

11

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004-2005)**

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

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

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2005-2006)**

ELEVENTH REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

ELEVENTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004-2005)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLY)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2005-2006)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 20.4.2005

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 20.4.2005



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2005/Chaitra, 1927 (Saka)

C.R.D. No. 014

Price : Rs. 40.00

© 2005 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eleventh Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, New Delhi-110 005.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
ABBREVIATIONS	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)
REPORT	
CHAPTER I Introductory	1
CHAPTER II Analysis of drinking water scenario in rural areas in the country in the context of accessibilities and availability with special reference to ARWSP and Swajaldhara	3
CHAPTER III Quality of Drinking Water	26
CHAPTER IV Water Management and Sustainability of the Water Source	31
CHAPTER V School coverage : Drinking Water Scenario	38
CHAPTER VI Rural Sanitation	41
APPENDICES	
I. Statement indicating proposed allocation, BE, RE and Actual expenditure during 9th and 10th Plan	50
II. State-wise coverage of habitations under Drinking Water Supply Schemes	52
III. Concerns expressed by the Committee on replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara (Recommendation Para 2.60 of 1st Report of the Committee—14th Lok Sabha)	54
IV. State-wise Releases and expenditure under CRSP(TSC) during 2003-2004	57
V. State-wise Releases and expenditure under CRSP(TSC) during 2004-2005	59
VI. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 4 April, 2005	61
VII. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 18 April, 2005	64
VIII. Statement of observations/recommendations ...	66

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

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

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

(iv)

Rajya Sabha

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

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary | — | <i>Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri V.K. Sharma | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 4. Shri A.K. Shah | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

* Vice Shri Keshubhai S. Patel ceased to be a member of the Committee *w.e.f.* 22 March, 2005 consequent upon his resignation from the membership of Standing Committee on Rural Development.

@ Vice Shri Stephen Marandi ceased to be a member of Rajya sabha *w.e.f.* 16 March, 2005 consequent upon his election to the Jharkhand Legislative Assembly *vide* Rajya Sabha Secretariat notification No. RS. 10/2005-T, dated 11 April, 2005.

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 Organisation
NHRDP	—	National Human Resource Development Programme
O&M	—	Operation and Maintenance
PC	—	Partially Covered
PRIs	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	—	Revised Estimates
SWSM	—	State Water Sanitation Management
TSC	—	Total Sanitation Campaign
UNICEF	—	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UT	—	Union Territory

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2004-2005) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Eleventh Report on Demands for Grants (2005-06) 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 4 April, 2005.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 18 April, 2005.

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 to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
18 April, 2005

28 Chaitra, 1927 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

REPORT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

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

1.2 The Department of Drinking Water Supply was created in October 1999 to focus attention on the goal of providing safe drinking water to all the rural villages in the next five years, as contained in the National Agenda for Governance of the Government of India (1999). The Tenth Plan accorded the highest priority to provide the 'Not Covered'(NC) habitations with sustainable and stipulated supply of drinking water. It was envisaged to cover all the rural habitations including those which might have been slipped back to NC/PC category by the end of the Tenth Plan. At present, the following Schemes are being implemented by the Department:

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

1.3 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry were laid in Parliament on 18 March, 2005.

1.4. The Demand for Grant of the Department was laid in the Parliament under Demand No. 81.

1.5 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for 2005-2006 is Rs. 4751.42 crore for both plan and non-plan.

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

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF DRINKING WATER SCENARIO IN RURAL AREAS IN THE COUNTRY IN THE CONTEXT OF ACCESSIBILITY AND AVAILABILITY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ARWSP AND SWAJALDHARA

Analysis of the outlay provided for drinking water under ARWSP during 9th and 10th Plans

The Department of Drinking Water Supply supplements the efforts of the State Governments in providing drinking water and sanitation facilities in the rural habitations by rendering financial assistance under Centrally Sponsored Schemes. There are two sectors under the jurisdiction of the Department *viz.* Drinking Water and Sanitation.

Evolution of drinking water schemes under Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM).

2.2 As per the reply of the Government, a national water supply and sanitation programme was introduced in the social sector in the year 1954. The Government of India provided assistance to the States to establish special investigation divisions in the Fourth Five Year Plan to carry out identification of the problem villages. Taking into account the magnitude of the problem and to accelerate the pace of coverage of problem villages, the Government of India introduced the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) in 1972-73 to assist the States and the Union territories with 100 per cent grants-in-aid to implement the schemes in such villages. This programme continued till 1973-74. But with the introduction of the Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) during the Fifth Five Year Plan (from 1974-75), ARWSP was withdrawn. The programme was, however, reintroduced in 1977-78 in which the progress of supply of safe drinking water to identified problem villages under the MNP was not adequately focussed.

2.3 The entire programme was given a mission approach when the Technology Mission on Drinking Water Management, called the National Drinking Water Mission (NDWM) was introduced as one of the five missions in 1986. The NDWM was renamed as Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM) in 1991.

2.4 The Technology Mission on drinking water was set up with the primary objective of improving the performance and cost effectiveness of the ongoing programmes in the field of rural drinking water supply so as to ensure the availability of an adequate quantity of drinking water of acceptable quality and to ensure sustained availability of such water on a long term basis. This was to be achieved by providing low cost but practical and effective solutions to identified problems, associated with the supply of safe drinking water in rural areas, through the application of all available scientific and technological inputs from various national laboratories and by promoting better water management. The Mission is now functioning as a Department of Government of India, namely, Department of Drinking Water Supply, in Ministry of Rural Development since the year 1999.

2.5 The RGNDWM is presently implementing two centrally sponsored programmes, namely, Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) and Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP). The functions of the RGNDWM are briefly as under :—

- (a) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) for supplementing State Governments efforts in providing access to safe drinking water to all rural habitations in the country;
- (b) Sector Reform/Swajaldhara: up to 20 per cent of annual ARWSP allocation is earmarked for institutionalizing community participation in Rural Water Supply Programme. Sector Reform Projects were implemented initially in 67 districts on the basis of community participation to the extent of 10 per cent of the capital cost and shouldering entire O&M responsibility by the community. Sector Reform Project approach was scaled up throughout the country as Swajaldhara in December, 2002 so that the reform projects can be taken up in any district of the country within the overall ceiling of 20 per cent of ARWSP funds;
- (c) Sub-Mission : Five Sub-Missions on problems of water quality and water conservation have been set up. Before 1 April, 1998, projects under sub-missions were sanctioned centrally by RGNDWM and implemented by State Governments. Since then, powers have been delegated to State Governments to sanction projects under sub-mission;
- (d) Human Resources Development: for creating trained manpower at various levels (including Panchayat functionaries at grass roots levels);

- (e) Research and Development : in various priority areas of source finding, technology development/application, preparation of hydrogeomorphological maps, solar photovoltaic deep well water pumping systems etc.;
- (f) MIS: Development of software for monitoring the data/programme at different levels;
- (g) Provision of water supply in rural schools not covered by the Ministry of Human Resource Development;
- (h) IEC- Awareness campaign, sensitization of community and various agencies involved in implementation of rural water supply/Rural Sanitation programme under RGNDWM;
- (i) Extending financial and technical support to Monitoring and Investigation Units in States to identify problem villages, purchase of drilling rigs by States; and
- (j) Monitoring and Evaluation activities.

2.6 Overall Position of outlay provided for Drinking Water Supply in rural areas

The Statement indicating proposed allocation, BE, RE and Actual Expenditure during 9th and 10th Plan is at Appendix-I.

	(Rs. in crore)
9th Plan outlay proposed	8563.95
9th Plan outlay provided/released	8454.56
10th Plan outlay proposed	24800
Allocation	13245
Outlay released as on 3.3.2005	7275.19
B.E. 2003-2004	2585
R.E. 2003-2004	2565
Actual Expenditure 2003-2004	256.90
Proposed BE during 2004-2005	3142
B.E. 2004-2005	*2900
Actual Expenditure 2004-2005	2609.59
B.E. 2005-2006	4050

*Original BE was Rs. 2900 crore and Rs. 248 crore was additionally provided through Supplementary Grants. However the RE was kept at the level of original BE i.e. Rs. 2900 crore.

2.7 The activity-wise details of the assessed outlay of Rs.24,800 crore as Central share for the Rural Water Supply for Tenth Plan provided are as under:

1.	Coverage of rural habitations	12,300
2.	Sector Reforms—community participation in Rural Water Supply Programme and related policy issues, Sustainability of systems and sources, Role of PRIs and NGOs, Restructuring and Re-orientation of the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission	2,000
	Water Quality, Sub-Missions including that on Sustainability, Research and Development, Technology and Integrated Water Resource Management.	10,000
	Other activities like Human Resource Development (HRD), Information, Education and Communication (IEC), Management Information System (MIS), Monitoring and Evaluation, Fresh habitation Survey and Validation of Data.	500

2.8 Further substantiating the details of the requirement of proposed outlay of the Department for Drinking Water Sector, the Department has added as under:

“In the rural drinking water sector, the Department has planned to cover all rural habitations, cover all rural schools and tackle the water quality. The total amount assessed for this purpose is Rs. 26,000 crore. In regard to coverage of rural habitations, assessment has been made based on the assessment of the Tenth Plan working group. For School coverage and water quality, the assessment is based on the concept papers prepared for the purpose. In the rural sanitation Sector the assessment of Rs. 5,950 crore made for accelerating sanitation coverage is based on the concept paper prepared for the purpose.”

The assessment of outlay by the Department based on the National Common Minimum Programme of the Government

2.9 The National Common Minimum Programme of the Government has envisaged provision of safe drinking water to all. As

per the Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) prepared on the basis of information furnished by the State Governments, the objective could be achieved subject to availability of funds. The Department has assessed the requirement of Rs. 31,950 crore for the next five years and projections in this regard have been made to Planning Commission.

2.10 When asked how the Department proposes to fill the gap between the projected outlay and outlay as provided by the Planning Commission, the Department has informed that the gap is proposed to be filled through enhanced budgetary and extra budgetary support.

2.11 As regards the assistance provided by World Bank, the following information was provided:

“Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Projects for the States of Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra have been sanctioned by the World Bank loan component which is US \$ 398.10 million and the balance fund is provided by the respective State Governments.

The Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Government of India is the nodal agency, which reviews the physical and financial status of the projects from time to time. The Department of Drinking Water Supply's role is to provide technical sanction to the project to ensure adherence to the policy/guidelines of this Department. However, based on the Review Mission report sent by the World Bank, the percentage of assistance utilised so far for the three Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Projects sanctioned by the World Bank is as follows:

- i. Kerala Rural Water Supplies and Environmental Sanitation Project:

As per the World Bank's Review Mission report of December, 2004, the amount disbursed under the project is 38 per cent of the project cost.

- ii. Karnataka Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project: The First Karnataka Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project taken up during 1993-2000, is already completed.

As per the World Bank's Review Mission report of September, 2004, the amount disbursed under the project is 10 per cent of the project cost.

iii. Maharashtra Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project:

The First Maharashtra Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project taken up during 1991-1998, is already completed.

As per the World Bank's Review Mission report of March, 2004, the amount disbursed under the project is 3.3 per cent of the project cost.

2.12 At present the following three Rural Water Supply & Sanitation Projects have been sanctioned by the World Bank:

I. Kerala Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project :

The approved project cost is US\$ 89.8 million and the IDA loan amount for the project would be US \$ 65.5 million. The project will benefit 15 lakh populations in 10 districts. The project started in January 2001 and is expected to be completed by the December 2006.

II. Second Karnataka Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project :

The project cost is US\$ 193.44 million and the IDA loan amount to the project is to the tune of US\$ 151.6 million (approx. 78 per cent). The project will benefit about 40 lakh population in 1688 villages in 11 districts. The project started in February 2002 is expected to be completed by the year December 2007.

III. Second Maharashtra Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation Project :

The project cost is US\$ 268.65 million and the IDA loan amount is US\$ 181 million. The project will cover 2800 village Panchayats and will benefit about 75 lakh population in 26 districts. The project started in October 2003 and *i.e.* expected to be completed by September, 2009.

2.13 The Department had Water and Sanitation Programme – South Asia (WSP-SA). World Bank was asked to prepare a model document on implementation of water supply projects through public-private partnership in the context of successfully operative models of public-

private partnership in rural drinking water sector in different countries/ States. WSP-SA has prepared an approach paper on public-private partnership.

2.14 When asked about the name of State & Union territories which have incorporated policy framework for public and private partnership, the Department has informed that initially it is proposed to analyse the public and private partnership in the following States:

- (i) Uttaranchal (Swajal)
- (ii) Uttar Pradesh (Swajal)
- (iii) Maharashtra (Jal Swarajya)
- (iv) Karnataka (KRWSSA), and
- (v) West Bengal (Sanitation).

2.15 The Committee note from the data furnished by the Department that during Tenth Plan, the allocation made for drinking water is Rs.13,245 crore against the proposed outlay of the Department amounting to Rs.24,800 crore. The Department has later projected outlay of Rs.26,000 crore. Thus almost half of what was proposed for Tenth Plan has been made available for the Department. Further during the first four years of Tenth Plan upto 2005-2006, Rs.7275.19 crore could be allocated. Thus Rs.5,969.81 crore is the balance amount. Besides, the Committee find that to achieve the target envisaged in the National Common Minimum Programme of the Government the requirement of outlay for the next five years has been assessed as Rs.31,950 crore. As regards the releases from the Department, the data indicate 100 per cent achievement. State-wise allocation and spending position has been reviewed in the subsequent part of the report.

The Committee find from the information provided by the Department that the gap between the projected outlay and the existing allocation is to be filled through enhanced budgetary and extra budgetary support. For the said purpose three projects in Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra with World Bank loan component of US \$ 398.10 million were taken up. Out of these two projects have been completed. Further three more projects in the said States are being taken up with World Bank assistance. Another method suggested is taking up the projects on private-public partnership. The Department has proposed to analyse the private-public partnership in five States

namely Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka and West Bengal.

In the aforesaid scenario the Committee conclude that resource constraint is the major challenge for achieving the laudable targets set by the Government. Even the proposed extra budgetary support is not to the required level. The Committee note that drinking water is the fundamental need for the survival of life in the world. As such, it needs top most priority. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend the following:

- (i) Central allocation for drinking water should further be augmented. There cannot be any compromise on the issue of drinking water. The Government should provide the requisite outlay to achieve the set objective;
- (ii) There is enough scope for getting loans from the World Bank and other international institutions/organisations etc. Efforts should be made in this regard and more projects in the remaining States should be taken up; and
- (iii) The proposal for private-public partnership should be analysed expeditiously and the Committee be apprised of the outcome of such analysis in the aforesaid five States.

The position of fully covered (FC), Not Covered (NC), Partially Covered (PC) and slipped back habitations

2.16 The status of coverage of habitations as reported by the Department is as follows:

Not covered	5,368
Partially covered	60,884
Fully covered	13,56,031
Un inhabited/Migrated	381
Total	14,22,664
Coverage of habitation Plan-wise	
Eighth Plan	3,39,705
Ninth Plan	4,17,951
Tenth Plan (till 25.3.2005)	1,14,577

The position of coverage last year 2004-2005

Not covered	6,782
Partially covered	73,273 (refer para 2.6 of 1st Report – 14th Lok Sabha of the Committee 2004-2005)
Fully covered	13,42,238
Coverage during the period 2004-2005 to 2005-2006	
Not covered	1414
Partially covered	12,389

2.17 The Secretary during the course of oral evidence while explaining the achievement of the Department in this regard stated as under:

“Though there are still as much as 38,000 habitations left to be covered. The fact is that we have covered about 95 per cent of all the habitations in the country in the last 50 years. Further as per the data indicated by the Department more than Rs. 48,000 crore have been invested since independence by the Central and State Governments and 37 lakh hand pumps, 1,45,000 piped water supply schemes have been installed.”

State-wise coverage of habitations

2.18 The position of State-wise coverage has been indicated in *Appendix-II*.

2.19 As per the coverage status reported by the States based on Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) 1999, 11 States and 3 Union territories have no NC/PC habitations. Such States include Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Daman & Diu and Delhi.

The coverage of NC/PC habitations year-wise

2.20 The year-wise coverage of habitations since Eighth Plan is as under:—

Year	habitations covered
1	2
1992-93	34,360
1993-94	41,488

1	2
1994-95	70,934
1995-96	93,272
1996-97	99,651
Total Eighth Plan	3,39,705
1997-98	1,16,994
1998-99	1,12,933
1999-00	74,636
2000-01	68,648
2001-02	44,740
Total Ninth Plan	4,17,951
2002-03	39,250
2003-04	39,736
2004-05 (as reports received upto 25.3.2005)	35,591
Total 10th Plan (upto 25.3.2005)	1,14,577

2.21 When asked about the practical difficulties being encountered State-wise in coverage of NC/PC habitations, a routine reply was given stating that the difficult and geographical terrain, adverse climatic conditions, non-availability of safe source within a reasonable distance, drinking quality problem etc. were the constraints in covering NC/PC habitations.

2.22 While examining Demands for Grants of previous year, the number of uninhabited/migrated habitations was stated to be as low as 371, which in this year has been indicated as 381. Besides, the coverage of habitations during 9th Plan was indicated as 4,28,774 (refer para 2.9 of the 1st Report 14th Lok Sabha). This year the said data has been stated as 4,17,951.

2.23 Explaining the discrepancies the Department has furnished the following information:

“While examining Demands for Grants 2004-2005, the figures for the 9th Plan coverage was given as 4,17,950 as per the following year-wise detail:

Year	Habitations covered
1997-1998	1,16,994
1998-1999	1,12,933
1999-2000	74,636
2000-2001	68,648
2001-2002	44,739
Total Ninth Plan	4,17,950

It would be seen that total number of habitations covered was 4,17,950. This would be evident from reply of the question No.11 of 2004-2005 (para 14 of the Booklet) reproduced in para 2.10 of 1st report. However, there seems to be some typographical error in the total which is shown as 4,28,774 in Para 2.9 of the 1st Report 14th Lok Sabha.

Further, this year, the figure quoted is 4,17,951. This is because during 2001-2002, the coverage indicated was 44,739. Subsequently, Lakshadweep reported coverage of one PC in the month of March, 2002. This information was received in the Department on 16 August, 2004. Hence, the coverage for 2001-2002 increased to 44,740. The total coverage therefore, increased by one habitation, thus increasing the figure from 4,17,950 to 4,17,951.”

2.24 The Budget Speech of Finance Minister last year indicated that 75,000 habitations are to be provided with adequate drinking water facilities. According to the Finance Minister’s Budget Speech (2005-2006), 74,000 habitations are not covered with drinking water facilities. This implies that only 1,000 not covered habitations could be covered with drinking water facilities between the presentation of last year’s and this year’s Budget, despite remarkable amount earmarked for this sector.

2.25 The Department while clarifying the position in this regard furnished the following information:

“As per the Finance Minister’s Budget Speech in July, 2004, more than 75,000 habitations were to be provided with drinking water facilities. The number of uncovered villages is not a static figure and goes on decreasing as State Governments report coverage status periodically. The Finance Minister had also mentioned in the Budget Speech 2005 that during the current year, so far, 31,355 uncovered rural habitations had been provided with drinking water facilities. Therefore, it cannot be inferred that only 1000 habitations were actually covered during the period of approximately 6 months between the two budget speeches.”

2.26 While this issue was raised during the course of oral evidence, the Secretary submitted as under:

“Certainly there is inconsistency in the numbers. It is absolutely apparent and there is no doubt about it.”

Ground Position

2.27 The Committee in their previous reports had observed that slippage of habitations is a major hurdle in the rural drinking water sector. Working Group set up for Tenth Plan on drinking water sector assessed slippage of approximately 2.8 lakh habitations. When asked about the basis of 2.8 lakh slipped back habitations, as worked out by Tenth Plan, the Committee have been informed that the Working Group assessed that about 20 per cent of the habitations would have fallen into the category of slippage in coverage. The Government had commissioned a survey to analyse the position with regard to slippage of habitations from Fully Covered (FC) to Partially Covered (PC) and Partially Covered to Not Covered (NC) categories. The habitation survey data has been received from 26 States and 3 Union territories. However, there were discrepancies in the survey data like improper categorization of habitations into NC, PC and FC; inclusion of habitations where no population resides; total of different categories of habitations *i.e.* NC, PC and FC not tallying with the total habitations of the State, etc. Survey results received from States/ Union territories are being validated by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). Therefore the picture will be clear only after revalidation of the habitations is completed. Further the Committee have been informed that IIPA has entered to an MoU with the Government on 6 December, 2004 to complete the validation in 14 months.

2.28 As regards the basis of making projections, the Committee have been informed that for the present, Department is making projections and planning on the basis of estimates of the Tenth Plan Working Group till the results of detailed survey are finalised. The Department has further indicated that at present, the data is based on balance NC/PC habitations of CAP, 1999. The slippage position will be taken into account after revalidation exercise is completed.

2.29 On the issue of having some sort of mechanism to revalidate the data of NC/PC habitations periodically, the Department has stated that the possibility of having slippage position on a regular intervals, preferably on a quarterly basis is being explored. The said issue was discussed with the State Governments in a conference-cum-workshop held on 23-24 November, 2004. Most of the States felt that assessing slippage on regular basis will amount to fresh habitation survey and the State Governments have no infrastructure for that.

2.30 The Committee for the last three years have been emphasizing the need to have the exact data of slippage of habitations. They note that in this direction a State-wise habitation survey was initiated and in 26 States the results have been made available. However there were some discrepancies in the data and the results are being revalidated by Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The Committee would like to be apprised of the final position with regard to slippage of habitations, after the revalidation is completed.

2.31 The Committee are constrained to note the handling of 'Not Covered' and 'Partially Covered' habitations by the Department. Although the Department admits that slippage of habitations is at a larger level and for that the Working Group for Tenth Plan has estimated 2.8 lakh slipped back habitations. The picture of slipped back habitations will be more clear when the final results of the aforesaid survey are made available. With the said state of affairs, the Department has continued to claim that the position of coverage of habitations in the country is 95 per cent. Not only that, States of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Daman and Diu and Delhi are stated to be the States/Union territories which have achieved 100 per cent coverage. The Committee disapprove the way a very bright picture as opposed to the ground position with regard to the availability of drinking water in the country is projected by the Department. The Committee strongly recommend that announcements regarding

achievements of the Department should be realistic and accurately presented in various Budget documents presented to the Parliament as well as submitted to the Parliamentary Committees.

2.32 The Committee are disturbed to find that the position of actual coverage of habitations reflects a sharp decline as compared to previous year. Equally disturbing is the fact that same routine reply stating that Not Covered (NC) habitations are in the difficult terrain is furnished by the Department every year. The Committee fail to understand the said reply of the Department in this age of technological advancement. They would like the Department to inform the Committee about the technology options explored to provide such difficult areas with drinking water. It should be ensured that the said difficult areas are covered within a stipulated time frame.

2.33 The Committee further find that there is utter confusion with regard to the data indicated regarding coverage of habitations. Two Budget Speeches of Finance Minister made during 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 reflect this position. The Finance Minister during 2004-2005 indicated the number of habitations to be covered as 75,000 and during 2005-2006 this data has been stated to be as 74,000 indicating achievement of only 1,000 habitations. The Department's data reflect the achievement of 35,591 habitations during 2004-2005. Even the Secretary has acknowledged the discrepancy in the data. The Committee find from the aforesaid position that perhaps there is a race for chasing data irrespective of the ground reality in this regard. The Committee are really disappointed to note such a situation and strongly recommend that the data presented by the Department should be realistic.

2.34 On the issue of periodical updation of data of slipped back habitations, the Committee note that the Department propose revalidation on a quarterly basis. The Committee find that revalidation is a detailed exercise and as such revalidation should be done on yearly basis. On the issue of the reservation of State Governments that they have no infrastructure in this regard, the Committee would like the Department to sort out the matter in consultation with the State Governments and the viable option of appointing some agency for the purpose and also for allocating outlay from the allocation of ARWSP should be explored. The details in this regard when finalised should be placed before the Committee for further review and comments.

State-wise utilisation of outlay during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 under ARWSP

Opening balance during 2003-2004

2.35 As per Performance Budget (2005-2006), 88.84 per cent is the expenditure position during 2003-2004. State-wise expenditure further indicates poor performance in the following States:

Gujarat	—	50.49 per cent
Manipur	—	76.22 per cent
Rajasthan	—	74.00 per cent
Tripura	—	26.26 per cent
Uttar Pradesh	—	59.67 per cent

2.36 Opening balance has been reported as Rs. 40,068 lakh. Total availability of funds in 2003-2004 has been reported as Rs. 2,96,509.10 lakh. The expenditure reported to the available funds is 66.03 per cent.

Opening Balance during 2004-2005

2.37 During 2004-2005, only the following States could utilise more than 70 per cent of available outlay.

Maharashtra	—	100 per cent
Manipur	—	100 per cent
Sikkim	—	72.89 per cent
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	—	100 per cent
Uttar Pradesh	—	93.88 per cent

2.38 During 2004-2005, the opening balance as on 24 February, 05 has been indicated as Rs. 39,834.37 lakh. Total availability of fund is reported as Rs. 2,77,361.83 lakh out of which expenditure reported is Rs. 1,06,710.92 lakh which means 38.47 per cent could actually be utilised.

2.39 When asked for the reasons for huge underspending, the Department has justified the same by stating that the unspent balance during 2004-2005 is lower than the unspent balance as on 1 April,

2003. It is significant to note that unspent balance during 2004-2005 is just 234.59 lakh lesser than the data indicated for the year 2003-2004.

2.40 Another noticeable fact is that during 2004-2005, percentage coverage as reported at page 15 of the Performance Budget 2005-2006 under ARWSP in Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Rajasthan and Sikkim is more than 100 per cent. In Goa, the achievement is 1300 per cent. In Kerala 152.65 per cent, in Orissa 2320 per cent, in Dadra and Nagar Haveli 203.45 per cent.

2.41 With regard to the issue of inflated physical achievement in some of the States, it has been stated by the Department that some States fix the targets on a very low scale so that these States could cover much more habitations.

2.42 While clarifying more with regard to performance of States the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted as under:

“...The capacity of the States to absorb and actually deliver as most of these programmes, what we have found these days is that, for example, in 2003-2004 we have given a target to cover 1,11,000 villages but the actual achievement was 39,736 villages. Similarly, in 2004-2005 the target was 74,868, but the achievement was 35,591 so absorption capacity of the State Governments may be one limitation.”

2.43 The Committee after analysing the position of the performance of States, note that whereas from the side of the Union Government, the spending is ensured almost 100 per cent as could be seen from the earlier part of the report, the State-wise performance is not so encouraging. Only 66.03 per cent of the total available funds could be utilised during 2003-2004, whereas during 2004-2005, 38.47 per cent is the utilisation position. The Committee note that the data during 2004-2005 may further increase with more States indicating physical achievement, but with the level of the achievement noted during 2003-2004, the performance is not so favourable.

Another disappointing fact is the lower absorption capacity of State Governments as indicated by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence. The Committee are really confused with the paradox of demanding more outlay without ensuring the absorption capacity of the State Governments. As noted earlier by the Committee, on the issue of drinking water, there is no scope for compromise. In

this situation the Department has to work on war footing. The issue of increasing the absorption capacity of State Governments and better performance on the drinking water sector should be taken up at the highest level so that a dialogue on this aspect could be held at various Chief Ministers conferences/ seminars. Further on the Department's part, the issue should be debated in various workshops/ seminars arranged where the officials of the State Governments represent so that the situation could be analysed State-wise and corrective action initiated thereon. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action initiated in this regard.

2.44 The Committee note that during 2004-2005, the unspent balances were to the tune of Rs.39,834.37 lakh against the said data of Rs.40,068.96 lakh during the previous year. It is significant to note that there is only improvement of Rs.234.59 lakh as compared to previous year. The Committee find that when the issue for huge unspent balances, was brought to the knowledge of the Department, instead of taking the desired action the Department has tried to justify the position by stating that unspent balances during 2004-2005 are lesser than 2003-2004. The Committee disapprove the aforesaid tendency on the part of the Department and feel that urgent and desired action should be taken in case of underspending of scarce resources.

2.45 The Committee are further constrained to note that while in some States physical achievement is less than 50 per cent, some States could achieve the inflated targets as high as upto 2,320 per cent in Orissa and 1,300 per cent in Goa. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Department that these States fix the targets on a very low scale whereas these States could cover much more habitations. The Committee find that there is gross mismatch between physical and financial achievements. Besides such a data reflect that there is some sort of confusion in reporting the data by the State Governments. The Committee strongly recommend the Department to have a critical and indepth analysis of the mechanism of reporting by State Governments and explain the position to the Committee so as to enable them to understand State specific performance in a better way and comment further in this regard.

2.46 Inter-State Allocation Criterion

Weightage	Percentage
Rural Population	40
States under DDP, DPAP, HADP & NC/PC	
Habitations (2:1)	35
Quality Affected Villages	10

Funding Pattern of ARWSP

ARWSP (Normal)	50:50 Central & State Govts.
ARWSP (DDP)	100 per cent by Central Govt.
Quality SM	75:25 Central & State Govts.
Swajaldhara	90:10 Central Govt. & community
Three Programmes announced by PM	90:10 Central Govt. & community

2.47 Under ARWSP, as regards financial distribution between Centre and the States, 15 per cent of funds can be utilised for O&M. The funding pattern for O&M is 50:50. 15 per cent of the annual allocation is for sub-mission on quality and 5 per cent for sustainability. Funding pattern for sub-mission is shared on 75:25 between Centre and States.

2.48 On simplification of funding pattern, the Department has stated that the different funding patterns have been assigned for different components of the programme so that adequate attention could be paid to all aspects of rural water supply sector. With regard to coverage, the main responsibility lies with the State Governments and therefore the funding pattern for this is 50:50. In their efforts for full coverage, the States are not able to provide adequate financial resources for quality and sustainability. So the funding pattern for this has been kept as 75:25, so as to ease the burden of the States.

2.49 The Committee find that different funding patterns have been adopted under the various components of ARWSP. Under ARWSP (Normal) 50:50 is the Central and State Government contribution, but in case of DDP, 100 per cent is the Central allocation. For quality and sustainability for which 15 per cent and 5 per cent of allocation respectively under ARWSP can be utilised, the Centre, State ratio is 75:25. For Swajaldhara for which 20 per cent of the outlay under ARWSP is earmarked, 90 per cent is the Central contribution and 10 per cent is the community contribution. While appreciating the fact that for quality and sustainability, States are being provided more Central funds, the Committee note that monitoring of such a complex inter-State allocation criterion is a difficult task. The Committee would like the Department to explain how the monitoring is being done so as to ensure that the specified State contribution and specified inter-scheme allocation is ensured for the specific purpose, to enable the Committee to come to some meaningful conclusion and comment further in this regard.

2.50 The Committee also note the water tight compartments for allocating resources for various components of ARWSP. For example for sustainability 5 per cent outlay is earmarked and for quality 15 per cent allocation can be used. 20 per cent of funds are earmarked for Swajaldhara. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to simplify the inter component allocation of ARWSP. The Department may examine the issue and apprise the Committee accordingly.

2.51 The Committee further note that under normal ARWSP, States are unable to contribute equal amount of what is allocated by the Central Government in a year. In this regard the Committee desire that the total outlay provided by the Union Government as well as State Governments so far may be furnished so as to enable the Committee to analyse the position of matching share by State Governments in a better way and comment further in this regard.

Special allocation for Tsunami affected area

2.52 The Tsunami affected States/Union territories include Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Pondicherry and Kerala. In Tsunami affected areas, the main job is for immediate restoration of drinking water supply Schemes. Based on the inter-Ministerial Group (IMG) recommendations, funds to an extent of Rs. 8.50 crore to Tamil Nadu, Rs. 1.75 crore for Kerala, Rs. 3 crore for Andhra Pradesh and Rs. 1 crore to Pondicherry have been released from the grants available under 'Natural calamities' head of ARWSP during 2004-05. In case of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, the CGWB have been authorized to purchase the desalination plants and other related equipment at an estimated cost of Rs. 5 crore. This was also made available from special provisions of ARWSP. Further, the IMG recommended additional assistance of Rs 15 crore for immediate restoration works in water supply schemes. These funds have also been released from special provisions of ARWSP. In addition to the above, Central Teams and the IMG have also recommended for additional assistance from the provisions of NCCF.

2.53 The Committee appreciate that special allocation as indicated in the aforesaid para has been made for Tsunami affected States *viz.* Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Pondichery and Kerala. The Committee call for strict monitoring so as to ensure that the allocation earmarked for Tsunami affected areas is utilised for the intended objective *i.e.* restoration of water supply to such areas.

Replacing Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) by Swajaldhara

2.54 At present, 20 per cent of annual allocation under ARWSP can be spent on demand driven programmes and community participation schemes under the sector reform projects and Swajaldhara. Under Swajaldhara 10 per cent is the community contribution. When asked about the policy of the Government with regard to ARWSP *vis-a-vis* Swajaldhara, the Department has clarified that after all the rural habitations are covered with the existing norms, it would be possible to take up relaxed norms broadly on the present day Swajaldhara principle.

2.55 Under ARWSP Guidelines, the norms may be relaxed to provide for 55 ltrs. per capita per day with a source within 0.5 km. in the plains and 50 metres elevation in the hills after the coverage of all Not Covered(NC)/Partially Covered(PC) rural habitations in that State is achieved, as per the existing norms of 40 litres per capita per day. It includes slipped back habitations. The Tenth Plan envisages consolidation of coverage by end of the Plan period (2006-07) and once the backlog of coverage of all habitations of CAP 1999 Survey and slippages upto habitation survey 2003 are covered, there would be a steady state in which coverage with relaxed norms, as well as the annual slippages, can be attended to.

2.56 When asked as to whether, there was any flexibility of allocation of more than 20 per cent of outlay, if more projects are demanded by State Governments, the Department has replied that at present there is no flexibility.

2.57 The Department has further informed that the EFC Memo has been initiated for necessary plans and changes to facilitate phased extension of reform principles to ARWSP from the beginning of the Eleventh Plan and to seek flexibilities in the transition phase, to adjust the ARWSP (normal) and ARWSP (Swajaldhara) funds as per the demand received from States by revising existing guidelines of 20 per cent of annual ARWSP allocation on ARWSP (Swajaldhara) plan.

2.58 About the policy of the Government in such districts where it is difficult for the community to contribute even 10 per cent of the funds under drinking water projects, the Department has replied that Swajaldhara guidelines have recently been amended to reduce proportion of cash contribution from 5 per cent to 2.5 per cent, in case of Scheduled Tribe/ Scheduled Caste habitations. The remaining

7.5 per cent contribution will be in kind (labour, material etc.). When asked as to whether the Government propose some sort of relaxation in guidelines thereby waiving 10 per cent community contribution in most backward and tribal districts the Department has again indicated the aforesaid special provision for SC/ST.

2.59 As regards the performance of Swajaldhara during 2002-2003, 4,732 schemes were taken up out of which 1,102 schemes have been completed. During 2003-2004, 3,791 schemes have been taken up and 1,145 schemes could be completed. During 2004-2005, the number of schemes taken up was 2,074 out of which only 6 schemes could be completed.

2.60 As regards the gestation period of Swajaldhara projects, as per guidelines issued, the projects under Swajaldhara follow a scheme of cycle of about 36 months consisting of four distinct phases, viz. (a) Start up phase, (b) Sensitization and Identification Phase, (c) Training, and (d) Scheme/System Planning and a post project completion phase. For small schemes taken up in a single Gram Panchayat under Swajaldhara, the duration of scheme cycle could be between 12-18 months. The incomplete schemes of 2002-03, though seem to have not been completed within the stipulated period on account of the fact that the funds for these schemes were released late and the States had to devote some time for IEC activities to gear up the work, practically speaking none of the scheme could be considered as late.

2.61 The Department has further informed that in order to institutionalize the reform initiative, Swajaldhara guidelines issued in June 2003, provide for a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Government of India and the State Government and future funding to be contingent upon signing of the MoU. The draft MoU prepared by Department was circulated to all States in November 2003. The following steps are involved in the MoU process as per details given below:—

- (i) Conducting Sector Status Study of the State,
- (ii) Preparation of Terms of Reference,
- (iii) Hiring of Consultant/Agency by the State Government,
- (iv) Finalisation of Sector Status Study,
- (v) Preparation of State Vision Statement

- (vi) Preparation of comprehensive Water & Sanitation Policy by the State Government,
- (vii) Preparation of Agreed Action Framework and signing of the MoU with the Government of India,
- (viii) Monitoring of the MoU process.

2.62 The Department has prepared and circulated the terms of reference of the proposed Sector Status Study to all the three States and all States have initiated action in respect of the Sector Status Study, which is to be conducted for the State. Detailed interactions with these States have been completed on the Sector Status Study submitted by them. As on date, no MoU was signed with any State.

2.63 The Committee understand that at present 20 per cent of annual allocation under ARWSP can be spent on demand driven Swajaldhara for which 10 per cent of the outlay has to be contributed by the community. They also note that as per the existing position there is no flexibility of allocation of more than 20 per cent of outlay if more projects are demanded by State Governments. So far as the issue of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara is concerned, the Committee find that the Department has already initiated the necessary plans and changes to facilitate phased extension of reform proposals to ARWSP from the beginning of the Eleventh Plan.

The Committee would like to add here that since Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme, the better performing States would only be able to take the benefit of the scheme. Thus the less performing States would be deprived of the Central allocation.

2.64 The Committee note that the performance of Swajaldhara is not very encouraging. The number of projects taken under Swajaldhara which was 4,723 during 2002-2003 has further declined to 3,791 during 2003-2004. During 2004-2005, the position is further worse. Only 2,074 schemes could be taken up. The number of completed schemes has also declined. During 2002-2003, 1,102 schemes were completed. The number increased to 1,145 during 2003-2004 but declined considerably during 2004-2005 to only 6 schemes. To understand more about the implementation of the scheme, the Committee would like to be apprised of the cumulative data of number of projects taken up so far, habitations/population benefited, expenditure incurred, projects completed etc.

2.65 The Committee in their earlier report (para No. 2.60 of 1st Report-14th Lok Sabha) had examined the concept of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara and expressed serious concerns in this regard. The concerns expressed by the Committee have been given at Appendix-III. The Committee strongly recommend to review the position in this regard in the light of what has been stated above and the apprehensions expressed by the Committee. The Committee may be adequately explained about the position to enable them to analyse the not so encouraging performance of ARWSP as evaluated above.

2.66 The Committee note that recently Swajaldhara guidelines have been amended to reduce proportion of cash contribution from 5 per cent to 2.5 per cent in case of Scheduled Tribe/Scheduled Caste habitations. The remaining 7.5 per cent contribution can be in kind (labour, material etc). The Committee would like that the possibility of extending the facility of said relaxed norms should be explored in case of most backward districts in the country.

CHAPTER III

QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER

ARWSP guidelines provide for 15 per cent of the allocation for tackling quality problems. After 1 April, 1998, full powers have been delegated to the State Governments for sanctioning and supplementing sub-mission projects.

Extent of contamination of water

3.2 The survey carried out by the Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission in 1991 based on 1 per cent random sampling revealed that about 1.50 lakh habitations are affected by various quality problems, namely excess fluoride and arsenic. The subsequent updation of data (1999) received from the State Governments indicated the magnitude of the problem in terms of habitations affected as follows:—

Number of habitations affected with water quality problems

Quality problem	No. of affected habitations
Excess Fluoride	36,988
Excess Arsenic	3,136
Excess Salinity	32,597
Excess Iron	1,38,670
Excess Nitrate	4,003
Other reasons	1,400
Total	2,16,794

3.3 As per the survey ordered by Government of India in March 2000 and as reported by the State Governments, the worst affected States having drinking water quality problems in rural areas are West Bengal (65,156), Rajasthan (41,072), Orissa (32,254), Karnataka (21,008), Gujarat (8,717), Assam (8,119), Tripura (7,031), Tamil Nadu (5,574), Madhya Pradesh (5,381), Uttar Pradesh (5,062), Chattisgarh (5,021) and Andhra Pradesh (4,050).

3.4 The States affected with arsenic in drinking water include West Bengal, Bihar and Chhattisgarh. Worst affected States with fluoride in rural drinking water are Rajasthan, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh. States affected with excess nitrates in drinking water include Rajasthan, Karnataka and Gujarat. Excess iron in drinking water is found in 23 States, of which, West Bengal and Orissa are the worst affected.

3.5 As a prelude to working out an action plan for addressing the major water quality problems, a fresh survey is being undertaken to ascertain the exact magnitude of problem. State Governments were requested in 1999 to conduct a survey on two phases—1st phase required stratified random sampling of 10 per cent of sources in blocks, and in 2nd phase, 100 per cent survey of blocks found affected during survey in the first phase was to be undertaken. The data for the first phase is available from all States. However, not all States have done survey of 10 per cent sources in blocks, as stipulated. Only a few States have completed 2nd phase of survey.

3.6 The Department has further informed that it is now proposed to sanction sub-mission projects, centrally, for specific problem areas in needy States. A concept paper on Water quality and Sustainability has been prepared seeking additional funding of Rs. 13,000 crore (Rs. 10,000 crore as Central share and Rs. 3,000 crore as State share). Various guidelines and technical manuals have been prepared and circulated to States for assisting the States to identify solutions to water quality problems.

3.7 On the issue of supplementing the efforts of States in addressing the problem at a broader level, the Department has further stated that addressing the water quality problems involves identification of exact problem, quantification of magnitude of problem and devising appropriate mechanism for monitoring and surveillance of water quality. As the magnitude of testing water samples in the district water quality laboratories is a gigantic task, it has been decided to institutionalize community based water quality monitoring and surveillance programme by adoption of catchment area approach, wherein quality will be tested at the grass root level by the Panchayats/VWSC. It has also been decided to implement the programme in collaboration with the National Institute of Communicable Diseases, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare at the Centre and Department of Health to actively participate at all levels in disease and health surveillance activities and conducting joint sanitary surveys to facilitate the States in implementation of water

quality and sustainability programmes. Technical guidelines like Manual on Water Quality & Surveillance, Defluoridation Manual, Ground water prospect Maps based on hydro-geo-morphology, guidelines for sustainability, IEC, R&D, Executive guidelines for establishment of district water quality testing laboratories, SRP and Swajaldhara guidelines, and manual of rain water harvesting have been circulated to States. As the quality affected habitations did not reduce as per the surveys conducted in 1991 and 2000, it is now proposed to revive the sub-mission programme so that specific quality affected projects could be sanctioned centrally with a basic directive of extending the coverage.

3.8 While presenting the Budget for the year 2005-2006, the Union Finance Minister emphasised the need for tackling water quality problems in 2.16 lakh affected habitations of the country, apart from coverage of uncovered habitations.

Action Plans by State Governments

3.9 The Department has informed that State Governments have not furnished action plans for tackling water quality problems. Only Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan and West Bengal have furnished proposals which too did not contain action proposed to be taken in a phased manner.

National and State level water quality laboratories

3.10 As reported by the Department, Government of India has sanctioned 433 district water quality testing laboratories. An amount of Rs. 425.95 lakh has been disbursed by the Department for establishment of these district water quality testing laboratories since 1998-99.

3.11 The funding pattern for establishment of new district water quality testing laboratories, is as under:—

Non-recurring Cost	Rs. 1.00 lakh for building and Rs. 3.00 lakh for lab equipment
Recurring cost for Lab staff, chemicals/consumables, contingencies, etc.	On equal cost sharing of 50:50 by the Centre and the States for 5 years.

3.12 The Committee find from the data furnished by the Department that so far 2,16,794 habitations have been affected by various contaminants like fluoride, arsenic, salinity, iron, nitrate etc. The worst affected States having drinking water quality problems in rural areas are West Bengal, Bihar, Rajasthan, Orissa, Karnataka, Gujarat, Assam, Tripura, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Andhra Pradesh. The Committee further find that as per the existing position, 15 per cent of ARWSP funds can be utilised for taking care of quality problem. While analysing the Demands for Grants of previous year (refer Para 2.90 of 1st Report-14th Lok Sabha), the Committee were informed that the Department has proposed to enhance the earmarked outlay for water quality from 15 per cent to 30 per cent. The Committee further note that as per the estimates prepared by the Department, additional fund of Rs. 13,000 crore is required to tackle the problem of quality habitations in various States. The Committee conclude that the funds constraint is the major factor which needs to be tackled urgently. On the proposal of the Department to enhance and earmark funds up to 15 per cent to 30 per cent for quality under ARWSP funds, the Committee would like to hear from the Department about the exact position in this regard. The Committee further note that the Finance Minister while presenting the Budget 2005-06 emphasised on the issue of quality of drinking water in the affected habitations. The Committee hope that adequate outlay would be provided for in this regard and they be apprised accordingly.

3.13 The Committee further note that State Governments are not serious in tackling the issue of quality of drinking water which is evident from the fact that 1st phase of survey as initiated in 1999 which require stratified random sampling of 10 per cent of sources in blocks has not been completed so far by all States. With regard to 2nd phase involving coverage of 100 per cent survey of blocks, only a few States could complete the survey. Similar is the position with regard to action plans by the State Governments. Only Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan and West Bengal have furnished the proposals in this regard. The Committee feel that in this scenario, Union Government have to play a more pro active role in this regard. The State Governments will have to be motivated to address the problem of quality habitations on a priority basis. The Department should take the desired steps in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.

3.14 The Committee find that in order to address the water quality problems, it is essential to identify the exact problems besides ascertaining the magnitude of the problem. The Committee feel that if the water quality is tested correctly it will go a long way in dealing with the problem of contamination of drinking water. The Committee appreciate the position of the Government to institutionalise community based water quality monitoring and surveillance programme by adoption of catchment area project wherein quality will be tested at the grass roots level by the Panchayats/VWSC. The Committee also note that some efforts are being made to provide district level testing laboratories for which Rs. 425.95 lakh have been released by the Department. The Committee would like to know the physical performance of the funds released in this regard so far. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the funding pattern for water quality testing laboratories at the Panchayats/VWSC level.

CHAPTER IV

WATER MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY OF THE WATER SOURCE

Mode of source of water in rural areas

The Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted that the major issues faced by the Department of Drinking Water Supply pertain to the quality and sustainability of the sources. He also stated that 90 per cent of all drinking water is dependent on ground water and its quality is depending upon terrain through which a given ground water passes. He further informed the Committee that unless ground water resources are husbanded carefully, these sources may be threatened particularly during the summer and the lean months or those areas where unfortunately a severe drought is experienced.

4.2 As per the information furnished by the Department, at present 90 per cent of all drinking water is dependant on ground water. Approximately 37 lakh hand pumps and 1.45 lakh piped water supply schemes are in operation in the rural areas of the country.

Water Conservation

4.3 Clarifying on the issue of water conservation, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence submitted that very large programmes have been undertaken in this regard by the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources), Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Water Resources and Department of Drinking Water Supply too. In all these schemes the approach is to build the structure to conserve and increase the seepage of ground water and the sustenance in any given source of water.

Water harvesting

4.4 On the issue of water harvesting the Department has informed that the subject falls under the Ministry of Water Resources. However, being one of the users of water resources, the Department of Drinking Water Supply has initiated action and appointed an officer to the Working Group on sustainability of water sources.

4.5 So far as the efforts of the Department of Drinking Water Supply for rain-water harvesting are conserved, the Committee have been informed that a bankable scheme for extending financial assistance for household and community level rain water harvesting structures has been formulated in consultation with NABARD and circulated to State Governments for their comments. The said scheme is relevant to hilly areas, DDP, HADP, DPAP areas and North-Eastern States, where rainfall is in plenty and can not be stored and/or there is inadequacy of ground water sources. The response of the said scheme from the States has not been found encouraging. Only eight States have so far sent their comments and a majority of these States have intimated that subsidy level provided for the rain water harvesting structures should be enhanced.

Model Bill on protection and conservation of drinking water sources

4.6 The Department has informed that a model Bill prepared by the Department of Drinking Water Supply is pending with the Ministry of Water Resources for comments/vetting. The model Bill was also circulated to all States. No comments have been received from the State Governments.

Financial allocation of the Department for sustainability of sources

4.7 At present 5 per cent of ARWSP funds have been earmarked for tackling sustainability issues.

Involvement of NGOs/VOs for schemes on rain water harvesting and disseminating awareness

4.8 The Department has informed that manual on rain water harvesting and artificial recharge and has been circulated to all States which envisages active involvement of NGOs and VOs on schemes for rain water harvesting.

Dual policy for drinking water and other purposes

4.9 The guidelines of ARWSP provide that dual water policy may be adopted for rural habitations facing acute water quality problems. In these habitations even if water is provided upto 10 lpcd, which would be sufficient for drinking water and cooking purposes, it may be considered as a habitation with a safe source of drinking water, for other activities like washing, ablution etc. water available from the unsafe sources can be utilised without any problem. When asked,

whether any direction/guidance has been issued to States/Union territories for treating the used water and then supplying again for other than drinking water purposes the Department has informed that no such directions have been issued.

4.10 The Committee find from what has been stated above that the sustainability of system itself is dependent of sustainability of sources. Another noticeable issue is that 90 per cent of all drinking water is dependent on ground water sources. The ground water is depleting fast which may be the main reason for slippage of FC and PC habitations to NC habitations the details of which have been given in the previous chapter of the Report. In this scenario, the Committee conclude that the major challenge that the Department may have to face in the coming years is the sustainability of sources.

4.11 The Committee further note that although the Department accepts the magnitude of the problem relating to sustainability of water sources, substantial efforts have not been made in this regard. Only 5 per cent of the funds under ARWSP could be used for water sustainability. The issue of water tight compartments for different components under ARWSP has been dealt with in the previous part of the report. Here the Committee would like to recommend to the Government to give more thrust on sustainability and the allocation for the purpose should be enhanced. There is an urgent need to enhance the allocation for sustainability since the issue of slippage of habitations can only be tackled by handling this issue. The Department would be able to achieve the objective of full coverage of habitations only when the problems of sustainability is properly handled. The Committee would like the Department to take earnest action in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

4.12 The Committee further find that efforts are being made in different directions by several Ministries of the Union Government like the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources and Drinking Water Supply), Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Agriculture etc. Similarly the problem is being tackled by the State Governments under their own schemes. There is an urgent need to coordinate the efforts being made on the issue of sustainability as well as water conservation. There should be some sort of coordinating mechanism through which efforts made in the separate directions can be coordinated so that the issue may be tackled more effectively. More so, there is also an urgent need to coordinate the schemes being implemented by the State Governments

at the field level. All these coordinating mechanisms would not only help in coordinating the efforts made in different directions, but would also help in having a clear idea of the magnitude of the problem which may be the basic input for the future planning. The Committee would like the Department to duly communicate to the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission and Ministry of Water Resources the nodal Ministry for water conservation, the concerns of the Committee in this regard. Besides, this issue needs to be appropriately raised during various interactions, conferences, seminars etc. The Committee may also be kept apprised about the outcome of such interactions.

4.13 The Committee further note that around 90 per cent of drinking water is dependant on ground water and there is an urgent need to discourage water schemes dependent on ground water. More stress needs to be given on the use of surface water and to water harvesting. The Committee find that the Department has proposed a bankable scheme for extending financial assistance for household and community level rain water harvesting structures. The said scheme has been formulated in consultation with NABARD and circulated to the State Governments for the purpose. The Committee also note that majority of the States who have sent comments desire enhancement of subsidy component. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the details of the scheme so as to enable the Committee for comment further in this regard.

4.14 The Committee observe from the information provided by the Department that State Governments are not serious on such a serious issue of water sustainability and water management. On the aforesaid scheme for water harvesting, inspite of the pursuance of the Department, only 8 State Governments have so far responded. Further on the model Bill for protection and conservation of water resources, none of the State Governments have furnished their comments. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have reforms in the land bylaws of the State Governments whereby water harvesting structures in individual buildings may be made compulsory. Since State Governments have to implement various schemes, their cooperation is the prerequisite. The Committee feel that perhaps there is an urgent need to play a more pro-active role by the Union Government. Certain efforts need to be made for motivating the State Governments. These issues further need to be taken at the Cabinet Secretariat level so that more constructive dialogue can be undertaken at various Chief Ministers Conferences

being conducted by the Government. The Department may also deliberate this issue in various conferences and seminars held with the officers of State Governments and suitable action may be taken by the mixed tactics of persuasion and compulsion. The Committee would like the Department to take the desired action in this regard and apprise them accordingly.

4.15 On the issue of water conservation, the Committee note that ARWSP guidelines provide for dual water policy for rural habitations facing acute water problems. The Committee feel that dual water policy should apply to all areas of the country since scarcity of drinking water is the issue concerning all the States/Union territories. It should be ensured that every habitation should use the treated water for drinking and cooking and for other purposes, like washing and ablution, untreated water can be used. The Committee recommend to the Department to think of revising ARWSP guidelines and inform them about the action taken in this regard.

4.16 The Committee find that efforts have not been made so far for treating the used water and then supplying the same for drinking water purposes. Besides another issue which needs urgent attention is the leakage of water where water is being supplied through pipes. The Committee would like the Department to analyse the position in this regard, take the desired action and inform them accordingly.

4.17 The Committee would also like to recommend to the Department to involve more and more NGOs/VOs on the various issues specifically on the issue of enlightening the public about the magnitude of the problem of sustainability and water conservation. The milestones in different directions can be achieved only when the public is made aware of the need to conserve each drop of water. Besides for technology dissemination for various projects specifically for individual water harvesting mechanism, people's participation through NGOs/VOs of having good track records can play an important and crucial role. The Department should take the desired action in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.

Role of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in Rural Drinking Water Sector

4.18 The last year's Budget Speech mentioned that PRIs will be encouraged to plan, implement, own, operate and maintain rural water supply schemes in consultation with the State Governments. Funds were to be devolved on PRIs to implement ARWSP.

4.19 When asked about the present role of PRIs in drinking water and sanitation programme, the Department has replied that Panchayati Raj Institutions can act as implementing agencies for rural drinking water supply and rural sanitation projects. The guidelines provide that the PRIs should also be involved in the implementation of schemes, particularly in selecting the location of stand post, spot sources, operation & maintenance, fixing of cess/water tariff, etc. In tune with the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, Steps have been initiated to institutionalise community participation and full involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions in planning, implementing, owning, operating, managing and maintaining the rural water and sanitation schemes by extending the reform process in the entire country. An MOU is proposed to be signed with State Governments. The MOU outlines in considerable detail the role of State Governments and Panchayati Raj Institutions in the water supply and sanitation sectors. The draft MOU has been circulated to the States. They are in the process of completion of pre-requisite steps connected with the signing of MOU.

4.20 The Committee find that the Department has initiated process for full involvement of Panchayati Raj Institution for handling the various schemes related to drinking water supply and sanitation sectors. The Committee feel that capacity building of the Panchayati Raj Institutions is the major constraint. Association of Panchayats with the various drinking water supply schemes and programmes will not be enough. There is an urgent need that the drinking water and sanitation schemes are implemented fully by the Panchayati Raj Institutions in true spirit of the mandate of the Constitution as enshrined in article 243G. Not only that, outlay for the purpose should also be devolved in the specific accounts of PRIs. The Committee feel that by implementing the schemes through PRIs the community participation to the greatest extent can be ensured. Once the community is motivated and ready to evince interest and feel the ownership of these schemes, all the related issues like maintenance of sources and sustainability will automatically be taken care of. The Committee strongly recommend to the Government to initiate the process in this regard and apprise them accordingly.

Desalination Plants

4.21 For desalination plant in coastal areas, the last Budget proposed implementation of the projects through public private partnership.

4.22 When asked to indicate the desalination plants taken up/ proposed to be taken up in coastal areas, the Department has replied that rural drinking water supply is a State subject. The State Governments are competent to sanction and set up desalination plants as and when required, and they need not approach Central Government for the purpose. The Department has already received a request from Union territory of Lakshadweep regarding setting up of sea water based desalination plant at Kavaratti at an outlay of Rs. 12.70 crore. This proposal is being processed for SFC approval.

4.23 The Committee in their earlier reports have been drawing the attention of the Department to pay more attention to desalination of sea water for drinking purposes. The reply of the Department smacks of the casual approach in this regard. Instead of taking an urgent action, the Department seems to be contented simply by stating that drinking water is a State subject. The Committee fail to understand the mindset of the Department. In spite of the fact that massive investment is being made by the Union Government and the Government's resolve to provide drinking water to each and everybody in rural areas, the Department has chosen to respond to the critical issues simply by stating that water is a State subject. The Committee feel that the problem of drinking water in coastal areas has to be handled in a different way. The desalination of sea water is perhaps the desired option for these areas. The Committee would like the Department to pay more attention towards various related issues, like R&D for having cost effective technology, for desalination plants. Further there is an urgent need to study the experience of desalination plants in other countries.

4.24 The Committee further note that Union territory of Lakshadweep has furnished a request for setting up of sea water based desalination plant at Kavaratti. The proposal is being processed for SFC approval. The Committee would like the early clearance of the said project. The Committee also calls for more serious attempts by the Department on this issue in view of what has been stated above.

CHAPTER V

SCHOOL COVERAGE: DRINKING WATER SCENARIO

As per the 6th Educational Survey, out of 6.37 lakh schools, 3.5 lakh schools were without drinking water supply. 7th All India Educational Survey has been undertaken by the Ministry of Human Resource Department but so far the results related to water and sanitation have not been released by NCERT. Department of Drinking Water Supply has advised the States to conduct the baseline survey under total sanitation survey campaign programme and so far 293 districts have submitted the baseline findings and as per the results 34 per cent of the schools are still without drinking water supply.

5.2 When asked about slippage in case of schools, the Department has clarified that the term slippage relates only to habitations. For schools there could be only two categories, Fully Covered and Not Covered.

5.3 When enquired about the efforts of the Department in this regard, the Committee have been informed that since 2000-2001, 1,59,341 schools have been covered with drinking water supply till December, 2004 under ARWSP and Prime Minister's Independence Day announcement scheme of 2002. Further the Department has informed that a target to provide safe drinking water supply and sanitation facilities in all rural schools of the country by the end of 10th Five Year Plan has been set.

Contribution from MPLAD scheme

5.4 The issue of providing 10 per cent community contribution through MPLAD funds where the schools are covered under Swajaldhara, has been raised by the Committee in their earlier reports. The Committee have been informed that MPLADs funds have been administered by the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation, Government of India. The said Ministry has clarified that MPLAD funds being Government of India funds cannot substitute community contribution.

Data with regard to private/public Government approved schools covered with drinking water supply

5.5 The Department has advised the States to conduct the baseline survey. The exact data for drinking water supply and separate toilet for girls and boys and such a survey for public/private Government approved Schools is not available.

State-wise position of coverage of schools during 2003-2004

5.6 As per the data furnished in the Performance Budget 2005-2006, the over-all coverage of schools is 53.66 per cent. In Bihar, Goa, Kerala, Manipur, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Pondichery, the percentage of coverage indicated is nil. For Haryana, Daman and Diu, Delhi, Lakshadweep, no targets were fixed. In Assam, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Mizoram, Punjab, Dadra and Nagar Haveli the percentage achievement of targets is less than 50 per cent. The worse is the position during 2004-2005. For 12 States/ Union territories, the physical achievement is nil. In 11 States and Union territories the achievement is less than 50 per cent of targets. For 5 States/Union territories which include Tripura in the list of States and Union territories indicated during 2003-2004, no targets were fixed.

5.7 The Committee have repeatedly been drawing the attention of the Department towards the urgent need to provide safe drinking water in rural schools in a stipulated time-frame. In spite of that the work has not been done at the desired level. As per Government's own data, 34 per cent of the Government schools are yet to have facility of drinking water. The ground reality in this regard may be further grim. About private, public and Government aided schools, the data of drinking water availability is yet to be procured. Further alarming is the data with regard to achievement of physical targets by States/Union territories during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. As many as 8 States/Union territories reported nil performance during 2003-2004. Further, for Haryana, Daman and Diu, Delhi and Lakshadweep no targets were fixed. The worse is the position during 2004-2005. Twelve States/Union territories reported nil achievement. The Committee find that the Government have set the targets of coverage of all schools by the end of Tenth Plan. In this scenario it seems difficult to achieve the targets. Another disturbing fact noticed by the Committee is the Department's concept that there is no question of slippage of coverage of schools. The Committee fail to understand as to how the Department can stop the various issues such as the resources being dry, or the system going non-operational which is rampant in case of rural habitations when it comes to the issue of

school coverage. The Committee are constrained to note the thinking of the Department in this regard. Without verifying the ground reality, the Department has chosen to state that the position of slippage of coverage of schools for non coverage is not applicable to schools. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reaction of the Department in this regard.

5.8 On the issue of contributing 10 per cent community contribution from MPLAD funds for the schools covered under Swajaldhara, the Committee fail to understand the logic furnished by the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation that MPLAD funds, which is Government's funding cannot be substitute for community contribution. The Committee strongly feel that schools can not be treated at par with other rural habitations. The schools can not be deprived of drinking water or sanitation in case community is not ready to contribute. If MPLAD funds can not be equated with community contribution, then 100 per cent Central assistance should be provided for coverage of schools in this regard.

5.9 In the aforesaid scenario, the Committee feel that it is really shameful to find that inspite of five and a half decades of planned development, providing drinking water to schools is a distant reality. The Committee while expressing their strong concerns in this regard call for taking the issue on a mission mode. The Committee note that education and drinking water is on top most priority of the Government. Not only that, cess for education is being levied since 2004-2005. Besides recommending for adequate outlay for the purpose, there is an urgent need to have a coordinated approach with all the Union Ministries related with the subject and the State Governments in this regard.

5.10 The Committee also call for a high level intervention in this regard since the country can not wait further on this issue. The Committee would like that their concerns in this regard should be duly communicated to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance and Cabinet Secretariat and all the other concerned Ministries and they be apprised of their reaction in this regard. The Committee would further like to be apprised about the reasons for nil achievement of targets in the aforesaid States. Besides, the Committee would like the Department to explain whether fixing no targets for as many as five States, the details of which have been furnished above, means 100 per cent coverage of schools, in those States. The Committee urge for the clarification in this regard.

CHAPTER VI

RURAL SANITATION

Rural Sanitation Scenario—An overview

The following are the broad features of rural sanitation encompassing the country:

- (i) As per latest estimates coverage of sanitation in rural areas is estimated to be only 31 per cent;
- (ii) As large as 64 per cent of India defecates in open, resulting in 20,000 MT excreta everyday endangering drinking water sources;
- (iii) Only 15 per cent of Primary Schools have toilets.

Requirement of Funds

6.2 The fund requirement for rural sanitation would be order of Rs.676 billion and Rs.503 billion respectively if the goal of achieving 50 per cent of rural sanitation by 2015 and full sanitation by 2025 has to be achieved as set out by 'World Summit for Sustainable Development' held at Johannesburg in 2002 and Millennium Declaration by United Nations.

Funds utilisation during 9th and 10th Plan periods

6.3 The analysis of outlay provided during the 9th Plan and 10th Plan is as under:

9th Plan	Rs. in crore
Outlay	500
Releases	514
10th Plan	
Proposed	3663
Agreed	955
Difference	2708
Releases (as on 3.3.2005)	672.54

BE 2003-2004	165
RE 2003-2004	165
Actual Expenditure 2003-2004	205
BE 2004-2005	400
RE 2004-2005	400
Actual Expenditure (as on 15 March, 2005)	349.52
BE 2005-2006	700

6.4 The following conclusions can be arrived at from the above figures:

- (i) In order to achieve the 50 per cent rural sanitation by 2015 and full sanitation by 2025 flow of funds has to be enhanced many folds;
- (ii) There is more than 100 per cent utilisation of resources during Ninth Plan on rural sanitation;
- (iii) For Tenth Plan, the outlay agreed to by the Planning Commission is around one fourth of the proposed outlay; and
- (iv) There is only 66 per cent release of budgeted outlay during the first three years of the current plan;

6.5 The Finance Minister in his Speech on Budget (2005-2006) has stated that sanitation remains critically deficient. Only about 30 per cent of the rural household have access to safe sanitation facilities.

Responsibility for rural sanitation

6.6 The primary responsibility for providing sanitation facilities in the country rests with States Governments and more specifically, local bodies. As per TSC guidelines the pattern of funding in TSC projects would be in the ratio of 60:30:10 among Central, State and beneficiary. And a Central subsidy per unit is to be restricted to Rs. 12,000 for a unit of cost of Rs. 20,000.

Scheme for Rural Sanitation

6.7 In 1986 the Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) was started with the objective of improving the quality of life of rural

people and to provide privacy and dignity to women. In April, 1999 the programme was restructured and Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) with people oriented and demand driven approach was launched.

6.8 The Department plans to cover all the districts by the end of the Tenth Plan. So by the end of 11th Plan the Department plans to achieve full coverage of rural sanitation facilities.

6.9 In this connection a representative of Drinking Water Supply during the course of evidence informed as under:

“The problem of rural sanitation is a big problem. In rural India out of more than 13 crore of uncovered households, 4 crore households have been provided sanitation facilities under the scheme. The Department is committed that total sanitation campaign is completed in all States by 2010. Our target is for 2015 but we desire that it is completed by 2010 and by 2011 we would be able to bring entire country under Total Sanitation Programme. For this a total fund of Rs. 5,932 crore would be needed. There would be a shortfall of Rs. 4,100 crore. We have prepared a plan to mobilise resources through domestic resources and through World Bank and have submitted the same to Ministry of Finance/ Planning Commission. Both have approved our proposal and forwarded the same to World Bank.”

Financial and physical performance of TSC

Status of TSC (Physical Performance)

(As in March 2005)

Item	Sanctioned	Achieved
BPL Household Toilets	3,94,48,353	94,94,525
School Toilets	4,58,938	1,33,790
Anganwadi Toilets	1,22,344	22,064
Community Complexes	30,203	4,607
RSMs/PCs	3,752	3,429

6.10 TSC is being implemented, in 30 States/Union territories, in total 452 districts. So far Rs. 4,402.24 crore have been approved. The share of Central/States and beneficiaries is as under:

Share	Amount (Rs. in crore)
I. Central	2610.68
II. States	979.45
III. Beneficiaries/Panchayat/PTA	812.12

6.11 The State-wise details of releases and expenditures during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 is at Appendices IV & V

6.12 During 2003-2004 the expenditure in the data given at Appendix- IV is Rs. 205 crore. The State-wise position indicates that Rs. 165.61 crore is the expenditure.

6.13 In the data given at Appendix – V, the expenditure during 2004-2005 has been indicated as Rs. 349.52 crore out of BE of Rs. 400 crore. However the State-wise performance (as on 31 January, 2005) indicate Rs. 288.96 crore were released to the States/Union territories out of that Rs. 170.27 crore is the expenditure.

6.14 The following are State-wise releases and expenditure along with physical achievements under Central Rural Sanitation programme (TSC during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 of major States lagging behind in TSC):

As on 31.1.2005

Sl.No.	Name of States	2003-2004			2004-05		
		Release (Rs. in crore)	Expenditure (Rs. in crore)	Sanitary latrines constructed (in thousands)	Release (Rs. in crore)	Expenditure (Rs. in crore)	Sanitary latrines constructed (in thousands)
1.	Uttar Pradesh	31.20	4.92	148	2.53	4.89	722
2.	Madhya Pradesh	44.25	11.37	133	22.42	19.81	244
3.	Tamil Nadu	27.70	22.54	432	0.74	0.28	562
4.	Jammu & Kashmir	0.76	0.00	0.62	9.64	0.24	2.5
5.	Uttaranchal	0.13	0.03	0.77			28
6.	Manipur	1.03	.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Meghalaya*	2.21	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8.	Mizoram	0.11	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9.	Tripura	8.19	6.98	193	26.76	23.67	83

*TSC projects were sanctioned towards the end of the financial year.

6.15 The Department has stated that a TSC takes four to five years for completion. The Department has stated that total 452 TSC projects were sanctioned as on 31 Jan, 2005.

6.16 The Department has stated that during 2002-2003 to 2004-2005 the total number of TSC projects sanctioned are as under :

Year	TSCs Projects Sanctioned
2002-2003	116
2003-2004	134
2004-2005	54
	302

6.17 When asked for the reasons for under spending the Department has clarified that releases and expenditure could not be compared as the former relates to the Central releases and latter indicates actual booked expenditure after assets are created at the district level.

6.18 About progress of TSC in North Eastern States the Department has stated that the Government is bringing in inter-sectoral co-ordination between concerned Departments like Education, Health & Family Welfare, Social Justice & Empowerment, Tribal Affairs, etc. for improving TSC performance in the districts. Further, regular reviews are being taken up by Secretary (DWS) for ensuring effective TSC implementation. These States of Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram and Daman & Diu are being advised to enhance the TSC performance through proper IEC activities. For the purpose, a Community and Capacity Development Unit (CCDU) could also be established at the State level to take up State-specific IEC activities for TSC and Swajaldhara programmes.

6.19 When asked about the reasons for poor performance by some of States in TSC projects and strategy drawn up to improve State-wise performance, the Ministry has stated that some of non-performing States have been identified and efforts are made to speed up their implementation. States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Gujarat, North Eastern States Himachal Pradesh, Goa and Karnataka are some of the non-performing States.

Awareness Creation

6.20 As replied by the Department the programme gives emphasis on information, education and communication for demand generation for sanitation facilities. However, large number of villages in India lack the infrastructure for dissemination of information and education on sanitation and consequently demand may not be created in such areas. The infrastructure for dissemination of information and education on sanitation has been strengthened which now includes mass media and inter personal inter communication tools which are effectively designed to reach the unreached areas specially through the village level motivator and NGOs and with such support it is expected to covered all the villages which lack clean sanitation facilities. The Department has also developed national and district level communication plan adequately supported through CCDUs, which will enhance the demand of coverage of the sanitation facilities in rural areas. Further, rural sanitation is a State subject and the State Government's need to ensure that all habitations/villages have accessibility to safe sanitation facilities.

Incentives for rural sanitation

6.21 The Ministry has informed that in order to promote rural sanitation incentives have been given to PRIs by giving them Nirmal Gram Puraskars to 38 Gram Panchayats in 6 States and Rs. 1.30 crore were distributed as awards. Besides Nirmal Gram Puraskar, it provides for cash award for individuals/organizations ranging from Rs.10,000 to Rs.30,000 and Rs.20,000 to Rs.50,000 that are driving force for full sanitation.

Coverage of Schools

6.22 One of the objectives of TSC is to cover schools/Anganwadis in rural areas with sanitation facilities and promote hygiene education and sanitation habits among students.

6.23 The Ministry has stated that there has been increase in the allocation of TSC from Rs. 205 crore in 2003-04 to Rs.400 in 2004-05. As per reports available up to 25 March, 2005, 62,721 toilets were constructed in 2003-04 as compared to 45,377 toilets in 2004-05 which shows better achievement.

6.24 It also came out before the Committee the Government has proposed to cover all Anganwadis and schools in the rural areas of

the country with drinking water and sanitation by the year 2005-2006. All States are required to furnish action plans in this regard. On being enquired whether the dead line had earlier been fixed by the Department for the States to furnish the responses on the said action plan the Department in their reply has stated that the dead line was fixed earlier for 29th Feb. 2004, which was further revised till 15th Nov. 2004. The Department has advised States to cover all the schools and Anganwadi with water and sanitation facilities by 2005-06. Accordingly they are advised to submit the State level action plan based on the baseline findings. So far, the Department has received action plans from Arunachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh and Sikkim.

6.25 Asked further about required allocation to achieve the same objective the Department has stated that estimates of funds requirement for water supply and sanitation facilities in Government schools based on the findings of baseline survey of 150 districts, suggest the requirement of Rs. 1,399 crore for sanitation and Rs. 754 for water supply. An additional amount of Rs. 178 crore will be required to provide the sanitary facilities in all the uncovered Anganwadis.

6.26 The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their strongest concern on the issue of sanitation in rural areas in their respective reports. However nothing substantial could be done so far. It is a matter of serious concern that even after more than five decades of planned development in the country, only 31 per cent of the rural households, that too as per the Government own data could be provided latrines, not to speak of the total sanitation. As many as 64 per cent of the rural households defecates in open. As rightly admitted by the Finance Minister sanitation remains critically deficient. Out of Rs. 3,663 crore proposed during Tenth Plan, the Department has got Rs. 955 crore which is around one fourth of the proposed outlay of the Department. The Committee further note that fund required for rural sanitation would be of the order of Rs. 676 billion and Rs. 503 billion respectively if the goal of achieving 50 per cent of rural sanitation by 2015 and full sanitation by 2025 has to be achieved as set by 'World Summit for Sustainable Development' held at Johannesburg in 2002. More so as per Department's own estimates, a total of Rs. 5,932 crore would be required if the target of covering the whole country by Total Sanitation Programme has to be achieved by 2010. The Committee observe that during 2005-2006, the outlay has been increased from Rs. 400 crore as provided during 2004-2005 to Rs. 700 crore. But even the enhanced outlay is not sufficient. There is an urgent need to step up the outlay considerably.

6.27 The Committee further find that the Department has initiated action for mobilising resources through domestic resources and World Bank. The proposal in this regard after the approval of Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission has been forwarded to the World Bank. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the projects to be taken up by the World Bank assistance. Besides the Committee note that there is enough potential to mobilise resources through internal as well as international resources like World Bank. The Committee urge to pay more attention in this regard keeping in view the funds constraint.

6.28 Besides funds constraint, the Committee find that implementation of the sanitation programme is not too impressive. Out of 3,94,48,353 sanctioned BPL toilets, the achievement is 94,94,525. Community complexes position is further worse. Out of 30,203 community complexes sanctioned so far, the achievement is 4,607. The State-wise position also indicates the similar view. There is huge difference between releases and expenditure. Worst is the position in certain North-Eastern States. In 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 in Mizoram, Manipur and Meghalaya the position of expenditure reported as well as toilets constructed is nil. As per Government's own admission States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Gujarat, North-Eastern States, Himachal Pradesh, Goa and Karnataka are some of the non-performing States. In this scenario the Committee find that merely enhancing the outlay will not be sufficient. Since Total Sanitation Campaign is a demand driven programme there is an urgent need for educating the masses about the ill effects of open defecation. The success of the programme can be achieved through public involvement. More needs to be done with regard to the involvement of Panchayats, NGOs/VOs so that public through them can be educated and more projects could be demanded by them. State Governments too need to be motivated in this regard. The Committee feel that the Department has to work on war footing, if the objective of total sanitation is to be achieved within a stipulated time frame.

6.29 The worst and critically deficient status is school sanitation. It is really a matter of shame for the country that whereas 31 per cent of the rural areas are stated to be having sanitary latrines when it comes to schools only 15 per cent of the primary schools could be provided toilets. The Committee in their earlier reports have repeatedly been drawing the attention of the Department in this regard, but it seems nothing substantial could be done so far. The

Committee have no data to substantiate the percentage of dropouts from schools due to the basic facilities of drinking water and sanitation specifically with regard to girls, yet they feel that this may be the major factor of dropouts from schools. The schools should be provided toilets without any further loss of time. The Department has to work on a mission mode. Besides adequate outlay, State Governments should be consulted urgently so that the objective of having separate toilets for boys and girls is achieved within stipulated time frame.

6.30 The Committee further find that having the toilets in schools will be a major factor for awareness creation. Since children are the motivating factors for adults, the inculcation of habits of sanitation will automatically be a forceful factor for awareness in adults in the family. Sanitation is more related to mind set. Once the habit is developed, the society themselves will demand for the facilities and this will put pressure on the implementing authorities to perform better and deliver results. The Committee hold the view that to achieve the objective of school sanitation, there is an urgent need to take coordinated and concerted efforts in consultation with the Ministry of Finance, Planning Commission, State Governments, District Authorities, PRIs, NGOs and all other concerned Ministries/Departments. The Committee strongly feel that since too many Ministries/Departments are involved in the task higher level intervention is needed. The Committee would like that the concerns of the Committee may be brought to the knowledge of Cabinet Secretariat in this regard.

6.31 The Committee conclude that sanitation and drinking water are the inter related issues. It is alarming to note the fact that 64 per cent of India defecates in open resulting in 20,000 MT of excreta everyday. The Committee find that open defecation not only pollutes the environment but also is the major factor for water contamination. Not only that, the use of toilets can be ensured if water is made available. Thus there is an urgent need to have a coordinated approach in this regard. The Committee may further like to add here that with the use of water efficient devices, huge saving of water can be made. The Committee calls for the effective steps by the Department in this regard.

NEW DELHI;
18 April, 2005
28 Chaitra, 1927 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT INDICATING PROPOSED ALLOCATION, B.E., R.E. AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE DURING 9TH TO 10TH PLAN

9th Plan outlay as proposed (ARWSP) Rs. 8563.95 Crore
9th Plan outlay as proposed (CRSP) Rs. 2562.00 Crore

(Rupees in crore)

9th Plan	Rural Water Supply Programme		Rural Sanitation Programme	
Year	Outlay	Release	Outlay	Release
1997-98	1302.00	1299.91	100.00	96.66
1998-99	1612.00	1600.64	67.00	64.90
1999-00	1715.00	1714.41	92.00	92.00
2000-01	1960.00	1896.55	140.00	130.86
2001-02	1974.95	1943.05	150.00	130.05
Total	8563.95	8454.56	549.00	514.47

(Rupees in crores)

10th Plan	Proposed Outlay	Allocation
ARWSP	24800.00	13245.00
CRSP	3663.00	955.00

(Rupees in crore)

10th Plan	Rural Water Supply Programme			Rural Sanitation Programme		
Year	BE	RE	Actual Expenditure	BE	RE	Actual Expenditure
2002-03	2235.00	2110.00	2100.70	165.00	140.00	141.10
2003-04	2585.00	2565.00	2564.90	165.00	205.00	205.00
2004-05	2900.00	2900.00	2609.59	400	400	349.52
(upto 15.3.2005)						
2005-06	4050.00			700.00		

*Original BE was Rs. 2900.00 Crore and Rs. 248.00 Crore additionally provided through Supplementary Grant. However, the RE was kept at the level of original BE i.e. Rs. 2900.00 Crore.

Non-Plan

9th Plan total outlay	Rs. 6.20 Crore
9th Plan actual expenditure	Rs. 5.40 crore
(Rs. in Crores)	

10th Plan	Department of Drinking Water Supply (Secretariat)		
Year	BE	RE	Actual Expenditure
2002-03	1.33	1.38	1.39
2003-04	1.38	1.39	1.38
2004-05 (upto 15.3.2005)	1.39	1.39	1.36
2005-06	1.42		

APPENDIX II

STATUS OF COVERAGE OF HABITATIONS AS ON 1.11.2004
BASED ON CAP, 99 AND COVERAGE REPORTED THERE
AFTER BY STATES/UTs TILL 31.1.2005 UNDER RURAL
WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME (PROVISIONAL)

Sl.No.	State/UT	Status of Habitations as on 1.11.2004			
		NC	PC	FC	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0	0	69732	69732
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	245	656	3397	4298
3.	Assam	301	10691	59563	70555
4.	Bihar	0	0	105340	105340
5.	Chhattisgarh	0	0	50379	560379
6.	Goa	0	7	388	395
7.	Gujarat	0	52	30217	30269
8.	Haryana	0	0	6745	6745
9.	Himachal Pradesh	0	6891	38476	45367
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	678	2640	7866	11184
11.	Jharkhand	0	0	100096	100096
12.	Karnataka	0	5618	51064	56682
13.	Kerala	0	7573	2190	9763
14.	M.P.	0	0	109489	109489
15.	Maharashtra	346	23743	61841	85930
16.	Manipur	0	0	2791	2791
17.	Meghalaya	13	404	8219	8636
18.	Mizoram	0	112	695	807

1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	Nagaland	41	690	794	1525
20.	Orissa	0	0	114099	114099
21.	Punjab	906	1198	11345	13449
22.	Rajasthan	2785	0	91161	93946
23.	Sikkim	0	74	1605	1679
24.	Tamil Nadu	0	0	66631	66631
25.	Tripura	0	0	7412	7412
26.	Uttar Pradesh	0	0	243508	243508
27.	Uttaranchal	34	274	30666	30974
28.	West Bengal	0	0	79036	79036
29.	A&N Islands	0	102	402	504
30.	Dadra Nagar Haveli	19	41	456	516
31.	Daman & Diu	0	0	32	32
32.	Delhi	0	0	219	219
33.	Lakshadweep	0	10	0	10
34.	Pondicherry	0	108	159	267
35.	Chandigarh	0	0	18	18
Total		5368	60884	1356031	1422283
Percentage		0.38	4.28	95.34	100.00
Number of habitations uninhabited/ unpopulated/migrated/urbanised					381
Grand Total					1422664

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

APPENDIX III

RECOMMENDATION PARA 2.60 OF 1ST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE—14TH LOK SABHA

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

- (i) As has been highlighted in the previous chapters, the position of NC habitations is not clear with the Government. Unless the results of the recent survey being undertaken by the various States are analysed, the clear picture with regard to NC and PC habitations would not emerge;
- (ii) During Tenth Plan, Rs. 24,800 crore have already been earmarked under ARWSP, but how the Government would ensure utilisation of resources is not clear;
- (iii) Since Swajaldhara scheme is a demand driven scheme, how the Government would address the problems with regard to accessibility, availability, sustainability and quality etc. especially for the States/Districts which are not up to the mark and could not be motivated to come forward with the projects;
- (iv) In case ARWSP is phased out, how the Government would achieve the objective of full coverage is not clear;
- (v) The position of implementation of Swajaldhara is also not very encouraging. Excepting Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu, none of the States show

competition of even a single project taken up under the scheme;

- (vi) As per Government's reply, there is no problem of community contribution under Swajaldhara. However, Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme and hence, the projects are demanded from areas where people have the mindset to bear the cost of the projects and owe the responsibilities of operation and maintenance. However, since Swajaldhara is applicable to few of the districts and few areas in the country what will be the position of community contribution is not clear;
- (vii) Under ARWSP some inter-sector allocation according to a fixed criteria has been made. However, Swajaldhara does not have any such prescribed weightage;
- (viii) How the Government would take care of the capital intensive complex projects costing to the tune of several lakhs of rupees under Swajaldhara is not clear; and
- (ix) Whether the rural masses have enough resources and are ready to bear the cost of drinking water from a distant source to the village entry point is not clear as per the replies of the Government.

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

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

APPENDIX IV

CENTRAL RURAL SANITATION PROGRAMME (TSC) DURING 2003-04

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	Name of State	Release	Expenditure*
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4660.35	5113.66
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0.00	224.01
3.	Assam	199.31	106.12
4.	Bihar	0.00	234.92
5.	Chhattisgarh	0.00	47.69
6.	Gujarat	0.00	35.65
7.	Haryana	62.06	128.40
8.	Himachal Pradesh	0.00	163.51
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	76.48	0.01
10.	Jharkhand	284.61	430.10
11.	Karnataka	0.00	296.22
12.	Kerala	864.13	888.39
13.	Madhya Pradesh	4425.96	1137.71
14.	Maharashtra	725.05	1460.71
15.	Manipur	103.56	5.00
16.	Meghalaya	221.37	0.00
17.	Mizoram	11.51	0.00
18.	Nagaland	0.00	112.96
19.	Orissa	284.16	999.72

1	2	3	4
20.	Punjab	0.00	25.26
21.	Rajasthan	119.12	220.12
22.	Sikkim	38.37	109.90
23.	Tamil Nadu	2770.53	2254.23
24.	Tripura	819.21	697.73
25.	Uttar Pradesh	3120.44	492.04
26.	Uttaranchal	13.40	3.97
27.	West Bengal	1181.10	1372.61
28.	Daman & Diu	0.00	0.00
29.	Pondicherry	0.00	0.72
30.	HRD	12.50	0.00
31.	IEC	250.00	0.00
Grand Total		20243.22	16561.36

An amount of Rs. 256.67 lakh has been spent for Water Supply Programme in NE States under ARWSP under Major Head 2552 i.e. total funds released of Rs. 202.43 crore + Rs. 2.57 crore = Rs. 205.00 crore.

*The expenditure figure relates to actual expenditure in the filed by District Implementation Agency.

APPENDIX V

CENTRAL RURAL SANITATION PROGRAMME (CRSP) TSC STATE-WISE RELEASE POSITION UNDER TSC DURING THE YEAR 2004-2005 (AS ON 31.1.2005)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl.No.	Name of State	Release	Expenditure (upto 31.1.2005)
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	3070.26	3478.82
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0.00	21.92
3.	Assam	90.00	131.81
4.	Bihar	120.00	404.97
5.	Chhattisgarh	1100.17	99.40
6.	Goa	134.67	0.00
7.	Gujarat	3625.19	74.22
8.	Haryana	811.13	224.35
9.	Himachal Pradesh	50.00	20.88
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	964.73	24.37
11.	Jharkhand	160.00	240.49
12.	Karnataka	461.99	15.68
13.	Kerala	728.00	473.90
14.	Madhya Pradesh	2242.97	1981.19
15.	Maharashtra	3493.05	664.87
16.	Manipur	0.00	0.00
17.	Mizoram	0.00	0.00
18.	Nagaland	50.00	5.12

1	2	3	4
19.	Orissa	10.00	5.42
20.	Punjab	3083.36	912.40
21.	Rajasthan	699.94	10.62
22.	Sikkim	562.84	322.80
23.	Tamil Nadu	74.07	28.47
24.	Tripura	2676.86	2367.73
25.	Uttar Pradesh	253.66	489.23
26.	Uttaranchal	2606.34	3706.04
27.	West Bengal	503.23	33.38
28.	Dadar & Nagar Haveli	1232.73	1283.18
29.	Daman & Diu	0.00	1.67
30.	Pondicherry	47.42	4.79
31.	HRD	35.20	0.00
32.	IEC	3.12	0.00
33.	M&E	5.40	0.00
Grand Total		28896.33	17027.72

APPENDIX VI

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 4TH APRIL, 2005

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1300 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Mohan Jena
5. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
6. Shri Hanan Mollah
7. Shri Dawa Narbula
8. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
9. Shri K.C. Palanisamy
10. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
11. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
12. Shri S. Sudhakar Reddy
13. Shri Mohan Singh
14. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

Rajya Sabha

15. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
16. Shri Penumalli Madhu
17. Shri Kalraj Mishra
18. Dr. Faguni Ram
19. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Secretary*
2. Shri V.K. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

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

1. Shri J. Harinarayan, Secretary
2. Shri V. Subramanian, AS & FA
3. Shri Rakesh Behari, Joint Secretary
4. Shri Md. Aslam, Joint Secretary (IFD)
5. Shri Kumar Alok, Director (CRSP)

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 (2005-2006).

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

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

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2005-2006). The Secretary, Drinking Water Supply, briefly explained to the Committee the overall position with regard to the allocation and expenditure of the Department during 9th Plan (1997-2002) period as well as the projections of the Department during the 10th Plan (2002-2007). He also dealt with various issues and enumerated the problems being faced with regard to the implementation of various schemes of the Department. The Committee then discussed in detail the various issues related to the examination of the Demands for Grants (2005-06) of the Department with special emphasis on the issue of providing safe drinking water and proper sanitation in rural areas. The representatives of the Department clarified the queries of the members and were asked

to send written replies thereto which could not be answered during the sitting.

[The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 1500 hrs. to take up the evidence of representatives of Ministry of Panchayati Raj on Demands for Grants (2005-2006).]

A record of verbatim proceedings was kept.

APPENDIX VII

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEVENTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 18 APRIL, 2005

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1645 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Mohan Jena
4. Shri Srichand Kriplani
5. Shri Dawa Narbula
6. Shri K.C. Palanisamy
7. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
8. Shri Mohan Singh
9. Shri Sita Ram Singh

Rajya Sabha

10. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
11. Shri Penumalli Madhu
12. Shri Kalraj Mishra
13. Dr. Chandan Mitra
14. Dr. Faguni Ram
15. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri V.K. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri A.K. Shah — *Under Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Chairman, welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) and adopted the draft Report with slight modifications.

3. ***

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

The Committee then adjourned.

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

APPENDIX VIII

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS		
Sl. No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.15	<p>The Committee note from the data furnished by the Department that during Tenth Plan, the allocation made for drinking water is Rs. 13,245 crore against the proposed outlay of the Department amounting to Rs. 24,800 crore. The Department has later projected outlay of Rs. 26,000 crore. Thus almost half of what was proposed for Tenth Plan has been made available for the Department. Further during the first four years of Tenth Plan upto 2005-2006, Rs. 7275.19 crore could be allocated. Thus Rs. 5,969.81 crore is the balance amount. Besides, the Committee find that to achieve the target envisaged in the National Common Minimum Programme of the Government the requirement of outlay for the next five years has been assessed as Rs. 31,950 crore. As regards the releases from the Department, the data indicate 100 per cent achievement. State-wise allocation and spending position has been reviewed in the subsequent part of the report.</p> <p>The Committee find from the information provided by the Department that the gap between the projected outlay and the existing allocation is to be filled through enhanced budgetary and extra budgetary</p>

1	2	3
		<p>support. For the said purpose three projects in Kerala, Karnataka and Maharashtra with World Bank loan component of US \$ 398.10 million were taken up. Out of these two projects have been completed. Further three more projects in the said States are being taken up with World Bank assistance. Another method suggested is taking up the projects on private-public partnership. The Department has proposed to analyse the private-public partnership in five States namely Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka and West Bengal.</p> <p>In the aforesaid scenario the Committee conclude that resource constraint is the major challenge for achieving the laudable targets set by the Government. Even the proposed extra budgetary support is not to the required level. The Committee note that drinking water is the fundamental need for the survival of life in the world. As such, it needs top most priority. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Central allocation for drinking water should further be augmented. There cannot be any compromise on the issue of drinking water. The Government should provide the requisite outlay to achieve the set objective; (ii) There is enough scope for getting loans from the World Bank and other international institutions/ organisations etc. Efforts should be made in this regard and more projects in the remaining States should be taken up; and

1	2	3
		(iii) The proposal for private-public partnership should be analysed expeditiously and the Committee be apprised of the outcome of such analysis in the aforesaid five States.
2.	2.30	The Committee for the last three years have been emphasizing the need to have the exact data of slippage of habitations. They note that in this direction a State-wise habitation survey was initiated and in 26 States the results have been made available. However there were some discrepancies in the data and the results are being revalidated by Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The Committee would like to be apprised of the final position with regard to slippage of habitations, after the revalidation is completed.
3.	2.31	The Committee are constrained to note the handling of 'Not Covered' and 'Partially Covered' habitations by the Department. Although the Department admits that slippage of habitations is at a larger level and for that the Working Group for Tenth Plan has estimated 2.8 lakh slipped back habitations. The picture of slipped back habitations will be more clear when the final results of the aforesaid survey are made available. With the said state of affairs, the Department has continued to claim that the position of coverage of habitations in the country is 95 per cent. Not only that, States of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Daman and Diu and Delhi are stated to be the States/ Union territories which have achieved 100

1	2	3
		<p>per cent coverage. The Committee disapprove the way a very bright picture as opposed to the ground position with regard to the availability of drinking water in the country is projected by the Department. The Committee strongly recommend that announcements regarding achievements of the Department should be realistic and accurately presented in various Budget documents presented to the Parliament as well as submitted to the Parliamentary Committees.</p>
4.	2.32	<p>The Committee are disturbed to find that the position of actual coverage of habitations reflects a sharp decline as compared to previous year. Equally disturbing is the fact that same routine reply stating that Not Covered (NC) habitations are in the difficult terrain is furnished by the Department every year. The Committee fail to understand the said reply of the Department in this age of technological advancement. They would like the Department to inform the Committee about the technology options explored to provide such difficult areas with drinking water. It should be ensured that the said difficult areas are covered within a stipulated time frame.</p>
5.	2.33	<p>The Committee further find that there is utter confusion with regard to the data indicated regarding coverage of habitations. Two Budget Speeches of Finance Minister made during 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 reflect this position. The Finance Minister during 2004-2005 indicated the number of to be covered habitations as 75,000 and during 2005-2006 this data has been stated</p>

1	2	3
		<p>to be as 74,000 indicating achievement of only 1,000 habitations. The Department's data reflect the achievement of 35,591 habitations during 2004-2005. Even the Secretary has acknowledged the discrepancy in the data. The Committee find from the aforesaid position that perhaps there is a race for chasing data irrespective of the ground reality in this regard. The Committee are really disappointed to note such a situation and strongly recommend that the data presented by the Department should be realistic.</p>
6.	2.34	<p>On the issue of periodical updation of data of slipped back habitations, the Committee note that the Department propose revalidation on a quarterly basis. The Committee find that revalidation is a detailed exercise and as such revalidation should be done on yearly basis. On the issue of the reservation of State Governments that they have no infrastructure in this regard, the Committee would like the Department to sort out the matter in consultation with the State Governments and the viable option of appointing some agency for the purpose and also for allocating outlay from the allocation of ARWSP should be explored. The details in this regard when finalised should be placed before the Committee for further review and comments.</p>
7.	2.43	<p>The Committee after analysing the position of the performance of States, note that whereas from the side of the Union Government. The spending is ensured almost 100 per cent as could be seen from the earlier part of the report, the State-wise</p>

1	2	3
		<p>performance is not so encouraging. Only 66.03 per cent of the total available funds could be utilised during 2003-2004, whereas during 2004-2005, 38.47 per cent is the utilisation position. The Committee note that the data during 2004-2005 may further increase with more States indicating physical achievement, but with the level of the achievement noted during 2003-2004, the performance is not so favourable.</p> <p>Another disappointing fact is the lower absorption capacity of State Governments as indicated by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence. The Committee are really confused with the paradox of demanding more outlay without ensuring the absorption capacity of the State Governments. As noted earlier by the Committee, on the issue of drinking water, there is no scope for compromise. In this situation the Department has to work on war footing. The issue of increasing the absorption capacity of State Governments and better performance on the drinking water sector should be taken up at the highest level so that a dialogue on this aspect could be held at various Chief Ministers conferences/seminars. Further on the Department's part, the issue should be debated in various workshops/seminars arranged where the officials of the State Governments represent so that the situation could be analysed State-wise and corrective action initiated thereon. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action initiated in this regard.</p>
8.	2.44	<p>The Committee note that during 2004-2005, the unspent balances were to the tune of</p>

1	2	3
		<p>Rs.39,834.37 lakh against the said data of Rs.40,068.96 lakh during the previous year. It is significant to note that there is only improvement of Rs.234.59 lakh as compared to previous year. The Committee find that when the issue for huge unspent balances, was brought to the knowledge of the Department, instead of taking the desired action the Department has tried to justify the position by stating that unspent balances during 2004-2005 are lesser than 2003-2004. The Committee disapprove the aforesaid tendency on the part of the Department and feel that urgent and desired action should be taken in case of underspending of scarce resources.</p>
9.	2.45	<p>The Committee are further constrained to note that while in some States physical achievement is less than 50 per cent, some States could achieve the inflated targets as high as upto 2,320 per cent in Orissa and 1,300 per cent in Goa. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Department that these States fix the targets on a very low scale whereas these States could cover much more habitations. The Committee find that there is gross mismatch between physical and financial achievements. Besides such a data reflect that there is some sort of confusion in reporting the data by the State Governments. The Committee strongly recommend the Department to have a critical and indepth analysis of the mechanism of reporting by State Governments and explain the position to the Committee so as to enable them to understand State specific performance in a better way and comment further in this regard.</p>

1	2	3
10.	2.49	<p>The Committee find that different funding patterns have been adopted under the various components of ARWSP. Under ARWSP (Normal) 50:50 is the Central and State Government contribution, but in case of DDP, 100 per cent is the Central allocation. For quality and sustainability for which 15 per cent and 5 per cent of allocation respectively under ARWSP can be utilised, the Centre, State ratio is 75:25. For Swajaldhara for which 20 per cent of the outlay under ARWSP is earmarked, 90 per cent is the Central contribution and 10 per cent is the community contribution. While appreciating the fact that for quality and sustainability, States are being provided more Central funds, the Committee note that monitoring of such a complex inter-State allocation criterion is a difficult task. The Committee would like the Department to explain how the monitoring is being done so as to ensure that the specified State contribution and specified inter-scheme allocation is ensured for the specific purpose, to enable the Committee to come to some meaningful conclusion and comment further in this regard.</p>
11.	2.50	<p>The Committee also note the water tight compartments for allocating resources for various components of ARWSP. For example for sustainability 5 per cent outlay is earmarked and for quality 15 per cent allocation can be used. 20 per cent of funds are earmarked for Swajaldhara. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to simplify the inter component allocation of ARWSP. The Department may examine the issue and apprise the Committee accordingly.</p>

1	2	3
12.	2.51	The Committee further note that under normal ARWSP, States are unable to contribute equal amount of what is allocated by the Central Government in a year. In this regard the Committee desire that the total outlay provided by the Union Government as well as State Governments so far may be furnished so as to enable the Committee to analyse the position of matching share by State Governments in a better way and comment further in this regard.
13.	2.53	The Committee appreciate that special allocation as indicated in the aforesaid para has been made for Tsunami affected States viz. Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Pondicherry and Kerala. The Committee call for strict monitoring so as to ensure that the allocation earmarked for Tsunami affected areas is utilised for the intended objective i.e. restoration of water supply to such areas.
14.	2.63	The Committee understand that at present 20 per cent of annual allocation under ARWSP can be spent on demand driven Swajaldhara for which 10 per cent of the outlay has to be contributed by the community. They also note that as per the existing position there is no flexibility of allocation of more than 20 per cent of outlay if more projects are demanded by State Governments. So far as the issue of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara is concerned, the Committee find that the Department has already initiated the necessary plans and changes to facilitate phased extension of reform proposals to ARWSP from the beginning of the Eleventh Plan.

1	2	3
		<p>The Committee would like to add here that since Swajaldhara is a demand driven scheme, the better performing States would only be able to take the benefit of the scheme. Thus the less performing States would be deprived of the Central allocation.</p>
15.	2.64	<p>The Committee note that the performance of Swajaldhara is not very encouraging. The number of projects taken under Swajaldhara which was 4,723 during 2002-2003 has further declined to 3,791 during 2003-2004. During 2004-2005, the position is further worse. Only 2,074 schemes could be taken up. The number of completed schemes has also declined. During 2002-2003, 1,102 schemes were completed. The number increased to 1,145 during 2003-2004 but declined considerably during 2004-2005 to only 6 schemes. To understand more about the implementation of the scheme, the Committee would like to be apprised of the cumulative data of number of projects taken up so far, habitations/population benefited, expenditure incurred, projects completed etc.</p>
16.	2.65	<p>The Committee in their earlier report (para no. 2.60 of 1st Report-14th Lok Sabha) had examined the concept of replacing ARWSP by Swajaldhara and expressed serious concerns in this regard. The concerns expressed by the Committee have been given at Appendix-III. The Committee strongly recommend to review the position in this regard in the light of what has been stated above and the apprehensions expressed by the Committee. The Committee may be adequately explained about the position to enable them to</p>

1	2	3
		analyse the not so encouraging performance of ARWSP as evaluated above.
17.	2.66	The Committee note that recently Swajaldhara guidelines have been amended to reduce proportion of cash contribution from 5 per cent to 2.5 per cent in case of Scheduled Tribe/Scheduled Caste habitations. The remaining 7.5 per cent contribution can be in kind (labour, material etc). The Committee would like that the possibility of extending the facility of said relaxed norms should be explored in case of most backward districts in the country.
18.	3.12	The Committee find from the data furnished by the Department that so far 2,16,794 habitations have been affected by various contaminants like fluoride, arsenic, salinity, iron, nitrate etc. The worst affected States having drinking water quality problems in rural areas are West Bengal, Bihar, Rajasthan, Orissa, Karnataka, Gujarat, Assam, Tripura, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Andhra Pradesh. The Committee further find that as per the existing position, 15 per cent of ARWSP funds can be utilised for taking care of quality problem. While analysing the Demands for Grants of previous year (refer Para 2.90 of 1st Report-14th Lok Sabha), the Committee were informed that the Department has proposed to enhance the earmarked outlay for water quality from 15 per cent to 30 per cent. The Committee further note that as per the estimates prepared by the Department, additional fund of Rs.13,000 crore is required to tackle the problem of quality habitations in various States. The

1	2	3
		<p>Committee conclude that the funds constraint is the major factor which needs to be tackled urgently. On the proposal of the Department to enhance and earmark funds of up to 15 per cent to 30 per cent for quality under ARWSP funds, the Committee would like to hear from the Department about the exact position in this regard. The Committee further note that the Finance Minister while presenting the Budget 2005-06 emphasised on the issue of quality of drinking water in the affected habitations. The Committee hope that adequate outlay would be provided for in this regard and they be apprised accordingly.</p>
19.	3.13	<p>The Committee further note that State Governments are not serious in tackling the issue of quality of drinking water which is evident from the fact that 1st phase of survey as initiated in 1999 which require stratified random sampling of 10 per cent of sources in blocks has not been completed so far by all States. With regard to 2nd phase involving coverage of 100 per cent survey of blocks, only a few States could complete the survey. Similar is the position with regard to action plans by the State Governments. Only Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan and West Bengal have furnished the proposals in this regard. The Committee feel that in this scenario, Union Government have to play a more pro active role in this regard. The State Governments will have to be motivated to address the problem of quality habitations on a priority basis. The Department should take the desired steps in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.</p>

1	2	3
20.	3.14	<p>The Committee find that in order to address the water quality problems, it is essential to identify the exact problems besides ascertaining the magnitude of the problem. The Committee feel that if the water quality is tested correctly it will go a long way in dealing with the problem of contamination of drinking water. The Committee appreciate the position of the Government to institutionalise community based water quality monitoring and surveillance programme by adoption of catchment area project wherein quality will be tested at the grass roots level by the Panchayats/VWSC. The Committee also note that some efforts are being made to provide district level testing laboratories for which Rs. 425.95 lakh have been released by the Department. The Committee would like to know the physical performance of the funds released in this regard so far. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the funding pattern for water quality testing laboratories at the Panchayats/VWSC level.</p>
21.	4.10	<p>The Committee find from what has been stated above that the sustainability of system itself is dependent of sustainability of sources. Another noticeable issue is that 90 per cent of all drinking water is dependent on ground water sources. The ground water is depleting fast which may be the main reason for slippage of FC and PC habitations to NC habitations the details of which have been given in the previous chapter of the Report. In this scenario, the Committee conclude that the major challenge that the Department may have to face in the coming years is the sustainability of sources.</p>

1	2	3
22.	4.11	<p>The Committee further note that although the Department accepts the magnitude of the problem relating to sustainability of water sources, substantial efforts have not been made in this regard. Only 5 per cent of the funds under ARWSP could be used for water sustainability. The issue of water tight compartments for different components under ARWSP has been dealt with in the previous part of the report. Here the Committee would like to recommend to the Government to give more thrust on sustainability and the allocation for the purpose should be enhanced. There is an urgent need to enhance the allocation for sustainability since the issue of slippage of habitations can only be tackled by handling this issue. The Department would be able to achieve the objective of full coverage of habitations only when the problems of sustainability is properly handled. The Committee would like the Department to take earnest action in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.</p>
23.	4.12	<p>The Committee further find that efforts are being made in different directions by several Ministries of the Union Government like the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources and Drinking Water Supply), Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Agriculture etc. Similarly the problem is being tackled by the State Governments under their own schemes. There is an urgent need to coordinate the efforts being made on the issue of sustainability as well as water conservation. There should be some sort of coordinating mechanism through which</p>

1	2	3
		<p>efforts made in the separate directions can be coordinated so that the issue may be tackled more effectively. More so, there is also an urgent need to coordinate the schemes being implemented by the State Governments at the field level. All these coordinating mechanisms would not only help in coordinating the efforts made in different directions, but would also help in having a clear idea of the magnitude of the problem which may be the basic input for the future planning. The Committee would like the Department to duly communicated to the Ministry of Finance/ Planning Commission and Ministry of Water Resources the nodal Ministry for water conservation, the concerns of the Committee in this regard. Besides, this issue needs to be appropriately raised during various interactions, conferences, seminars etc. The Committee may also be kept apprised about the outcome of such interactions.</p>
24.	4.13	<p>The Committee further note that around 90 per cent of drinking water is dependant on ground water and there is an urgent need to discourage water schemes dependent on ground water. More stress needs to be given on the use of surface water and to water harvesting. The Committee find that the Department has proposed a bankable scheme for extending financial assistance for household and community level rain water harvesting structures. The said scheme has been formulated in consultation with NABARD and circulated to the State Governments for the purpose. The Committee also note that majority of the States who have sent</p>

1	2	3
		<p>comments desire enhancement of subsidy component. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the details of the scheme so as to enable the Committee for comment further in this regard.</p>
25.	4.14	<p>The Committee observe from the information provided by the Department that State Governments are not serious on such a serious issue of water sustainability and water management. On the aforesaid scheme for water harvesting, inspite of the pursuance of the Department, only 8 State Governments have so far responded. Further on the model Bill for protection and conservation of water resources, none of the State Governments have furnished their comments. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have reforms in the land bylaws of the State Governments whereby water harvesting structures in individual buildings may be made compulsory. Since State Governments have to implement various schemes, their cooperation is the prerequisite. The Committee feel that perhaps there is an urgent need to play a more pro-active role by the Union Government. Certain efforts need to be made for motivating the State Governments. These issues further need to be taken at the Cabinet Secretariat level so that more constructive dialogue can be undertaken at various Chief Ministers Conferences being conducted by the Government. The Department may also deliberate this issue in various conferences and seminars held with the officers of State Governments and suitable action may be taken by the mixed tactics of persuasion and compulsion. The Committee would like</p>

1	2	3
		the Department to take the desired action in this regard and apprise them accordingly.
26.	4.15	On the issue of water conservation, the Committee note that ARWSP guidelines provide for dual water policy for rural habitations facing acute water problems. The Committee feel that dual water policy should apply to all areas of the country since scarcity of drinking water is the issue concerning all the States/Union territories. It should be ensured that every habitation should use the treated water for drinking and cooking and for other purposes, like washing and ablution, untreated water can be used. The Committee recommend to the Department to think of revising ARWSP guidelines and inform them about the action taken in this regard.
27.	4.16	The Committee find that efforts have not been made so far for treating the used water and then supplying the same for drinking water purposes. Besides another issue which needs urgent attention is the leakage of water where water is being supplied through pipes. The Committee would like the Department to analyse the position in this regard, take the desired action and inform them accordingly.
28.	4.17	The Committee would also like to recommend to the Department to involve more and more NGOs/VOs on the various issues specifically on the issue of enlightening the public about the magnitude of the problem of sustainability and water conservation. The milestones in different directions can be achieved only when the public is made aware of the need

1	2	3
		<p>to conserve each drop of water. Besides for technology dissemination for various projects specifically for individual water harvesting mechanism, people's participation through NGOs/VOs of having good track records can play an important and crucial role. The Department should take the desired action in this regard and inform the Committee accordingly.</p>
29.	4.20	<p>The Committee find that the Department has initiated process for full involvement of Panchayati Raj Institution for handling the various schemes related to drinking water supply and sanitation sectors. The Committee feel that capacity building of the Panchayati Raj Institutions is the major constraint. Association of Panchayats with the various drinking water supply schemes and programmes will not be enough. There is an urgent need that the drinking water and sanitation schemes are implemented fully by the Panchayati Raj Institutions in true spirit of the mandate of the Constitution as enshrined in article 243G. Not only that, outlay for the purpose should also be devolved in the specific accounts of PRIs. The Committee feel that by implementing the schemes through PRIs the community participation to the greatest extent can be ensured. Once the community is motivated and ready to evince interest and feel the ownership of these schemes, all the related issues like maintenance of sources and sustainability will automatically be taken care of. The Committee strongly recommend to the Government to initiate the process in this regard and apprise them accordingly.</p>

1	2	3
30.	4.23	<p>The Committee in their earlier reports have been drawing the attention of the Department to pay more attention to desalination of sea water for drinking purposes. The reply of the Department smacks of the casual approach in this regard. Instead of taking an urgent action, the Department seems to be contended simply by stating that drinking water is a State subject. The Committee fail to understand the mindset of the Department. In spite of the fact that massive investment is being made by the Union Government and the Government's resolve to provide drinking water to each and everybody in rural areas, the Department has chosen to respond to the critical issues simply by stating that water is a State subject. The Committee feel that the problem of drinking water in coastal areas has to be handled in a different way. The desalination of sea water is perhaps the desired option for these areas. The Committee would like the Department to pay more attention towards various related issues, like R&D for having cost effective technology, for desalination plants. Further there is an urgent need to study the experience of desalination plants in other countries.</p>
31.	4.24	<p>The Committee further note that Union territory of Lakshadweep has furnished a request for setting up of sea water based desalination plant at Kavaratti. The proposal is being processed for SFC approval. The Committee would like the early clearance of the said project. The Committee also calls for more serious attempts by the Department on this issue in view of what has been stated above.</p>

1	2	3
32.	5.7	<p>The Committee have repeatedly been drawing the attention of the Department towards the urgent need to provide safe drinking water in rural schools in a stipulated time-frame. In spite of that the work has not been done at the desired level. As per Government's own data, 34 per cent of the Government schools are yet to have facility of drinking water. The ground reality in this regard may be further grim. About private, public and Government aided schools, the data of drinking water availability is yet to be procured. Further alarming is the data with regard to achievement of physical targets by States/Union territories during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. As many as 8 States/ Union territories reported nil performance during 2003-2004. Further, for Haryana, Daman and Diu, Delhi and Lakshadweep no targets were fixed. The worse is the position during 2004-2005. Twelve States/ Union territories reported nil achievement. The Committee find that the Government have set the targets of coverage of all schools by the end of Tenth Plan. In this scenario it seems difficult to achieve the targets. Another disturbing fact noticed by the Committee is the Department's concept that there is no question of slippage of coverage of schools. The Committee fail to understand as to how the Department can stop the various issues such as the resources being dry, or the system going non-operational which is rampant in case of rural habitations when it comes to the issue of school coverage. The Committee are constrained to note the thinking of the Department in this regard. Without verifying the ground reality, the Department</p>

1	2	3
		has chosen to state that the position of slippage of coverage of schools for non coverage is not applicable to schools. The Committee would like to be apprised of the reaction of the Department in this regard.
33.	5.8	On the issue of contributing 10 per cent community contribution from MPLAD funds for the schools covered under Swajaldhara, the Committee fail to understand the logic furnished by the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation that MPLAD funds, which is Government's funding cannot be substitute for community contribution. The Committee strongly feel that schools can not be treated at par with other rural habitations. The schools cannot be deprived of drinking water or sanitation in case community is not ready to contribute. If MPLAD funds can not be equated with community contribution, then 100 per cent Central assistance should be provided for coverage of schools in this regard.
34.	5.9	In the aforesaid scenario, the Committee feel that it is really shameful to find that inspite of five and a half decades of planned development, providing drinking water to schools is a distant reality. The Committee while expressing their strong concerns in this regard call for taking the issue on a mission mode. The Committee note that education and drinking water is on top most priority of the Government. Not only that, cess for education is being levied since 2004-2005. Besides recommending for adequate outlay for the purpose, there is an urgent need to have a

1	2	3
		coordinated approach with all the Union Ministries related with the subject and the State Governments in this regard.
35.	5.10	<p>The Committee also call for a high level intervention in this regard since the country can not wait further on this issue. The Committee would like that their concerns in this regard should be duly communicated to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance and Cabinet Secretariat and all the other concerned Ministries and they be apprised of their reaction in this regard. The Committee would further like to be apprised about the reasons for nil achievement of targets in the aforesaid States. Besides, the Committee would like the Department to explain whether fixing no targets for as many as five States, the details of which have been furnished above, means 100 per cent coverage of schools, in those States. The Committee urge for the clarification in this regard.</p>
36.	6.26	<p>The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their strongest concern on the issue of sanitation in rural areas in their respective reports. However nothing substantial could be done so far. It is a matter of serious concern that even after more than five decades of planned development in the country, only 31 per cent of the rural households, that too as per the Government own data could be provided latrines, not to speak of the total sanitation. As many as 64 per cent of the rural households defecates in open. As rightly admitted by the Finance Minister sanitation remains critically deficient. Out</p>

1	2	3
		<p>of Rs. 3,663 crore proposed during Tenth Plan, the Department has got Rs. 955 crore which is around one fourth of the proposed outlay of the Department. The Committee further note that fund required for rural sanitation would be of the order of Rs. 676 billion and Rs. 503 billion respectively if the goal of achieving 50 per cent of rural sanitation by 2015 and full sanitation by 2025 has to be achieved as set by 'World Summit for Sustainable Development' held at Johannesburg in 2002. More so as per Department's own estimates, a total of Rs. 5,932 crore would be required if the target of covering the whole country by Total Sanitation Programme has to be achieved by 2010. The Committee observe that during 2005-2006, the outlay has been increased from Rs. 400 crore as provided during 2004-2005 to Rs. 700 crore. But even the enhanced outlay is not sufficient. There is an urgent need to step up the outlay considerably.</p>
37.	6.27	<p>The Committee further find that the Department has initiated action for mobilising resources through domestic resources and World Bank. The proposal in this regard after the approval of Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission has been forwarded to the World Bank. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the projects to be taken up by the World Bank assistance. Besides the Committee note that there is enough potential to mobilise resources through internal as well as international resources like World Bank. The Committee urge to pay more attention in this regard keeping in view the funds constraint.</p>

1	2	3
38.	6.28	<p>Besides funds constraint, the Committee find that implementation of the sanitation programme is not too impressive. Out of 3,94,48,353 sanctioned BPL toilets, the achievement is 94,94,525. Community complexes position is further worse. Out of 30,203 community complexes sanctioned so far, the achievement is 4,607. The State-wise position also indicates the similar view. There is huge difference between releases and expenditure. Worst is the position in certain North-Eastern States. In 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 in Mizoram, Manipur and Meghalaya the position of expenditure reported as well as toilets constructed is nil. As per Government's own admission States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Gujarat, North-Eastern States, Himachal Pradesh, Goa and Karnataka are some of the non-performing States. In this scenario the Committee find that merely enhancing the outlay will not be sufficient. Since Total Sanitation Campaign is a demand driven programme there is an urgent need for educating the masses about the ill effects of open defecation. The success of the programme can be achieved through public involvement. More needs to be done with regard to the involvement of Panchayats, NGOs/VOs so that public through them can be educated and more projects could be demanded by them. State Governments too need to be motivated in this regard. The Committee feel that the Department has to work on war footing, if the objective of total sanitation is to be achieved within a stipulated time frame.</p>

1	2	3
39.	6.29	<p>The worst and critically deficient status is school sanitation. It is really a matter of shame for the country that whereas 31 per cent of the rural areas are stated to be having sanitary latrines when it comes to schools only 15 per cent of the primary schools could be provided toilets. The Committee in their earlier reports have repeatedly been drawing the attention of the Department in this regard, but it seems nothing substantial could be done so far. The Committee have no data to substantiate the percentage of drop outs from schools due to the basic facilities of drinking water and sanitation specifically with regard to girls, yet they feel that this may be the major factor of dropouts from schools. The schools should be provided toilets without any further loss of time. The Department has to work on a mission mode. Besides adequate outlay, State Governments should be consulted urgently so that the objective of having separate toilets for boys and girls is achieved within stipulated time frame.</p>
40.	6.30	<p>The Committee further find that having the toilets in schools will be a major factor for awareness creation. Since children are the motivating factors for adults, the inculcation of habits of sanitation will automatically be a forceful factor for awareness in adults in the family. Sanitation is more related to mind set. Once the habit is developed, the society themselves will demand for the facilities and this will put pressure on the implementing authorities to perform better and deliver results. The Committee hold the view that to achieve the objective of school sanitation, there is an urgent need to take</p>

1	2	3
		<p>coordinated and concerted efforts in consultation with the Ministry of Finance, Planning Commission, State Governments, District Authorities, PRIs, NGOs and all other concerned Ministries/Departments. The Committee strongly feel that since too many Ministries/Departments are involved in the task higher level intervention is needed. The Committee would like that the concerns of the Committee may be brought to the knowledge of Cabinet Secretariat in this regard.</p>
41.	6.31	<p>The Committee conclude that sanitation and drinking water are the inter related issues. It is alarming to note the fact that 64 per cent of India defecates in open resulting in 20,000 MT of excreta everyday. The Committee find that open defecation not only pollutes the environment but also is the major factor for water contamination. Not only that, the use of toilets can be ensured if water is made available. Thus there is an urgent need to have a coordinated approach in this regard. The Committee may further like to add here that with the use of water efficient devices, huge saving of water can be made. The Committee calls for the effective steps by the Department in this regard.</p>