 24

**Total: 8**

**Chapter – II**

(ii) Observations/Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the replies received from the Government:

Para Nos. 3,4,9,12,15,21 & 23

**Total: 7**

**Chapter – III**

(iii) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:

Para Nos. 6, 7, 13 and 17

**Total: 4**

**Chapter – IV**

(iv) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies/no replies:

Para No. 10, 14, 16, 18 and 22

**Total: 5**

**Chapter –V**

3. The detailed examination of the subject by the Committee had revealed certain shortcomings/deficiencies on the part of the Ministry of Jal Shakti which *inter-alia included inadequate funding and inadequate manpower leading to improper inspection, need for regular monitoring of National Water Policy and fixation of timelines for the proposals under the Roadmap of policy framework, delay in the restart of Project "Neem", need for inclusion of Industrial pollution within the remit of National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) etc.* The Committee had accordingly given their observations/recommendations in their Eighth Report.

4. The Action Taken notes furnished by the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change, which informed that the matter now comes under the purview of Ministry of Jal Shakti, have been reproduced in the relevant chapters of this Report. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on their Observations/Recommendations which either need reiteration or merit comments.

5. The Committee desire that action taken notes in respect of Observations/Recommendations contained in Chapter I and final action taken replies in respect of the Recommendations contained in Chapter V for which interim replies have been given by the Government may be furnished to them within six months of the presentation of the Report to the House.

### **Inadequate funding and inadequate manpower leading to improper inspection**

#### **(Recommendation Para No. 6)**

6. The Committee in their original Report *inter alia* recommended as under :

"...While acknowledging that calculating damage costs of environment remains a very complicated matter as futuristic cost elements have also to be taken, the Committee observe that only mere levy of damage costs by way of enhancing penalties may not as such become an effective deterrent. The dismal number of inspections, totalling to a mere 857, carried out by the Environmental Surveillance Squad (ESS) of Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) in last three years (2009-2012) on 1055 grossly



polluting industries in the Country generating as much as 9982 MLD effluents reveals the weaknesses in the enforcement regime for pollution of water *vis-a-vis* the quantum of pollutants generated. Compared to this, the total number of Courts cases filed under the Water Act as on 30.06.2012 stood at a fair 6320, also indicative of the large number of violations taking place all over the country. The Committee further note that, directions issued under sections 5 and 18(1)(b) of the Water Act, 1974 during the last 3 years (2009-2012) totalling to 118 and 195 respectively included 7 directions issued to NGRBA under section 18(1)(b) of the Act. The Committee therefore recommend that :

- (i) The proposal for enhancing the minimum penalty from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 1,00,000 for violation of the Water Act, 1974 and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 without amending the provisions for imprisonment with maximum penalty upto Rs. 10 crore be implemented expeditiously;
- (ii) Other options for ensuring compliance to non polluting norms by the domestic sectors as well as for local authorities may also be explored;
- (iii) A robust water inspection regime be put in place with inbuilt provisions for mandated periodic as well as surprise checks by an empowered and well-equipped inspection team to detect and report all cases of violation of norms; and
- (iv) Adequate funds be provided by the Union and the State Governments for this purpose and the necessary manpower be trained to work in this regime."

7. The Ministry in their Action Taken Notes have *inter alia* stated as under:-

"The proposal of enhancing minimum penalty from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 1,00,000 for violation of Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 without amending the provisions for imprisonment with maximum penalty up to Rs. 10.00 crore has been dealt by the TSR Subramaniam Committee constituted to review various Acts being administered by MoEF&CC for the purpose of amendments/repealing in

view of the current scenario. The Committee has submitted its report in the Ministry and the same has been accepted for examination of the recommendations.

CPCB has issued directions under Section 18 1(b) of Water (prevention and Control of Pollution ) Act, 1974 in April, 2015 to all State Pollution Control Boards/Pollution Control Committees, to make mandatory for local/urban bodies to set up STPs of adequate capacity and provide underground sewerage system to cover the entire local/urban areas and to bridge the treatment capacity gap as well as enforcement of consent management in line with standards for sewage treatment.... CPCB has also issued directions under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 in October, 2015 to 178 towns for proper treatment and disposal of sewage generated in their jurisdiction....

2. The waste water generation from household and cumulatively through municipal area and its treatment is dealt under the general discharge standard notified by MoEF&CC (*now under Ministry of Jal Shakti*). CPCB has proposed to enforce stringent norms for sewage treatment and a separate set of standards are developed for treatment of sewage. CPCB has recently proposed draft revised standards for treatment effluent of sewage treatment plants are as under:

#### STANDARDS FOR TREATED EFFLUENT OF SEWAGE TREATMENTS PLANTS

Sl. No.	Industry	Parameters	Standards for New STPs (Design after notification date)*
1.	Sewage Treatment Plant	pH	6.5-9.0
2.		BOD, mg/l	10
3.		COD, mg/l	50
4.		TSS, mg/l	10
5.		NH4-N mg/l	5
6.		N-total, mg/l	10
7.		Fecal Coliform (MPN/100ml)	<230
8.		PO4-P, mg/l	2

Note: (i) These standards will be applicable for discharge in water resource as well as for land disposal. The standards for Fecal Coliform may not be applied or use of treated sewage in industrial purposes.

\*Achievements of standards for existing STPs within 05 Years from date of notification.

3. Operation and maintenance of STPs has been a matter of concern since long, which is essentially the responsibility of the respective State Governments/implementing agencies. State Pollution Control Boards (SPCBs) are vested with the powers under the Water

(Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 to take the defaulting agencies responsible for O&M of treatment plants....”

8. While vetting the said ATNs, the Audit made the following comments:-

“The proposal for enhancing the minimum penalty from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 1,00,000 and amending the provisions of imprisonment have yet not been implemented.”

“Finalization of the draft revised standards needs to be intimated to the PAC. No other options for ensuring compliances to non-polluting norms by the domestic sections have been explored.”

9. In their further comments to the above audit observations, the Ministry *interalia* stated as under:

“Regarding the proposal for enhancing the minimum penalty from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 1,00,000 and amending the provisions of imprisonment, MoEF&CC is examining the recommendations contained in the report of TSR Subramanian Committee.

MoFF&CC has completed the process of consultation with the Ministry Housing & Urban Affairs, which is a nodal agency in the Government for laying sewerage systems and tackling domestic wastewater in the urban areas. The revised standards for treated wastewater from sewage treatment plants have been notified on 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2017.

To ensure compliance to norms, CPCB had issued directions under section 5 of EPA to the Municipal Commissioners of 46 million plus cities and 20 State Capitals to setup STPs and meet with revised/new standards. Also, directions have been issued to the Municipal Commissioners of 118 towns located on the banks of river Ganga to setup STPs.

...all the State Governments/implementing agencies have been advised by MoEF&CC to ensure the followings:

- In case of already commissioned STPs, ‘Consent to Operate’ under the water Act, 1974 must be obtained from the respective SPCBs/PCCs, and monitoring reports are to be submitted with a copy to CPCB.
- For the proposed STPs, Consent to Establish under the Water Act, 1974 needs to be obtained from the respective SPCBs/PCCs.”

10. The Committee are concerned to note that gaps continue to exist in monitoring mechanism leading to loopholes in ensuring compliance mechanism of the regulations for preventing the water pollution. The Committee had advocated a robust water inspection regime so as to detect and report cases of violation of norms but are astonished to find that even assessment of performance of effluent treatment plants at industrial units is not periodic but random and merely 1782 industrial units are under the purview of online monitoring system. Further, the Committee are pained to note that the proposals of State Pollution Control Board (SPCBs) under the “Strengthening of Environmental Regulators (SER)” still await approvals thereby defeating the envisaged objectives of enhanced manual monitoring network and strengthened IT infrastructure. The Committee assert their recommendation of enhancing penalties for violation of Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 be implemented without any further delay.

11. The Committee are dismayed to note from the reply of the Ministry that inadequate manpower still persists and is a major hurdle in successful monitoring and performance evaluation systems. Even in cases where the project staff have been sanctioned, further course of action of recruitment and appointment have not yet been done. The Committee strongly feel the need for ensuring that all staff shortages and unscientific man power planning are done away with. The Committee, while noting that the Ministry had not adhered to their recommendation, also desire that urgent steps be taken in matters of staff approval and appointment under all categories in fixed timeline projects and report back within 6 months following the presentation of this Report. Also, the Ministry must finalise the programme of training of staff and come out with purposeful and tangible results of robust regime of monitoring and inspection.

Need for regular monitoring of National Water Policy and fixation of timelines for the proposals under the Roadmap of policy framework

(Recommendation Para No. 7)

12. The Committee had *inter alia* made the following recommendations in their original Report:

"...The Committee observe with serious concern that while only 18 States have framed Water Policy, most of them do not give adequate emphasis to Prevention and Control of Water Pollution except the State Government of Kerala which seeks to address water pollution issues. Notably, 14 States have already enacted the Ground Water Bill and another 16 States have taken initiatives for enactment of such a Bill based on the Model Bill circulated to the States/Union Territories for Regulation and Control of Ground Water Development and Management. The Committee further find that as regards policy framework, the Road Map for 'Management of Water Pollution in India' prepared by the MoEF in consultation with the line Ministries addresses various important issues in environmental management viz. hike in the penalties for contravention of its provision, a civil administrative adjudication system to ensure fast tracking of the imposition of penalties for environmental offenders; proposal to establish a National Environmental Appraisal and Monitoring Authority (NAEMA) to carry out environmental appraisals and monitoring of compliance conditions; setting up of Bureau of Water Efficiency (BWE) under the Water Resources Ministry; legal entity status to common effluent treatment plants to facilitate investments and enable enforcement of standards; encouragement of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and use of biodegradable pesticides as also explicit accounting of groundwater pollution in pricing policies of agricultural inputs; establishment of bio-conservative zone around water body; integrated water resources management, etc. Taking note of the laudable objectives of the National Water Policy, 2012, the Committee recommend :

- (i) The National Water Board urgently prepare a plan of action for regularly monitoring of implementation of the National Water Policy, 2012;
- (ii) Appropriate and sustained steps may be taken to encourage all the States to formulate clear water Policies with special thrust on prevention and control of water pollution including ground water as well as ecological restoration of degraded water bodies, as

also reorientation of development policy of the States (as already done by the State of Kerala) in accord with the objective of the National Water Policy 2012 and the National Environment Policy 1992;

- (iii) Mandatory periodic review be made of the implementation of various policies relevant to the issue of water pollution, environmental conservation and findings thereof publicly disclosed ; and
- (iv) The proposals rolled out in the Road Map pertaining to policy framework be implemented in right earnest to achieve the stated objectives within the given time frame and the Committee apprised.
- (v) An inventory of all water bodies including rivers, lakes, ponds, streams, wells, etc. be made and digitalized within a time bound programme."

13. The Ministry in their Action Taken Notes have stated as under:-

"The National Water Policy (2012) has made several recommendations for conservation, development and management of water resources in the country.

2. Ministry of Water Resources, RD&GR has informed that implementation of various recommendations would require different time periods. It also requires the active cooperation and support of the States. Accordingly, the National Water Policy, 2012 has been forwarded to all the States/Union Territories and the concerned Ministries Departments of Central Government for appropriate action. The National Water Policy, 2012 is being implemented by many States.

3. MOWR, RD&GR constituted a Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.R. Hashim, Former Member, Planning Commission & Former Chairman, Union Public Service Commission for suggesting a road map for implementation of National Water Policy, 2012. The Committee submitted its Report in September, 2013. The recommendations of the Committee are under examination.

4. As per the National Water Policy 2012, recycle and reuse of water has been included as Service Level Benchmarks for sewerage and sanitation. In its various programmes of the

Ministry of Urban Development, reuse of treated wastewater has to be ensured by the respective Urban Local Bodies for the sewerage schemes sanctioned by the Ministry.

5. MoEF&CC, in consultation with CPCB/SPCBs/PCCs carry out periodically review of industrial standards as well as water quality standards which are aimed at improving environment performance of industries in terms of operational efficient and compliance.”

14. While vetting the said ATNs, the Audit made the following comments:-

“No action for regularly monitoring of implementation of National Water Policy as well as no periodic review have been done. No timelines have been prescribed by the Ministry for the proposals rolled out in the Roadmap pertaining to policy framework.”

15. In their further comments to the above said audit observations, the Ministry *inter alia* stated as under:

“1. MoWR, RD&GR has the prime mandate for implementation of the National Water Policy. A Committee was constituted by the MoWR, RE&GR for suggesting roadmap for implementation of National Water Policy-2012 under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.R. Hashim, former Chairman, UPSC & former Chairman, UPSC & former Member, Planning Commission. The Committee submitted its report to MoWR, RD&GR in September,2013. The copy of the Report of Committee had been circulated by the MoWR, RD&GR to all the States and UTs for necessary action/comments. The report is under finalisation in the Ministry.”

Apart from this, MoWR, RD&GR has been impressing upon the States/Union Territories (UTs) to formulate State Water Policies in line with the National Water Policy, 2012 and pursued the same through correspondence to them. A statement indicating the details of States/UTs who have formulated State water policies in pursuance of National Water Policy, 1987 and 2002 are as under:

Andhra Pradesh (2008), Goa (2000), Jharkhand (2011), Kerala (2008), Maharashtra (2003), Rajasthan (2010), Tamil Nadu (1994), Himachal Pradesh (2005), Karnataka (2002), Madhya Pradesh (2003), Odisha (2007), Sikkim (2009) and Uttar Pradesh (1999).

....The Governments of Bihar, Gujarat and NCT of Delhi have also initiated action for formulation of their State water policies.

2. .... To ensure improvement in water quality of river and other water bodies, standards of effluent from STPS have also been made stringent and have been notified on 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2017 after consultation with Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs. As contribution of wastewater from domestic sector is significant, revision of standards of effluents of sewage treatment plants will strengthen in effective control of water pollution.

The existing provisions of Water Act are being implemented through CPCB for control of pollution and monitoring of ambient water quality of aquatic resources. Monitoring network of Water Quality Assessment have been established throughout the country at 2500 locations and the outcome/results help in preparation of plans for restoration of water quality. The review of activities is carried out on regular basis through Chairman & Member Secretaries Conference of SPCBs/PCCs. Other Committees are also reviewing provisions for control of pollution and enforcement of standards. Polluted river stretches have been identified along with the sources of pollution and Municipal Authorities have been directed by SPCBs/PCCs based on the communication from CPCB under section 18(1)(b) to set-up STPs to tackle the untreated sewage generated in their area/town."

16. The National Water Policy, 2012 contains several recommendations for conservation, development and management of water resources in the country. However, the recommendations are yet to be implemented. The Committee are of the view that merely impressing upon the States/UTs to formulate their own State water policies will not serve the purpose unless and until the Government at the Centre pursues the same diligently and regularly. Further, the Committee are constrained to note that the National Water Board has not yet prepared any action plan for regular monitoring of the National Water Policy. Instead, the Ministry has only reported about the following States which have formulated State Water policies in pursuance of National Water Policy, 1987 and 2002 : *Andhra Pradesh (2008), Goa (2000), Jharkhand (2011), Kerala (2008), Maharashtra (2003), Rajasthan (2010), Tamil Nadu (2004), Himachal Pradesh (2005), Karnataka (2002), Madhya Pradesh (2003), Odisha (2007), Sikkim (2009) and Uttar Pradesh (1999).*

17. The Committee feel that the large number of States not formulating their State level Water policies in coherence with the National Water Policy defeats the objectives and vision of the National Water Policy 2012; let alone the aspect of regular monitoring. The Committee also note that the submission of the Ministry is vague, which does not highlight the policies and standards that have been reviewed. Also, the time frame for such review are reported in a abstract way. The Committee, therefore, impress upon the Ministry of Jal Shakti to submit a detailed statement showing the policies that have been reviewed with the details of time



along with publicly disclosed findings. Upon noticing the lack of submission of information pertaining to the proposals rolled out in the Road Map pertaining to policy framework, the Committee desire to know the extent of work carried out, if any, in the process of implementing the proposals. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the timelines prescribed for these proposals.

### Delay in the restart of Project “Neem”

#### (Recommendation Para No. 13)

18. The Committee in their original Report *inter alia* recommended as under :

"....Taking in view that the MoEF had neither developed Water Quality Goals for each river/lake nor established any enforceable water quality standards especially for agricultural run offs, which is one of the biggest non-point sources of pollution, the Committee recommend that:

- (i) Enforceable water quality standards for rivers/lakes/groundwater be fixed with deterrent penalty provisions for violations thereof in consultation with Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources so that clear and specific standards are laid down for pollutants such as nitrogen/phosphorus/ pesticides/ fertilizers, etc;
- (ii) Vigorous and sustained efforts be made for educating/sensitizing the farmers for sustainable use of bio fertilizers/manures and Integrated Pest Management to prevent and control deleterious agricultural runoffs due to use of chemical fertilizers/pesticides constituting a major pollutant of water bodies especially the groundwater;

- (iii) Linkages be set up/strengthened amongst institutions especially Ministry of H&FW and CPCB/MoEF/CGWB/SPCBs so that real time data collected on water quality monitoring may be shared instantaneously for immediate concurrent action by concerned agencies especially those having high risks to human health such as outbreak of water borne diseases, etc; and
- (iv) The project 'Neem' which had been closed mid way may be restarted so as to harness India's rich biodiversity and to give impetus to environment friendly agricultural practices."

19. The Ministry in their Action Taken Notes have *inter alia* stated as under:-

"CPCB has informed that the assessment of water quality with respect to fertilizers pesticides contribution is already covered in the protocol of monitoring which covers nitrogen, phosphorus, pesticides and fertilizers. The strengthening of monitoring to assess the micro pollutants on regular basis is envisaged....MoWR, RD&GR has informed that under the NGRBA program there is a real time water quality monitoring stations to be implemented by CPCB at 113 locations along the main stem of River Ganga and under the data purchase concept the linkages will be provided to access the data by other departments once the project is implemented. NGRBA cell has been created for implementation of projects.

In addition, Ground water chemical Quality Data is collected regularly in the form of Reports which are shared with various Central and State agencies. The Ground water level & quality data is available on Ground Water Information System, through a link available on [www.cgwb.gov.in](http://www.cgwb.gov.in) and at Water Resources Information System (WRIS) in public domain. In addition a MoU has been signed between CPCB & CGWB which *inter-alia* included sharing of data.

Ministry of Agriculture has informed that Department of Agriculture & Cooperation is implementing scheme on Integrated Pest Management (IPM) with strategic and multi pronged approach to promote the optimum use of pesticides and sensitizing farmers by continuous feeding of research inputs on new IP & technologies. Efforts are also made to

ensure quality and reliable delivery of inputs by enforcing provisions made under Insecticides Act 1968 (IIA).

In addition, Plant Protection Division of Ministry of Agriculture is implementing a Scheme entitled "Strengthening and Modernization of Pest Management Approach in India" since 1991 to reduce the use of chemical pesticides in agriculture to reduce adverse effects of Chemical pesticides on quality of water and public health.... "

20. While vetting the said ATNs, the Audit made the following comments:-

"The project 'NEEM' has not been restarted. Other actions taken are still in pipeline."

21. In their further comments to the above said audit observations, the Ministry stated as under:

"Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Farmers Welfare have informed that in order to minimise to use of chemical pesticides and reduce the level of pollution, they are implementing a scheme with strategic and multi pronged approach to promote the optimum use of pesticides feeding of research inputs on new technologies. In addition, Plant Protection Division is implementing a scheme "Strengthening & Modernisation of Pest Management Approach of India" Since 1991 to reduce the use of chemical pesticides in agriculture to reduce adverse effects of chemical pesticides on quality of water and public health. As already brought out in reply of this Section, the activities undertaken in the scheme with latest update are reproduced:

- Conducting regular pest surveillance and monitoring to access pest/disease situation. So far up to December 2016, a total 268.66 lakh hectare area has been monitored.
- Rearing biological control agents for their use and conservation of naturally occurring bio-control agents. Up to December 2016, 52263.78 million bio-control agents have been released on field crops and 137.56 lakh hectares is conserved under conservation.
- Promotion of bio-pesticides and neem based pesticides as alternative to chemesticides. Farmers have been trained in HRD programmes to adopt bio-pesticides and neem bases pesticides instead of chemical pesticides.
- HRD in IPM by imparting training to master trainers, extension workers and farmers through Farmers Field Schools (FFS). Total 16868 nos. of FFS have been organised up to December, 2016 in which 58620 AEOs and 506040 farmers have been trained.
- Organising of FFSs through KVKs/SAUs/ICAR institutes to develop sufficient human resources.

- Under the HRD programmes, short duration courses of two days and five days for pesticides dealers/NGOs/Graduate/Pvt. Entrepreneurs and progressive farmers have been organised. Upto December, 2016 a total of 931 HRD trainings of two days and 102 nos of five days HRD training have been organised since 2006-07 in which 41320 farmers and 4060 AEOs/pesticide dealers/progressive farmers have been trained.
- Organisation of Season Long Training Programmes on major agriculture/Horticultural crops for extension workers of the State Government up to December 2016. 69 nos. of such training programmes have been organised under which 2760 master trainers have been trained.
- Popularisation of 'Grow Safe Food' campaign by placing hoardings and banners at prominent public places.
- Revised 87 nos. of IPM package of practices and uploaded on farmers portal and Directorate website in collaboration with NCIPM/NIPHM.
- Establishment of bio-control laboratories for production of bio-pesticides and bio-control agents. At present, 361 nos. of bio control labs are functioning in the country.

Further, advisories have been issued by the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare to all the States requesting them, inter-alia, to exhort extensive functionaries to sensitise farmers about non chemical alternatives to plant protection and judicious use of pesticides as per the approved leaflets."

22. **Under the project Neem, Government of India had mandated 100 percent Neem-coating of all urea sold in the country. Realising the multi-fold benefits of neem-coated urea on agricultural growth and consequent reduction in adverse effects of chemical pesticides on the quality of water, the Committee had recommended restarting project "Neem" which was stopped midway so as to give impetus to environment friendly agricultural practices. From the reply of the Ministry, the Committee note that the Plant Protection Divisions, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Farmers are promoting bio pesticides & neem based pesticides as an alternative to chemical pesticides. Yet, the Committee still feel that the promotion of neem coated urea is a necessity so as to do away with harmful effects of chemical pesticides. The Committee strongly feel that to achieve sustainable benefits from the use of eco-friendly neem-coated pesticides, it is imperative that a dedicated project like**

“Neem” is re-commenced with instead of taking piece-meal measures by the Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & farmer’ welfare.

23. The Committee appreciate the efforts of Department of Agriculture & Cooperation under whose HRD programme, short duration courses have been conducted for pesticides dealers/NGOs/graduate/Private Entrepreneurs but it would be more fulfilling on the part of the Department, if farmers are also made beneficiaries in these short duration courses as they are the ultimate/grass root beneficiaries implementing any project aimed at doing away with chemical fertilizers. Further, the Committee reiterate that the States have also to be taken along to consolidate efforts at the earliest so as to sensitise farmers about bio-pesticides. All possible efforts should be made to amalgamate Central & State level efforts. Details of the same may be reported to the Committee within six months of the presentation of this Report.

**Need for inclusion of Industrial pollution within the National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD)**

**(Recommendation Para No. 17)**

24. The Committee had in their original Report recommended as under:

"The Committee are surprised to find that neither the MoEF nor the States have introduced any accountability structure either to prevent pollution of ground water or address pollution from agricultural sources. Although CPCB has prepared a list of sources of pollution, MoEF has not created any specific programmes to prevent effluents entering the rivers. Worse, even the implementation of the NRCP and NLCP was flawed due to the lack of comprehensive survey to assess the amount of pollutants discharged into rivers and lakes. The Committee observe that such deficiencies in the finalization of projects without any scientific data on actual pollution load on water bodies have affected the performance of the programme in so far as abatement of pollution control is concerned. Weaknesses in control activities to ensure accountability of technical and financial aspects of projects as also unsatisfactory level of implementation of projects in the States reveals

itself with many projects delayed beyond the scheduled completion dates and 28 projects costing Rs. 251.27 crore constructed but not commissioned. The Committee also find that inclusion of rivers under NRCP was not based on their pollution levels with the result more polluted rivers were not selected for pollution control; the *state-wise* selection of rivers in NRCP was as symmetrical with more river stretches approved for selection from States like MP and TN though Maharashtra, Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh had more polluted rivers. Admittedly, States implementing the projects faced problems in land acquisition, getting requisite permissions, technical problems, problems from contractors, resistance from locals over proposals for construction of STPs, disputes over sites, inability to arrest sewage flow, non-availability of land, etc contributing to non-completion of projects resulting in poor implementation in many States. The gross ineffectiveness of NLCP in conservation and restoration of lakes is evident from the fact that only two of the projects out of 22 test checked, had been completed and rest had met time overrun or were abandoned. The Committee consider it rather untenable that the NRCD does not deal with cases of industrial pollution on the specious ground that the industrial pollution is dealt with by CPCB. The Committee therefore feel that it would be appropriate and more efficacious if industrial pollution is also brought within the remit of NRCD where they pollute the rivers."

25. The Ministry in their Action Taken Notes have stated as under:-

"Prevention and control of industrial pollution throughout the country is being addressed by the Central and State Pollution Control Boards/Pollution Control Committees. To control discharge of industrial effluents, CPCB and respective State Pollution Control Boards/Pollution Control Committees monitor industries with respect to effluents discharge standards and take action for non-compliance under the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, These activities are coordinated by the CP (Control of Pollution) Division of MoEF & CC to ensure uniform approach. NRCD is regularly interacting with CP Division and CPCB in cases where industrial pollution is polluting the rivers.

CPCB has set up an NGRBA Cell for tackling industrial pollution in Ganga river basin and are coordinating with NMCG, MoWR, RD&GR in this regard."

26. While vetting the said ATNs, the Audit made the following comments:-

"Industrial Pollution has not been brought within the remit of NRCD so far."

27. In their further comments to the above said audit observations, the Ministry stated as under:

“NRCD is an object oriented Directorate which provides financial assistance to States for supplementing their efforts in sewerage management for controlling pollution in rivers. The CP Division on the other hand takes steps for controlling industrial pollution in association with CPCB & SPCBs, including framing of standards from various specific industries. It may be submitted that both NRCD and CP Division work in harmony to address the issues of pollution in rivers, including industrial pollution.”

28. The Committee are constrained to note that no efforts have been made so far in bringing the subject of industrial pollution within the ambit of National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD). The Committee are not convinced with the Ministry's isolated contention that Central Pollution Control Board CCP (B) has set up an NGRBA cell for tackling issues of industrial pollution in Ganga River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation Scheme/Programme. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation that industrial pollution related with rivers should be brought in the ambit of National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD). It seems irrational to assign the responsibility of managing industrial pollution relating to rivers to the Control of Pollution Division of Ministry of Environment Forests and Climate Change. As National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) has the mandate of conserving the rivers in the country at the national level, National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) should also address the issues related to the effect of industrial pollution on rivers. National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) should imbibe the objective of managing pollution through industrial effluents in its prime agenda including periodic review and assessment. The Committee strongly feel that with the agenda of managing industrial pollution in rivers, getting mandated in National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) will not only solve the issue but shall also get a strong pedestal for enforcement.

29. The Committee take cognizance of the fact that both National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) and CP Divisions work in harmony to address the issues of pollution in rivers, including water pollution. However, a consolidated approach of NRC shall strengthen

the spirit and bear great results in times to come. A consolidated approach of managing pollution in river basins through National River Conservation Directorate (NRCD) shall supplement the ongoing efforts and if any of the powers is over lapping with the Control Pollution Division, it shall not only dilute the approach but shall also leverage the stream of activities for proposals and approval.

---